

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 18 AUGUST 1910

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 18 AUGUST, 1910.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (W. D. Armstrong, Esq., *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

NUMBERS AND WAGES OF ABORIGINALS IN GULF DISTRICT.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. The number of aboriginals registered in the districts of Normanton, Burketown, and Camooweal?
2. The name of each station which has aboriginals registered?
3. The number of aboriginals registered by each station?
4. The average wage paid to each aboriginal?
5. What is the amount of money held in trust by the Protector in each of these districts for the aboriginals?
6. For what purpose is this money available?
7. How much of this money has been spent by the Protector during the last five years?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

As the answering of the questions of the hon. member involves the collection of a large amount of information, I would ask the hon. member to be good enough to move for a return.

Mr. NEVITT: I give notice accordingly.

CHINCHILLA RECREATION RESERVE.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

1. On whose recommendation did he cut up the Chinchilla Recreation Reserve?
2. Did not the public and trustees protest against the cutting up?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

1. On the recommendation of the land commissioner and in view of the proclamation of a larger reserve, which will be available for show-ground and recreation purposes.
2. Yes.

"MOURILYAN" PONTOON DREDGE.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Treasurer—

Who is responsible for the locally-constructed pontoon dredge "Mourilyan," built for the work of dredging the entrance to Mourilyan Harbour, leaving for the North without being fitted with steering gear?

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

The officers of the Harbours and Rivers Department. The dredge is a pontoon, without powers of self-propulsion, and it is unusual to steer vessels of this type when being towed.

GRAVES OF FALLEN SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. WALKER (*Wide Bay*) asked the Premier—

Referring to question asked by the member for Lockyer on 8th December, 1909, relative to the graves of fallen soldiers in South Africa, will he inform the House as to what action has been taken?

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—

The sum of £500 is available for the purpose.

BROADMOUNT TO ROCKHAMPTON RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. What are the ordinary classification or schedule rates for general cargo goods over the 27 miles of railway from Broadmount to Rockhampton?

2. What will be the ordinary classification or schedule rates for general cargo goods, as per agreement with the shipping companies, over the 37 miles of railway from Port Alma to Rockhampton?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

1. The ordinary classification rates for 27 miles are (Broadmount to Stanley street)—

M.	A.	B.	1.	2.	3.
2s. 8d.	4s. 8d.	7s. 3d.	12s. 1d.	16s. 7d.	22s. 6d.

2. The ordinary classification rates for 37 miles are (Port Alma to Stanley street)—

M.	A.	B.	1.	2.	3.
3s. 6d.	5s. 11d.	9s. 9d.	16s. 3d.	22s. 5d.	30s. 10d.

GOLDEN GATE CONSOLS DISPUTE.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*) asked the Secretary for Mines, without notice—

Has the Minister any objection to lay on the table of the House all the papers in the possession of the Mines Department in connection with the dispute between the Golden Gate Consols tributaries and the liquidators of the No 1 Gold Mines, Croydon?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

I have no objection.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, WICKHAM TERRACE, BILL.

SECOND READING.

On this Order of the Day being read, Mr. MACARTNEY (*Brisbane North*) moved that it be postponed until Thursday, 1st September.

Question put and passed.

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The PREMIER moved—

That the remaining items of general business on the paper for this day be postponed until after the consideration of Government business.

Question put and passed.

NEW SESSIONAL ORDERS.

TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES.

The PREMIER: I have to move the resolutions that I gave notice of yesterday to give effect to the progress report of the Standing Orders Committee. Hon. members will see that this motion really involves three new Standing Orders. It is proposed to alter the Standing Orders in regard to three different matters—"Time Limit of Speeches," "Days Limited for Supply," and specifying a particular edition of "May's Parliamentary Practice" that may be referred to. By the leave of the House, and for the convenience of hon. members, I think it would be better if I only moved the first Standing Order, dealing with the "Time Limit of Speeches," and then, when hon. members have settled that, I will move the next motion relating to "Days Limited for Supply," and then, when that resolution is carried, I will move the other motion.

Mr. HAMILTON: Why not deal with the different matters in Committee, with the Chairman in the chair, and take each item seriatim?

The PREMIER: This is the proper time to deal with the matter, and if hon. members have any objection I will move the resolution all at once, but I think it would be much better to move each section singly, and, assuming I have the leave of House, I will proceed in that manner.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that these resolutions be taken separately?

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*): I would suggest, having regard to the importance of this matter, and for the convenience of hon. members, that a general discussion take place on the general principle of the motion, and go into details afterwards. I think that would be much more convenient to hon. members.

The PREMIER: If we divide the motion into three sections, we will only be dealing with one subject at a time.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I would not like to anticipate anything that might be said by the leader of the Opposition, but I would like to point out that, by carrying out the idea of the hon. gentleman, it might stultify us if we want to send any suggestions back to the Standing Orders Committee. We might wish to refer the matter back to that committee.

The PREMIER: We can do that now if we wish to do so.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): This is the first time during the ten or eleven years that I have been in the House that the Standing Orders have come up for revision, and it appears to me that the best way to settle a position of this kind would be to deal with the resolution limiting the time of speeches as one specific resolution—deal with the principle like a second reading, and then take it into Committee, if it would be permissible under the Standing Orders, and discuss each item seriatim. Of course the House governs its own procedure and makes its own Standing Orders. If we discuss the principle on the motion for the time limit of speeches, for a definite time, and later on deal seriatim with the various clauses in Committee, or in some way to be determined by the will of the House, any amendments that may be thought necessary may be then adopted, and time saved. I merely throw out the suggestion

Mr. Lesina.]

after what has been said by the hon. member for Ipswich, because I believe it would save time.

* Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): I would like the Premier to tell us on whose recommendation this has been brought down. Was the Standing Orders Committee unanimous?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

The PREMIER: If you allow me to move the motion I will tell you.

Mr. MANN: I think the Deputy Speaker invited discussion as to whether we would take it seriatim or otherwise, and, before agreeing to take it seriatim or otherwise, I want some information, inasmuch as I would like to know if the Standing Orders Committee were unanimous in urging that the House should adopt these Sessional Orders?

Mr. LESINA: They were unanimous in recommending them.

Mr. MANN: I understand the hon. member was not present at all when this was drafted.

Mr. LESINA: Then you understand too much.

Mr. MANN: I understand from what the leader of the Opposition said last night that the Standing Orders Committee had not finally dealt with it, and while I do not trouble a great deal how you take it, because I am sure the Premier will gag them through, for the reason that he wishes them passed before the Bible in State Schools Bill—they were brought in for the very purpose of guillotining the Bible in State Schools Bill, because every member in this House must admit that with one exception there has not been a single lengthy speech made this session.

Mr. D. HUNTER interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: I am glad you called him to order, because he is always interjecting. I would ask the Premier whether the whole of the Standing Orders Committee has agreed to these resolutions, who are the members of the Standing Orders Committee who drafted this motion, and were all of them present, and if he will give us a promise that if it is passed to-day he will not apply it to the Bible in State Schools Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

For the information of the House I make this statement: The Standing Orders Committee meet under the chairmanship of the Deputy Speaker. Their interim report is presented to the House by the leader of the House, whoever he may happen to be for the time being. That practice has been followed in the past, and has been followed on the present occasion. In regard to any discussion on the new Standing Orders, if hon. members will take them separately, they will be able to discuss each recommendation as it is moved, and may refuse to accept it, or they may refer the resolution back to the Standing Orders Committee, or take any other course which is acceptable to the House. I therefore put the question: Is it the pleasure of the House that these recommendations be taken separately?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no! Yes!

Mr. MANN: I beg to move that it be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: Do I understand I must move the three sections together?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

[*Mr. Lesina.*

The PREMIER: I have only suggested moving each separately for the convenience of hon. members in discussing it. Hon. members can see that it is just as easy for me to move them all at once, but I think it is better to move them separately, so that hon. members can more intelligently deal with them. I beg to move that this be adopted as a Sessional Order—

TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES.

No member shall speak for more than half an hour at a time in any debate in the House except in the debate on the Address in Reply, or on a direct motion of want of confidence, when a member shall be at liberty to speak for one hour.

Provided that this rule shall not apply to a member moving the second reading of a Bill.

Provided further that with the consent of the House (to be determined without debate) a member may be further heard for a period not exceeding thirty minutes.

In Committee of the House, except as hereinafter provided, no member, other than the member in charge of a Bill, or Minister in charge of an estimate, shall speak for more than three times on any one question, nor more than ten minutes on the first occasion, and five minutes on the second and third occasions.

This does not apply to a Minister delivering the Financial Statement, or to any member debating the same. Members debating the Financial Statement may speak for one hour, but not more than once. A reply, however, is allowed to the Minister who has delivered such Statement. Such reply not to exceed half an hour.

Now, that is a recommendation made to the House unanimously—

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

Mr. GRANT: Yes.

