

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 1899**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 4 OCTOBER, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed :—

Tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement for the year 1899-1900.

QUESTIONS.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WAGES BOARDS.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to accede to the request made by a deputation that waited on the Chief Secretary, on the 23rd of August last, for the introduction of legislation providing for the establishment of wages boards (similar to that which obtains in Victoria) to deal with the question of a minimum wage, etc., for operatives employed in boot, shoe, and other factories in Queensland?

2. If so, about what date will such legislation be introduced?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) replied—

The Government, while giving full consideration to the views of the deputation, are unable to promise legislation this session.

PASTORAL LEASES IN THE SOUTH-WEST.

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

When will he be prepared to introduce legislation dealing with the pastoral leases in the south-western portion of the colony?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*) replied—

During the present session, if time permit.

RENT APPEAL CASES.

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

1. Has the Lands Department obtained a copy or report of the evidence in the recent rent appeal cases with reference to Norley, Bulloo Downs, and other pastoral runs or holdings in that district?

2. If so, will he cause the same to be laid upon the table of the House?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

1. No; but reports of the evidence were published in all the metropolitan daily newspapers, and copies of his Honour Mr. Justice Cooper's judgment in case of Norley and Thargomindah holdings, of notice of motion on appeal to the Full Court by the Crown in the case of Bulloo Downs holding, and of judgment of the Full Court on appeal by the Crown in connection with Norley and Thargomindah holdings, were given in the annual report of the Department of Public Lands laid before Parliament on 14th September, 1899. See pages 4, 5, 61, 62, 63, and 64 of said report.

TENDERS FOR RAILWAY ROLLING-STOCK.

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

What was the number of locomotives, carriages, and wagons for which tenders were invited in each year from 1890 to 1898?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Murray, *Normanby*) replied—

Year.	Locomotives.	Carriages.	Wagons.
1890	...	16	20
1891	...	22	100
1892	...	1	40
1893	8	...	1
1894	...	1	25
1895	40	18	152
1896	...	16	486
1897	...	22	418
1898	2 ("Abt") 10	31	810
	60	127	2,052

REMOVAL OF TICK INSPECTORS FROM THE BORDER.

Mr. MOORE (*Murilla*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture, without notice—Is there any truth in the statement appearing in this morning's *Courier* that the Queensland Government are pressing New South Wales to remove the border inspectors; and will he let the House know the facts?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. J. V. Chataway, *Mackay*) replied: The statement—the reference—is incorrect.

AUSTRALIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*) asked the Chief Secretary, without notice—Can the hon. gentleman give any information as to when he will be able to produce the papers in connection with sending a contingent to the Transvaal?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I am waiting for a reply, which I believe has been received to-day, but which has not yet been deciphered, concerning the attitude of the Imperial authorities; and I am also waiting for the return of the Commandant from Melbourne to learn what agreement it is proposed to make in connection with an Australian contingent. I should before this have submitted the papers to Parliament, but I think they would be exceedingly incomplete as they are. I can assure hon. members, however, that they shall be submitted as early as practicable, in good time for hon. members to understand the exact position in view of the proposals which I shall make to Parliament if this contingent is to be sent to South Africa.

CROWN LANDS ON THE BRISBANE RIVER.

On the motion of the Hon. E. B. FORREST (*Brisbane North*), it was resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return giving particulars of all lands—whether improved or unimproved, occupied or unoccupied, leased or free—now in possession of the Crown, having frontage to the river Brisbane, from the entrance at Luggage Point to Victoria Bridge, and on both sides of the river.

FEDERATION.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

\* The PREMIER (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*), who, on rising to move the following motion, was received with applause:—

“That this House agrees to the following Address to the Queen, praying for the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia, and authorises Mr. Speaker to sign such Address on behalf of the Legislative Assembly and present it to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, for transmission to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a request that the Right Honourable Lord Lamington, K.C.M.G., Governor, may be permitted to personally submit the Address to Her Majesty:—

“To Her Most Gracious Majesty Victoria, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, Empress of India, &c., &c., &c.

“We, Your Majesty's most faithful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of the colony of Queensland, in Parliament assembled,—

“Humbly represent to Your Majesty:—

“1. That we approach Your Majesty with the assurance of our devoted loyalty to Your Majesty's Throne and Person.

“2. That, pursuant to legislation passed by the Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, and Western Australia, a convention of representatives of the colonies named met, during the years 1897 and 1898, and framed a draft of a Federal Constitution for Australasia.

"3. That in the beginning of the present year the Prime Ministers of the colonies named, and the Prime Minister of Queensland, in conference assembled, amended the said Draft Federal Constitution in certain respects.

"4. That subsequently the Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania severally passed a Federal Enabling Act, which provided for the submission of the Federal Constitution, so drafted and amended as aforesaid, to the electors of the said colonies respectively for acceptance or rejection.

"5. That the electors of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania have accepted the said Federal Constitution so drafted and amended as aforesaid.

"6. That the Australasian Federation Enabling Act (Queensland), 1899, being the Federal Enabling Act passed as aforesaid by the Parliament of Queensland, contains the following provision:—

'If two colonies, of which New South Wales shall be one, in addition to Queensland, accept the Constitution, the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly may adopt Addresses to the Queen, praying that the Constitution may be submitted for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland subject to the adoption of similar Addresses by the Parliaments of such two colonies.

'When such Addresses have been adopted they shall be transmitted to the Queen with a certified copy of the Constitution.'

"7. That the Constitution in the next preceding paragraph mentioned is the said Federal Constitution so drafted and amended as aforesaid.

"8. That the Parliaments of the said colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania have adopted Addresses to Your Majesty of a similar nature to those mentioned in the provision set out in the sixth paragraph hereof.

"We therefore humbly pray, that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take the premises into your Royal consideration, and to cause the said Constitution, of which the accompanying is a certified copy, to be submitted for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to cause all other necessary steps to be taken for the establishment of an Australian Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the said Constitution, consisting of Queensland and all those other Australasian colonies whose Parliaments similarly pray Your Majesty.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

"On behalf and in the name of the Legislative Assembly."

said: In rising to move the motion standing in my name, I must confess to a feeling of supreme satisfaction—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: In being permitted to consummate the legislative and electoral stages in connection with federation, by submitting this motion for, I trust, the unanimous acceptance of this Legislature.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. THORN: Not at all.

The PREMIER: A motion which prays that Her Majesty the Queen will instruct such necessary action to be taken by the Imperial Legislature as may lead to the consummation of the federal bond of union in the form of a united Australia. I must confess that I feel it to be not only a great honour and privilege, but also a great patriotic duty, to endeavour to bring to a successful consummation the union of federated Australia. I have no desire to re-open the various stages of contention in which we have all been engaged during the last couple of months; on the contrary, I trust that now that the voice of the people has spoken so emphatically, that all of us—whatever our views previously may have been—will accept the verdict given so unmistakably and emphatically by a tribunal which we ourselves have constituted. I say it is not our duty now to enter into the merits of the question, but having regard to the electors of the colony, who have so emphatically pronounced in favour of federation, our duty here is to give effect to that verdict.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I feel that it is undesirable that I should in any way invoke the passions which presented themselves during the discussion of this most important question, but still, I think, I may be permitted to represent to this Chamber the attitude of the people in the different electorates in the colony, and also the attitude of the people throughout Australasia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I do not wish to trouble the House with a great number of statistics, but it is just as well that we should understand that we are carrying out the real sentiments and feelings of the people of Queensland and Australasia, and therefore I desire to submit to the House the form in which the verdict of the people has been obtained. I think all of us will admit from these figures that we have every justification in asserting that the people of Queensland, as a body, are largely in favour of this idea of federation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: This is moreover a matter of supreme satisfaction to me, considering how little the people were acquainted with the matter till a comparatively recent period—

Mr. FOGARTY: That is the reason for the vote.

The PREMIER: I say it is a matter of great satisfaction to see that the people have been so thoroughly moved in such a short time, and that they have returned a verdict so emphatic and so assertive of their desire to be incorporated in the United States of Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I am sorry to have to place at the head of the list, the metropolitan vote, which is adverse to federation. In the metropolitan districts, 4,028 votes were recorded in the negative, and that is the only group of constituencies in the colony which have given a negative vote. In the Southern districts—

Mr. FOGARTY: What about Toowoomba, Cambooya, and Aubigny?

The PREMIER: I am not going into minute details. In the Southern constituencies, outside the metropolis, which consist of twenty-seven electorates, fifteen constituencies voted for Federal Union, and only twelve against it—a majority of three constituencies and 371 votes. In the Central district, consisting of eleven electorates, eight voted for Federal Union and only three against it—a majority of five electorates, representing a majority of 2,156 votes. In the thirteen electorates of the Northern districts—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Ah! That's the place.

The PREMIER: I say in the North every electorate voted for federation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. W. THORN : More shame to them.

The PREMIER : There there was a majority of 8,933 votes in favour of federation. Looking at the whole figures, the total majority of votes in favour of federation, outside the metropolis, was 11,520, but the adverse vote of the metropolis reduced the majority to 7,492, as asserted by the chief returning officer. Thirty-six constituencies in Queensland voted for, and twenty-four against federal union.

Mr. JENKINSON : What about Dalby ? On which side do you put it ?

The PREMIER : One electorate is in the unique position of not having quite made up its mind which way it should vote.

Mr. BROWNE : That is characteristic of Dalby.

The PREMIER : However, I think I am justified, from these tables, in saying that the people of this colony have unmistakably recognised the great advantages of federation, and have clearly expressed their desire to form a component part of the federal union. In that light I think that I am justified in submitting this motion to the consideration of this Assembly. And I feel that even those who have conscientiously differed from me in their views on this great and important question must now recognise that the people have unmistakably affirmed the proposals made, not by the Government but by both sides of the House. This is not by any means a party triumph. We on both sides are the custodians and guardians of the public will. The people have directed us to enter into this bond of union, and I therefore submit the motion believing and hoping it will be received with perfect unanimity. This is a matter which not only deals with Queensland—although I consider Queensland's interests will be unmistakably advanced and promoted by federal union—but we must look at it from the point of view of Australia as a whole.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The PREMIER : We should look at what has been done by the sister colonies. No longer are we merely Queensland citizens. When this resolution has been adopted, we shall be citizens, not merely of Queensland, but of Australia. Any part of Australia will be as dear to us as the welfare and prosperity of Queensland. That, to my mind, is the broad and statesmanlike view that we should take of this great national question. I trust that the narrow views and ideas which unfortunately have been expressed throughout the discussion of this subject will now cease, and that the larger view of Australian union will supersede mere local ideas of provincial citizenship. It must be borne in mind that in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania there has been a double verdict recorded, the second time considerably enlarging the verdict which was given the first time ; but I shall only deal with the recent verdicts. In Victoria on the 27th of July, 1899, the number of votes recorded in the affirmative was 152,653, and in the negative 9,805, showing a majority for of 142,848.

Mr. W. THORN : Never mind about the other colonies.

The PREMIER : I may as well remind hon. gentlemen of the sentiment of Australia as a whole. I do not think anyone who is desirous of having an impartial review placed before him can object to the very few statistics which I have the honour to submit. In New South Wales, in June, 1899, 107,420 votes were recorded for and 82,741 against, giving a majority of 24,679. In South Australia, in April-May, 1899, there were 65,990 in the affirmative and 17,053 in the negative, leaving a majority of 48,937 recorded in favour of federation. In Tasmania, on the 27th of July, 1899, at its referendum, there was an

1899—R\*

affirmative vote of 13,437 and only 791 against, showing a balance of 12,646. Queensland, on the memorable 2nd of September, 1899—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The PREMIER : Queensland, on the memorable 2nd of September, 1899, at its referendum, recorded 33,488 votes in favour of federal union, and 30,996 against, leaving a majority of 7,492, which, as I have already stated, I consider—taking into view the limited period in which federation was before the electors of Queensland as a matter of practical politics—is a result exceedingly satisfactory.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The PREMIER : I am constrained to believe that if a second referendum had to be taken—which I trust will not be the case—a decidedly larger majority would be obtained from the reflective and intelligent voters of this colony.

Mr. FOGARTY : Quite the reverse.

The PREMIER : Who, perhaps, were somewhat confused in their ideas concerning federation from the many fictions which were circulated amongst them—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear ! Oh, oh !

The PREMIER : Concerning the evils which would accrue to the State under federal union. However I do not wish to make any remarks which will arouse a feeling of irritation or antagonism amongst those who voted against the measure.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : Then don't do it.

The PREMIER : I wish merely to state that throughout Australia 377,988 electors recorded their votes for federation as against 141,386 against, leaving a majority of 236,602 in favour of the movement which I now desire to consummate in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. No less than 519,374 voters in the five colonies have been interested in this great and important movement. I say, in view of these facts, that the heart of the people has been thoroughly exercised in this matter. I do not think anyone can say the feeling was of a spurious or doubtful character—that the people acted merely from a temporary impulse ; and it is extremely gratifying—knowing that the heart of the people has been exercised in this matter—that it has resulted in the manner shown by these statistics. I disclaim that it is a party victory or triumph. Both sides of the House have lent their assistance, aid, and co-operation to bring about this most desirable result, and the thanks of Australia generally should be recorded in favour of those gentlemen who used their energy and their talent to educate the people up to a true perception of what Australian federation implies.

Mr. W. THORN : To mislead them.

The PREMIER : I think that any hon. gentleman who makes that statement impugns the good sense of the people of Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The PREMIER : They were the tribunal to whom the matter was referred, and they unmistakably recorded the opinion that federation is for the welfare of Queensland as well as for the welfare of other component parts of Australia. I therefore look upon the will of the people as a guide to direct this House in affirming this motion, and any hon. gentleman who objects to receiving the will of the people, so emphatically expressed, must undoubtedly place himself in this position—that he must say that the people of Queensland have not exercised an intelligent vote on this momentous occasion.

Mr. FOGARTY : They were misled.

The PREMIER : I say distinctly that the people were well-informed on this subject. I have already expressed my opinion that there were men who were actuated by conscientious convictions who took a different view from that which I expressed. I believe they honestly and

sincerely laboured under a morbid misapprehension of what federation would do for this great territory of Queensland. I give them credit for it. Although I cannot coincide with their views, I feel that they, equally with other hon. members and prominent members of the public outside, have been beneficial in educating the people up to a fuller perception of the great question of federation, and that out of the attrition of arguments *pro* and *con*, there have been educed an electricity and a warmth that has aroused the people from apathy, which probably they would otherwise have indulged in, and brought them to record their votes in the very emphatic manner they have done on this occasion. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any prolonged recommendation in connection with the motion that I am now submitting. It has passed entirely from the stage of contention, or it should certainly have emerged from that stage, at the present time. It has been referred, and properly referred, to the people, and if we do not bow to the will of the people we not only impugn their intelligence, but we impugn the benefits and machinery of that new institution the referendum which for the first time has been introduced for the purpose of deciding this important question.

Mr. DAWSON: We would also impugn the right of the people to express an opinion.

The PREMIER: Certainly. I do trust that the motion which I have the honour to introduce—and which so far as Queensland is concerned will consummate the legislative and elective stages of this great movement—will be received with an amount of unanimity which will show that, whatever our views have been, we recognise the intelligence of the people and the use they have made of that intelligence. I do not desire to descant on the benefits of federation at the present time, but I fully believe that many of those gentlemen, both inside and outside the Chamber, who hold different views to my own will yet recognise the great benefits to the colony of Queensland and to Australia through having been formed into one component State under the British flag. I fully believe that not only in the whole of Australia itself, but in the whole of the great British Empire, the momentous event of consolidating Australia will be a factor which will earn the gratitude, not only of men living at the present day, but of future generations, who will acknowledge the great advantage and prosperity which Australia has enjoyed from becoming a consolidated state and a pillar of strength to the establishment and maintenance of that great Empire, which we recognise as the greatest monarchy which the world has ever seen. I believe also that it will tend largely to encourage and facilitate the advancement of Queensland in all that constitutes the prosperity and development of a great country.

Mr. GLASSEY: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is in that light I regard it—that, not only in our domestic and social legislation the time has arrived when Queensland should become federated in view of the great extent of country which she possesses, but also in view of the environment of other nations by whom daily she is becoming more and more surrounded. I believe also it will tend to make throughout Australia a more perfect and complete consolidation of those great institutions which we have the privilege of enjoying as descendants of the British race. I am sure in this great land of Australia those institutions, those constitutional liberties and privileges which we inherit from our great mother land, will long flourish and expand, and that they will ever be here, as this movement is—

Broad based upon the people's will,  
And encompassed by the intricate sea.

I trust that this motion will pass without any acrimony or the introduction of any of those feelings which would disturb the fair consideration of the matter, and which perhaps disturbed the public during the taking of the referendum. I must confess that such feeling, however, during the taking of the referendum, was a healthy one. It induced many thinking men and others to consider the matter in a fuller and broader light than they would have done if opinions had not been fully and freely expressed. But this is not a fitting time to re-open the question—to fight the battle over again. We must accept the verdict of the tribunal so emphatically and happily expressed, and I do trust that this motion will be received with acclamation by all parties in this House—or rather I should say by all members of the House—because in this connection I feel there are no political parties in this House.

