

Mr. JENKINSON: Yes, it is the hon. member for Wide Bay talking again.

The HOME SECRETARY: I think I will call him the leader of the Opposition, because he is the only leader who sits opposite.

Mr. JENKINSON: We can't all sit opposite to you; there is not enough room.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not necessary in committee to adopt the resolutions for the introduction of these Bills *in globo*. Surely it is possible for an hon. member to move an amendment in committee and separate the sheep from the goats!

Mr. DAWSON: We are separated now.

Mr. McDONALD: And the goats are on that side.

The HOME SECRETARY: If a majority of the members of the Committee have any objection to any particular Bill, it will be quite competent for them to omit that Bill from the resolutions which will come from the Committee. This is done purely for the sake of saving time. What I rose for particularly was to answer the absurd contention of the hon. member for Flinders. The hon. member wanted to know why all the Bills were not lumped together and introduced by one Minister? The reason is that they are dealing with different departments, and necessarily must be introduced by different Ministers.

Mr. TURLEY: No; that is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for South Brisbane is distinctly wrong in stating what is not a fact.

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): The hon. gentleman says I am wrong in stating what is not a fact, but there is nothing to prevent any hon. member on the front Treasury bench introducing the whole batch of Bills at once, and any other Minister afterwards taking up each Bill allotted to him.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you advocate that?

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman is an advocate lately of saving time, but he almost cried the other day when members on this side of the House would not take up time in discussing the Address in Reply. He said this unusual procedure was something they could not reckon with.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: They came down reckoning that three weeks would be taken up. Then they had no business to go on with, and now the hon. gentleman comes down and lectures this side because we want the business done in what has always been the method of conducting business since I have been in the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not correct.

Mr. TURLEY: It is correct. On one occasion two or three Bills were brought down at one time, and exception was taken on that occasion with the result that from that time Bills have been introduced in committee one at a time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I may be allowed, by permission of the House, to say that I knew from my experience in former years in this House that it was not unusual for Ministers, in order to have Bills placed before hon. members, to move in the way I am doing now. In order to guard against anything which might have arisen since then, I took the trouble to ask the Clerk of the House, in case there might have been any alteration in the practice, whether it was usual to propose such a motion. I gathered from him that it is by no means unusual, or a departure from the practice of the House in recent years. I had no desire to make any departure from practice, or unwittingly to give any ground for offence to hon. members by proposing anything to which they would be likely to take exception. I may say that my

intention is, when the House goes into committee, to move the introduction of each of these Bills in a separate resolution.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): This is not only the practice in this House, but in most other legislative assemblies, and a very desirable practice it is, and one which I trust will be adhered to. I would point out, however, that this is the wrong time to take exception to it. It should have been done when the previous motion was passed.

Mr. DAWSON: Why did you not give us the hint?

Mr. COWLEY: From "Votes and Proceedings" you will see that yesterday—

Mr. Rutledge moved, pursuant to notice, that the House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing the following Bills:—

Then they are enumerated. If hon. members wished to alter the practice they should have done it on that occasion. It is too late to interfere now.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is an order of the House now.

Mr. COWLEY: It is an order of the House which cannot be rescinded now.

Question put and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE BILL.

INTRODUCTION—COMMITTEE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that it was desirable to introduce a Bill to establish a code of criminal law.

HON. G. THORN differed from the Minister and from the hon. member for Herbert. He did not think it was the practice of that House, and it was not the practice of the House of Commons to introduce Bills in this way. So far as the practice of the House of Commons was concerned, Ministers there in introducing Bills gave the Committee an inkling of what they were like. He thought the Attorney-General should give the Committee some inkling of what this Bill was like.

* The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that he had known instances of the provisions of a Bill being set forth by the mover at this stage, but it was very unusual, and was done by leave of the House as a matter of courtesy, but it was certainly not within his recollection that on a resolution of this sort it was the practice for the mover of a Bill to go into an exposition of the provisions of the Bill. All that was reserved for the second reading, and as the present Bill was of a character which would necessitate a lengthy second-reading speech on his part, he would rather not have to go over the ground a second time. Hon. members would see that this was a Bill to establish a code of criminal law. If that was not sufficiently explanatory in itself, it might be enough to tell hon. members that it was a Bill by which the whole of the statutes at present in force in Queensland—the statutes which had been passed by that House, the statutes which had been passed by the New South Wales Legislature before separation and were still in force in Queensland, the statute law passed before Act 9 George IV., cap. 83, and the whole body of the common law—which formed a large proportion of the law at present in force in Queensland, was to be reduced to a simple form, so that any intelligent man could understand it. It would enable a man to ascertain in a few minutes the law which now—however diligent and well-informed he might be—it would take him hours or days to ascertain.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*) had no desire that the introducer of the Bill should explain its provisions now, but he would take

the opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman if he intended to have the Bill circulated that afternoon among hon. members?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes.