The PREMIER: By the Standing Orders Committee. It is not made to the House without having been fully discussed by the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. HAMILTON: How many meetings were held of the Standing Orders Committee?

The PREMIER: And a number of the details of it settled by a vote. There were differences of opinion on certain details, but when the details were finally settled as hon. members see them printed here, the committee were unanimous in recommending the House to adopt them.

Mr. HARDACRE: Not at all; I said I was violently opposed to it.

Mr. ALLEN: They apparently did not count you.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows quite well that this question of whether the proposed Standing Orders should be recommended to the House was carried in Committee, and there was no division, there was no dissent.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The PREMIER: That is so.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The PREMIER: Will the hon. member be quiet.

Mr. LESINA: Why didn't you get your dissent recorded?

The PREMIER: Hon. members are quite at liberty to believe the hon. member for Leichhardt.

Mr. HARDACRE: I should be surprised if anybody believes you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I do not submit this proposed Standing Order for the favourable consideration of the House only because the com-

mittee appointed to consider the matter recommended it; I recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House because of the fairness of it in itself. (Opposition laughter.) Some hon. members may think it is unfair to limit debate in any way at all, but hon. members on both sides of the House know that this is not only a matter which concerns the Government. Members on both sides of the House surely wish to facilitate the doing in an ordinary way, and without continual resort to the "guillotine" motion, the business of the country, the business which we are paid to get through in fairly reasonable time.

Mr. COYNE: But this does not do away with the "guillotine."

The PREMIER: And it is more than that. Members on both sides of the House know quite well that one of the evils of our present lack of limit to speeches is that some hon. members monopolise the time of the House, and other members—whose opinions have just as much right to be heard—have to keep their seats.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hon. members on the other side of the Chamber know that that is true about themselves.

Mr. MANN: Your side know it is true, too.

The PREMIER: Although it is true to a much larger extent that members on this side of the House, who, perhaps, feel more strongly the responsibility of getting the business through—

Mr. MURPHY: Because they see your business in your caucus.

The PREMIER: And have to keep their seats often when they would like to speak because other hon. members monopolise the time of the House.

Mr. MURPHY: It takes two "Whips" to get your party here at all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: In modern times the fullness of newspaper reports, and the greater extent to which these reports are read by their constituents, tempt members to speak more, perhaps, than was the case in former days, and the need of some time limit for speeches has been recognised in many Parliaments before this one. Even in that example to all democratic communities—the Parliament of New Zealand—they have a time limit for speeches—

Mr. COYNE: Not half so drastic as these proposals.

The PREMIER: Of which this is practically a copy. (Opposition "No, no!" and laughter.) There are some details which I will point out in this by which I think it will be shown that these Standing Orders are an improvement, even on the New Zealand Standing Orders.

Mr. BOWMAN: More drastic.

Mr. MURPHY: You could not deal straight with the Standing Orders Committee; you had to dodge them.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: In New Zealand it has been found better to limit speeches than to use the "gag," and I remember that I spoke on the other side of the House on one occasion when the Labour party, to which I then belonged, was very eloquently declaiming against some

proposed alteration of the Standing Orders. I remember on that occasion how we pleaded for the New Zealand method—

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS conversing in loud tones,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would ask hon. members on the back benches on the Government side to preserve order. (Opposition "Hear, hears!") There is a loud conversation going on, and I must ask them to desist. (Renewed Opposition "Hear, hears!")

The PREMIER: I remember how eloquently on that occasion we appealed to have the New Zealand method adopted of a time limit for speeches, and if I am able to read aright the premonitory signs of the other side, when they are going to get the opportunity of adopting the New Zealand method with a time limit for speeches, they are just going to oppose it as strongly as they would if it had been a proposal to introduce the "gag."

Mr. MURPHY: There is no time limit to Ministers.

The PREMIER: I will refer to the details of the proposed Sessional Order. It suggests that on ordinary occasions a member should not speak more than half an hour.

Mr. RYLAND: What is an "ordinary occasion?"

Mr. MURPHY: When you are talking. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: For instance, when the hon. member, Mr. Ryland, is speaking on the question of the abolition of the Parliamentary Refreshment-room—(laughter)—that will be an ordinary occasion. But the time is extended to one hour on the Address in Reply, and to one hour on a direct want of confidence motion, provided that the rule limiting the time of speeches does not apply to a member of the Government on the second reading of a Bill.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is not once in a session.

The PREMIER: When it may be desirable in the interests of hon. members that the member introducing the Bill should have the fullest opportunity of explaining it to hon. members.

Mr. MURPHY: It confines the leader of the Opposition to half an hour.

The PREMIER: It is provided further that a member may, with the consent of the House, have another half hour granted. It may well happen that a member who is particularly well acquainted with some particular subject may be discussing it, and other members of the House may well desire to hear him finish his argument and explain

[4 p.m.] the matter at length, and there will be little difficulty, I fancy, in such a case of the member getting an extension of time allowed. But, speaking generally, I fancy that half an hour is quite long enough. With seventy members to speak, it means that on every second-reading speech thirty-five hours may be occupied; and when the time is given as one hour, as on the Address in Reply, and an hour on a want of confidence motion, I fancy that this Standing Order certainly does not err on the side of too great stringency. It is a matter which will affect all sides of the House equally—the Government side as well as the Opposition.

Hon. W. Kidston.]

There is no difference in that. I understand that the chief objection to this Standing Order is to the time allowed in Committee.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is provided that in Committee a member shall not speak more than three times on any one question, or more than ten minutes, and five minutes, and five minutes, on the three occasions respectively.

Mr. HAMILTON: Is that the New Zealand limit?

The PREMIER: No. They are allowed to speak four times in Committee in New Zealand.

Mr. COYNE: And ten minutes each time.

The PREMIER: Yes, that is so. I submit that this is a better rule than that in operation in New Zealand.

Mr. COYNE: It is, for you.

The PREMIER: It will be more effective. Of late years there has been too much tendency to make long second-reading speeches in Committee, when members only weary the House to death, and do no good at all only waste time. That is not Committee work at all. The Committee should not deal with the principle of a Bill, but only the details of the clauses. Now, on the details of every clause a member can speak three times. On every little amendment that you can propose to every clause a member can speak three times. In that way a week of parliamentary time may be taken up by members speaking on every little amendment that they move on every line of every clause of a Bill. Each member will have the right to speak for twenty minutes on every amendment, and if all members exercise their right in that matter that means twenty-three and one-third hours, which means three whole parliamentary days, an ordinary parliamentary week, on every little amendment which you like to move.

Mr. MURPHY: Do you propose to do away with the "gag"?

The PREMIER: Hon. members will see, I think, how exceedingly difficult it is to make a time limit for speeches which will really prevent obstruction, and yet leave members with some reasonable liberty in discussing questions that come before us. I submit that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will admit that, on the whole, this is a fair attempt to combine the conflicting principles of free speech and reasonable facility for getting through business.

Mr. COYNE: Will the adoption of this provide for the abolition of the "gag" in the Standing Orders?

Mr. MURPHY: No.

The PREMIER: That will depend. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: He gagged his colleagues last session on the Port Alma Railway.

The PREMIER: It will depend whether the Standing Orders Committee at a later stage of their labours recommend the abolition of the "gag," and whether, even if they do recommend it, this House will adopt that recommendation. Hon. members know that the Standing Orders Committee are going over the whole of the Standing Orders, and they will make recommendations from time to time as they go along.

Mr. MURPHY: Are you in favour of the abolition of the "gag."

The PREMIER: Not for the hon. member for Croydon.

[Hon. W. Kidston.

Mr. MURPHY: You will gag anybody. You gagged your colleagues last session.

The PREMIER: It will depend on this House itself whether the "gag" is abolished or not. I might just point out that the most effective way, and the readiest way, to get the "gag" abolished is to get into a method of carrying on our business in this House without undue waste of time, and give to every member a reasonable opportunity for expressing his opinions on every question that comes before the House.

Mr. MURPHY: So that Parliament can be called together in November and finish in December.

Mr. MULLAN: If you want to keep the House in a good temper, this is not the right way to go about it.

The PREMIER: If members had not exceeded reasonable limits in discussing matters brought before the House, there would never have been any "gag" at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: You were as bad yourself.

The PREMIER: I am just as bad as other members.

Mr. MURPHY: Worse.

The PREMIER: I have been worse on these matters than most members, but that does not affect my duty—(Opposition laughter)—to try to get the Standing Orders of the House made so as to reasonably facilitate the discussion of matters and also so as to give all members of the House a somewhat fair share of the opportunity of being able to express their opinions.

Mr. MANN: Why don't you let them speak on your own side?

Mr. MURPHY: He can't. He has got them hobbled.

The PREMIER: So far as I can see, the objections to this are based on the fact that some hon. members think it is going to interfere with the right they now have to speak at unlimited length on every occasion they so desire.