Mr. W. THORN: You tried to make them.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition, equally with myself, is desirous that the matter should be dealt with in that spirit; and in that light I venture to submit the matter to the approval of the House, feeling that, in so doing, I am carrying out the will of the people—acting under the directions which they themselves have expressed in this matter. I have, therefore, very great and profound pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion, and I do not think it is desirable that I should unnecessarily protract discussion on the subject. We have now arrived at what is merely a formal stage. But it is a very proud and grand stage in the history of the people—it is undoubtedly the most grandly historic epoch in the annals of Queensland and of Australasia—when we now address to Her Majesty this resolution expressing the desire of the people to enter into this federal union, and the will of the Parliament of Queensland to support that view as representatives of the people. I beg to move the motion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): In rising to second this Address—

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I can assure you that it affords me as much satisfaction to have that distinguished privilege, as has fallen to the Premier the distinguished privilege of being the mover of it.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I am very pleased as a Queenslander, born and bred, that I have the privilege of seconding an Address of this description, and pleased as one who has a great interest in this colony, the only country that I have ever known. And it is also a source of great satisfaction to me to stand up here and second the Address as one who has spent the best part of his time in the North, and a representative of a portion of the colony where we are proud to say not one electorate recorded an adverse vote.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: Notwithstanding the fact that certain people seem to feel that the North of Queensland does not belong to Queensland, that we should be marooned somewhere on a particular island and not so much as exercise the ordinary functions of citizenship. I do not intend to go into the matter of the Bill. I quite agree with the Premier that the contentious part has already passed. Whether the Bill is a good one or a bad one, whether in our opinion it will bring prosperity or ruination on the people of Queensland, we have already passed that stage. We have appealed to Cæsar. Cæsar has given his verdict, and the question now before us is whether we are going to accept Cæsar's verdict after having appealed to him.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I draw hon. members' attention to this fact, very pleasing indeed to

federalists, very pleasing to myself as one who contended against the terms and conditions of the Federal Enabling Bill when before this Chamber this year, that hon. members, in order that Queensland might fairly express an opinion on the referendum, tried to insist that a certain minimum should be fixed. The minimum was moved by the hon. member for Toombul, and he proposed an affirmative vote of 25,000 before Parliament would be justified in proceeding with the Address which we have before us this afternoon. That is, that Parliament should take it up and adopt this Address to Her Majesty. On that we were defeated, but I am very pleased to find that the affirmative vote has exceeded what we demanded. Then in another Chamber there was another minimum fixed upon—namely, that a total vote of 30,000 should be recorded. That also was defeated, and I am very proud to say that that proposed minimum was exceeded. So that the minimum proposed in each Chamber, when we were fixing the terms and conditions of the Federation Enabling Bill, a minimum which both billites and anti-billites thought necessary, has been exceeded; and had either of the proposals then made been adopted we should have been compelled by the verdict of the people of Queensland to go on with the Address we are going on with this afternoon. I am quite in accord with the Premier in the opinion he has expressed that the time has passed now when we should remember the harsh words that might have been used in the contest, and that we should try to get away from any feeling of irritation we may have had during the campaign. The campaign was short, sharp, and decisive, and the result was radically in favour of the Bill. I think it speaks well for the intelligence and the true Australian feeling and spirit of the people of this colony, both those for and those against the Bill, that they could fight a sharp battle like that fought prior to and on the 2nd of September, and yet remain good friends after all. It speaks volumes for the people. During the time of that contest members held different opinions on the question of the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill, and I am not prepared to say that the man who held an opinion different from my own, and expressed that opinion, did so because he was a stupid man, or that he did so out of pure cussedness, or because he wanted to be on the other side. I believe that those who took an active part in the campaign honestly and conscientiously believed that the side they took was the correct one, and I suppose anti-billites will give us credit for the same conscientiousness. Hopes and fears, beliefs and disbeliefs, and prophecies innumerable were expressed by the advocates on both sides, and it was then for the electors to say whom they would believe, and they have answered in an unmistakable way. Perhaps in the actual number of the votes they have not answered in the same way as some of the other colonies, but they have answered in a more emphatic way than most of us at the time the Federation Enabling Bill was going through, could possibly have hoped for. In addition to what has been said by the Premier, I would point out that, if we would really understand how decisive was the verdict given by the people on the 2nd of September last, we must remember that only one little spot called the metropolitan area has voted against the Bill. The rest of the southern areas have voted for the Bill; the Central district has voted for the Bill; and the Northern district has voted in favour of the Bill. But there is more than that in this verdict. It is not to be thought of that in time to come this colony of Queensland will remain one State as it is at the present time. There are certain divisions that are likely to take place, and if you will look at those par-

ticular divisions you will understand how emphatic that vote was. The proposed divisions are the Centre, the North, the Gulf, and the Wide Bay and Burnett districts; and every one of those divisions has voted distinctly and emphatically in favour of the Commonwealth Bill. But, in addition to that, I should like to point out that the primary industries of the colony have voted emphatically in favour of the Bill. The leading industry in the colony—that is, the gold-mining industry—has recorded a verdict in every instance in favour of the Bill.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Freetrade.

Mr. DAWSON: Whether it is a matter of freetrade or not, I think hon. members should bow to the will of the people. The mining industry, the leading industry of the colony—I mean to say the industry that employs more people and pays more to the revenue of the colony than any other—has voted without a single failure in favour of the Bill. The next industry to that, the pastoral industry, was equally emphatic in its pronouncement in favour of the Bill, and I should like to draw the particular attention of hon. members to this fact: that the men who open goldfields and who open pastoral country are the pioneers of this colony, and they make it possible for other men to come along and get a living. If those people had not gone out and opened up the country as goldmining fields or pastoral country we should hear nothing about railways in the settled districts, because we should have had no settled districts. Then, so far as the agricultural industry is concerned, the area in which there has been a majority against the Bill is comprised within a very small compass. From Toowoomba to the border it is all federal, and even the town of Toowoomba itself is federal. The manufacturing industries are federal, and that is not a matter of freetrade. Maryborough is distinctly federal, and gave a large majority in favour of the Bill. The primary and secondary industries are distinctly federal, the majority of the members of this House are federal, the majority of the electorates are federal, the majority of the electors are federal, and we have an overwhelming case, in the shape of the territory of the colony where votes were recorded in favour of the Bill. So it appears to me that the vote which was recorded on the 2nd of September is a very emphatic one indeed, and I contend that it is the duty of hon. members to look these facts sternly in the face and clearly recognise what they mean to them, to the colony, and to the electors they represent in this Chamber. And I say, if they do that, according to my opinion at any rate, they have got to bow to the verdict that was given by the great majority on the 2nd of September, and, whether they were for or against the Bill before that vote was taken, they must recognise that the will of the people is paramount to the will of any member in this Chamber, and vote for the adoption of this Address to Her Majesty. Some members, I know, consider the Commonwealth Bill is defective. I do not suppose that any Bill that could be framed by the wisest and most skilful man living would escape the criticism of his opponents; they would say that it was defective, and could be amended, and I dare say they would be quite correct. Conscientious and intelligent men may say and believe that the wisest scheme is defective, but we should remember that when any scheme is propounded, and it is merely a question of opinion, as this question undoubtedly is, there is a final court of appeal, and you must be willing to abide by the verdict that is given by that final court of appeal. In this particular instance the final court of appeal was the whole people who had the opportunity to record their votes on

the 2nd of September, and they have answered that the Commonwealth Bill is a good one, and for the benefit of the people of this colony. If members who happened to differ before the verdict was given are going to ignore that decision, then I say, in the name of common sense, what is the value of making the appeal at all? The principle of the referendum might as well be thrown overboard and every man will stick to his own opinion, and there will never be any final decision come to at all.

Mr. JENKINSON: You don't look upon that as a true referendum, do you?

Mr. DAWSON: I undoubtedly do. The hon. member for Wide Bay, I think, ought to cheerfully recognise the will of the people.

Mr. JENKINSON: So I do.

Mr. DAWSON: I am quite satisfied that the hon. member would not like to be ruled by the will of the men who voted for Mr. Chippendale and agree that he should not be a member of this Chamber. He would rather be ruled by the majority of the electors of Wide Bay who said he should be a member of this Chamber, and the proof that he recognises that fact is that he is sitting where he is and has the privilege of interrupting me this afternoon. Hon. members fought all they knew how to get that Bill defeated, and they had all the eloquence on their side, while we had merely a statement of facts. (Laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: Is that why you had to get men from New South Wales?

Mr. DAWSON: And the facts defeated the eloquence.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You had all the money.

Mr. DAWSON: We might have had the big drum, but we did not have all the trumpets.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You had the special trains, too.

Mr. DAWSON: That has got to be answered yet.

Mr. McDONALD: They had the *Telegraph*, too.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the *Courier*?

Mr. DAWSON: I would honestly urge upon hon. members that this is not a time for contentious matters; that they have got a duty to perform this afternoon; that they have to distinctly recognise that they are sent into this Chamber, not to exercise their own sweet will on every occasion. They are sent here to represent, as well as they can conscientiously, the people of this colony—to express the will and intention of those people who sent them in here. And on this particular question there can be no mistake about the matter at all, that the people of Queensland to-day, judged by the vote they gave on the 2nd September, are looking confidently to the members of this Chamber to know what is their duty, and to perform it faithfully and well.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: It is their expressed intention and will that we should present this Address to Her Majesty in order that federation may be consummated as soon as possible. I say that the ideal Parliament is one in which the members fully recognise that they are merely the guardians of the public interest, and that they are here not to give orders, but to obey the people's will when it is expressed. And I say it has been unmistakably expressed on the 2nd September that the people's will in this matter is that this Address shall be passed and sent to Her Majesty. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question stated.

HON. G. THORN: It is not my intention to say much after the speeches delivered by the

Premier and the leader of the Opposition, but I think I am in duty bound to the country—to the Southern parts of the colony—in which I include the metropolitan area—to say that South Queensland has unmistakably declared against federation.

Mr. McDONALD: When?

HON. G. THORN: At the referendum.

Mr. ANNEAR: No.

HON. G. THORN: What nonsense! The hon. member separates the metropolitan area from the Southern part of the colony, but if he adds the metropolitan area to the rest of the Southern parts of the colony he will find that the South has unmistakably gone against federation. The Premier has before to-day divided the colony into three parts, and why did he not split it up into three parts for the purposes of the referendum? Is there not a Northern, a Central, and a Southern part of the colony?

The PREMIER: It is all one colony.

HON. G. THORN: The hon. gentleman talks of it being all one colony, but there are three divisions, and the hon. gentleman made a great point of the concession he got from the conference of Premiers when he was promised a portfolio. (Laughter.) The concession he got was that he could please himself how he divided Queensland. He would not trust the Queenslanders, but he was prepared to trust the other colonies. That is a serious charge I make against the Premier—that he is not prepared to trust the people in the Southern and South-western parts of Queensland. I have been astonished that the metropolitan Press, and the *Courier* especially, has not seen through the little schemes of the Premier. In the Northern part of the colony there are sixteen members, and taking them *in globo* that part of the colony unmistakably declared in favour of federation. The Central division also declared in favour of it, and there are eleven members there. But in the Southern division of the colony there are forty-five members.

Mr. McDONALD: It has no right to them either.

Mr. THORN: Taking these forty-five *in globo* I say the majority is against federation, and before the Premier should press this motion on the House there should be unanimity between all parts of the colony. That is not the case, as the South has declared unmistakably against it, and the Premier has no right therefore to go on with this Address to the Queen. Will the Premier tell us that he is prepared to go before his constituents and ask them for a vote of confidence or no confidence on this question? The hon. gentleman was pleased to write to one or two little places in his electorate congratulating them upon the vote they had given in favour of federation, but he did not speak to the whole of Bulimba. Wellington Point and Cleveland are not the only places in the electorate of Bulimba, and the hon. member ought to know that the electors of Bulimba are unmistakably against federation, and it is his duty to go before them again to know whether he has got their confidence before he attempts to thrust this down our throats. It is thus owing to those Bulimba voters that the hon. gentleman is now at the head of the Treasury benches. (Laughter.)

He has no right to be there, and I challenge him to go before his constituents—even  
[4:30] with the plural vote—to see whether he possesses the confidence of the electors of Bulimba. I believe in having everything done fairly and squarely. I know how this majority vote was brought about, taking the whole colony as one electorate for the purpose of the referendum. I can tell the House. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Let us have it.

HON. G. THORN: The Premier went to Fassifern, and three special trains were sent there to put the electors in my district crooked, but instead of my district going crooked there was a majority of three to one there against federation. If I had had the privilege of free trains to the North, and free water carriage, and my expenses paid, I could have made a great difference in the vote, but I had no money to spare, like those on the federal side. The senior member for Townsville knows that money was the thing that did it in the North; that was the cause of that big vote in the North.

Mr. SMITH: You did a lot of wire-pulling yourself.

HON. G. THORN: I did advise the people of Bowen to do a certain thing, but I believe my wire went too late there. (Laughter.) "The fat was in the fire," and it was not made use of; but I believe that if a proper man had received the wire the night before the poll, there would have been a difference. I know there were several importations from the other colonies by the other side. Look at the lawyers in favour of federation! Who paid their expenses? The hon. member for Townsville knows that there were—I won't say a lot of schemers, but a lot of scheming people in the North. I acquit the hon. member of all blame; but what was their object from the beginning? Was it not a deep-laid scheme to block the port of Moreton Bay? That was the whole thing in going into this federation—a deep-laid scheme to wipe out Brisbane. I wish I could have gone to the North and talked to the people there—and there were other members in the Southern part of the colony quite as capable and better able than I—but we had not the means, we had not "the sinews of war." There was no work done in the North by Southern members except sending a few wires, and I must here thank the hon. member for Clermont, Mr. Lesina, who worked admirably. He deserves patting on the back for the unmissable good work he did from an anti-billite point of view. I must also take in the three musketeers from Rockhampton. They certainly did good work, and I hope even now it is not too late to get an alteration made in the Commonwealth Bill, allowing those people the right of forming separate States before this Address goes to the Queen. Why should the people of the Riverina district be deprived of annexing themselves to Victoria, and having the benefit of their natural port? Why should the people of the Clarence and Richmond and Tweed River districts not have the right to separate from New South Wales and be connected with Queensland? And why should not the people of the Central district form a separate State if they wish to do so? I trust it is not too late even now for the honourable and venerable—(laughter)—member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, and his colleague, and the hon. member for Rockhampton North, Mr. Stewart, to try whether an alteration cannot be made in the 123rd clause of the Commonwealth Bill, which states that before separation can be granted or an alteration be effected you must have a vote of the State Parliament. I do not think there should be a vote of the Parliament.

Mr. BROWNE: You want to get Fassifern made into a separate State.

HON. G. THORN: I want to see fair play all round, and I trust that something will be done even now by the members for Rockhampton to make some difference in the way I have indicated. I think it would be out of place to mention it here—I am anxious to get on with the business and not waste the time of the House—but the hon. member for Maryborough can tell you how he first voted one way on this question and then altered his mind. He may be able to tell the

country why he turned round. I know why, but I am not going to enlighten the House. In conclusion, I say that it will be a very bad day indeed for Queensland when federation takes place. What does it mean? It means a tremendous loss on our railways. The Hon. the Treasurer prided himself a little while ago on the fact that our railways were paying so well, but with federation they will not pay nearly so well.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why?

HON. G. THORN: Because our produce will have to go over them for nothing, or next to nothing. Farm produce will have to be carried for next to nothing, and the Queensland Government will have at once to go in for a steamship service of their own. They must have a terminus as well as the other colonies. There will be the three steambot services—the A.U.S.N., with its terminus at Sydney; the Howard Smith, with its terminus at Melbourne; and the Adelaide Company, with its terminus at Adelaide. That is all they care about; they do not care a snap of the finger about Queensland. I do not suppose this Government will last very long after this (laughter)—after this vote is taken, but it will be the duty of the next Government to go in at once for a line of steamers. They will be compelled to do so to save the colony, the Southern part of the colony, from utter destruction—utter ruin. I may say that the people who pull the wires at election times informed me straight that I was to go over to the Opposition. I was waited on by a deputation and requested to take my place on the opposite side of the House, but I pointed out to them that it would be like jumping "out of the frying-pan into the fire," because the leader of the Labour party is a federalist like the leader of the Government, and so is the leader of the Remnant. (Laughter.) I was told that there was the Darling Downs contingent, led by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom. Of course I will think over the position and will please myself. I am not going to change my seat at the present time; I shall wait for developments; I shall wait to see how other hon. members act in the future.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Form a new party.

HON. G. THORN: I trust that we shall have an amendment to this Address; that my friend the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, will try to have a clause inserted in order to do justice to all parts of the colony. We have been told that justice has long been denied to the Central division, and I hope they will get justice as quickly a possible.

\* Mr. GROOM (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Labour Opposition, in speaking this afternoon, said he did not wish to say anything to cause irritation in the course of his remarks, but I must say that the hon. gentleman's speech was the most irritating that could possibly be made, to those who differ from him on this question of federation. I think if he had followed the conciliatory and gentlemanly tone of the Premier, it would have been much better. I think that most of us who have been in the House for any time, know our relations to our constituents, and the relations of constituents to their members, and I am prepared to act up to what I believe to be right—right to them, right to this House, and right to the country.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: I am not going to be influenced by any such expressions of opinion—harsh and irritating as they were—that have been voiced this afternoon. I felt it my duty to take a certain course of action with regard to this federation question, and I claim, as the leader of the Opposition claims, to have been actuated by the highest and most conscientious motives.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I believe I said that.

Mr. GROOM: I have done what I considered to be my duty to my constituents and the country. But the people of the colony have given their verdict, and I am not going to take any action this afternoon that will be contrary to the voice of the people.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has said, and said rightly, that the period for contention has gone by. So it has. We have got the vote of the people, and I consider that I should be no more justified in opposing the wishes of the majority than if the anti-federalists had obtained a majority, and the minority desired to oppose the wishes of the majority.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: That is the right and proper ground for a parliamentary representative to act upon, after he has given his assent, as I have done, to the question of federation being referred to the people. I do not withdraw one word of what I said two or three weeks ago with regard to the probable consequences of federation. I know that many people differ from the views I take, but I claim to be a close observer of the politics of the adjoining colonies as well as any other hon. member of this House, and I have observed that some of the leading men who took part in the campaign are now looking forward with fear and apprehension to the financial question.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: I believe that will be the stumbling-block; that when our Customs and other revenues are taken away from us, then the financial problem will have to be solved, and then the severity of the action now taken will be felt, and probably on many heads more curses than blessings will rest in years to come.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: No one takes a greater interest in the development of the colony than I do. All I have and all that I hold dear is in this fair colony of Queensland, and any action that will affect their interests will affect the interests of the people generally. I therefore hope the predictions forecasted by many people that great good will result from our action will be realised. If so, I, if I live long enough, will enjoy those advantages, and if I pass over to the "great majority" my family will reap the benefits of it. Considering the amount of business to be done and the short time to do it in, I do not think this is the time to prolong this discussion. The people have expressed their view, and it is the duty of every hon. member to carry out the will of the people. I may say in closing that the farmers in the agricultural districts have expressed their opinion against federation—very largely against it. The Premier cannot deny that, and they had reason to be apprehensive of the consequences that will follow. I hope that their fears will not be realised, but that the great good foretold will be realised. Having given my assent to this matter being referred to the people, and the people having expressed their opinion on the question, I think I should not be doing my duty to the country if I now offered any factious opposition to the adoption of this Address.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): I agree with the opening remarks made by the hon. member for Toowoomba. I came into this House about the same time as the leader of the Opposition, and I have always been one of those who objected to dictation, whether it came from the Ministerial bench, the bench behind the Ministry, or from hon. members on the Opposition benches.

We are answerable to our constituents and to the country generally, and I certainly enter my protest, as the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba has just done, against my duty being dictated to me on the present occasion.