Mr. DAWSON: It was a very important matter. Hon. members might say that it was a non-contentious measure. It might be their opinion; but it might be contentious to hon. members on his side; and it was such a big question that if they were going to take the second reading to-morrow there would be very little time for hon. members to master the contents of the Bill—if they could do it at all—and the hon. gentleman ought to give them as much time as possible by having the Bill circulated that afternoon. He particularly asked it, because their own Attorney-General wanted to have the Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You shall have it this afternoon.

Mr. DAWSON: Thank you, very much. Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INTRODUCTION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that it was desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Supreme Court Acts, 1867 to 1895. He might say for the information of hon. members that there was nothing contentious in the Bill. It only contained a few clauses, and was intended to prevent a delay which sometimes occurred in Rockhampton and Townsville by reason of the judge being absent, and there being no one left who could deal with such simple non-contentious matters as the adjudication of a man insolvent *in forma pauperis*. The Bill would permit that to be done by the registrar of the court.

Question put and passed.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INTRODUCTION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that it was desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Registration of Deeds Acts. That was a Bill of only one clause.

Mr. DAWSON: We want that Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was a very useful Bill, and one which every legal practitioner desired to see.

Mr. DAWSON: Will you circulate that this afternoon?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL was not sure whether the Bill was ready, but he thought he would be able to circulate it among hon. members.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the resolutions to which the Committee had come in reference to the foregoing Bills, and the report was adopted.

FIRST READINGS.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, three Bills were then presented, and read a first time.

The second readings were made Orders of the Day for to-morrow.

LOCAL WORKS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INTRODUCTION—COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER moved—That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Local Works Loans Acts.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*) said he had the same request to make in regard to this Bill as he had made in connection with the Criminal Code Bill—namely, that it be circulated amongst

hon. members before they went home to-night, so that they might be in a position to discuss it on its merits to-morrow.

The TREASURER: If it was possible he would get it done; but he did not think it was possible that the Bill would come on to-morrow.

Mr. DAWSON: Our Attorney-General will get through the other Bill in half-an-hour.

The TREASURER: If it was possible he would get it circulated.

Question put and passed.

FIRST READING.

The House resumed; the resolution was agreed to, the Bill was presented and read a first time, and the second reading made an order for to-morrow.

ABORIGINALS PROTECTION AND RESTRICTION OF THE SALE OF OPIUM BILL.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

The desirableness of introducing this Bill having been affirmed in committee, the Bill was presented and read a first time, and the second reading made an order for to-morrow.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND BILL.

On Order of the Day No. 4 being called—Consideration in committee of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to incorporate and endow the University of Queensland—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*): I beg to move that this Order of the Day be postponed till to-morrow.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): I hardly understand the reason of the hon. gentleman for postponing this matter after the Home Secretary saying that the Government are very anxious to go on with business. I understand that this is one of the matters—according to the Home Secretary—of a non-contentious nature, and will go through very easily, so that in a day or two we shall be again without business to go on with. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman coming down with a motion to postpone this matter, if it is part and parcel of the policy of the Government to have these measures gone on with.

Question put and passed.

SUPPLY.

OPENING OF COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*): I move that you do now leave the chair.

GYMPIE GOLD FIELD.

* Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*): This is an opportunity afforded to members of referring to any little grievances they may have, or to make any corrections that are necessary, and I take this opportunity of referring to a matter of some consequence to Gympie, a damaging statement regarding which has appeared in one of the Government publications. The statement occurs in the report of a speech, and is not at all correct, and is most unwarrantable as applied to the Gympie Gold Field. The portion of the report to which I object is as follows:—

The gold obtained at Gympie costs £6 an oz. to take it out. However, it employs a large number of people, money passes through their hands, and no doubt to some extent the industry there is a success; but it is approaching very closely towards its rapid decrease and almost extinction.

I think in these times it is advisable that no such matter affecting such an important goldfield should appear in a Government publication without being contradicted, and I therefore take this