Mr. COYNE: You don't call five minutes unlimited?

The PREMIER: Whether it is to the satisfaction of their own party or their own constituents. While they are members of this House at the present time they have that right, and they can abuse that right, and many members have abused that right. Alike in the interests of members of this House, and with the view of adopting a reasonably fair method of facilitating the despatch of business, I move that this be a Sessional Order.

Mr. BOWMAN: In moving his motion for the limitation of speeches, the Premier told us that it was a progress report from the members of the Standing Orders Committee. Now, I might assure members of this House that I have no objection at all to a time limit to speeches, but I think there should be a fair thing. I do not think the Standing Orders Committee have given us as fair a limit as we could expect. The hon. gentleman considered that half an hour was long enough for a member to speak on a question except when speaking on the Address in Reply or on a direct want of confidence motion, when any member might speak for one hour. I think half an hour is altogether too short.

Mr. GRANT: But another half-hour may be allowed on a motion being made to that effect.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is just as well not to have to depend upon the permission of the other side of the House. It depends very largely upon the temper of the House at the time whether a member will be allowed to continue his speech or not. I have seen occasions when an application for such extension of time would have had very little chance of being acceded to, and we would have been told that we had had long enough.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That was so when you were on this side.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is one reason why a fair time limit for speeches should be definitely laid down. The Premier stated that some years ago, when he was a member of the Labour party, there was a clamour on this side to follow the example of New Zealand.

The PREMIER: I did not say there was a clamour on that side. I said we made an earnest appeal.

Mr. BOWMAN: Well, I will say "an earnest appeal." I remember the hon. gentleman being just as anxious as most of the members who then constituted the Labour party to copy the example of New Zealand. But I find that this proposed rule is even more drastic than that in force in New Zealand. I suppose New Zealand is the one country that has a time limit for speeches. Certainly there is no other State in the Commonwealth that has such a limit.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is the model State.

Mr. BOWMAN: Well, it is a model that we might emulate with advantage in many respects regarding legislation; and I am glad that the Premier has thought it advisable to emulate them on more than one occasion, and I hope some of the good legislation they have passed in New Zealand will yet be emulated by him or else by somebody else. If we had three-quarters of an hour substituted for half an hour, I think it would be a fair thing, and, in addition to the Address in Reply and want of confidence motions, it should also apply to the second reading of Bills, the same as it does in New Zealand. Hon. members might be allowed to speak on any one of those three occasions for one and a-half hours. I think that would be a fair thing.

The PREMIER: Where would the limit come in?

Mr. BOWMAN: Well, the time occupied would be very much limited as compared with the length of some speeches which the hon. gentleman has had the pleasure of listening to in this Chamber. He has listened to some speeches of four, five, and six hours. The hon. member for Clermont on one occasion made a much longer speech. Of course, those were really stonewalling speeches; but I think every member on this side is just as anxious as the hon. gentleman that there should be no unduly long speeches, always provided that we have a fair time for criticising Bills and other questions that come before the House.

Mr. COYNE: He does not want fair criticism. He does not want any criticism.

Mr. BOWMAN: I hope that I shall be able to show that it is reasonable on the part of the Opposition and hon. members generally to ask for a fair time for discussion, without

limiting us to the extent now proposed by the Standing Orders Committee. The second paragraph reads—

Provided that this rule shall not apply to a member moving the second reading of a Bill.

That seems to give Ministers an advantage over other members.

The PREMIER: Oh, no!

Mr. BOWMAN: I claim that that will give a Minister introducing a Bill practically unlimited time. Now, it is only fair that whoever replies to a Minister should be afforded equal time. It does not matter who may be the leader of the Opposition or who may reply from this side to a Minister. If it takes a Minister one and a-half hours or two hours to propose the second reading of an important Bill, then whoever replies to him from this side should be given the same time. Take, for argument's sake, an important measure like the proposed consolidation of the Land Acts. That will be a very large measure, and it will probably take the Secretary for Lands one and a-half or two hours to move the second reading. It is a matter of indifference to me whether I, as leader of the Opposition, or some member who may be deputed to do so by this side, replies to the hon. gentleman. There are very few members who have a better knowledge of the land laws of the State than the hon. member for Leichhardt, who for years past has taken a very keen interest in debates on the subject. Now, to limit the hon. member to half an hour on such a Bill, even with the proviso that he may be allowed another half-hour, would be to narrow the limits of debate altogether too much.

Mr. COYNE: And that is dependent upon the will of the Government, and they might refuse to grant it.

Mr. BOWMAN: I think it will be admitted by the Premier that whenever amending Land Bills have been before us, it has been of advantage to the Secretary for Lands for the time being that both the hon. member for Leichhardt and the hon. member for Gregory—who have specialised on land legislation—have been able to give the House the benefit of their knowledge. The proposal with regard to speaking in Committee is even less agreeable than that portion of the rule which deals with speeches delivered in the House. In Committee, we are to be allowed to speak three times on a question—for ten minutes the first time, and for five minutes on the second and third occasions. Now, nobody knows better than the leader of the Government that there are Bills in which practically the whole debate in Committee is centred in one clause.

The PREMIER: And, without amendment, we can discuss it for three days under this rule.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is not simply a question of moving amendments, as the hon. gentleman suggested. We do not desire to move amendments unless they are going to improve the Bill under discussion. I remember when we were dealing with the Wages Boards Bill, in 1907 and 1908, the chief argument in Committee centred on the one question of whether we should include farm labourers within the scope of the Bill. The Premier and his then Secretary for Works, the Hon. T. O'Sullivan, were striving to get the Bill through, and the opposition from the then Opposition and the principal speeches that

Mr. Bowman.]

were made by members of the Government and Labour parties were all directed to that particular clause. We may be similarly circumstanced on some other Bill, and it would be unfair to limit us to five minutes. It may be an important amendment, which would have beneficial results if fully discussed; but a man cannot say very much in five minutes.

The PREMIER: Twenty minutes.

Mr. BOWMAN: I know there are twenty minutes in all; but, seeing that the hon. gentleman went to New Zealand, I think he might give us as liberal provisions as exist there.

Mr. MURPHY: He went to New Zealand to inquire into State insurance.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He insured himself, anyhow.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is my intention to move certain amendments in the hope that we may be able to get a little more latitude than is proposed in the report of the Standing Orders Committee. The fifth paragraph of the 1st clause reads—

This does not apply to a Minister delivering the Financial Statement, or to any member debating the same. Members debating the Financial Statement may speak for one hour, but not more than once. A reply, however, is allowed to the Minister who has delivered such Statement. Such reply not to exceed half an hour.

I do not think half an hour is a fair thing for a Minister. The Treasurer read his Budget speech yesterday, and there was no opportunity to discuss it. If an hour is good enough for an ordinary member to make his speech on the Financial Statement, it is surely good enough to allow the Minister in charge an hour and a-half in reply.

The PREMIER: In such a case every other Minister may speak for an hour, and the Minister in charge may also speak in reply.

Mr. BOWMAN: No doubt Ministers have greater advantages than other members, because they will be able to get an extension of time for speaking. I think there is no great hurry to pass this motion to-day; and it would be a fair thing to discuss these matters and refer them back to the Standing Orders Committee with certain amendments, as suggested by myself and by other hon. members. If the hon. gentleman does not accept that suggestion, I shall be compelled to move several amendments.

The PREMIER: They have already considered the matter, and it is now for the House to decide.

Mr. BOWMAN: Then the only thing we can do is to test the feeling of the House.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear! Test it on every line.

Mr. BOWMAN: I will move as an amendment, on line 1, that the word "half" be deleted, with the view of substituting "three-quarters of"; but before doing so I would like to ask a question: In the event of amendments being moved and not carried, can we refer the whole of the proposed Sessional Orders back to the Standing Orders Committee as a definite motion?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The whole thing is in the hands of hon. members to accept, reject, or amend.

Mr. BOWMAN: In order that I may not lose my right, I will withdraw the amendment I gave notice of and move the omission

[*Mr. Bowman.*]

of the words, "made Sessional Orders for this session," with a view of inserting "referred back to the Standing Orders Committee for further consideration."

The PREMIER: This is the old matter of the referendum over again.

Mr. MURPHY: The Standing Orders Committee never had a meeting for four years till this session.

The PREMIER: This House appoints a committee to consider certain matters. The members of that committee go into those matters and consider the various points very fully, give and take with one another, and make an unanimous recommendation to this House. And this House, before going into the discussion of the matter, says, "Your recommendation does not please us, and we [4.30 p.m.] refer it back to you for reconsideration." If the Standing Orders Committee reconsider the matter, will this House promise that they will then accept the recommendations of the committee?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No!

The PREMIER: Then, what is the good of referring the matter back to them? It is the question of the referendum over again—"You have not voted as we wanted you to do; we will send the question back to you, and, if you vote as we want, we will accept your verdict."

Mr. MURPHY: How many meetings did the committee have?