Mr. DAWSON: No dictation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: But I leave that question alone for the present.

Mr. DAWSON: Because you are wrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I was one of those, with the hon. member for Toowoomba, who held the view that the acceptance of the Constitution under the Commonwealth Bill would be disadvantageous to Queensland. I fought in my constituency and in other constituencies against it, but those who fought against it found that their power was insufficient. They were defeated; we must accept that defeat, and I accept it. I now offer those who are in the majority my most loyal support.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I say distinctly that now the Bill is accepted we should do all we can to make it a success. Each hon. member who opposed it, like myself, will best serve the interests of the agriculturists of Queensland by working to make this Bill a success, and not by factious opposition. Those who were victorious, when the referendum was before the people, can certainly afford to be generous to those who, like myself, are in the minority. Although I think that the period for the acceptance of this Constitution might have been deferred, as the majority have decided that it is applicable to the conditions of to-day, I hope that all those who, like myself, thought their interests would be injured will find that they held very wrong views indeed. I intend to support the motion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): I represent an agricultural constituency, and I have done my level best to defeat the Commonwealth Bill. I recollect when the matter was first mooted a number of prominent politicians in this House and outside approached the question with the words, "Will it pay?" I think it will not pay. I contend that Queensland has all to lose and nothing to gain under this Constitution. We have had special pleaders brought here, no doubt at considerable expense, to throw dust in the eyes of the electors, and we had the leader of the House making certain promises—very important promises. He was reported to have said at Wynnum that in the event of the people accepting the Bill he would advocate electoral reform, and that it would not be his fault or the fault of the Government if effect was not given to that promise. I do not think it was worthy of that hon. gentleman or of his position to endeavour to influence any section of the community by promises of that sort.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: It has also led to the retirement from the Government of one of its ablest members—the Hon. A. H. Barlow—who has done yeoman service to the colony. I, for one, am not afraid to stand here and publicly express that opinion. As far as pioneers are concerned, it is news to me, although I am an Australian, that there were any pioneers in connection with the discovery of gold. The first great mining field in Queensland was Gympie, which was discovered in 1867, and property and life were quite as safe thirty-two years ago as they are at present. Hence these people were not pioneers in the sense which is generally accepted. They did not go out to open up any country with their lives almost in their hands. Nothing of the sort. They were surrounded by protection in every shape and form. Therefore, I do not think that remark applies.

Mr. DAWSON: Where would Queensland be without the diggers?

Mr. FOGARTY: I have as much sympathy with the great mining industry as the leader of the Opposition; but it has been admitted by all political economists that the agricultural portion of a nation is the backbone of it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: When the mining fields of Gympie and Charters Towers are things of the past, agriculture will continue, unless the removal of the present Customs duty swamps our small farmers. The Government introduced an excellent measure some years ago known as the Agricultural Lands Repurchase Act. They purchased land at very considerable cost with a view of settling the people upon it, and something like 800 or 900 families have obtained employment by it. The Government made the payments to extend over twenty years; but I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said outside the House, that these people will not be able to meet their engagements, if the small amount of protection they are given at present is removed. It has been said that under federation we shall have intercolonial freetrade and protection against the world: but there is no such provision in the Commonwealth Bill. There is nothing to prevent the Federal Parliament—which, I presume, will meet in Melbourne—from saying we shall have freetrade with the outer world as well as between the colonies. I believe that the interests of Victoria and New South Wales are almost identical, and if they amalgamate their forces they can make a fiscal policy suited to their requirements. If they do that, it will certainly injure our farming community—one that I have every respect for. Down south they have large yields, owing to the rains, and they have the labour-saving appliances by which they have reduced the cost of production to almost a minimum. Our people have not reached that stage. Our farmers are young; our industries are young, and they require protection for some time to come. I am pleased to say that all those engaged in this important sphere of life—agriculture—were keenly alive to their own interests and almost unanimously voted “No.” Should not the opinion of this respectable minority be considered? Should they be completely ignored? I say they should receive as much consideration as the majority. I admire the principle of the referendum quite as much as the hon. the senior member for Charters Towers; but I deny that the vote taken on the 2nd of September was a true reflex of public opinion, and for this reason—that there were thousands disfranchised. If it was the intention of the Government to take an honest opinion of the electors of the colony, they would have made no movement until these people had the same opportunity of voting as I had.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you vote?

Mr. FOGARTY: I voted, I am pleased to say, and I say it with a good deal of pride and satisfaction, and erased the word “Yes.” I believe that those who were in sympathy with the farming industry voted in the same way.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: Not in the sugar districts.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Because they want black labour.

Mr. FOGARTY: It is true that the sugar industry voted in favour of the proposal. I have every sympathy with the sugarcane-grower; but I refuse to be taxed to the extent of  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. extra for my sugar. If we had a guarantee from the Commonwealth that coloured labour or alien labour of every sort would be a thing of the past I would willingly pay it, but we have no such guarantee. True, it was said that a black labour colony might be established, but I should be very

sorry to see such a colony established in any portion of Australia—I will go further, and say of Australasia. I believe that, as far as the sugar-growers are concerned, the awakening will be a very rude one. I do not think federation will be any benefit to those engaged in the production of sugar. I believe it will affect them almost to the same extent as it will any of the agriculturists down south. If you take the different electorates, independent of the metropolitan round the city, you will find that in all the electorates in which farming has attained to any dimensions a majority was cast against the Bill. If you take the electorates a short distance from Brisbane—we will say, Bulimba, Oxley, Rosewood, Stanley, Lockyer, Drayton and Toowoomba, Cambooya, and Aubigny—you will find, in the aggregate, that there was a majority against the proposal. The cost of this referendum was £8,000. I do not think the taxpayers have received anything like a *quid pro quo* for that expenditure. I believe it was a complete waste of money. Although I was a lad, I remember the immense amount of agitation which took place in connection with our severance from New South Wales. I also remember the great and active part taken and the great services rendered by Dr. Lang on that occasion, and to the disgrace of Queensland be it said, those services have not been recognised up to the present. Now we are prepared to hand over all that we received on that occasion. That is what we shall do if federation becomes an accomplished fact, and I believe it will. I am not going to offer any factious opposition to it at this stage. I recognise that the majority has said “Yes,” and whether I agree or disagree, I must bow to it. Notwithstanding that, I say that we are now inclined to surrender certain advantages and certain privileges that we received on the 10th December, 1859. A good deal was made out of the fact that the electors of the Northern portion of the colony almost unanimously voted “Yes.” But they did not vote in connection with this great question. It was clouded by a side issue, and a very selfish and narrow one. It was the North *versus* Brisbane. That, I am satisfied, accounted for the large majority of votes cast in the North. We also speak of improving our harbours and rivers. Well, there is no necessity for concern in that direction, for the reason that Sydney, owing to her great natural advantages, must become the commercial centre of Australia. The late Premier of New South Wales, when speaking at a very important centre, with a population of something between 28,000 and 30,000 souls, advised them to vote for the Commonwealth Bill, pointing out that a market existed in Queensland for their agricultural produce. It is perfectly true that there is a market here. Those people can reach the only market that they have very much cheaper owing to the carriage being by water. Our farmers at Roma, Killarney, on the Darling Downs, and even in the West Moreton district, cannot compete with the farmers of the Clarence, Richmond, or Tweed. Therefore, to my mind, this matter of federation spells ruin to the people whose interests I am here to advocate. True, we shall have the benefit of supplying our southern friends with live stock; but if federation was not accomplished, if the people had had the good sense to say “No” on the 2nd September, that market would still be open to us, because, owing to the geographical position of the southern colonies, their live stock must be obtained from us. Therefore the cattle-grower had nothing to fear without federation, and I believe myself that the consumer will not reap the benefits that are anticipated by some. When I speak of “the cattle-grower” I mean the man who counts his increase by the thousands, and probably

federation may be some indirect benefit to him. It will also be a benefit to the farmer who farms from 500 to 1,000 acres; but we have a number of small farmers who surely deserve some consideration. If federation is accomplished the federal tariff will be so framed by the amalgamation of the two chief States that it will be utterly impossible for the industries of Queensland to exist. There is only one manufacturing centre in the colony—Maryborough—which by its vote supported federation; and I understand that Maryborough is in the very happy position of having one of the best equipped foundries in Queensland, if not in Australia. Federation may be a benefit to Maryborough; but Walkers Limited is not the only firm engaged in that particular industry.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about arrowroot?

Mr. FOGARTY: That is a very small matter indeed, but as far as the Darling Downs is concerned there is something like £50,000 sunk in the erection of breweries and malhouses to encourage people on the rich agricultural lands to grow malting barley. If the duty is removed from barley and malt, that money will have been completely wasted, as the industry in Victoria is so deep rooted, and the production so much over the local demand, that the people there will look in the direction of Queensland for a fresh market. It will probably be their best and most convenient market, and this colony will become their dumping-ground. The Premier pointed out in the course of his eloquent speech—the most eloquent I ever heard the hon. gentleman deliver—that the number of people in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania, and South Australia who voted "Yes" on federation was very great. True; because they have nothing to lose, and they have everything to gain. They will come in here with their productions and swamp our people. I think it is the bounden duty of any Government to protect the industries in which the people are engaged. We have good land here, and we have every variety of climate; we have all the elements necessary to make this colony of Queensland into a great nation, independent of any other portion of Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: We have lands and mines and industries of various kinds, but our southern friends are to be allowed to come in here and develop them. I do not suppose that civil war will be declared, but they will be in the same position as the President of the Transvaal, who is taking possession of the British mines, and is going to work them for the benefit of the Boers. Victoria and New South Wales will take possession of every industry that we have got.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: The industries in the southern colonies are older than ours; they have the capital and machinery. Our industries need both age and machinery. If time were given—I would say five years—we would be in a much better position to federate than we are to-day. At the secret conference of Premiers held in February last, the Premier of this colony left here an anti-billite, and he returned quite the opposite. Sir John Forrest, representing the youngest colony of the group, Western Australia, insisted that better terms should be given to his colony by being allowed to retain the Customs duties for a further period, and in other ways. Those were advantages which Queensland might very well have claimed, but, notwithstanding that they were granted to Western Australia, that colony is standing aloof from the federal movement. Queensland, I contend, should have been represented, not by the Premier, not by any

particular Minister, but by a representative elected by the people. If the people had sent down delegates to the last convention it is more than probable that the conditions of entry into the federation would have been much better so far as this colony is concerned. But we had no voice in the framing of this Commonwealth Bill, and hence we are asked to accept a measure which we know scarcely anything about. Even the greatest exponents of federation admit that a considerable cost will be entailed in connection with defraying the expenses of the Federal Parliament. Many of the best authorities say that the cost will not be less than £100,000 a year, and that is independent of anything in the shape of expenditure on buildings for federal purposes. How is that sum of £100,000 to be met when our Customs duties are removed? I presume it means an income tax and a land tax.

Mr. McDONALD: I hope so.

Mr. FOGARTY: I presume the hon. member who interjects that he hopes so is thinking of some poverty-stricken country that produces neither gold nor anything else, and where the local taxation, whether by divisional boards, or shire councils, or municipal councils, is extremely low, but I think the majority of people must agree that in Queensland at the present time we have sufficient taxation as far as local authorities are concerned, without any additional burden being imposed on the taxpayers. The Right Hon. G. H. Reid, in the course of the campaign in the mother colony, advocated the imposition of a land and income tax; but I say we cannot bear such a tax. Sir George Turner, when speaking at St. Kilda shortly after the late conference, advocated that an excise duty should be imposed on sugar. At the present time the colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia derive a revenue of £600,000 from duty on our sugar, and as under federation that would be a thing of the past, Sir George Turner wants to have an excise duty on sugar. The shrinkage which will take place in our revenue must be made up in some shape or form, as the government of the country must be carried on, and, as far as the local Parliament is concerned, I am given to understand that no reduction will be effected there. Therefore in addition to the cost of that Parliament the taxpayers will be called upon to subscribe £100,000 towards the cost of the Federal Parliament. Our representation in the Federal Parliament will be only ten members, so that if New South Wales and Victoria should combine our ten representatives will be entirely powerless, and we might as well have no representation at all. The people of the other colonies are human, and alive to their own interests, and will certainly vote in a way which will protect their interests, which at this stage are not at all identical with our interests. If we had the population of New South Wales, and we are sadly in need of population, we should then be in a position to hold out the hand of good fellowship to the other colonies, but I believe that when the New South Welshmen found that we were equally as strong as they were, that we had such great resources, and that we have a territory which exceeds theirs more than twofold, and Victoria more than fourfold, they would pause before entering into the federal compact. But now when we are in our infancy and need protection, they are prepared to embrace us and absorb us. As short speeches have been the order of the day up to the present, I do not intend wearying the Chamber by speaking at length, although personally I should like to speak for at least three or four hours on this important question. I think I have made myself sufficiently clear, and shown that I am not in accord or sympathy with the

Commonwealth Bill. I am not at all opposed to federation; quite the reverse. I have no hesitation in saying that we could arrive at some arrangement with the southern colonies that would be mutually beneficial, but, unfortunately, we are now asked to enter into a union which will not be for our advantage, and which there can be no divorce from once the compact is made. Once the shackles are placed round the neck of Queensland this colony will eventually become strangled. If the conditions were at all equal I certainly would offer no opposition to the Commonwealth Bill. I do not think I should have spoken at all on this question were it not for the observations which fell from my friend, the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, in which he stated publicly that anyone opposing the Commonwealth Bill now was opposing the principle of the referendum. I am quite as warm in my advocacy of that principle as the hon. member, notwithstanding that I am opposed to the Commonwealth Bill. But I have entered my protest, and I have not come here to stonewall. If the people are determined to have this Bill they will have it, but when the history of Australia is written fifty years hence, I think it will be recognised that those who opposed this infamous proposal did their duty to themselves, to their country, and to posterity. I have nothing more to say.

\* Mr. ANNEAR (*Maryborough*): For fear the hon. member for Fassifern should have to leave to catch his train I should like to say a few words now with regard to the remarks he made a few minutes ago. The hon. member is very desirous of some information. Well, I will give him that information this afternoon. I gave that information to my constituents some weeks before the vote was taken on the 2nd of September. I admitted to them that I was not very keen on the question of federation, but I am one of those simpletons who live to learn, and when I saw that the four great colonies of Australia had decided to federate, my conscience told me that Queensland could not remain outside. I asked myself the question, "Can the producers, the agricultural producers, of this colony afford to throw away customers who sent them £2,800,000 for produce in the year 1898?" I say "No." I represent an agricultural community, and I found that the great fruit-growing industry of Northern Queensland, including my electorate, received from the southern colonies in 1898 the sum of £98,000 for green fruit. I am aware that my hon. friend—I call him my hon. friend, the hon. member for Fassifern, because he has been a friend of mine since 1864—I say I am aware that my hon. friend is a protectionist. So am I a protectionist, but I want a proper form of protection, and the form of protection I want is, as I have said in this House before, inter-colonial freetrade, and protection against the outside world. I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Lockyer that nothing should be said in this debate to irritate any member in the House. I consider that the battle has been fought, and that it is merely a formal duty we have to perform this afternoon in passing this Address to the Queen. As the hon. member for Lockyer said, each member is responsible to those who sent him here, and if I do anything wrong in this House I am responsible to my constituents, who have sufficient intelligence to deal with me at the proper time. The hon. members for Toowoomba would like this House to believe that the Darling Downs is the only agricultural district in Queensland.

Mr. KEOGH: It is the best, at all events.

Mr. ANNEAR: It may be the best; I do not say whether it is best or not, but I can tell the hon. member that there are thousands of families settled on the land in the Wide Bay and Burnett districts who are making a good living from the

soil. Is not the electorate of Cunningham an agricultural district? Is not the electorate of Maranoa an agricultural district? The Wide Bay and Burnett districts, from one end to the other, gave a most substantial majority of over two to one in favour of federation.

Mr. FOGARTY: Cunningham and Maranoa are portions of the Darling Downs.

Mr. ANNEAR: They are portions of the Darling Downs, and both those electorates voted in favour of federation, and that being the case the hon. member is mistaken in claiming a monopoly of the agricultural industry of the colony. Wide Bay has been referred to, and the foundry in Maryborough, and I ask what does protection against the outside world mean? Does it mean more work for the foundry in Maryborough only? No; it means far more work for the whole of the foundries of Queensland. I saw a gentleman in this House last evening, and no doubt other hon. members saw him—let me say, I suppose, that Charters Towers is the part of Queensland that more any than other requires the most mining machinery. I know that the Charters Towers miners are in sympathy with the manufacturing industries of Queensland at the present time, and they have decided, owing to the sympathetic vote given in my electorate in favour of federation, that, if possible, all their orders shall come to the electorate of Maryborough.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Bribery! "You grease me and I'll grease you."

Mr. ANNEAR: I am sure hon. members on both sides tell their constituents, who are chiefly like ourselves, working men, that to the best of their ability they do all they can to bring into existence legislation which will give them work. I voted for federation because I believe it will give the working men of the colony—those here now and thousands more, I trust, to come—more work and better wages than they receive at the present time.

Mr. FOGARTY: Does competition create better wages?

Mr. ANNEAR: Some members who have not been as long in the House as I have do not know the hon. member for Fassifern as well as I do, but he has let the secret out this afternoon. He is in the "know," and he has told us that one of the members for Rockhampton is to move an amendment to this Address to Her Majesty.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: It is printed and circulated.

Mr. ANNEAR: I have not seen it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You found a mare's nest.

Mr. ANNEAR: We have always contended in this House, and especially members on this side, that the electors of Rockhampton did not represent the feelings of the people of the Central district of Queensland. Rockhampton is not the Central district, for what do we find? When this vote was taken Rockhampton, which is represented in this House by three members, was the only place in the Central district that gave a vote against federation.

Mr. STEWART: The intelligent part.

Mr. ANNEAR: Go to Mount Morgan—

Mr. STEWART: Go to the Mount Morgan Company.

Mr. ANNEAR: I do not know the exact distance, but I do not think Mount Morgan is more than twenty miles from Rockhampton, and I ask: Are not the miners working at Mount Morgan and the people living there intelligent people?

Mr. STEWART: They were bulldozed by the company.

Mr. ANNEAR: The people of the electorate of Mount Morgan voted fully three to one in favour of federation.

Mr. STEWART: They voted as the company told them.

Mr. ANNEAR: And it shows to what a little distance the influence of those three hon. gentlemen penetrates in the Central district. I have no desire to prolong this discussion.

Mr. STEWART: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: I am sure the hon. member for Rockhampton North will recognise fully the truth of my remark that his influence and the influence of the two hon. members for Rockhampton is confined to Rockhampton only, and to no other part of the Central district. I vote with pleasure for the motion so ably moved by the Premier and seconded most ably by the leader of the Labour Opposition. I do not think that hon. gentleman said one word that was irritating. I like a man to stand up and say what he means. There is no need to be mealy-mouthed over this question. This is a resolution backed up by a large majority of the electors of Queensland. I do believe we shall not have long to live before we shall see that not only those who have voted for this measure but hon. members and electors outside who have voted against it will agree that this measure will be not only for the benefit of Queensland but for the great benefit of united Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*): I have already in this House expressed my objection to federation, and I shall not occupy the time of the House long about it now. On referendum day I voted against federation, and I intend to do so now if this motion goes to a vote. I have expressed my opinion of the disastrous effect it will have upon the industry with which I have been connected since I came to the colony, and I have not changed my opinion yet. I am sure if the people had been allowed to use their own discretion in connection with federation, the referendum vote would have been a great deal different from what it was.

Mr. McDONALD: It would be much larger.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: It would have been against federation very extensively. I am sorry to say we found the Premier and the leader of the Opposition going hand in hand in unduly influencing the people to vote for federation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the other side?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The Ministry made promises to the people which were rather indiscreet, and they were substantiated by the leader of the Opposition. The result was that at one polling-place north of Brisbane—I shall not mention where—where there were 150 possible votes, and where the leader of the Opposition was conspicuously prominent, there were actually, when the ballot-box was opened at 5 o'clock in the evening, no less than 400 federal votes came out of the box.

Hon. G. THORN: I forgot to talk about that.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Where?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I will not mention where it was; but I can assure you that this was told to me in the presence of the hon. member who represents the electorate, and he did not contradict it.

Mr. McDONALD: What about the *Cambooya* electorate—if you are going to talk about that?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The *Cambooya* electorate is very well able to mind itself. I will not go into these matters, as the case is still *sub judice*, and when it has been dealt with I may have something to say about it. I hope hon. members will refrain from mentioning it any more in the House until the parties within whose jurisdiction it lies in the meantime have decided upon it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACKINTOSH: As a fact, I know that federation is troubling my friend the hon. member for Cunningham and another gentleman very much, because they have been agitating to get reductions in railway freights in connection with wheat in order to enable them to waive off the evil that will arise by the time we get freetrade in agricultural products. Whatever their ideas have been in advocating federation before, they are backing down now as quickly as they possibly can. Having expressed my objections to federation before, I shall say no more now but that if a division is called for on this motion I shall certainly vote against it. If the voice of the electors carried it, and enabled the Premier to send this Address to Her Majesty, I would be quite agreeable to it, but when I find it has been decided by a majority of the members of this House, it is my duty to conscientiously vote according to my convictions, and I shall vote against it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Against the will of the people.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I shall not occupy the time of the House any longer. I think the motion should go to a vote as quickly as possible.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Moreton*): It seems to be the rule that those who took an [5.30 p.m.] active part in opposing the Commonwealth Bill on the referendum should say something in explanation of the course they intend to pursue. I wish to say that while my conviction in regard to the matter is not altered by the vote—I still think it will be a bad thing for Queensland—at the same time I am bound to admit that the vote in favour of the measure is such as to warrant my not offering any further opposition—at any rate factious opposition—to the adoption of the measure.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CAMPBELL: If a division takes place I shall feel it my duty, in view of the expression of opinion given by my constituents, to vote against the Address, but if the House does not divide on the question I do not intend to offer any further opposition to it. I am now more concerned as to when freetrade is likely to eventuate. I had not the pleasure of being present when the Premier made his speech this afternoon; I am not aware whether he gave any forecast as to when it may eventuate, but I hope the time indicated during the debate on the Commonwealth Bill will prove substantially correct—that is, that we may expect it in three or four years. In that connection I think the Premier failed in the representation he made at the Conference of the Premiers, inasmuch as he did not contend for special relief in that way, because I believe that if he had put his foot down he would have been listened to with great respect, and the matter would have been carried on those lines, giving the colony more breathing time before such a drastic alteration comes into effect. I take it that the vote that has been cast in favour of the measure is in many respects not a vote in favour of federation, but a vote against Brisbane. Old-time grievances were brought into the matter, and whatever the consequence might be, they knew that Brisbane itself would probably go against the measure, and they wanted to show how they could upset Brisbane; and I believe that largely accounts for the big vote in the North in favour of federation. However, the principle of the referendum having been adopted by this House, and the colony as a whole having approved of the Commonwealth Bill, I think it would be futile—only a waste of time—to carry objection further. Therefore, I hope those who did vote against it—and I was one of the most earnest I believe in that way—will now cast in their lot to assist in protecting

Queensland in the framing of the tariff that will eventually have to be framed for the Commonwealth of Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): Though I worked very hard to defeat this Bill—the Commonwealth Bill—when it went before the country, I have no intention of offering any opposition to the Address which is before us now.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEWART: But while that is the case, I must confess that I see no reason whatever for the triumphant note sounded both by the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition in moving and seconding the adoption of this Address. To listen to the hon. gentlemen one would imagine, if the facts were not perfectly well known, that Queensland had almost unanimously accepted the Commonwealth Bill—that the billites had literally swept the field of the anti-billites.

Mr. KEOGH: They had the means to do it; we had not.

Mr. STEWART: What are the facts? We find that out of every 100 electors in Queensland thirty-two did not vote, thirty-eight voted for the Bill, and thirty against the Bill; or, to reduce the thing to a minimum—which fairly expresses, I think, the relative vote—out of every eleven men who voted six were for the Bill and five against the Bill. Is there anything to boast about in connection with that? And then when we consider the means by which this great majority was obtained, the billites had not sufficient talent in Queensland to carry the thing on themselves, they had to import all the principal speakers. They had to send to Victoria and New South Wales; and I am certain that if they could have got men from South Australia, they would have brought them from there also. I am astonished when I consider the talent I see opposed to me to-night, that the billites of Queensland had to resort to the wretched expedient of bringing their orators from other portions of Australia. When I look at the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and consider what an eloquent speaker he is, when I look also at the hon. gentleman sitting beside him—the hon. member for Bundaberg, whose qualifications as a public speaker we are all so well acquainted with, and when again I look upon the hon. gentleman who holds the purse strings of the colony, whose eloquence we all know, and when I look further afield and see the hon. member for Bulloo, who is perhaps one of the gladiators of debate, I may almost say, I repeat that I am lost in astonishment at the billites sending to other colonies for their public speakers.

Mr. LEAHY: Who told you we sent for them?

Mr. STEWART: I do not know whether they sent for them or not of my own knowledge, but it is common report that they were sent for.

Mr. KERR: Mr. Trenwith said he was invited.

Mr. STEWART: It is common report that the billites of Queensland sent to the Southern colonies asking them for God's sake to send up men to advocate, to speak for the Bill, and it is also a matter of common report that the Southern colonies not only sent up the wind which carried this Bill through, but that they also sent up something more substantial in the shape of money.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEWART: That is a matter of common report.

Mr. GLASSEY: It is not true.

Mr. STEWART: Of course, we know that rumour has always been a lying jade; of course we know that Victoria had no interest in getting Queensland into the federation; we know perfectly well that New South Wales had no money

interest in getting Queensland into the federation; and knowing that, is it at all likely that those colonies would spend money in getting the black sheep to come into the federation? If hon. gentlemen opposite think we are exactly the fools we may appear to them, I say they are very much mistaken. In addition to the men from the south, and in addition to the money from the south, we had the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. When federation was in *extremis*, when it was just trembling in the balance, what did he do? He came forward and threw a sop down to the public of Queensland. He said, "If you people will vote for federation, I will give you one man one vote." Well, the people voted for federation. When is the hon. gentleman going to give them one man one vote? He caught the people with that bait, but he has not redeemed his promise yet. I hope he will do so. I think the hon. gentleman might very well have left federation to be decided upon its merits without introducing any extraneous matter of that kind.

Mr. LEAHY: That promise never reached the bulk of the electors.

Mr. STEWART: That promise did reach the bulk of the electors, and it influenced a great number of them. And I may just tell the hon. gentleman that if he does not fulfil that promise the result may not be altogether too pleasant for him. But while federation was carried by such a small majority and by such questionable means as far as the Government were concerned, I would like to say this—and I say it "more in sorrow than in anger"—that the question was not treated by the country as it ought to have been; it was not decided on high political grounds.

Mr. LEAHY: Whose fault was that?

Mr. STEWART: Whose fault was that? I say that the only portion of the colony where it was decided on high political grounds was the Central division. Why did Brisbane vote against the Bill? Because if the Bill was carried they thought that the southern colonies would swamp the industries here. The average voter never took the Constitution into consideration at all. He did not care two straws whether it was democratic or conservative, or what it was. He simply looked at the question this way—Will federation help me in my industry?

Mr. LEAHY: You have a very poor opinion of the people.

Mr. STEWART: The result of the vote bears this out. Then take the western portion of Southern Queensland. What influenced the farmers there? Why, they thought they would be swamped by the southern colonies.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: So they will. Quite right.

Mr. STEWART: Other people—for instance, the wheat-growers—thought they would have an Australian market for their wheat. As far as Southern Queensland was concerned, the question of federation was not decided on its merits at all, but according to the industrial and money aspect of the matter. Then with regard to the mining industry the vote in this connection went for the Bill. Why? Because the miners thought they would get cheap food under intercolonial freetrade. That was what animated the miners throughout Queensland. They did not care two straws about the Constitution. The same might be said of the pastoralists. They expected to get cheap potatoes; the miners cheap onions, and somebody else cheap something else.

Mr. LESINA: Cheap neckties.

Mr. STEWART: Yes, cheap neckties, and cheap machinery. Miners thought that if the Bill was accepted that machinery would have free access to the Australian markets. I would like to point out to those protectionists who voted for

the Bill, that the matter is not settled by any means yet. The miners are not only in favour of intercolonial freetrade but also of freetrade with the world.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEWART: The pastoralists are in the same position. Why? Because they desire cheap clothing, cheap machinery, cheap potatoes, and cheap something else.

Mr. LEAHY: Did you not advocate that here last year?

Mr. STEWART: Yes; I did.

Mr. LEAHY: If it was right then, how can it be wrong now?

Mr. STEWART: Because, like the hon. member, I am always learning, and I have changed my opinions many times since I was born. As far as the mining and pastoral industries are concerned, would the Bill benefit the wage-earners? No; it will only benefit the absentee syndicates, and that is the reason why these absentee syndicates are doing their level best to carry through this legislation.

Mr. RYLAND: What about the Rockhampton vote?

Mr. STEWART: I will tell the hon. member about that vote. The people in Rockhampton and in the immediate vicinity—who seem to be despised by a large number of hon. members—were the only electors who dealt with this question from a high political point of view and in a statesmanlike manner. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A separation point of view.

Mr. STEWART: If they did look at it from a separation point of view, were they not justly entitled to do so? Was that not a higher point of view than the price of potatoes, onions, beer, or neckties? I ask hon. members to say if anything had done more to promote the progress of Australia than the subdivision of the States. Nothing, and every hon. member knows that.

Mr. LEAHY: That is a question. You cannot tell what the prosperity would be.

Mr. STEWART: Yes, I could. We have it all through history, that just as the territory of Australia has been subdivided, so has the country prospered.

The PREMIER: What about the history of federation.

Mr. STEWART: Not only did we object to the Constitution because it did not provide for a subdivision of the States, but we objected for other reasons. The Constitution was deemed quite democratic enough for the people of the North, and a large number of people in the South, but it was not democratic enough for the people of the Centre.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Hear, hear!

Mr. STEWART: That was the reason—the principal reason—why we in the Central portion of the colony—in Rockhampton and its immediate vicinity—objected to the Constitution: that it did not place the management of Australian affairs in the hands of the Australian people. As far as I am concerned, I am proud of the attitude I took up with regard to this Bill. I am proud that I opposed it, and that I am one of those who tried to show up its defects and suggest amendments. While I submit to the will of the majority, and I hope that federation will result in all the good that is claimed for it, yet it is the duty of every hon. member to amend the Constitution, and make it much more democratic than it is at present—much more in accordance with the advanced ideas of the Australian people;—and if I am alive after federation is accomplished, I trust I may be able to add my quota

to bring that about, just as I did my best to defeat the Bill when it went before the constituencies.

Mr. W. THORN (*Aubigny*): I don't wish to detain the House at any length, but, as I represent a district in which a very large majority was given against the Bill, I do not think it will be out of place if I say a few words on this matter now. The Premier, in introducing this motion, tried to make out that it was the will of the people that this Address should be presented to the Queen. I do not think it is the will of the people. They have not had time to consider the matter. It was forced upon them in a very short time, and the Premier used every advantage he had in his power to carry this Commonwealth Bill under the referendum. I am thoroughly in favour of the referendum—in taking the voice of the people—but I wish to mention that on the 2nd September I was in one portion of my electorate. I understood the Premier to state when the Enabling Bill was going through, that in every portion of the electorates where polling booths had existed before—everywhere where men wished to cast their vote—polling booths would be proclaimed, but at Jondaryn and other places, we had no polling booth and a large number of the electors there had to use the envelopes, and were knocked back by this omission. The greater portion of these electors were young men engaged shearing at that time at Jondaryn, and the manager of that station came down and endeavoured to persuade men to vote for the Bill. I heard something of this before, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that some of these men were frightened to sign their names on the envelopes for fear that they would be found out. I believe the hon. member for Charters, when speaking on this question, made out that the envelope system was a good one, but I can't say that it is any better than the postal ballot for our divisional boards. I don't agree with it at all. Look at the persuasive powers used by the billites to carry the people with them on this great question! Look at the men they brought from the southern colonies! The hon. member for Bulloo is no doubt a great and fluent speaker. He came to Toowoomba, and I believe he carried some of the electors of Toowoomba with him. I do not think he was paid; but I believe a great number were paid who went round the district. I heard on one occasion that the sum of £1,000 came from New South Wales—that it was sent up by the Chinese.

Mr. GLASSEY: They were anti-billites.

Mr. W. THORN: Not at all. The hon. member knows very well where the money came from.

Mr. GLASSEY: I have a list in my pocket.

Mr. W. THORN: If the hon. member wants facts, all he has to do is to go to the secretary of the Anti-Bill League. He will see that it came from the Chinese.

Mr. GLASSEY: They issued a manifesto calling upon anti-billites to oppose the Bill.

Mr. W. THORN: I challenge the statement. These are bogus statements made up by the billites themselves. What else did the Premier do when going round on this great subject of federation? When he was away in the North there was a great show at Laidley, and a wire was sent to Mr. Armstrong that he might show to the people, to the effect that if they voted for federation he would give them a railway up Laidley Creek.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Shame!

The PREMIER: The only thing is, I was not at Laidley at all.

Mr. W. THORN: I do not say the hon. gentleman was at Laidley. He was in North Queensland at the time. He knew very well there was a show at Laidley that day, and he

thought this was going to be a good bait. He also went to Warwick, and told the people there, "If you vote for federation you will get the *via recta* and the Warwick to St. George line." But the people are not going to be gulled altogether in that way.

Mr. LEAHY: Did he promise the Goombungee railway?

Mr. W. THORN: I believe it was promised on one occasion, not by the present Government, but by the continuous Government. It is something like the railway from Warwick to St. George. The hon. member for Charters Towers, in speaking to this question, wanted to make out that the mining industry of the colony is the principal industry. But he must know very well it is not. Every honest man, I believe, will admit that the farming industry is the backbone of the colony.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. THORN: Outside of that there is the pastoral industry; that comes before mining. A large majority of the votes cast on the mining fields were cast in favour of federation. Why? The hon. member for Charters Towers knows that if he had not gone to Charters Towers, Mr. Lesina had that place captured. The miners of Charters Towers, if asked to-morrow why they voted for this particular Bill, would tell you that the principal reason was that they were bribed to knock Brisbane out of existence altogether.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Cheap food, cheap clothes.

Mr. W. THORN: They regarded it from a freetrade point of view altogether.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Cheap beer.

Mr. W. THORN: They also looked at it from the point of view of one man one vote. That was promised to them. Has that Bill been brought in yet? I challenge the Premier. I say I do not believe he was sincere when he said he was going to alter our Constitution to one man one vote.

Mr. BROWNE: We will make him sincere.

The HOME SECRETARY: Every man who voted for federation must vote for one man one vote.

Mr. W. THORN: While hon. members on this side who voted for federation have said they are going to vote for the Address, only two members on the other side, I believe, have spoken. They are all very quiet and dumb-founded. I expected to hear some great and elaborate speeches.

Mr. McDONALD: They have got paralysed.

Mr. W. THORN: The hon. member for Charters Towers knows as well as I do that the miners are not the pioneers of the colony.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes, they are.

Mr. W. THORN: They are not pioneers at all.

Mr. RYLAND: They saved Queensland in 1866.

Mr. W. THORN: That is not so. It was the capital that came into the colony from the old country that saved it at that time. The hon. member knows that as well as I do. He knows very well that every ounce of gold taken out of Gympie costs £3 10s. to get.

Mr. FISHER: It is not fair to say that.

Mr. W. THORN: I say it, and I say it without fear of contradiction. If there was a rush started over the border to-morrow, where should we be? The miners would go over the border into New South Wales just like a flock of sheep. We heard something this afternoon about closing our border. I believe that if this Bill is carried the border will be closed to the squatters in the north and north-western portions of this colony. We should pause before we hand this great country over to New South Wales and Victoria. I intend to oppose the motion.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): There has been a hackneyed expression used by hon. members—

that they are not going to take any very active part against the passing of this Address. I am not going to use any strong language with regard to this matter; but I would be remiss in my

duty were I not to stand up and [7 p.m.] say in as intelligent a manner as possible the few words I have to say on the question. I spoke at some length on the subject when the House met some short time ago, and I have not fallen away in the slightest from what I said on that occasion. I still believe that federation will not be judicious for Southern Queensland. I have expressed that opinion forcibly on many platforms, not only in my own electorate, but in certain other electorates in West Moreton. I was cordially listened to, and, judging by the votes recorded in those electorates on the 2nd of September, what I stated bore fruit to some extent. The leader of this party and also the Premier of the colony has stated, not only here but on public platforms throughout the country, that federation will be beneficial to the great bulk of the Queensland people.

Mr. GLASSY: Don't you think it, too.