Mr. NEVITT: Two.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Croydon must remember that the question now before the House is the adoption or otherwise of the Standing Order recommended by the Standing Orders Committee, and that if he wants any information regarding the meetings of that committee the Clerk is at perfect liberty to supply that information.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not know that.

The PREMIER: If the proposal were to remit this matter to the Standing Orders Committee again on the understanding that we agreed to abide by their decision without discussion when the Standing Order came back from that committee, I would have no hesitation in accepting the amendment. But this is merely obstruction.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no! That is not fair.

The PREMIER: The Standing Orders Committee have already very fully considered this matter without any party bias. I think that will be admitted. The members of the committee did not manifest any party bias. Whatever may be done here, the matter was not made a party question in the committee.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: There is no desire to make it so this afternoon.

The PREMIER: I did not see any sign of partisanship in the committee. They were not all of the same opinion when they sat down at the table, and they discussed the matter, and changed their opinions after discussion. I myself varied my opinion with regard to some matters, and we ultimately arrived at what seemed to be a fair compromise, and made our recommendation. Now, it is proposed that this House, before discussing the matter or giving any reasons for their action, should refer it back to the committee.

What will be the result? Supposing that the Standing Orders Committee adhere to this recommendation, and submit it to the House again, will the House refer it back to the committee again? I appeal to the good sense of hon. members, and ask them what good is likely to result from such a course?

Mr. MURPHY: No good at all that I can see.

The PREMIER: I quite agree with the hon. member. I think it is the manifest duty of hon. members to express their opinions on this Standing Order. If they do not agree with any of the details, they should move amendments and endeavour to get the Standing Order framed in accordance with their wishes. Let the House decide on each detail, and then adopt the thing. It is the House's Standing Order. The function of the committee is simply to make suggestions for the guidance of the House. It does not give the Standing Orders to the House. This House ought to make Standing Orders for itself, and having got suggestions from the Standing Orders Committee—very fair suggestions, I think—however members may differ about some details, members should consider those suggestions and deal with them. To refer those suggestions back to the Standing Orders Committee would simply be a waste of time.

Mr. CORSEY: And a vote of censure on the committee.

The PREMIER: It is just a way of shuffling with the matter. Surely members are competent to say whether they are pleased with the rules recommended. Surely the leader of the Opposition is quite competent to say whether they please him or not, and whether he wishes three-quarters of an hour instead of half an hour. It is within the province of any hon. member to do that. If the matter were to be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee, I am quite sure that when the committee met I would immediately move that it be referred back to the House. The committee have already given very careful consideration to these Standing Orders.

Mr. MULLAN: They might change their minds on the matter being referred back to them.

The PREMIER: Suppose we carried the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, whatever ground would the members of the Standing Orders Committee have for changing their minds? What ground has been given for their changing their minds?

Mr. MURPHY: No ground at all yet.

The PREMIER: I could understand the leader of the Opposition or any other member trying to amend these Standing Orders in a number of different ways, and a discussion taking place on their proposed amendments, and then, if they were not satisfied with the general result, asking the House to refer the matter back to the Standing Orders Committee; but I cannot understand the present proposal. Our duty is to consider the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee, and, if we do not think they suit our circumstances, to amend them in accordance with the wishes of the members of the House, and then adopt them. It would be a foolish thing, not to say a disrespectful thing, to refer the Standing Orders back to the committee without giving them any consideration.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is not with any disrespect that I propose to send them back.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): The Premier, who is usually logical in his speeches,

has not equalled himself in that respect on this occasion. I never heard a more illogical and helpless speech than the hon. gentleman has just made. He says it is the referendum over again, meaning the referendum on Bible reading in State schools. If there were any argument in his statement, it would not apply in this instance, because the referendum is from an inferior body to a superior body, and in this case the proposed reference is from a superior body to an inferior body.

Mr. MURPHY: How can you tell whether these rules are satisfactory to the House until you get a vote?

Mr. HARDACRE: I shall come to that in a moment. We often recommit Bills for further consideration. When a Bill reaches the report stage, if the House is not satisfied with it, the Bill is sent back to the Committee for reconsideration. That is all we propose to do in this matter—to say that an inferior body which has been appointed to do something shall do it to the satisfaction of the House. What light has been given in this debate to the Standing Orders Committee for their guidance? At present no light has been given at all, except in the speech of the leader of the Opposition. So far as he has been able, he has given some light, and when other hon. members have spoken on this question, no doubt more light will be given; and it is for that very purpose that this amendment has been moved. It is this amendment to refer it back to the Standing Orders Committee which gives hon. members an opportunity of affording the Standing Orders Committee the light which they want to guide them.

Mr. MURPHY: We have not discussed it yet.

Mr. HARDACRE: This very amendment gives us the opportunity of discussing it. The leader of the Government has moved one particular section of the recommendation only, and now the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition opens up the whole matter for consideration, and not merely the section which has been submitted to us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would like the hon. member to understand that the motion before the House only allows of the discussion of one particular recommendation—the time limit of speeches.

Mr. HARDACRE: Of course, I have to accept your ruling, Sir; but I would like to point out I am not dealing with the motion—I am dealing with the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, which comes prior to the motion moved by the leader of the Government. The leader of the Government has moved that these be Sessional Orders—that is, the whole of them—to which we say, "No; they shall first of all be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee." I say now that we have an opportunity of discussing them, and when we have discussed them we will be able to show where, in some points, they are unsatisfactory to the House, and for the guidance of the committee—

Mr. MURPHY: I could understand your amendment coming at the conclusion of the discussion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member for Leichhardt kindly address the Chair? I have not been able to catch a word he has said during the last few minutes, because he has been turning to the cross benches on the Opposition side.

Mr. Hardacre.]

Mr. HARDACRE: If, at the end of the discussion—after the various hon. members have spoken—we could move an amendment of this kind, it would be much better. I quite admit that.

The TREASURER: What is to prevent the member speaking last moving that amendment? We would have all the discussion necessary then.

Mr. FORSYTH: The last speaker of all could move the amendment.

Mr. HARDACRE: If it was possible, I would much prefer that an amendment of this kind should be moved at the end of the discussion. I quite agree that it would be much better, but that is not possible.

The TREASURER: What is to prevent it?

Mr. HARDACRE: It was with the idea in my mind that it was not possible to move the amendment at the end of the discussion that this amendment was moved, in order to give a better chance of discussion on the general question now.

Mr. FORSYTH: You have that chance now.

Mr. HARDACRE: We have that chance, but not as good a chance. I quite admit that. The proposal now is that the resolution be a Sessional Order for this session, but the amendment refers to the whole recommendations. However, as I understand that at the end of the discussion some such amendment may be moved, and that the whole question can be discussed, I will say no more.

Mr. BOWMAN: With the permission of the House I will withdraw the amendment, as I have no wish to block discussion, and I will leave it to some other hon. member, if he so desires, to move it after the debate has been fully gone into on this first motion.

Amendment withdrawn accordingly.

Mr. LESINA: I suggested originally that we should have a discussion on the basic principle of this proposition—that is, the time limit of speeches. I think the House is generally agreed to the advisableness of adopting a time limit for speeches. (Opposition laughter.) It may appear rather belated on my part; but there is joy in heaven over the first sinner who repents, and for he who repents at the eleventh hour, of course, there is greater rejoicing. As a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I say I was entirely in accord with the other members that the time had arrived for the limitation of speeches.

Mr. HARDACRE: That was unanimous.

Mr. LESINA: That section in the New Zealand Standing Orders has worked very well, although it has not stopped long debates and long sittings. They had a very long sitting only a couple of months ago—it lasted a couple of days, even under their drastic Standing Orders. I do not think it will curtail debate in any way, otherwise I would not agree to it. I think, having made this interim report, which the Premier has submitted to the House for discussion, it is entirely for the House to adopt such amendments as they think fit. I propose to move an amendment myself—on line 6 I propose to add certain words. I entirely agree with the contention raised by the leader of the Opposition. This is a very important matter, and if it had been raised when the committee were dealing with the matter I would certainly have supported it then, but it missed attention. I propose to add to the clause, which reads: "Provided this rule shall not

[*Mr. Hardacre.*

apply to a member moving the second reading of a Bill," the following words, "or to the leader or acting leader of the Opposition."

Mr. BOWMAN: Do you move that now? That will prevent discussion.

Mr. LESINA: I am simply indicating that I intend to move that amendment at the proper time. I think it will meet the objection which the leader of the Opposition has made, and also the wishes of the House generally. There is no desire in this Chamber to limit the opportunities of criticising a Bill now enjoyed by the leader of the Opposition, who holds a very responsible position, and if the deputy leader takes up the responsibilities, he should have a larger share of time in replying to the Minister than falls to the lot of the ordinary member. I simply indicate that I will move that amendment at a later stage, if I have not forfeited my right.

Mr. FORSYTH: You have forfeited your right.