Mr. KEOGH: I certainly do not think it. It may be a good thing for the nomads—the people who are here to-day and away to-morrow—but that is where the vote has come in. I deny that that vote as expressed by the people of Queensland is the actual voice of the great producing people of this colony. I look upon that vote as merely a vote given by people who have no interest whatever in this colony. (Laughter, and "Hear, hear!") My friends on this side of the House may laugh, but I still believe I am correct when I say that the vote given by the bulk of the people in the Northern portion of this colony was simply a vote given by migratory people, who really have no interest in this colony further than that they are merely eking out an existence as long as they are in it, and do not care twopence how the country goes on after they leave it. Their concern is merely the amount of wages they get, or the amount they can make by digging—which is a most precarious living.

Mr. GIVENS: Were you ever in the North? You don't know anything about it.

Mr. KEOGH: I have not been in the North, but I have been on other goldfields throughout Australia, and I know what the digger's life is just as well as my hon. friend who interjects. I know as much about gold-digging perhaps as any man in this House, and I have no hesitation in saying that the object of a great number of those who recorded their votes in favour of federation was to get cheap bread, cheap meat, and everything as cheap as it is possible to get it, without caring how it comes, so long as they can live cheaper. It has been shown that the people in the Southern portion of the colony are decidedly opposed to federation, and it will be conceded that they are the bone and sinew of this great colony. (Laughter, and "Hear, hear!") We are the great producing people, at all events. It cannot be gainsaid, though my hon. friends may laugh, that we cannot "hump our blueys" and leave the colony whenever we choose. We are here—the bone and sinew of the land. We are the great people of this colony. (Laughter and "Hear, hear!") It has been said that there are three great producing interests in Queensland—the pastoral, the sugar, and the mining interests; but the very men who now say that are the men who, on the hustings, are for ever dinning it into the ears of the people in our agricultural districts that the agricultural industry is the backbone of this colony. Now, these men say we are a mere handful—we are nothing—the sugar industry and the mining industry are the great industries of Queensland. I do not wish to say one word against those

industries. I shall be glad to give them a helping hand, so long as I have life or breath. It is to my interest, and to the interest of the colony generally, that these industries should prosper; but I certainly should not like to see these industries prospering at the expense of the great agricultural industry. The agricultural industry lives without the help of black labour, and the very men who are now talking so much about the importance of the sugar industry are the very men who cry out against black labour and alien labour of any kind. I ask my friends here to mark my words—federation is the very thing which will keep black labour in this country. And why? Because this sugar industry is being supported by southern capitalists. The very men who will keep black labour in this country are the very men that the supporters of federation are doing all they can to bring here. They are using undue influence to keep a class of people in Queensland whom my friends on this side have always been up in arms against. I shall certainly show my consistency to those who returned me to this House by voting this evening against the Address to Her Majesty. I do not blame the Government. I have nothing to say against those people who believe in federation. They are perfectly right in what they are doing as far as their lights are concerned; but I cannot see with their eyes, and, as far as I can see, I am of opinion that federation would not benefit this colony for years to come. Eventually no doubt it would be suitable to us, but we should be given an opportunity of growing up gradually as a little baby. Let us get on our legs; let us be placed in a position to compete with the other colonies, which we are not in a position to do now nor will be for some time. It is said that the moment we have federation we will have everything cheap, that we will have a market for all our goods and will be able to send them to the southern colonies. But what produce can we send to the southern colonies? Nothing. I grant you that we have wool and tallow and hides and sugar, but have we not got a market for all those things in the outside world? If we federate the intercolonial barriers will be broken down, and then we shall have to compete with the class of goods which come from Victoria and New South Wales. Eventually no doubt we could compete with them, but why not give us time to place our industries on a sound footing?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That would be eternity.

Mr. KEOGH: No, we do not want to wait for eternity. That would be too long a time. I believe that the fact of southern goods coming here will make those articles much dearer than at present. Some people say, "All the better for us, because our own produce will go up in price." To a certain extent that would be the case, but we are not yet in a position to grow the material that we would be able to send to the Northern portion of the colony or to the southern colonies. We are not self-supporting. We do not grow sufficient for our own requirements yet, and consequently the southern colonies will benefit at the expense of this great colony. No doubt the sugar industry is something of which the Northern people are very proud. We are all proud of a great industry like that, but I tell you I would rather see the North granted separation than see this fair colony enter the federation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You can have them both.

Mr. KEOGH: You can have my vote at any time in favour of separation.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUNSFORD: Will the Rosewood farmers give us separation?

Mr. KEOGH: Yes, on the ground that it would be to their interests and the interests of us all to see separation brought about. If we had separation, this great colony would be entitled to six members for each division in the Upper Chamber. I look upon it that we are the natural allies of the Northern portion of the colony. They would not do us any injury, and if separation took place the two Northern divisions, combined with Queensland South, would have eighteen members in the Senate, and in the Lower Chamber the South would have seven and the other two divisions would have five each. That would give us seventeen. We would then be fairly strong, and be able to fight our own way against the southern colonies. It is said that New South Wales is our great ally. I do not deny it. I do not deny that she has been a good friend to us just as we have been to her. We have been sending a good many things to that colony and she has reciprocated. This colony has been her best market, and so long as that state of affairs exists we no doubt will always be on good terms. Still, I am of opinion that we would be far better off if we only remained as we are for a considerable time yet. I believe this colony would go on and prosper. During the last five years none of the colonies have gone ahead as fast as Queensland, and I believe she will go on better and faster if left to her own devices than if she were tied to the other colonies. There would be something to recommend federation if they had held out to us some of the inducements that were held out to Western Australia. We would then have very little to cavil at. I, at all events, would not be so anxious to avoid federation if we had been offered similar terms to those offered to Western Australia. I believe the inducement held out to her is that she is to keep her own tariff for five years.

Mr. GLASSEY: No, it is to gradually decrease.

Mr. KEOGH: Even if those terms were offered to us it would be a concession from which this colony would derive a great deal of benefit. We are to enter the federation on equal terms so far as taxation is concerned, but not so far as having fair representation in each House is concerned. That is one of the great blots of the Bill so far as it affects Queensland. It is not at all fair that we should have only nine members in the Lower Chamber and all the voting power remain with New South Wales and Victoria. Western Australia, Tasmania, and South Australia are the natural allies of Victoria, and it is certain that those four colonies will go hand in hand, and we shall be left out in the cold with New South Wales. We would have a combined twenty-seven votes and nine votes, or a total of thirty-six, while the other colonies would have forty votes; and I have no doubt that Victoria would be always prepared to gain a point at our expense. It is stated, also, that £5,000,000 is going to be spent in building a capital city—wherever that is to be. That is a matter for future consideration, and no doubt the site will be decided by the Federal Parliament of Australia. But I am of opinion that that Parliament will not be taken from Melbourne. Once Melbourne is made the federal capital there will be no possibility of getting it away from there, simply because the preponderance of the voting power will be in favour of continuing the Parliament in that city, as the interests of her allies are more in consonance with those of Victoria than they are with those of New South Wales or Queensland. Federation is, I suppose, a foregone conclusion, but when it is accomplished I think the federal capital should be at some place in New South Wales, and Sydney is the natural outlet for that colony. However, I am only carrying

out the wishes of the electors of Rosewood when I say that if no other hon. member calls for a division on this question I shall do so, and I shall record my vote against the adoption of the Address. I do not bear any animosity or illwill against any hon. member who has taken a different view of this matter from that which I hold, because I believe he has simply been acting according to the dictates of his own conscience, as I have been acting according to the dictates of mine, and doing what I considered best in the interests of the electors who returned me to this House by an overwhelming majority. My constituency comes second to the constituency of the hon. member for Aubigny with its majority against the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill, and I am happy to see that it occupies that position. I worked hard and vigorously in the electorate of Ipswich, and through my exertions and the exertions of the senior member for Ipswich wonders were done in that electorate, for, notwithstanding that we were opposed by the greatest federalists in Queensland, we polled two to one against the federationists. That I look upon as one of the greatest victories of the anti-billites in Southern Queensland.

Mr. DUNSFORD: What sort of whisky did you use?

Mr. KEOGH: I always drink the best whisky, and leave other people to drink what they like. But whisky had nothing to do with the issue at Ipswich. Perhaps if I had had the means, which federalists on the other side of the House and on this side also had, to have gone into other electorates, the result would have been different from what it has been. Still, from the bottom of my heart I thank those people who voted sincerely and honestly to keep Queensland one grand nation, and I hope they will continue to maintain that we should have Queensland for Queenslanders, and not Queensland for New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): It is not my intention to detain the House at any length, but as one of those who fought against the Commonwealth Bill I think it devolves upon me to say a few words before this matter goes to a vote. As hon. members are aware, during the federal session I tried, with some other members, to amend the Bill so that it might be acceptable to the people of Queensland, but we were very much in the minority, and failed in our endeavours. I am not ashamed to say that I did my level best against the Commonwealth outside during the last few months.

Mr. DAWSON: You are sorry now.

Mr. PETRIE: I am not ashamed of what I did, because, although a majority has been obtained in the colony taken as a whole in favour of the Bill, we gained a victory as far as our electorates were concerned.

Mr. DAWSON: May you get many of them.

Mr. PETRIE: I am not going to reply to all the interjections of the leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately I did not hear all the hon. member said this afternoon, as I was called out, but I have no fault to find with what he did say. I believe he fought his fight with very good intentions, as I fought my fight with very good intentions. I may say that whatever I did was done for the best interest of the colony. I am a Queenslander, and am proud to be called a Queenslander. I am not against federation, but I think we are acting with undue haste in adopting a hard-and-fast measure, and that greater concessions should have been obtained for Queensland. If we had been accorded those concessions, then I should say let us have federation. We have been told that this is not a party question, and on those lines I have acted. At the same time I give the Premier credit

for the work he and his party have done in this matter. I have been accused of having said that in consequence of the action of the Government on this question I was going over to the other side to sit with my worthy friend, the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Stephens. It has also been said that I was going to sit with the hon. member for Bundaberg, Mr. Glassey. I have never turned my coat yet. I can sit on the cross benches here, and have my say, just as well as I could on the other side; and when I have to cross over to the other side, I think I shall be able to explain my reasons for doing so to the House and to the country. However, on this question of federation we have fought, and we have lost; the majority of the people of Queensland have voted for federation under the Commonwealth Bill. Of course I agreed with other members to refer the matter to the people, and although we have fought a good manly fight we have been beaten. The Northern portion of the colony has always had an edge on Brisbane and the Southern portion of Queensland, and I believe that has had a good deal to do with the vote in favour of the Bill. I can only say that if the anti-billites had had the opportunity and the money to go up North and talk against the Commonwealth Bill it is very likely the result would have been different.

Mr. McDONALD: I wish you had gone; we should have got an unanimous vote then.

Mr. PETRIE: I am very glad, for the sake of the hon. member for Flinders, that I did not go, because I believe that if I had gone he would not have seen this House again or the Federal Parliament. I am sorry that the Labour [7.30 p.m.] party, for whom I have a great respect, should have been carried away by the conditions as laid down in the Commonwealth Bill, because under that Bill I do not believe any of the Labour party will ever see the Federal Parliament. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you sorry for that?

Mr. PETRIE: I am sorry in a way. I am sorry for the leader of the Opposition, because he is a man I have a great respect for, and for a good many of those following him. I, as one of the leading anti-billites, fought a good fight against the Bill, and I am not a bit ashamed of what I did, though I am a federationist, and would as much like to see one grand united Australia as any man in this House. I am not personally to blame that the conditions laid down in the Bill were detrimental to this colony and to the advantage of our southern neighbours. However, the thing is gone, and the people have decided in favour of it, and I am here to please myself as to what I shall do if a division is called for. I am not going to say that I will vote against this motion or for it, but I think that keeping up my principles I should be inclined to vote against it.

Mr. KEOGH: Stick to your principles.

Mr. PETRIE: Yes, I always try to do that. This is a non-party question, and having fought what I consider a good fight against the Bill, I think I have a perfect right now, if a division is called, to vote against the Commonwealth Bill.

Mr. DAWSON: The Commonwealth Bill is not before the House at all.

Mr. PETRIE: No, I know it is not, and if I have made an error the House will pardon it. I hope that federation under the Bill will turn out a lot better than some of us expect, and will be for the advantage of Queensland in the long run. I have nothing further to add, except that if a division is called for I shall vote against the motion.

\* Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): I would like to say a word or two upon this matter before we

go to a division, if it is to go to a division. I could not help thinking when the Premier was speaking, that it was a very easy thing to speak of the "intelligent electors of the colony," when he was referring to those electors who voted in the way the hon. gentleman wanted them to vote. The hon. gentleman told us that anyone who questioned their good sense in voting as they did, impugned the judgment and good sense of the intelligent electors of Queensland, but I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he is not now impugning the intelligence and good sense of the intelligent electors of Bulimba? I am in the fortunate position that if I do not agree with the majority of the electors of Queensland upon this particular question, I at least agree with the majority of the electors whom I represent in this House. A good deal has been said about the character of the fight—how handicapped the anti-billites were in opposing the Bill, and what advantages the billites had in having the Government on their side, and all the leading men in this Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They hadn't you.

Mr. KIDSTON: I assume that the billites and anti-billites did the best they could for their particular views in the matter. I can honestly assert myself that I left no stone unturned to get the people of the Central district—the only place where I spoke—to vote against the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill. If other men who were on the same side as myself did not do the same thing they had no right to come here and complain now. If they had taken every legitimate opportunity they had to convince the electors that their case was the better case, and if in spite of that the electors of the colony chose to vote the other way, then I also think it is too late to come here now and complain about it. It is not now the proper time for fighting; now that the fight is over I accept the judgment of the electors of the colony, not because I agree with it—I think it is an unwise judgment—but whether I agree with it or whether I disagree with it is not the matter in question here at all. The referendum presupposes that we are going to accept the verdict which the referendum gives. The men who were not willing to accept the verdict given at the referendum should have opposed remitting the matter to the people when that question was before the House. After agreeing to remit the matter to the judgment of the electors, and after doing all we could to get the electors to vote in the particular way we wanted, I think the time has gone past for discussion as to whether we should adopt this or not. In regard to this particular question I would like to remind the hon. member for Rosewood, and other members who feel inclined to vote against the Address moved by the Premier, that in this matter we are no longer representatives. The people of the colony have spoken directly upon the matter, and we have no more right to use our position in this House to prevent the opinion of the majority of the electors of the colony being given effect to than a member of the French Parliament would have. When we agreed to submit the matter to the referendum we, in regard to that particular matter, abolished representative government, and the people have said directly by their own vote what they want done, and we have no more right in the matter.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: That is my position in the matter. I loyally accept the verdict of the majority, but not because I think it is a right verdict. So far as the interests of the Central district are concerned, I am quite persuaded that

it is an unwise verdict; but wise or unwise, the people have settled this matter for themselves.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And it is neither for me nor any other member of this House to call in question what they have chosen to do. This is self-evident to any democrat, and to any man who knows what self-government means it is impossible to attempt to get behind the verdict given by the people on this occasion. Anything that can be said as to how the verdict was obtained cannot affect the matter in any way at all. One thing I would like to say before I sit down is that I have always been a believer in the desirableness of securing a union of the Australian colonies; and it was with extreme regret that on the occasion of the recent referendum I was compelled to work and vote against the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill. I was compelled to do so because I believed it was inimical to the best interests of the people I represent, and the best interests of the people of the Central district. If the House will pardon me a minute I will tell them why. For the last six years the average surplus revenue taken out of Central Queensland and spent in Southern Queensland has been £225,000 a year, averaging somewhere about from £14 to £16 per year per family. Is it not natural that people labouring under a financial disability of that kind should seek some redress? The English residents in the Transvaal complain about the way the Boers overtax them, and have applied to Her Majesty to send out an army to get them redress and something like political justice. We are the Outlanders of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You have got a vote, which is more than the Outlanders have.

Mr. KIDSTON: So far as over-taxing is concerned, I doubt if there is another 60,000 British people, or any other kind of people in any civilised country on the face of the earth, who are suffering the same drain upon their resources as the people of Central Queensland. I do not blame anyone in particular for it. The present members for Southern constituencies are no more to blame for it than I am. But that is the broad result, and it does not matter whether somebody is to blame or whether nobody is to blame. The thing can be remedied by giving those people control of their own affairs. It was not possible that under present circumstances we could get control of our own affairs, but it was legitimate, when this great constitutional change was taking place in Queensland, that we should ask for an impartial tribunal. It was only natural and proper that the citizens of Central Queensland, understanding the way they are affected in this matter, should at least try to accomplish this—that the Imperial Parliament, in giving away the right they now possess to subdivide Queensland, should at least give it away not to this Parliament here which has, as I have shown, a very material personal interest in keeping the Central district as it is—that instead of giving it to this Parliament, which is a party to the dispute and has an interest in keeping things as they are, should have at least surrendered that power to the Federal Parliament, which would have been an impartial tribunal for the hearing and judgment of our claim. The meanest subject of her Majesty is supposed to get a fair trial and an impartial judge to decide in his cause. All that I claimed, all that I asked in opposing the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill, was that the Imperial Government should be asked, in making this great constitutional change in Australia, to secure that the Central and Northern districts of Queensland should get an impartial judge to decide their cause, and that they should not be

handed over for all time to the tender mercies of this Parliament, which it is not reasonable to expect will ever be able to rise above their personal bias and interest in the matter.

The PREMIER: Why?

Mr. KIDSTON: There are forty-one members in this House representing Southern constituencies.

Mr. GLASSEY: Are they all imbued with the spirit of injustice?

Mr. KIDSTON: No; they are not all imbued with the spirit of injustice, but they are all subject to the personal bias I have spoken of.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: May we not say the same of you?

Mr. KIDSTON: I do not make any claim that I am entirely unbiased in this matter. I claim distinctly that myself and my compatriots in the Central district are as biased in favour of separation as the Southern people are in favour of keeping up a connection which they do not want to lose. It is perfectly human and natural. Suppose the Secretary for Public Lands, who questions me, sued a man for £50, and when they went into court the debtor asked to remove the judge and to be put on the bench in his place to adjudicate in the matter, would the hon. gentleman not say that there was a danger of the personal bias of the debtor influencing the judgment of that case? And is it not the very same way with this Parliament? If there is any chance of the Southern men losing all that surplus revenue they derive every year from the Central district, is it not a natural thing—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We have no evidence that there is this large surplus you speak of.