Mr. LESINA: If I have forfeited my right, I ask some other hon. member to take it up at the proper time, as I do not desire to stand in the way of any hon. members. Generally speaking, I think the proposition is a good one. There may be room for amendment in detail. The members of the Standing Orders Committee are simply servants of the House, as the Speaker is a servant of the House when occupying the chair at our sittings, and the Clerk of the House, who is the servant of the House, is present to take minutes, and note whatever is done for the information of members here. If we bring along a report, and the Premier takes the responsibility of advising the House to adopt it, it is open to every member—apart altogether from party considerations—to suggest such amendments as he may think necessary. I think the House will be well advised in adopting the basic principles of this resolution, and amendments of any details which may require amendment are ones which the House may very well deal with without referring it back to the Standing Orders Committee. Generally speaking, I do not think that ought to be done; I do not think it would do any good. We have done the work we were asked to do, and the House should take the responsibility of rejecting or accepting these amendments. They are not tied down; any hon. member is absolutely free to do as he chooses in the matter, and I hope they will not delay any further in that respect, and that the House will this evening adopt such amendments as may be advisable in the proposition that has been made by the Premier.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I was very pleased to hear the leader of this party withdraw his amendment that this matter should be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee, because I think later on it will be the better place for it. I think that most hon. members agree with the principle of the limitation of speeches contained in these proposals; but, while agreeing to the principle, there may be many points of detail that hon. members may not agree with. I think that this is not being introduced in the best manner to deal with the subject intelligently and quickly. I think the list of suggestions which we have here should be introduced and dealt with more in the shape of a Bill. Even in this part (1), which has been moved by the Premier, there are four or five different questions. We ought to have dealt with the advisability of introducing a time limit to

speeches in the form of a Bill, and taken everything seriatim. That would have been much better than the present method. It is not to be thought that, because we have foreshadowed a few amendments, we are opposed to the principle of time limitation of speeches. I think that if hon. members condensed their speeches they would be far more effective than when they are carried over three or four hours, like some speeches have been. At the same time, it is quite possible to go too far in the direction of limitation of speeches, and I think some of the proposals contained in this resolution go too far altogether. The Premier led the House to believe that he is adopting the practice in vogue in New Zealand. As pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, New Zealand is the only country in the world that has a time limit to speeches.

Mr. GRANT: Italy and America. There is only fifteen minutes allowed in Italy.

Mr. HAMILTON: New Zealand is the only country in the world that I have ever heard of where they have a time limit.

Mr. MURPHY: Italy is not one of the most progressive countries in the world, either.

Mr. HAMILTON: When the House goes into Committee, instead of imitating the practice of New Zealand, where members can speak four times of ten minutes each, the Premier wants to cut it down to three times, and to only speak ten minutes on the first occasion, and on the others for five minutes. I think that is going too far.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that this is a recommendation from the Standing Orders Committee to the House, and not the second reading of a Bill. The hon. member must confine himself to the recommendation.

Mr. HAMILTON: I beg pardon; I am just following the Premier. The Premier has given expression to these ideas, and I might say I disagree altogether with the recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee. As pointed out by the hon. member for Leichhardt, the members of that committee were not unanimous. The Hon. the Premier says they were unanimous, but the hon. member for Leichhardt denies that they were unanimous. In the first part, the resolution says—

No member shall speak for more than half an hour at a time in any debate in the House except in the debate on the Address in Reply, or on a direct motion of want of confidence, when a member shall be at liberty to speak for one hour.

As pointed out by the leader of our party, there is an occasion on the second reading of a Bill when it is almost impossible for a member who is conversant with a subject—we will say it is a measure dealing with land or mining matters—to deal intelligently with that subject within the space of half an hour, which he is only allowed. As pointed out by our leader, while the Minister has unlimited time in introducing a Bill, the leader of the Opposition in following him is limited to half an hour. I do not think that is a fair thing at all. The hon. member for Clermont said that he was going to move an amendment in that direction, but we had an amendment foreshadowed before he spoke. Then the resolution says—

Provided that this rule shall not apply to a member moving the second reading of a Bill.

Now, we know very well that it is very seldom a private member introduces a Bill. I do not suppose we have more than two or three Bills of any consequence during the whole of a session which are moved by private members, but we

know that Ministers introduce Bills almost every other day, and a Minister would have unlimited time. Yet hon. members in Opposition would be cut down to half an hour to reply to the Minister's explanation. Now, it is the duty of members to criticise, and I do not think it is right to limit the time for discussion as proposed by the Standing Orders Committee. I have a compilation here showing that forty-nine members occupied forty-six hours twenty-seven minutes on the Address in Reply, or an average of forty-nine forty-third-forty-nine minutes. On those figures, I do not think that anyone can contend that there has been much waste of time during the present session.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COTTELL: Not on the average.

Mr. HAMILTON: On the Mines Regulation Bill, twelve members occupied six hours fifty-four minutes, or an average of twenty-nine and a-half minutes. That Bill dealt with the whole of the mining industry, so I do not think it can be said there was waste of time there.

Mr. GRANT: Does not that cut against your argument?

Mr. HAMILTON: No; I say there may be occasions when we have such extensive measures as the Local Authorities Bill or the Lands Acts Consolidation Bill, and how can hon. members deal intelligently with such measures in the space of half an hour? It is a great pity that a matter of this sort cannot be dealt with in a non-party spirit, because hon. members on that side of the House may be sitting on this side to-morrow; and those who are in power to-day, and make stringent conditions, do not know the day when the order of things may be reversed, and they may get a taste of their own medicine. The Sessional Order also says—

Members debating the Financial Statement may speak for one hour, but not more than once. A reply, however, is allowed to the Minister who has delivered such Statement.

I remember one time when the leader of the Government was a member of this [5 p.m.] party, and he used to be deputed by the leader of this party to do all the financial criticisms for the party.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMILTON: He was always the one who was deputed by the leader of this party to answer the Treasurer when he delivered his Financial Statement, and anyone who was in the House at that time will know that the hon. gentleman used to take two and a-half to three hours to make his speeches.

A LABOUR MEMBER: And good speeches, too.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, the hon. gentleman used to make good effective speeches, too. They were well thought out and intelligent speeches, and yet now the hon. gentleman comes down with a proposal—he is also one of the Standing Orders Committee—to limit speeches of members, even the speeches of the leader of the Opposition; and when the leader of the Opposition has to reply to the Treasurer's speech on the Financial Statement he has to do it in one hour. I do not think that that is a fair thing at all. I admit that I am in favour of the limitation of speeches in this House, but the proposals introduced here are much too drastic altogether. It is really a new form of "gag," because it is introducing a new form of automatic "gag" without wiping out the old "gag" and "guillotine" clauses that are at present in our Standing Orders. So I

Mr. Hamilton.]

shall certainly vote for the amendment when it is moved; or I shall move an amendment myself to omit the word—

Mr. MANN: Don't prevent us from speaking on the main question.

Mr. HAMILTON: I have the right to move an amendment if I wish.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: There are others to speak.

Mr. HAMILTON: Very well; I will leave it.

Mr. GRANT (*Rockhampton*): Members have been asking why it is proposed to alter these Standing Orders now. Well, the Clerk of the House has informed the Standing Orders Committee that practically all the copies of the Standing Orders have gone out of existence. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: A very poor excuse.

Mr. GRANT: It will be necessary to provide new copies of the Standing Orders, because if there was a general election there are not sufficient copies of the Standing Orders to go round. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: Ring off! Ring off!

Mr. GRANT: I do not know why this should be received with derision, as both the hon. members for Leichhardt and Ipswich know that that is so, and it is necessary to provide new copies of the Standing Orders; and, that being so, this is taken as being a good opportunity to alter our Standing Orders—before the new copies are printed. I carried a resolution in this House three years ago favouring a time limit to speeches. There was very little opposition to that. We are told that we have copied these Standing Orders from New Zealand, but that we have made them more drastic.

Mr. BOWMAN: So you have.

Mr. GRANT: It is true that we have shortened the time allowed for members' speeches in Committee, but we have given a greater length of time than New Zealand allows at the present time for members speaking in the House.

Mr. BOWMAN: In what way?

Mr. GRANT: In New Zealand it only allows half an hour on everything except the Financial Statement, Address in Reply, and direct want of confidence motion, but not on the second reading of a Bill.

Mr. BOWMAN: Neither do you.

Mr. GRANT: I will read what the New Zealand Standing Order says—

No member shall speak for more than half an hour at a time in any debate in the House, except in the debate on the Address in Reply or on the Financial Statement, or in the debate on a motion of "No confidence."

Mr. HARDACRE: Or in moving the second reading of a Bill.

Mr. GRANT: Yes; but that refers to the member moving the second reading of a Bill. We have gone further than that.

Mr. HAMILTON: It does not say "member moving the second reading of a Bill." You did not quote it rightly.