Mr. KIDSTON: I did not intend to do this, and the House will pardon me. The Minister for Lands questions whether what I have said is true. He says we have no evidence. I will supply him with the evidence. As this is possibly the last time I shall be speaking on the matter in this House, I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for giving me the opportunity of placing the facts once for all on record. A return is issued each year by the Treasury, showing the revenue and expenditure of each of the three divisions of the colony. For instance here is the revenue and expenditure of Central Queensland for 1897-98 copied from the return issued from the Treasury, 27th September, 1898:—

CENTRAL DISTRICT.		
Local revenue	...	£660,248
Local expenditure	...	451,482
Local surplus	...	£208,766
Proportion of deficiency on general account	...	77,207
Surplus	...	£131,559

But this "deficiency on the general account" is apportioned between the three districts on a wrong basis. To be fair, it should be apportioned on a population basis, instead of which it is apportioned in proportion to the amount of revenue contributed. This saddles the Centre with an unduly large share of the deficiency, as our revenue per capita is so much larger than that of the South, as you will see from this comparison for the year 1896-7.

	Population.	Total Revenue.	Revenue per Capita.
		£	£ s. d.
Southern District ...	322,675	2,144,104	6 12 10
Central District ...	56,127	667,000	11 7 10
Northern District ...	93,377	802,046	8 11 9

When we correct the Treasury figures in this respect, and allocate the general revenue and 1899—8\*

general expenditure to each of the three divisions of the colony according to population, we get nearer the truth, although even then the figures are less favourable to the Centre than they ought to be, because our contribution to the general revenue is larger, and our receipts from the general expenditure smaller, than that of the South. Here is a table showing the surplus of the Central district as given by the Treasury returns, and also when general revenue and general expenditure is apportioned according to population:—

Year.	Central Surplus according to Treasury Return.	Central Surplus calculated as above.
1892-93	£140,048	£180,627
1893-94	94,409	114,078
1894-95	112,550	133,157
1895-96	138,642	168,466
1896-97	68,460	92,468
1897-98	131,559	168,559
	£685,663	£857,355

Average surplus for six years ... £143,000  
 Add for Customs duties collected in Brisbane on goods consumed in Centre and for which no credit is given to Centre in Treasury Statement, variously estimated from £20,000 to £30,000, say ... 30,000

Average annual surplus ... £173,000

The mean population for the six years may be taken as 54,000; which would make the average annual surplus for the last six years £3 4s. per head of the population, equal about £10 or £12 per family. This shows that with self-government, Central Queensland could, if she wished, abolish all Customs duties, and still show a fair annual surplus. I may just mention that in addition to the surplus of £3 4s. per head as shown above there is a further sum of about £52,000 per year collected in the Centre and spent in the South, a great part of the general expenditure being spent there. It is of course quite legitimate to charge the Centre with such expenditure in any apportionment of the accounts between the three divisions. Nevertheless with local self-government that sum of £52,000 would be expended in the Centre, where it is raised, which would make the saving to the division—for all money left in the division whether it be paid locally in salaries, or left in the pockets of the taxpayers, is saved to the division—£173,000 and £25,000 equal £225,000 per year. This is about the drain upon Centre—namely, about £4 per head of the population; about £14 to £16 per family per year. Probably no people in the world are so happily situated as the people of Central Queensland would be if left to themselves, so far as freedom from taxation is concerned. And yet there is not another people subjected to so heavy and impoverishing a drain upon their resources.

Mr. LEAHY: It is a wonder you are alive.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is astonishing; it is only the phenomenal resources of the district that enable us to bear the drain.

Mr. LEAHY: You cannot take credit for the resources.

Mr. KIDSTON: I have no credit for the resources, neither has the hon. member any credit for the resources; though he has a great deal more of them, he has not any credit for them any more than I have. There is probably no English-speaking community on the face of the earth that is subjected to the same drain upon its resources as Central Queensland, and the hon. gentleman, if he thinks differently, can get up and tell us where it is. I think I have given the evidence I was asked for—evidence that ought to be good enough for any intelligent man in the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Secretary for Lands did not hear it.

Mr. KIDSTON: Excuse me, I said for "any intelligent man in the House." I think it is evidence which justifies us in seeking to make sure, if we are able to so make sure, that when the future subdivision of Queensland passes out of the hands of the Imperial Parliament it should not pass into the hands of this Parliament but into the hands of the Federal Parliament. There were many minor objections to the Bill, but all those could have been got over in time. The bad feature about this part of the Bill is, that once the Constitution is accepted there is no means of remedying it.

Mr. LEAHY: Where do you get that from?

Mr. KIDSTON: If the hon. member will give me a copy of the Commonwealth Bill I will show it to him in a minute.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the 128th clause.

Mr. LESINA: It is practically unworkable.

Mr. KIDSTON: The 128th clause in the Commonwealth Bill provides that no subdivision of any of the colonies can take place—

The PREMIER: That is the 123rd clause.

Mr. KIDSTON: Without the consent of the local Parliament and a majority vote of the electors of that State. And I have shown that it is extremely unlikely—with the large motive which this Parliament has in keeping the Central district where it is—that this Parliament will ever be likely to give such a vote. The hon. member for Enoggera came up to our district and told us that if we would be good enough to accept the Commonwealth Bill they would have very little objection to us getting separation after that. I hope the hon. gentlemen will show us that they will have very little objection to separation after this.

Mr. JENKINSON: Is that another bribe?

Mr. KIDSTON: My own belief is—and this is why I said that I thought the people of the Central district had made an unwise decision in accepting the Commonwealth Bill—that they had every interest to induce them to make an effort to get this power given to the Federal Parliament before accepting the Bill. I did not want to delay the acceptance of the Bill one day or one hour, provided that that power was given to the Federal Parliament. I think it unwise to give away our right of appeal to the Imperial Parliament before we know whether that power will be given to the Federal Parliament. At the same time, the matter passed out of my hands when referendum day came along. The people have decided to accept the Bill, and while I am just as persuaded as ever I was that, so far as my own district is concerned, the decision was unwise, in spite of my own personal feelings, I shall support the Address to Her Majesty the Queen.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KATES (*Cunningham*): I am very glad that the hon. member who has just spoken accepts the position and intends to vote for the Address. I am not going to say anything about separation or anything of that sort, but I would like to say a few words in reply to those representatives of agricultural districts who say that if we pass federation the agricultural industry will suffer. I challenge them to point out in what way agriculture will suffer.

Mr. KEOGH: That's very easy.

Mr. KATES: The hon. member says it is very easy, but those hon. members have not pointed out a single thing, and I repeat my challenge. When I moved the Address in Reply I said, referring to the Enabling Bill, "Trust the people." We have trusted the people. The people have said "Yes." And "Yes" it shall be. I live in a constituency—and you, Mr.

Speaker, live in the very centre of it—where the men are all intelligent. If they were not intelligent I would not represent them.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. KATES: They said "Yes"; Warwick say "Yes"; Carnarvon and Maranoa also said "Yes." So did Townsville, Wide Bay, and Bundaberg. Still, some hon. gentlemen say that the agricultural districts said "No."

Mr. KEOGH: The majority said "No."

Mr. KATES: One great bogey in connection with agriculture—in connection with the wheat industry—was that we were going to be swamped with wheat from the southern colonies, but I can assure hon. members that no matter what the other colonies do, when we are in a position to export we will be able to send our wheat to the same places as they do, such as England, Italy, Spain, and the Cape of Good Hope—to wherever we get the best market. In this respect, I am not afraid of federation, and I told my constituents so in my addresses. I am very glad that the hon. members for Toowoomba and Lockyer have accepted the position, and that they intend to support the Address. I only wish that other hon. members representing farming constituencies would do likewise.

Mr. KEOGH: They are not renegades.

Mr. KATES: We have accepted the referendum, the people have said "Yes," and no principle has been violated. And, again, the pastoral industry said "Yes." I am quite proud to day to be on the winning side, and I can assure hon. members who are in a minority that we want to be magnanimous, and that we will let them down light. I repeat that from an agricultural point of view there is nothing to fear under federation. We are beginning to export almost everything.

Mr. KEOGH: What?

Mr. KATES: Well, everything in the dairying line, which is one of the most important industries in the colony.

Mr. FOGARTY: What about cheese?

Mr. KATES: Well, we don't import cheese.

Mr. KEOGH: Yes, we do.

Mr. KATES: No, we don't. We are producing as much as we require. Then what about butter? We can export butter already, and a number of other things. As for wheat, I am happy to say that we are going to have a wonderfully good crop this year.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the rust.

Mr. KATES: The frost will kill the rust. This year we will be able to supply two-thirds of the breadstuffs for the colony of Queensland. And then we must remember that there will be increased settlement, so that before long we shall become exporters, the same as the other colonies. I do not wish to say anything more on this point to-night. All I can say is that I am very glad we have won the battle—a battle which has been very fairly fought out. I do not agree with the hon. member who said that the Northern miner is any better than the miner in the South. An elector is an elector whether he is a miner, a farmer, or a squatter.

Mr. KEOGH: He has not got the same stake in the colony.

Mr. KATES: If he has not now, he will have. In the great mining town of Ballarat, when people gained a competency, they settled on the land; and so it will be with our own miners, and then further settlement on the land will take place.

\* Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): One thing has struck me as very peculiar about this discussion, and that is that no reference has been made to the federal flag. I have a shrewd suspicion that the hon. member for Enoggera has got that flag

concealed somewhere about his person to-night, and when the vote is carried, he will fetch it out and the hon. member for Oxley will start off with a stave of "God Save the Queen." This kind of thing has been done in every other Parliament where the Address has been carried, and I am quite satisfied that it has all been arranged. I have seen the hon. member for Oxley going about with a piece of paper which looks suspiciously like a bit of music, and I am quite satisfied that when the vote is taken he will sing "God Save the Queen." (Laughter.) I took an active part in this contest. I visited various parts of the colony, and did my best to influence the people against voting for the Bill. I was not very successful. For that I am very sorry, but when the victory was won by the people I was perfectly satisfied to take off my hat to the crowd. I was perfectly satisfied that the people of Queensland desired federation on the terms of the present Commonwealth Bill. Whether they thoroughly understood it or not is a matter I am not going to discuss at present. We agreed to refer the matter to the people when the Enabling Bill was going through. I not only strenuously advocated that the men on the roll should be given an opportunity of recording their vote for or against the Bill; but that hundreds—thousands—of others who had no vote at all should be allowed to vote for or against it. I believe, as I said then, in trusting the people. The Government trusted the people, and the people have voted for the Bill. I do not support the argument that we should trust the people on the ground that they always come to right decisions. I do not say that in this matter they have come to a right decision. I believe they are wrong. I base my argument on the inherent natural right of the people to make what decision they please with regard to their own affairs, and then take the consequences, whether pleasant or unpleasant—that the people should decide, whether rightly or wrongly, and we should accept the verdict. If their vote on this question tends for good—as I hope it will—they will receive the advantages. If it tends for harm, the whole community will suffer, including those who voted against the Bill. Just as they have made their bed, so shall they lie on it. There are one or two points which have been made by various speakers that I should like to briefly refer to. But before I do that, there is one matter I should like to touch on that has been overlooked. That is the means by which this enormous vote was obtained. Some of these were very reprehensible. I should like to say a word with reference to a statement made by one or two speakers—that the miners are a migratory people; that they are more or less of unsettled occupation; that they travel from one part of the country to the other; and that they have not the stake in the country that farmers have. I do not think that is a correct way of looking at it. Every man who has to work for his living has interests which are identical with those of every other man in the community in as far as it affects him in his livelihood and in seeking for employment wherewith to support his wife and children. No man can have any greater interest than another in a matter of that kind. Can you say that a man who sweeps the street for his living, and who has a wife and family to support, has not as keen an interest in the welfare of the country as the man with his millions.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He has not as much beef-stake.

Mr. LESINA: It means he has not as much property interest. That is the argument.

Mr. KEOGH: A good argument, too.

Mr. LESINA: Yes; but I do not think it is logical. That is an argument which includes not only the large body of men who follow

mining as an occupation, but a large number of people who work in the bush, such as shearers and timber-getters. It has been said that the timber-getter has not a stake in the country; but if he has not a stake, he, at least, has a chop. I feel sure that the hon. member, Mr. Keogh, will not deny that. It has also been pointed out by one hon. member—and to my mind it sheds a very brilliant sidelight on the motives of those who opposed the Bill. I opposed the Bill because I thought it was undemocratic; but the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty, opposed it because he thought it might lead to a land and income tax, and believed the people of the country could not bear imposts of that kind.

Mr. KEOGH: Quite right.

Mr. LESINA: If there is any country which has less direct taxation than Queensland, I should like to know where it is.

Mr. GLASSEY: There is not one.

Mr. LESINA: There is not a country in the world where the man of wealth has been let go so practically scot-free of taxation as in Queensland. The large property-owners—the men who own large areas of valuable land—are not contributing in proportion to their means to the Government of the country as they do in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, and even in little Tasmania. They are altogether too lightly taxed. If I thought federation would bring about a land and income tax, I should hail it with glad acclamation. I hope it will result in that. They are two planks of the Labour platform for which we have been striving for years. If federation has brought us one man one vote—or within measurable distance of it—and it also brings us a land and income tax, I should hail it with pleasure, in spite of the many bad things that have been said about it, and in spite of the many bad points in the Bill.

Mr. KEOGH: You handicap the small men to get the big men in.

Mr. LESINA: It would not handicap a small man. It would be a tax on the value of the land. Therefore, it would fall heaviest on land in the cities—the small areas of great value. One little block of land in a city would swamp 1,000 acres in the country in value.

Mr. KEOGH: Would they not be taxed?

Mr. LESINA: They would be taxed. Under a direct system of taxation the tax would fall chiefly on the land small in area in the big cities, on land worth £1,500 or £1,700 a foot. It has been said that many persons refused to accept the Bill because they thought it ought to be more perfect than it is. I think that is a very good objection. But it is practically impossible—and I suppose it will always be impossible—for imperfect man to bring about legislation or frame any particular enactment which will be perfect in all its details; that would not suit everybody. The platform of the Labour party we have striven to make as perfect as we can. Yet hon. members on the other side are perfectly dissatisfied with it. They will not have it at any price. Occasionally they discover something good in it and pirate it, as the Premier did several matters in his address at the opening of this session. But taking it as a whole, there are many hon. members on that side who refuse to regard it as containing anything at all that is any good. Nothing good could come out of the Labour party. I have no doubt that if the Labour party adopted the Ten Commandments as its political platform, hon. members opposite would say it was a platform that would ruin the country if adopted. The hon. member for Cunningham said he was glad that he was on the side of the big majority. I do not know that the fact of sitting on the side of a big majority is altogether

a special virtue which any hon. member should crow about. It is said that a dead fish can swim with a stream, but it takes a live one to swim against it. Perhaps, like other people, he thinks there is safety in big battalions. I should like briefly to refer to one or two means that were used during the recent contest to carry the Bill and bring about a majority in favour of it. One marked feature of the campaign was that a large percentage of the oratory indulged in by advocates of the Bill was flummery. It was appeals to sentiment. It was appeals to the flag. It was appeals to one people—one destiny. It was appeals of a sentimental character which should not have carried the weight they did carry. I do not disagree altogether with the importation of sentiment into the consideration of a question of this kind, because it enters into our consideration of everyday affairs. It plays a part even in political affairs—and they are as cold-blooded as anything could be. But here sentiment was worked for all it was worth in obtaining votes in favour of federation on the 2nd of September. Federation was spoken of in language fit only to delude children or fools. The people who were asked to vote for federation were told that if they did not seize this one favourable opportunity of grasping the skirts of federation the opportunity would be gone for ever; we would be left entirely outside the federal ring; invidious laws would be made which would operate injuriously against our interests; a federal tariff would be framed, the object of which would be to injure our industries and prevent the development of our resources. We were told, furthermore, that not only would our brothers in the southern colonies, if we refused to enter the federal union, do these unbrotherly and dishonourable things, but that we would be ruined for all time, that we would never have a chance, or if we did it would be on terms laid down by the other colonies. A great many people believed these things, and a great many people voted for the Bill in consequence. We were further told that if we did not vote for the Bill, even greater evils would befall us. We were told that the result would be that the Labour party in Queensland would obtain control of the Treasury benches in the course of time, and every person in Queensland would be dominated by this party, with its nasty notions about revolutionising society, and imposing taxation, and many other things which the party on the opposite benches set their faces as flint against. The billite party during the late campaign worked in an atmosphere of Parisian political hysteria. You talk about Parisian political hysteria! You talk of the hysteria now being manifested over the Dreyfus case in France! It is nothing to the hysteria I witnessed myself in various parts of Queensland whilst this campaign was going on. I saw men drunk with enthusiasm, and other things—chiefly other things. But I saw them literally drunk with enthusiasm, flinging up their caps over a piece of calico rag that you could buy for 4d. at Finney's, which they called the federal flag, and which was shoved under one's nose in reply to every fact, figure, and argument advanced. This was the kind of influence brought to bear, and which operated to a large extent in bringing about the large majority which the federalists had on the 2nd of September.

Mr. GLASSBY: Is that not a serious reflection on the intelligence of the people?

Mr. LESINA: People are led in political matters largely by sentiment.

The PREMIER: Sentiment was indulged in largely by anti-billites.

Mr. LESINA: We had no sentiment. We dealt in hard facts and figures.

Mr. DUNSFORD: You appealed to people's prejudices—the very worst trait in human nature.

Mr. LESINA: The prejudice to which we appealed was only the prejudice which inspires a man to look after his own family and his own interests—a very natural prejudice, and one which I find even the most enthusiastic federalists is subject to. There is another thing. They appealed to the showman attributes of big drums, "noblest sons," a federal flag, and the other flummery and flim-flam to which I have referred. They were all imported into the contest, and were used for all they were worth. They were all pressed into the service; and, as a result, they caused many people to vote for the Bill. Even the poet was introduced into the battle—poets of the strictly vapoury cult. They wrote poems that appeared to be wrung from their very hearts, and in which they instructed the mass of the people that if they were not willing to surrender their bread and butter in favour of this abstract thing called federation, they were no better than the beasts that perish. We were told that if we did not seize the thing as it flitted past us at such a tremendous rate, our chance was gone for ever. Well, I regret very much that it influenced many people. It did not influence me, but I bow to the will of the majority. I thought the majority would probably vote against the Bill, but it did not. The majority determined to have the Bill, and they voted for the Bill. A majority of 6,000 or 7,000 voted in its favour, and, without wishing to appear to dictate to any hon. member, I believe that it is the bounden duty of every hon. member in this House no longer to set his face against the majority of the people. A majority have decided rightly or wrongly—in favour of the Bill. They have decided on account of the various influences I have spoken of which were brought to bear on them, and the thing is now past and gone, and what we are face to face with now is this—that before long we shall probably have in Australia a Federal Government administering federal affairs. This Address will be sent home, and I trust adopted, and as a result the Labour party—which was about equally divided on the matter—will now have to form a federal Labour party, for the purpose of returning men to sit in the Federal Parliament. That is an absolute certainty—an absolutely essential thing. Our little organisations, with which we have not been able to capture even a majority of seats in the Queensland Parliament, will have to extend in influence and in strength. We will want more money—considerably more—than we have had in the past, and we will have to fight two elections where we have only to fight one now. We will have to fight the whole colony to return members to the Federal Parliament, and our position as a party does not seem to be very much improved by the passage of the Bill, although it is said we are going to gain indirectly. We are going to gain by the fact that we will be one people with one destiny. We will have one flag. I have never known an instance where a flag has fed starving people; where it has ever developed any industry; but I do know of cases where it has been the cause of bloodshed. Flags have been waved on occasions when they have had the effect of rousing in men's breasts a sentiment mis-called patriotism, and of leading them to battle. Certainly, the federal flag has not caused any blood to be spilt yet, unless it was from an odd nose or two during the course of the federal campaign. But before long we may have an opportunity of raising our flag, and we may have the hope of many people realised, for the very Government that has treated the Central division so badly in many matters is now going to send abroad a contingent of soldiers to fight the Boers for certain rights which the Outlanders are demanding; and probably the federal flag, which has waved over

many people in this colony during the past few months, may wave over many a bloody battle in South Africa, and will realise the wish of people who want to give us one nation, one destiny, and a flag for which our people may fight. I trust all these things will pan out better than we anticipate. I look at the matter from a very gloomy standpoint. I do not think we will get as much as many people think we will, but I hope my predictions may not be realised. I trust that peace shall be as a river, and joy like the waves of the sea. I trust that the result may be that every working man may be able to wear a suit of broadcloth, elastic-side boots, and a top-hat. I trust he may even be able to drive his four-in-hand. All these things we were told by ardent federalists would come to pass. Undoubtedly a great deal of it will come to pass if what they say is true; but even if it should not—even if the colony just runs on as it is going now—we shall neither have gained nor lost much. I do not think there is much need to divide the House on a matter of this kind. I should certainly advise the hon. member who states that he intends to take a division that that is not the proper course to pursue in regard to this question. The people have determined they are going to have the Bill; and merely to divide on the Bill, and record an insignificant vote against it, is an absurdity. It may do an infinite amount of harm, because it may be said that we are not in love with the referendum, and it may be used as an argument against its being used any more, for the simple reason that there are members in this House who are unwilling to be bound by the decision of the people. I would, therefore, advise that the Address be allowed to pass, as I hope it will, on the voices, and let this thing be done with once and for all. I have no more to say, but I would like to impress one more fact, before I conclude, upon hon. members who are inclined to make any factious opposition to the passage of the Address, and it is this: If this Address is passed by the House and goes home to the Queen and becomes an Act of Imperial legislation, a point that I made during the passage of the second reading of the

Bill might be worth impressing upon [8:30 p.m.] hon. members before I sit down.

If the Imperial Government alters the Bill in any way, we have no means by which we can rectify the alteration, or by which we can prevent it. If the Imperial Government inserts in that Commonwealth Bill anything which is distasteful to us—anything which is contrary to the democratic ideas which many of us hold—we have absolutely no redress whatever. We cannot have another referendum. The present conservative capitalistic Government of the old country may insert many provisions which are distasteful to us; they may insert many things which will restrict our liberties or render the Bill less democratic than it is, and there is no possible way in which we can get over the difficulty. That always appeared to me a most serious defect in the measure. The Home Government may literally do as it pleases before they give the Bill their sanction. We have done with it. We can make no further alteration. Our work is finished, and it is completely out of our hands until we come to the Federal Parliament and ask to have it amended in such a manner as we think well.

\* Mr. CURTIS (*Rockhampton*): Before we go to a vote on this important question I would like to say a few words. It is very well known that I opposed the Bill. I did all that lay in my power to have it rejected for the simple reason that I could see that it would be highly prejudicial to the interests of the people of Central Queensland. It was a

Constitution that we might expect a number of absolutely different nations to adopt, but not such a one as we might expect a homogeneous people such as the people of Australia to adopt. My principal objection to the Bill was embodied in the clauses under the heading, "Creation of new States," and I saw, of course, that it would be in consequence of those clauses absolutely impossible for the people of Central or indeed of Northern Queensland, for many generations to come, to achieve that which they had been working for for so many years—namely, the management of their own affairs. The Bill erected an absolutely impassable barrier to anything of the kind. Notwithstanding the plain meaning of those clauses to any person of ordinary intelligence, I know the billites in the Central division induced a very large number of electors to vote in favour of the Bill, on their assurance that those provisions would make the ultimate division of the colony much easier than at present under our existing Constitution. The leading organ of the billites in the Central division, the *Daily Record*, reiterated that over and over again, until at least a large number of the electors came to believe that it must be correct. Others were induced to vote for the Bill because of the supposed benefits that would be derived from freetrade with the other colonies. I thought that a very shortsighted policy, and I described it as a miserably shortsighted policy on the part of any community of people desiring to accomplish their political emancipation to vote for such a Bill merely because it would give them some such small advantage as that. It seemed to me that the majority of the people of Central and Northern Queensland were subordinating their future political welfare to the mere prospects of the advantages that might be derived from freetrade with the other colonies, losing sight of the fact that any advantages they might derive by means of freetrade would be more than counterbalanced by the duties they would have to pay on importations from outside the federated area. Well, I say again that the people who voted for the Bill will eventually find that they made a great mistake. Their true policy, in view of the clauses to which I have referred, and which amounted practically to a denial of their rights of self-government, was to have voted against the Bill, and have sent home a communication to Mr. Chamberlain explaining why they voted against it—an explanation that while they were in favour of federation they could not vote for the Bill as framed.

The PREMIER: That would not have delayed the federation of the other colonies.

Mr. CURTIS: No, and I would have had no desire that the federation of the other colonies should be delayed, but my desire was that Queensland should stand out in the meantime until she could secure better terms. To my mind there was no good reason why all this feverish haste should be indulged in. It would have been right enough to have submitted the abstract question to the electors, "Are you in favour of federation—yes or no," but to ask them to give a vote, yes or no, upon a Bill of that kind, a complicated subject upon which very few of the politicians of the country were at one, was a very great mistake. I feel satisfied that a great majority of the people of Central and Northern Queensland who voted in favour of the Bill, as well as many of those who voted against it, voted with a very imperfect idea of what the thing really meant. They were influenced to a great extent by the advocates for and against the Bill. I feel convinced, after giving the matter very serious consideration, that in all probability if they had had more time for consideration, and had come to a better understand-

ing of what the thing really meant, most of those who voted in favour of the Bill would rather have voted against it. I believe the absence of any reasonable provision in the Bill providing for the division of the colony will be fraught in the future with great friction and trouble. If such clauses as I have referred to had been embodied in the Constitution of New South Wales there would have been no colonies of Victoria and Queensland, and we know that the advancement and development of this country has dated from the time of the separation of those territories from New South Wales. The very best thing that could happen to Australia would be the division of Queensland and some of the other great colonies, so that we should have a larger number of States, and a more even distribution of political influence and power. That was a fact referred to by Sir Henry Parkes over and over again, and more especially in his book, "Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History," in which he expresses the opinion, in speaking of federation, that it is desirable that Queensland, as well as some of the other colonies, should be divided into smaller States before federation. It would be far better for the federation of Australia if it were inaugurated by twenty States instead of five, so as ultimately to secure what Sir Henry Parkes termed "equality of federal power." As it is now, a few States of great disparity in power and numbers, and with a great population in one or two of them, thus securing a larger voting power, will become the dominant States of the union. I say therefore that it is distinctly unfair to Southern Queensland, as well as to Central and Northern Queensland, that they should be incorporated as one State under the terms of the Commonwealth Bill. She will be entitled to ten members in the House of Representatives and six in the Senate, that is sixteen altogether, while New South Wales, Victoria, and the other colonies will have a representation of something like eighty-seven members altogether in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The colony of Queensland, no matter what may be said to the contrary, is virtually three colonies, and its area is more than equal to the combined areas of New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania, and nearly equal to the combined areas of those three colonies and of South Australia proper.

The TREASURER: And about half the size of Western Australia.

Mr. CURTIS: Queensland has an area of nearly 700,000 square miles, and Western Australia has an area of about 900,000 square miles. When I spoke of South Australia I was referring only to what we call South Australia proper, not including the Northern Territory. The point I want to enforce is that it was very short-sighted policy on the part of the people of Queensland to vote for the incorporation of this great colony in the union as one State, bearing in mind the wretchedly miserable and inadequate representation she will have in the Federal Parliament. When any conflict takes place with the other colonies Queensland will be bound to go down every time. In reference to the Federal Parliament Queensland will be in the same position as Rockhampton and the Central district are in, in reference to this Parliament—always in a hopeless minority whenever any question comes up in which there is a conflict of interests between that portion of the colony and the southern part. Whenever that has occurred the Central district has always gone down, and so will Queensland under similar circumstances in the Federal Parliament. How much better it would be if Queensland were entering this federation as three states instead of one state.

I think it is a matter to be sincerely regretted by all of us that the proposal brought forward by Sir Samuel Griffith in 1890, 1891, and 1892 for a tripartite division of the colony was not carried out. If southern members had shown more statesmanship, and had accepted the wise and philosophical proposal of Sir Samuel Griffith, Queensland would have been constituted three provinces, and would have entered this federation as three states.

The TREASURER: You opposed that Bill.

Mr. CURTIS: I did not oppose it; the Central and Northern members supported the Bill, and it was the Southern members who defeated it.

The TREASURER: You were not in the House then.

Mr. CURTIS: No, I was not.

The TREASURER: But you opposed it at Rockhampton, didn't you?

Mr. CURTIS: I was not in the House at the time. I was chairman of a league formed for the purpose of securing territorial separation, and I had nothing to do with that matter. The Central and Northern members had a free hand in regard to it, and they supported the Bill. It was the Southern members who wrecked it.

The PREMIER: You don't imagine that if that tripartite proposal had been adopted each of the three divisions would have the same representation as is now proposed to be given to original States?

Mr. CURTIS: The southern colonies might not have been willing that the three provinces of Queensland should all have equal representation in the Senate, but at all events they would have had a representation far beyond that which the colony is now going to have as one State. When you consider that the small colony of Tasmania, with only some 26,000 square miles of territory, is to have six senators and five members in the House of Representatives, surely it is not an extravagant idea to say that the two great divisions of Central and Northern Queensland, with their immense area, their immense possibilities and potentialities, should have what is given to Tasmania. I know it was Sir Samuel Griffith's idea that three provinces should merge in the Australian federation as three States. I repeat again—this is the last opportunity I may have of speaking on the subject of the division of the colony in this House, and I should like to put on record the conviction which I have already expressed, that the people of Central and Northern Queensland have made a sad mistake in voting in favour of the Bill, which contains clauses that practically deny them their birthright under the British Constitution. Those clauses supersede the prerogative of the Crown, which has always been exercised on behalf of minorities such as those of Central and Northern Queensland, and instead of putting that power into the hands of the Federal Parliament as a tribunal which might be expected to be impartial, it is proposed by the Bill to place it in the hands of the provincial legislatures. If that had been the policy of Great Britain in the past she would not have had the number of colonies and the colonial Empire she possesses at the present time; there would not have been that development and expansion in her colonial possessions that has taken place. It had been my intention, as notified by an amendment which has been printed and circulated, to move an addition to this Address. I shall read what I proposed to move, as I want it put on record, and I shall then explain why I do not move it. I had intended to move that before the words "And your petitioners," the following provisions should be inserted:—

We further humbly submit to Your Majesty that the said Constitution does not, in its present form, suffi-

ently meet the peculiar circumstances of Queensland, as it fails adequately to provide for the division thereof into three States in accordance with the just and often repeated demands of the inhabitants of the Northern and Central portions thereof.

We therefore humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take the premises last aforesaid into your Royal consideration, and to exercise your Royal Prerogative of Recommendation to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland under your Royal Sign Manual, whereby provision shall be made in the said Constitution to grant to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australasia the power by legislative enactment (upon a Petition to the Governor-General of the said Commonwealth signed by a majority of the electors of the Northern and Central portions thereof) to divide Queensland into three States, and to admit the said States into the said Commonwealth with just representation in both Houses of the Parliament of the said Commonwealth.

The reason why I have not moved that amendment is, that I found it would not receive the support I think it should receive from members representing the Northern division of the colony.

Mr. GIVENS: What about the members representing the Central division?

Mr. CURTIS: The majority of those members would vote for it, but their support would not be sufficient to carry the amendment, even with the assistance of those Southern members who might cast their votes in favour of it. Therefore I did not see my way clear to move the amendment. But, in my opinion, it is an eminently reasonable proposition, and one which, if adopted by this House, I think there is no doubt the Imperial Government would have recommended the Imperial Parliament to give effect to. It does not propose that provision should be made for the incorporation of Queensland as three States, and it would not cause any delay in the incorporation of the colony as one State in the Commonwealth. It simply proposes that power should be given to the Federal Parliament to divide Queensland into three States at its discretion in accordance with a petition of a majority of the electors of the Central and Northern divisions of the colony. I have read that proposed addition in order that I might put on record what I proposed to do if I had had the promise of a sufficient amount of support to have enabled me to obtain a fairly good vote upon it. Bearing in mind, in conclusion, that the majority of the electors of Central Queensland have voted in favour of the Bill, I do not intend to vote against the Address to the Queen. But, bearing in mind, on the other hand, that the majority of my own constituents of the electorate of Rockhampton have voted against the Bill, I think the best thing and the proper thing for me to do under the circumstances is to abstain from voting. I certainly cannot make up my mind to vote for an Address to the Queen for the enactment of a measure containing the clauses I speak of, which I think the great blot upon the Bill, and which I think will be the cause of great future trouble in Australia. That is a point which that democratic organ the *Sydney Bulletin*, which, as hon. members know, advocated federation to the best of its ability from the very first, advanced in a very large number of articles upon the subject from time to time—that those clauses were a great blot upon the Bill, and would eventually cause great strife and trouble in Australia. Being firmly convinced that such is the case, and believing that a very large number of electors in Central and Northern Queensland voted under a misapprehension that the Bill meant something it really did not mean so far as their claims to self-government are concerned, I certainly cannot see my way clear to vote for the Address, and bearing in mind, as I have said before, that a majority of electors in Central Queensland voted for the Bill, I shall under the circumstances abstain from voting altogether.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): This is a very important matter, and as so far almost all the speeches made on the question have been made by gentlemen who opposed the Commonwealth Bill, it is only right that one of those who have supported the Bill right through should say a few words upon the question. Most hon. members know that I supported the Bill right through the campaign, and did all I could to help it along. Believing in the Bill, I travelled to a good few places to do what I could to induce people to vote for it. Hon. members on both sides, and amongst my own colleagues, took a different view and did their very best to prevent the acceptance of the Bill. The hon. member for Rosewood spoke proudly, and I think justifiably from his point of view, of the large majority in his district against the Bill. I can claim that I stand in the proud position that, without going into my district to influence the electors in any way, the electorate I represent recorded the record vote taken in Queensland on Referendum Day in favour of the Bill—something like 800 for the Bill and 41 against it. So that my constituents and myself are quite at one on this question. I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Rockhampton state that he was not going to move that amendment. As a separatist I feel just as strongly on the question as the hon. gentleman does himself, but I do not think this is the time, nor do I think that would be a good means to attain separation. For that reason I think the hon. gentleman by making the eloquent protest he has made, has done more for the question than he would have done by calling for a division on his amendment, when he would have had but a small following. When we know it is hopeless to get a good vote in favour of a measure, it is far better to make a protest in its favour and refrain from calling for a division.

Mr. ANNEAR: He would have had two supporters.

Mr. BROWNE: I believe he would have had more than two, but I say at once that I should not have been amongst them. During the debate I have been very pleased to hear the friendly tones adopted by members on both sides.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWNE: The fight was a hard one right through; all did their best for or against the Bill; and now that it has come to the formal business of accepting the voice of the people, a majority of hon. members seem to be that way inclined. One or two hon. members have stated their intention to divide the House on the motion. They will be perfectly within their rights—I do not think anyone will blame them for doing so—but at the same time I agree with the hon. member for Clermont, and others who have spoken, that it would be better for all parties that no division at all should be called for.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWNE: I know there will be a very small minority against the Bill; they worked hard against it, and their work has been recognised throughout the colony. They were fighting as honestly and as hardly against the Bill as we fought for it, and, having made their protest in this House as strongly as they have done this afternoon, I do not think a division will advance their cause one bit more than they have advanced it already. During the discussion there has been a good deal of talk about the Northern vote, and especially about the action of the miners of the colony. I may say at once, speaking not only as a representative of miners but as a miner myself, that those who have talked about the miners having no regard for Queensland—being actuated by selfish interests, being a nomadic class, and all the rest of it—have insulted men of equal intelligence, equal capability, and perhaps

truer friends of Queensland than they are themselves. This kind of thing is being continually said, and hon. members on both sides, when they are talking of pioneers, should remember who really are the men who have gone through the different parts of this colony and opened them up. If, many years ago, instead of travelling about the country as I have done, I had settled down in Brisbane and opened a little bit of a shop, and put every shilling I had into it, would I have been one bit a better Queenslander than I am to-day, or would thousands of other miners have been better Queenslanders if they had done the same?

Mr. GLASSEY: Not a bit.

Mr. BROWNE: When members on this side talk about democracy, I ask them who from the first have always been the most advanced men in the Australian colonies. Without talking about the Labour party, but going back to the old days of the radicals and liberals—who were always to the front in every attempt at progressive legislation—

Mr. FOGARTY: The farmers.