Mr. GRANT: I quoted it from *Hansard*—from the speech I delivered when I introduced the motion in this House. The Standing Order we propose makes this provision: that if a member desires to speak at any further length, he can get another half hour, at the pleasure of the House. New Zealand does not provide for that at all. In New Zealand a member simply gets half an hour and no

[*Mr. Hamilton.*

more. We have considered the matter raised by the leader of the Opposition in regard to some member who may be particularly well versed in a particular subject, and we give this latitude: that he may have double the time so that he might fully explain his views. I rather agree with the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Clermont, that the leader of the Opposition should be allowed greater time. I would go further than that, and say the leader of the Opposition or any member of his party nominated by him to reply to any particular question.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRANT: I think that that would meet the case the leader of the Opposition speaks of. I hope that the House will not accept this as a party question at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: We have not done so.

Mr. GRANT: It should not be a party matter at all. The Standing Orders Committee was of a most impartial character in discussing it.

Mr. MURPHY: The Government have a big majority on the committee, though.

Mr. GRANT: The minority at one time was represented by myself. The Government happened to be in a minority, so it cannot be that the Government are trying to force these Standing Orders on to the Standing Orders Committee. I think this Sessional Order would really facilitate the business of this House. It will not stop stonewalling. There are any amount of loopholes left for that yet. But it will improve the speeches delivered in this House. Hon. members will prepare their speeches, and they will be of a better character altogether. There will not be so much time lost in answering interjections. When a member knows that he has only got a limited time to speak, he will not waste his time on interjections. He will have more valuable matter which he wished to deliver, and he will keep to his speech. Now, this is not a new thing at all. In the United States Congress they are only allowed one hour for each speech, and Mr. Bryce, the present British Ambassador to the United States, speaks of it as giving great satisfaction.

Mr. MURPHY: There is any amount of corruption there.

Mr. GRANT: In New Zealand they have had this system of time limit for speeches for many years, and if it has not given satisfaction I am sure that it would have been rescinded long ago. The Standing Orders Committee met twice in connection with this matter, and gave a great deal of attention to it. We sat for many hours, and came to a resolution asking that this should be a Sessional Order, and this resolution was a unanimous resolution.

Mr. HARDACRE: No, it was not.

Mr. GRANT: A resolution was carried unanimously by the Standing Orders Committee that this should be recommended to the House as a Sessional Order for this session.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; not recommended.

Mr. GRANT: Well, anyone who desires any further information can see the minutes, as I am sure the Clerk of the House will give it to them. The committee gave a fair amount of consideration to the suggested alterations, and I think these alterations, if adopted, would meet with a greater despatch of business, and the ordinary member of the House will have a better opportunity of discussing matters than he has at the present time. He will not be overshadowed by members who

take up three or four hours discussing questions, and preventing others from having any say at all. I think that on the whole it will be advisable to carry out the alterations suggested.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): I must say that I think that this is a very good Sessional Order.

Mr. RYLAND: It will just suit you.

HON. R. PHILP: I never saw it until I came to the House to-day. It will be a good thing for all members of the House, as it will destroy monopolies. (Laughter.) And I am in favour of destroying monopolies. (Laughter.) I have known members to take three or four hours in discussing matters brought before this House, and they have not got three or four grains of wheat in all their chaff. Since I have been in the House I can say that I do not think that any member can speak for more than one hour and get listened to with any amount of pleasure. A man can say all that he has got to say in half an hour. I heard the leader of the Opposition pleading for more time for the hon. member for Gregory. I do not think the hon. member for Gregory ever spoke for more than an hour in his life, and he gave us more information in that hour than other hon. members give us when they speak for three or four hours.

Mr. BOWMAN: I referred to the hon. member for Gregory in connection with land legislation, of which I said he and the hon. member for Leichhardt have a special knowledge.

HON. R. PHILP: They can speak on every clause in a Bill for half an hour.

Mr. RYLAND: No; only for twenty minutes.

Mr. BOWMAN: They can speak for half an hour on the second reading, but not in Committee.

HON. R. PHILP: There may be half a dozen amendments on every clause. I recognise that we may not save time by adopting this proposal, but it will give every member an opportunity of speaking. Collectively, it may take more time, because any old parliamentary hand can get round the rule in several ways, and speak as often as he likes.

Mr. RYLAND: Why should it be necessary?

HON. R. PHILP: Because at the present time there are members who get up and speak for two, three, and four hours. There are only seventy-one members who recognise that a man is making a fool of himself, while the man himself thinks he is giving the country the benefit of untold wisdom. We shall have an hour to speak on the Address in Reply and on the Financial Statement, and half an hour on the second reading of a Bill. If every member in the House takes full advantage of that, we shall have a very long session. It is well to give young members an opportunity of speaking. At present they are crowded out. After the first week on the Address in Reply nobody will come and listen to a speech. A member may make a good speech, but the House could be counted out, so far as the members present to listen to him are concerned. Short, crisp speeches will improve the tone of the House, and they will improve the speeches themselves, as hon. members will have to take a little time in studying what they will say, instead of allowing themselves to be drawn to one side by interjections and making rambling speeches.

Mr. COTTELL: And talking to their electors.

HON. R. PHILP: And talking to their electors.

Mr. BOWMAN: "Satan reproving sin."

HON. R. PHILP: This will not make the session any shorter, but it will give every hon. member an opportunity of speaking. I have seen a whole night taken up by two or three speeches. I have been guilty of making long speeches myself on a few occasions.

Mr. HAMILTON: When you were in opposition you very often were.

HON. R. PHILP: Of course, I had to criticise the Government, and I had not so many assistants as the hon. member for Fortitude Valley; but I do not think I ever spoke much more than an hour, and I do not think any of those who sat with me spoke for more than an hour, either. The hon. member for Leichhardt used to be very fond of making long speeches, but he can say a great deal in half an hour, and speaks well if he speaks for no more than half an hour.

Mr. HARDACRE: You need one and a-half hours at times.

HON. R. PHILP: An hour and a-half is too long. It is bad for the health, and certainly nobody will listen to a member for one and a-half hours. During the twenty-four years I have been in the House there have only been two men to whom I have listened for more than an hour, and they are both out of the House now.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have seen you listening to the Premier for longer than that when he was leader of this party, and heard you compliment him on his speech.

HON. R. PHILP: Not when he spoke for more than an hour. Perhaps when I had charge of Estimates I may have had to listen to him. I understand this has been unanimously recommended by the Standing Orders Committee, and it is due to them that we should accept their recommendation. I feel satisfied it will be a good thing for everybody. Some of the long-speech members will not like it, but, in time, when they have learned to condense their speeches, they will see that it is a good thing. Certainly it will tend to improve the tone of debate. I have heard members on all sides condemn members for making long speeches, and, as this will prevent the delivery of such speeches, I hope it will be passed.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): I do not agree with the recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee. If this is carried, it will prevent intelligent debate and the proper consideration of Bills, especially as regards the Committee stages of those Bills. It provides that any hon. member moving an amendment or speaking in Committee can only speak for ten minutes, and for five minutes in subsequent speeches—that is, for twenty minutes altogether.

Mr. LESINA: On one question.

Mr. RYLAND: On one question in a Bill.

Mr. LESINA: On one point in a clause—for twenty minutes on every question.

Mr. RYLAND: If the hon. member will give his fancy full scope, he will recollect occasions when one clause, or one point in a clause in a Bill, was the very crux of the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: The Treasurer once put up a stonewall on one word.

Mr. RYLAND: Yes; on one word in a Bill. I remember on the Wages Boards Bill the one word "or" was discussed here for days, and I heard the late hon. member for Moreton make an hour speech on it in his electorate. Under this rule it will only be possible

Mr. Ryland.]

to discuss the most important question for twenty minutes.

Mr. MANN: This is introduced to prevent you discussing the Financial Statement.

Mr. RYLAND: I do not think hon. members realise the importance of the proposal. It is not very far back in the history of the Commonwealth when two Governments went out of office upon three or four words in a clause of a Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. RYLAND: That shows the importance of an amendment in a Bill. That was an amendment to include railway servants in the Commonwealth Arbitration Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order! I have called the hon. member to order because what he is saying is quite outside the scope of the question before the House.