Mr. BROWNE: I say it was the mining community. From that Sunday in 1854, when, at the stockade in Ballarat, Peter Lalor, the gallant countryman of my friend the hon. member for Cairns, stood with the miners for progress, the miners have always been in the front rank of every progressive party, no matter what name it worked under. In dealing with a matter like this, questions as to particular classes should be left alone. My contention is that the miners, and the people of the North generally, knew as much about this question—have studied it and the interests of the colony just as much as the people in any other part of Queensland. Anything that will cheapen food and put a little more comfort and a little luxury into the homes of the working men of the colony, I look upon it as my duty to support, and for that reason alone—if for no other—I would have voted for this measure. It is very easy to stand up here and say these men had a selfish way of looking at things, but things are pretty pinched with a great many at the present time, and anything that will alleviate their position and give to them cheaper food and put a few more comforts in their homes is, in my opinion, good legislation, and I am prepared to support it whether it is called selfish or anything else. But I believe that in all parts of the colony men

[9 p.m.] were influenced by higher motives than that. I believed those who voted against the Bill did so, not because they were going to lose 10s. or 15s. a ton on their onions or potatoes, although that may have influenced them to a certain extent, just as the North may have been slightly influenced by the hope of getting their supplies a little cheaper. Still I believe that the people of Queensland, during the referendum, were animated by a higher and better feeling, that those who were against the Bill were honestly fighting it, and not looking at it from any purely selfish view, but believing that it was going to be, as the hon. member for Rosewood and others honestly believe, injurious to Queensland in every way. And I believe that the bulk of the people who voted in favour of it were just as honestly of opinion that Queensland was going to benefit by becoming part of a united Australia. I certainly believe so, and believing so I did whatever lay in my little power to advance the cause right through, and I am very pleased it has come to its present issue, and that it is my privilege to-night to take part in sending this Address home to the Queen. I hope that after it is over we shall all be just as good friends as ever we were, and think just as highly of one another; and I firmly believe that

those who have been anti-billites or anti-federationists in the past will in future be just as earnest and honest in doing their best for Queensland and united Australia as those of us who have supported this Bill right through.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*): I should be wanting in my duty if I did not say a few words on the subject. I have been opposed to federation all along, as I need not tell you, and nothing that has occurred has altered my opinion. I am of the same opinion about it to-day as I was seven or eight years ago, and from that time to this. I do not think it will do any good to Queensland, especially to the farming districts. However, a majority has declared in favour of federation, and there is no hope of defeating it. Still, as one who has no belief in federation, I intend to vote against the present motion. I do not believe in all the results that have been promised if we accept federation; and in my opinion a good deal of the talk about what we are to gain by it is merely clap-trap. I hope I am not a prophet of evil, but I am afraid the Premier, by his action all through, has surrendered the best interests of his constituents and of Queensland to the south. Many promises were made before the vote was taken. Among other things we were to have one man one vote; we were to have a railway to protect the trade of our border, and Brisbane was to be made into a first-class port. All these and many other things were promised to secure votes for federation. It is my belief that at the present time New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia have as much idea of framing a federal tariff which will have for its aim the advancement of Queensland industries as they have of flying. We were told we were to have New South Wales joining in with our railways; it is now apparent we are to have nothing of the kind. And we notice another strange fact, that representatives of the three southern colonies are about to meet to frame a federal tariff in the absence of Queensland. If Queensland is ignored now what will she be when we are bound hand and foot to them? I say it will be a bad day for Queensland when we have federation. The tariff has been the mainspring of federation from the start. We were promised that three or three and a-half years should elapse before our present tariff ceased, and that would be far too short, but even that is more than we are going to get. What will be the result? That the North may gain something, I admit; but that the people of the South will be injured I sincerely believe. The result to Brisbane will be most serious. Boats for Queensland will be filled in Adelaide and Sydney, and will pass Brisbane by, and Brisbane will be just such another port as Maryborough and Gladstone are now. There will be no necessity for spending much money on deepening the river. I hope what I am saying will not come true, but I am saying it conscientiously, in the belief that the result will be as I say. I hold that Queensland is large enough and prosperous enough and wealthy enough and has enough individuality of her own to remain by herself. But we are to have federation. I am sorry for it, but I cannot help it. I have spent money and time in opposing it, in the firm belief that Southern Queensland will be injured by it; and believing so I should be wanting in my duty to my constituents if I did not now at the last moment vote against it. I hope, with the last member who spoke, that when it is over we shall all meet on friendly terms. I believe we shall; I see no necessity for anything else. I know that in this matter some of my best friends were opposed to me and did their best against me, as I did my best against them. I repeat that I hope my gloomy prognostications will not come true, but as we are to accept federation whether we like it

or not, I shall, even if it is the last vote I have to give, vote against the adoption of this Address.

Question—That the Address be agreed to—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 57.

Messrs. Chataway, Foxton, Rutledge, Dickson, Glassey, Philp, Lesina, Murray, Smith, Byland, W. Hamilton, Macdonald-Paterson, Kerr, Givens, Hardacre, Callan, Browne, Finney, T. B. Cribb, Jackson, Stodart, Story, Forrest, Jenkinson, Drake, Kates, Higgs, Turley, Fitzgerald, Fisher, Dibley, Stephenson, Kidston, Tooth, Dunsford, McDonnell, McDonald, Maxwell, Stewart, Dawson, O'Connell, Lord, Hauran, Bartholomew, Kent, Newell, Leahy, Forsyth, J. Hamilton, Moore, Cowley, Grimes, Aunear, Hood, Dalrymple, Armstrong, and Bell.

NOES, 10.

Messrs. G. Thorn, Keogh, Bridges, W. Thorn, Campbell, Petrie, Fogarty, Mackintosh, Plunkett, and Stephens.

Resolved in the affirmative.

When the result of the division was announced by Mr. Speaker, hon. members who voted in the affirmative rose to their feet and gave enthusiastic cheers.

### CRIMINAL CODE BILL.

#### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

##### DEATH OF MR. RUTLEDGE, SENR.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): Before proceeding to further business, he thought it was not out of place that he should tender to the Hon. the Attorney-General his sincere sympathy and condolence with him in the great loss he had just suffered.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*): He could assure hon. members that he felt very deeply the kind expressions of sympathy and condolence just uttered by the leader of the Opposition. He heartily appreciated the good feeling which had prompted those expressions.

Clauses 79, 80, and 81 put and passed.

On clause 82—"Attempted piracy with personal violence"—

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*) thought the punishment of death should not be inflicted for this crime, which was rather obsolete. It was associated with the old smuggling days, and it ought to be omitted from this Code, except in extreme cases, such as when accompanied with murder. In that case the murder would bring the death penalty itself, under the ordinary law. Piracy was merely robbery on the high seas, and was merely a crime against property. He did not see why robbery on the high seas should be subject to greater punishment than robbery on land. This clause dealt with piracy with personal violence.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A man would not be much of a pirate if he did not use violence.

Mr. HARDACRE instanced the case of a man taking possession of a boat or a yacht outside the three-mile boundary. That would be considered piracy, and would be punishable with death. In his opinion the crime ought to be visited with a lighter punishment, and so he objected to the clause passing as it stood.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Although the crime of piracy was not so common to-day as formerly, that was mainly due to the abhorrence with which all civilised countries regarded the crime of piracy, and to the fact that the punishment thereof was death. Persons going to sea in ships had quite sufficient perils without the risks being superadded to by men intent on robbery. Persons on the high seas had not the same means of protecting themselves against the attacks of ill-disposed persons as those on shore, and so he thought the death penalty for this crime should not be abolished. In time of peace persons expected to be protected under the law,

and he did not see why any man who committed such an offence as mentioned in the clause should be entitled to the smallest degree of sympathy or consideration by any member of the Committee.

Mr. HARDACRE: Robbery under arms had been omitted from the operation of [9:30 p.m.] the death penalty. Why should that penalty be imposed in this case? Surely it was as dangerous to be stuck up in the lonely bush of the West as on the high sea? Then, according to the clause, if a master of a ship became dangerous to the passengers or crew, and the passengers or crew confined him for their own sake, they would be guilty of piracy. He could understand death being made the penalty in extreme cases of piracy; but there were many minor forms in which it might be omitted.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Although piracy was not practised among civilised nations, it was not uncommon on the China seas. He would like to know what treatment the hon. member would give to a gang of pirates who descended on a vessel only a few miles from our shores? What consideration would such wretches deserve? Subsection (e) said that any person who laid violent hands on the master of a ship, with intent to hinder him from fighting in defence of the ship and the goods committed to his trust, would be guilty of piracy. That was to say, he would be guilty of piracy if he captured a master, put him in irons, and prevented him from taking control of his vessel or doing anything in defence of the passengers. If these things did not involve murder, they might lead to a great many crimes, and they ought to "put their foot" down and say a man should not do an act of that kind which might lead to murder in a wholesale degree.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why not have it in robbery under arms?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Robbery under arms, with wounding, was a capital offence under the present law. The cases were not parallel. A ship might be sailing along, with very little wind, and a steam vessel containing a band of pirates might come down on it, and it would not be able to do anything; but a man stuck up in the bush might be able to gallop away, or do something. Then a ship might have helpless women and children on board, and they might have their lives nearly terrified out of them. Would it not be a monstrous thing that any consideration should be shown to men who would do that sort of thing. When people went on the ocean, they had a right to be protected against all dangers, except such as were inevitable. He could not understand the hon. member being anxious to show consideration to men who were no better than wild beasts.

Mr. HARDACRE: The hon. member could not understand why he wished to intervene on behalf of these monsters. That was the argument which was formerly used against men who stole sheep. Fortunately piracy was not common, and in extreme cases extreme punishment might be deserved; but he had not heard of one case that the Hon. the Attorney-General had mentioned in which he thought the penalty provided for by the clause should be inflicted. The clause made it an offence to take goods from a ship. Why, if a man went to a ship half-a-dozen miles out, and stopped it, and stole a can of tinned provisions, he would be guilty of piracy, and be liable to the extreme penalty.

Mr. GIVENS: No.

Mr. HARDACRE: The stealing of an anchor or of provisions from a ship would constitute piracy, and the jury would have no option.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member was travelling outside the provisions of the clause, which had nothing to do with stealing

provisions from a ship. The three offences dealt with in the clause were—"Assaults any person on board of or belonging to the ship with intent to kill him or to kill any other person; or wounds any such person; or unlawfully does any act by which the life of any such person is endangered."

Mr. HARDACRE: If the piracy was accompanied by violence, it was punishable with death, and piracy was defined to be "any act with respect to a ship, or any goods or merchandise belonging to a ship or laden upon it, which, if the act were committed on land, would constitute robbery as hereinafter defined." It was quite evident that the Attorney-General had made up his mind not to alter the clause. He was sorry that the Bill was being passed so rapidly, or he would have moved an amendment in an earlier clause. They had already passed a clause in which a smaller offence carried the punishment of death, so that there was no use moving an amendment when a greater offence carried with it a smaller penalty. He made the remark in the hope that the Attorney-General would reconsider the matter when the Bill was recommitted, and in some of the minor forms of piracy with violence provide for imprisonment for life, of from seven years, or two years in some cases.

\* Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): There were a great many of the clauses that he objected to strongly, but if every hon. member wished to move amendments in every clause he objected to, they would never pass the Bill. They should not forget that they were not making new laws, but merely passing the existing law in a condensed form. Piracy was being carried on in Queensland waters now. Friends of his had been simply chopped up by pirates not long ago. On the north-east coast of New Guinea there were Malay proas with crews of twenty or thirty men who were armed with knives. They called themselves Malay merchants, but any boat trading on the north-east coast of New Guinea was liable to have a couple of these proas come down one on each side, and if they found they were more powerful than the occupants of the other boat, they jumped aboard, chopped them up, and annexed the cargo. That occurred some time ago to two friends of his who were pearling on the north-east coast of New Guinea. It was their duty to put a stop to that kind of thing. At the same time if the Bill passed, he would be happy to assist any hon. member to bring forward a Bill to make many amendments in the existing law as set forth in the Code.

Mr. HARDACRE recognised what the hon. member for Cook said—that it did not do to move too many amendments. He had not moved any amendment so far, and that was the only clause to which he had taken exception. He also agreed with the hon. member that it was necessary to put a stop to piracy of the kind the hon. member had alluded to, but he would point out that if one of the pearl-shelling boats stole some shell from another boat it would constitute piracy under the Code.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 83—"Aiding pirates"—put and passed.

On clause 84, as follows:—

Any person who, being employed in the Public Service, communicates to any person otherwise than in the course of his official duty any plans, documents, or other information, relating to any battery, field work, or fortification, in Queensland, or relating to any other defence of Queensland, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

If he does so advisedly, he is liable to imprisonment for three years, or to a fine of two hundred pounds.

If he does so by negligence, he is liable to imprisonment for one year, or to a fine of one hundred pounds.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) said that in clauses 37, 38, and 39, he had striven to get the penalties

lightened, but in clause 84 he intended to move an amendment making the penalty more severe. In clause 37 they had decided, after a long discussion, to inflict the death penalty for treason against the Sovereign, but the offence dealt with in the clause under discussion was an exceptionally objectionable form of treason, and yet the penalty was to be only three years' imprisonment, or a fine of £200. If an officer communicated plans, documents, or other information relating to any battery or fortification to any foreign power with which they might be at enmity now or at some future time, it would be a very serious breach of trust. He proposed to move the omission of the words "or to a fine of £200." It might be objected that in trivial cases it would be advisable to impose a fine, but against that he would urge that if it was an offence of a trivial nature—though he could not conceive of such a treacherous act being of a trivial character—the term of imprisonment might be reduced. If the crime was committed by negligence, the last part of the clause provided that the punishment should be imprisonment for one year, or a fine of £100. The clause would enable the wealthy, aristocratic officer to escape gaol for his traitorous act, whereas his orderly who might be guilty of the same act, but who was not able to raise the fine that might be inflicted, would have to suffer a term of imprisonment. He contended that if it was good for one man to go to gaol it was good for the other, and he strongly objected to any alternative penalty which would have the effect of letting go free the man with the longest purse or wealthiest friends. He moved the omission of the words "or to a fine of two hundred pounds."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 85—"Obtaining disclosures of secrets relating to defences"—

Mr. GIVENS moved the omission of the words "or to a fine of two hundred pounds."

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 86 to 140, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 141—"Forcibly rescuing capital offenders"—

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*): While the crime referred to in this clause [10 p.m.] was a very serious one, and should be severely punished, he thought the punishment of "imprisonment with hard labour for life with or without solitary confinement" was unnecessarily severe. In his opinion "imprisonment with hard labour for life" should be sufficient, without solitary confinement, as the latter would have no deterrent effect.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have no objection to the hon. member moving the omission of the words "with or without solitary confinement."

Mr. DUNSFORD: That being so, he moved the omission of the words.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 142 to 144, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 145—"Harbouring escaped prisoners"—

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): It appeared to him that a very wealthy man, who deliberately harboured an escaped criminal, would under this clause practically be permitted to go unscathed by the payment of a fine of £200.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The fine was an alternative punishment, and the cases were very few where rich men took escaped criminals

into their houses. He thought it could not be reasonably suggested that the clause was framed in the interest of persons who were wealthy. There might be cases in which the offence of harbouring an escaped prisoner would be met by a fine of £5, £10, or £20.

Mr. JENKINSON: Why not omit the fine and make it imprisonment?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A man might escape from gaol and twelve months after he might come along to a person's place in a starving condition. That person might not care to put the police on his track or hand him over to justice, and to relieve him might give him a week or a fortnight's work. Of course it was a serious offence to do that, but it was as well in such a case to give the court the option of a fine.

Mr. LESINA: The £200 is the maximum, and anything less—even a shilling—might be imposed?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, that is so.

Mr. LESINA: I am satisfied.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 146 to 151, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 152—"Clipping"—

Mr. DUNSFORD: This was another clause which provided for imprisonment for life with or without hard labour, and with or without solitary confinement, for the offence of dealing with current coin in such a manner as to diminish its weight with intent that when so dealt with it should pass as current coin. Under that a man who cut a hole in a coin and put it on his watch-chain, and who, when he got hard up, passed it would be liable, though he agreed that in such a case a man might not be found guilty. Still, imprisonment for life should be a sufficient penalty without solitary confinement.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Move the omission of the words.

Mr. DUNSFORD moved the omission of the words "with or without solitary confinement."

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 153 to 155, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 156—"Offences after previous conviction"—

Mr. DUNSFORD: That was another clause dealing with current coin in which imprisonment for life was provided, and with or without solitary confinement. He moved the omission of the words "with or without solitary confinement" at the end of the clause.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL drew the hon. member's attention to the fact that this was the maximum penalty, and that an offender under the clause might be sentenced to only one year with or without solitary confinement. It was important to observe that the clause dealt with offences after previous conviction, and therefore the penalty should be allowed to stand.

Amendment put and negatived, and clause put and passed.

Clause 157 and 158 put and passed.

On clause 159—"Defacing coin by stamping words thereon"—

Mr. KERR asked if a person who marked coins for identification would be liable under the clause?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied that it would not. The clause applied to cases where a man, for advertising purposes put his name or some symbol across the coin, or in some other way defaced it.

Mr. GIVENS: Supposing a man bored a hole in a coin to hang it on his watch chain?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That would not come within the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 160 to 183, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 184—"Interference with telegraphs"—

Mr. GIVENS asked if the Attorney-General did not think the punishment a little too severe. A schoolboy might throw a stone for a lark and break an insulator, and he would be liable to imprisonment with hard labour for three years; or if brought before a magistrate on summary jurisdiction he might be sentenced to three months' imprisonment or to pay a fine of £20.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The clause contemplated the commission of offences which might be serious and deserving of severe punishment. In a case such as that to which the hon. member referred, the magistrate would no doubt think the ends of justice satisfied by the infliction of a fine of 5s., or perhaps imprisonment for one week.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 185—"Attempt to injure telegraphs"—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there were a few more clauses in the 10.30 p.m. chapter; but as it was now half-past

10 he would keep his promise to the leader of the Opposition, unless he, the hon. member, was willing to go on to the end of the chapter.

Mr. DAWSON: Never mind; go on.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 186 to 191 of the schedule put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. The Government business to-morrow will be the resumption of the consideration in committee of the Criminal Code Bill.

Mr. DAWSON: I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether he is prepared to give notice to-morrow of a motion to facilitate the passage of the One Man One Vote Bill. We have not pressed the matter unduly upon the hon. gentleman. We waited patiently till the Address to Her Majesty with regard to federation was considered, and now that the Address has been passed I hope the hon. gentleman will take the first opportunity of putting it on the business-paper for Tuesday, if possible; also I would like to know if he is prepared from this out to ask for an extra sitting day.

The PREMIER: With regard to the extra sitting day, I think we will commence it next week; I shall give notice early next week for that purpose. With regard to the other matter—the Electoral Reform Bill—I promised the hon. gentleman that it should be introduced with the first batch of Bills after the Address to Her Majesty, and I intend to fulfil that promise. I am not prepared to say that it will be introduced to-morrow, but it will be introduced with the first batch of Bills—which I shall probably introduce next week.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-five minutes to 11 o'clock.