Mr. RYLAND: I want to point out that this rule may prevent hon. members discussing the real issues involved in a Bill. We have a Bill before us at the present time which only contains two clauses, and we shall only be able to speak for twenty minutes on each clause. I think that is entirely inadequate, and such a proposal has never been made, so far as I am aware, in any other Legislature. The New Zealand Standing Order is not anything like as drastic. I also think that the leader of the Opposition or some member representing this side of the House should have more time than is proposed in which to reply to the Minister who is in charge of a Bill. It is utterly ridiculous to suppose that on a Bill to consolidate the land law, or any other important Bill that may come along, the criticism of such a member should be restricted to half an hour. When such a Bill is introduced, the speeches of the Minister who moves the second reading, and of the leader of the Opposition, or the chief speaker from this side, appear in *Hansard*, and are read by the people outside, and in that way they get an intelligent idea of the legislation that is being proposed. Under this proposal Ministers will have time to put their views before the country, but the members of the Opposition will not have time to give their views on proposed legislation. I do not think that is fair, and I do not think it will assist in getting legislation through this House. When a Bill is fairly well discussed on the second reading, and the House gets the hang of the proposed legislation, there is not so much necessity for long speeches in Committee; so there will be nothing saved by not allowing the leader of the Opposition or some other member on this side to reply at greater length to the Minister introducing a Bill. This proposal is practically limiting free speech in this House; and I do not see why this should have been introduced simply because one or two members, perhaps, in one session made very long speeches, and took up the time of the House. There is a happy medium as regards criticism.

Mr. FORSYTH: What is the happy medium?

Mr. MURPHY: The criticism on a clause in the Port Alma Railway Bill last session saved the country £7,000. They put in a new clause, and we had to stay here till 12 o'clock to get that done.

Mr. RYLAND: I think half an hour is too short a time to allow for a speech on the second reading; and on the Financial Statement there should be an opportunity of speak-

[*Mr. Ryland.*

ing for more than an hour. It is not every man who has the ability to deal with financial questions like the Premier or the hon. member for Moreton; and most hon. members require time in order to put their views on financial questions intelligently before the country. It is not every member who avails himself of the opportunity of speaking on the Financial Statement; and it is only right that the financial experts should have the opportunity of putting their views and arguments fully before the House. We have been told that this is taken from New Zealand—

Mr. TOLMIE: It is exactly the same as ours.

Mr. RYLAND: It is not the same. This is the New Zealand Standing Order—

No member shall speak for more than half an hour at a time in any debate in the House, except in the debate on the Address in Reply, or on the Financial Statement, or in a debate on a motion of "No confidence," or in moving the second reading of a Bill, or on the debate on the Appropriation Bill, when a member shall be at liberty to speak for one hour. In Committee of the House no member shall speak for more than ten minutes at any one time—

Mr. TOLMIE: There is an alteration there.

Mr. RYLAND: Yes.

or more than four times on any one question before the Committee.

There has been an alteration there. In New Zealand they can speak four times, and ten minutes each time. The proposal here is that a member shall be allowed to speak ten minutes on the first occasion, and five minutes on the second and third occasions. Most important legislation has to be dealt with in Committee, and even under present conditions much legislation goes through without sufficient consideration. And what can a member say in five minutes on an important piece of legislation in Committee? There has been no abuse this session as far as occupying time is concerned. We put two Bills through in a night each.

Mr. MURPHY: And one of them we ought not—the Redistribution of Seats Bill.

Mr. RYLAND: Only seven or eight members spoke on the Mines Regulation Bill, and they did not talk for talk's sake, but for the purpose of expressing their opinions for the benefit of the men engaged in the industry of mining.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is correct.

Mr. RYLAND: In New Zealand, to a large extent, this was not the success it was expected it would be, because members, in order to get the opportunity for criticism during the time allowed, took every advantage of the Standing Orders, and moved amendments that were not necessary in connection with the legislation before them. And I do not believe this is going to act in the direction wanted, though it will curtail intelligent criticism. Why did not the Premier tell us about the Czar dismissing the Duma and sending people to Siberia? Our friend, the hon. member for Townsville, talked about the abuse of the Standing Orders in the past by indulging in useless talk. The whole thing reminds me of the story of the man who was told [5.30 p.m.] to write a history of the world, and returned with a camel-load of books, about 2,000 volumes. He was then told to go back and condense his works and write a short history of the world. After repeated condensation, the wise man returned with these words: "They were born,

suffered, and died." That was a short history of the world; but it was not a history which would commend itself to any sensible, intelligent person requiring information. If we adopt these proposed Sessional Orders, the Premier may introduce a Bill to link up the railways of the State, and say: "That is the object of the Bill, the Commissioner says it is all right," and ask the House to say "Yes" or "No" to the proposal without any comment. Why is there this unseemly haste to prepare to rush legislation through this House? Whenever there is a movement to rush legislation through this House there is always something behind the scene that we do not see. I want to know whether there are any more syndicate railways knocking about in the Minister's box.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member, as an old parliamentarian, must know that he is exceeding the bounds of fair criticism. I must ask him to confine his remarks to the question before the Chamber.

Mr. RYLAND: I apologise, and will not pursue that argument any further. I am satisfied that the proposed new Sessional Orders are quite unnecessary, and I am afraid that if they are passed they will not have a good effect on the legislation dealt with by this Chamber. If we prevent free speech and free criticism in regard to proposed legislation, it will not be a good thing for the country, and when the electors are returning their representatives at the next election they will resent this curtailment of speech. I am not going to say much more on the subject at this stage, but I hope that an opportunity will be given to move amendments which will make the proposed rules more perfect and bring them more into line with the views of hon. members. I do not think they are brought forward in the right way. When a Bill is introduced we have an opportunity of discussing its principles on the second reading, and after that we have an opportunity of discussing its provisions in detail in Committee. I say we should have an opportunity of discussing this proposal in a general way, and that after that we should have an opportunity of considering its details and moving amendments. As the matter has been introduced, if a member speaks on the general proposal he cannot afterwards move an amendment.

Mr. McLACHLAN: He can move an amendment before he sits down.

Mr. RYLAND: If he does that he will confuse the issue, because once an amendment is before the House the Speaker will not allow a member to speak on the general question, but will confine him to the amendment. Therefore, an amendment would prevent a general discussion on the whole question. I should like members to express their opinions in a general discussion on the principle of the proposed rules, and then to have an opportunity of moving such amendments as they think will improve those rules. I should like to see an amendment made extending the half-hour limit, and also the time allowed for speeches on the Address in Reply.

Mr. MURPHY: Move an amendment before you sit down.

Mr. RYLAND: No; I will not do that, because if I did so I should deprive the hon. member of the opportunity of taking part in the general discussion of the proposal.

Mr. MURPHY: You would not do anything of the sort.

Mr. RYLAND: I would not do that, because if I moved an amendment the hon. member would have to confine his remarks to that amendment. I am not going to move any amendment, but if any hon. member moves an amendment in the direction I have indicated he will have my support. I am sorry that we have not an opportunity to discuss the matter more fully. I think the proposed Sessional Orders are unnecessary, and that they will not have the effect which the Premier thinks they are going to have, but that, on the contrary, they will have a bad effect on the legislation put through this House, as they will prevent hon. members putting their views before the country as they should do, and as the country desires them to do. I am against the proposal.

Mr. TOLMIE (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): I should like to correct an error into which the hon. member for Gympie fell when he stated that the first part of this rule does not correspond with the New Zealand Standing Order on the same subject. An examination of the New Zealand Standing Orders will show that in the recommendation we have before us the Standing Orders Committee have followed exactly the New Zealand rule in regard to the time limit for speeches in the House, though there is a slight difference in the paragraph dealing with discussions in Committee. One fact must have been strongly impressed upon members by the speeches we have listened to, and that is that there is a general consensus of opinion in this House that there should be a limitation as to the length of speeches.

Mr. RYLAND: Nobody opposes that.

Mr. TOLMIE: And, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Clermont, that is the basic principle of this proposed Sessional Order. As the hon. member for Gympie says, nobody opposes the principle of the limitation of speeches. I think it would be an excellent thing if we were to accept that principle, and then, instead of discussing, as we are, the general principle of the limitation of speeches, we proceeded to discuss the text of the proposed Standing Order, and if it is thought desirable to amend it in any way, let amendments be made where it is thought necessary. A great deal of time would be saved if that were done, and the object of members on both sides of the Chamber would be achieved. This House has the full power to amend the proposed Standing Orders without any reference whatsoever to the Standing Orders Committee. I take it that the Standing Orders Committee went into the matter thoroughly, and discussed this from every standpoint—they did not bring forward the proposed Standing Order and pass it without due consideration. They had the matter under consideration for at least a fortnight, and in the direction of the limitation of speeches they had an opportunity of ascertaining what had been done in other countries, and they had the text of a Standing Order somewhat similar to the one they have presented to the House for several days before they met in conclave to consider it themselves, and this is practically the outcome of the consensus of opinion of members of the Standing Orders Committee. It may be thought advisable to make some variation in detail, and hon. members can express their opinions when they come to consider the text of the Standing Order and the amendments that may be proposed.

Mr. BOWMAN: Give a reason for departing from the Standing Order as referred to the committee.

Mr. Tolmie.]

Mr. TOLMIE: If we proceed to do that, when we come to the question of the limitation of speeches, hon. members will be able to say whether an hour is too long to address the House, or whether half an hour is too short. I would just like to point out to hon. members opposite that, at the average rate, hon. members speaking in this Chamber will, in ten minutes, speak sufficient matter to fill a column of one of the daily papers in Brisbane.

Mr. BOWMAN: About half an inch. (Laughter.)

Mr. TOLMIE: So that an hon. member speaking for half an hour will speak sufficient matter to fill three columns, and it is a very sad commentary on the value of the speeches delivered in this Chamber, when in the morning Press we see the speeches boiled down, as the leader of the Opposition pointed out, to half an inch.

Mr. MURPHY: If you get up to abuse Mr. Fisher you get three columns in the *Courier*. (Laughter.)

Mr. TOLMIE: I am only pointing out the quantity of matter spoken by hon members, and if hon. members bring common sense to bear on the matter, they will come to the conclusion that in a column of the daily papers enough argument can be concentrated to show what is the true value of any question that is submitted to the House. One great value of the limitation of speeches will be in the direction of the concentration of thought, so that hon. members, when they rise to address the Chamber, knowing that the time at their disposal is limited, will endeavour to marshal their arguments in such a manner as will thoroughly explain the ideas that may be in their minds; and, if that be achieved, it will be of distinct advantage to the debating power of this Chamber.

The PREMIER: And of distinct advantage to hon. members themselves.

Mr. TOLMIE: Quite so. Seeing that we are agreed upon the basic principle that there should be a limitation of speeches, we should allow the matter to proceed till we arrive at some point where there may be a difference of opinion, and then move an amendment to enable the Chamber to come to some decision on that point; and when the proposed Standing Order has been amended, it will be passed in such a manner as I hope will be satisfactory to this Chamber.

* Mr. MANN: The general consensus of opinion in this Chamber is that there should be some limit to speeches, but we remember the occasion when the Hon. the Premier and his then colleagues were stonewalling the syndicate railway proposals, and the Philp Government, in their wisdom, did not believe in the curtailment of speeches, but they passed the "gag" and the "guillotine," and with that power in their hands the Government had sufficient control over the proceedings of this House. The Government have shown no cause or reason for bringing down these Sessional Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member again that this is not a question of the Government bringing down Sessional Orders. This is a motion, as I pointed out earlier, moved by the leader of the House, as the leader of the House, to give effect to a report of the Standing Orders Committee. I ask the hon. member to consider the matter in that light.

[Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. MANN: If you listen to me for a few moments I will point out—inasmuch as the deputy leader of the Government, the senior member for Rockhampton, gave as a reason why the Government urged the Standing Orders Committee to bring in this report, and the reason the Government gave the Standing Orders Committee was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order! I cannot allow the hon. member to transgress. He must confine himself to the proper rules of debate. As a matter of fact, for the information of the House, I may explain that the Standing Orders are very short, and the Speaker, the Clerk of the House, and the other authorities considered that a new edition was necessary. At the same time it was thought necessary to revise them; the Standing Orders Committee have done so, and they are responsible.

Mr. MANN: I do not think I was transgressing, inasmuch as you allowed the senior member for Rockhampton to state the reason why the Government brought this in. Now you say it was brought in at the instigation of the Clerk of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order! I shall not call the hon. member to order again. The member for Rockhampton, Mr. Grant, explained that at the first meeting of the committee this was explained to them, and was explained myself as chairman of that committee. I hope the hon. member will now proceed to discuss this matter in a proper manner.

Mr. MANN: The senior member for Rockhampton made a statement to this House, of which I am a member, and I am replying to it, inasmuch as I am alluding to the fact that the hon. member justified the Government in bringing down—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order! I have already told the hon. member for Cairns that the Government have not brought this proposed Standing Order down. I must ask the hon. member to keep to the question, or else I shall have to name him.

Mr. MANN: When the Deputy Speaker can show me clearly I am transgressing I will apologise. On this paper which I hold in my hand it says, "Mr. Kidston to move." That is the leader of the Government. It does not say a member of the Standing Orders Committee. It is the Premier, Mr. Kidston, who has moved this. That is the position, and if the Government disassociate themselves with the motion, why have we the Premier as a pleader, and the senior member for Rockhampton as a special pleader?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It has been already stated in this House that the leader of the House, as such, must bring the report of the Standing Orders Committee before this Chamber. The leader of the House has done so in his capacity as leader. The same duty would devolve upon any other person who might be the leader of the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: May I call your attention to the business-paper supplied to me. That shows that, if you make one explanation, this business-paper makes another. It says here plainly, "Government Business—Notice of Motion." For that reason I contend that this is Government business.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: Every member has the same right in this Chamber. You have the right, if you please, to put me down, justly or unjustly—I cannot dispute your authority. But I have got before me the business-paper of the House, which says that this is Government business, and the apologist for the Government, the hon. senior member for Rockhampton, got up and stated in the House that the reason the Government had for bringing this down was that the Clerk of the House—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I shall not allow the hon. member to proceed as he is doing. His action is most unparliamentary. The only way in which the matter should be brought down is in the way it has been brought down.

Mr. MANN: I have to bow to your ruling, but on two other occasions I got your ruling upset by another tribunal.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: However, I won't go into that just now, but I suggest that it would have been wise if the leader of the Opposition had persisted in the amendment he moved to refer this back to the Standing Orders Committee for amendment and consideration, and if he had further moved that the Standing Orders Committee should wait until such time as the Speaker was able to preside over the deliberations of that committee.

Mr. MURPHY: That would have been a good reason.

Mr. MANN: I would further say that if the leader of the Opposition had stuck to the amendment he moved, we could have discussed every clause in this, and given reasons why it should have been sent back to the Standing Orders Committee or otherwise. Now, I do not think that the Government—or the Standing Orders Committee—can show that in this session there has been any undue lengthening of debates in this House. If this is carried, we would be prevented from speaking—as we have often heard the present Minister for Agriculture speak—for two hours on the sugar question. When he sat on this side, he would speak for two hours on the Agricultural Estimates. He spoke ably and intelligently, and it took him two hours to deal with the whole question of sugar from the time the plant was first put into the ground to the time it was turned out as a finished article. (Laughter.) It is not argued that the Minister could deal with the whole of that question in ten minutes. Does this motion mean that if I get up and speak for ten minutes in regard to the question of land settlement, prickly pear, and a thousand and one things that are mixed up with that question, that I cannot speak again? Does it mean that I have to speak on the Lands Estimates on three occasions of ten minutes that I may say what I have to say about prickly pear, lantana, and other pests inflicted on settlers?

Mr. FERRICKS: It means the "gag."

Mr. MANN: The hon. senior member for Rockhampton alleged that, at the pleasure of the House, a member can get another half-hour; but what is the good of that? I would point out that we get various reports in the House. Last session I was speaking on the report of the Commissioner for Railways in connection with the Renard road engine, which was brought over for experi-

mental purposes, and the hon. member for Rockhampton said, "For goodness sake, sit down and don't discuss it; I want to discuss my railway grievances." If I were going into the forestry report, what chance would there be of getting another half-hour from members like the hon. senior member for Rockhampton, who would refuse to allow me to voice my opinions on the various reports? Are these reports not submitted to the House for the consideration of members? Have not members to dive into the reports of Government officials, and point out on the Estimates how these reports are being overlooked? I shall want to go into the forestry report this session, and no man can go fully into the question of afforestation in ten minutes. It is ridiculous. To my mind, this was drafted in a hurry, and should be sent back to the Standing Orders Committee for reconsideration. The hon. senior member for Townsville stated that this would not stop the able parliamentarian from doing what he pleased, and I am inclined to agree with him, because the able parliamentarian can get round any Order he pleases. This will materially prevent new members from voicing their opinions on the various Bills, inasmuch as a new man has not acquired the atmosphere of the place, and is not able to marshal his facts and figures the same as an older member is, and he is at a disadvantage. This will practically give to the older members a monopoly of the business of the House. For example, I may wish to speak very fully on the Financial Statement. I am allowed an hour, but possibly I could not manage to do it in that time, because I am not able to marshal my figures like the hon. member for Moreton; but no one believes that the hon. member for Moreton could bring his endless stream of figures to a conclusion in one hour. Did the committee bring this down in view of the hon. member for Moreton speaking on the Financial Statement? If so, they must have been in league with the Government to prevent a full discussion on the Financial Statement. On the last Financial Statement I spoke for nearly two hours, and I do not think I said a single word too much, and on this occasion surely they do not wish to tie me down to an hour. For that reason, I am not in favour of these rules. I understand it has been agreed that the House should close at 6 o'clock, and I have no wish to transgress the expressed wish of the House, so, although I have not quite finished my speech, I will sit down. I say that this ought to be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee for amendment.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HARDACRE: May I be allowed to make a personal explanation. I interjected when the Premier was speaking that I did not agree to that resolution being recommended to the House. I have asked the Clerk of the Assembly to show me the report, and I find that it does contain the word "recommend." I did not know it contained that word. However, I find it contained those words. I wish to make this explanation.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

Mr. Hardacre.]