Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1900

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER, 1900.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Arthur Morgan, *Warwick*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPERS.

The following papers, laid on the table, were ordered to be printed :—

(1) Opinion of the Attorney-General upon certain matters connected with the prospectus of the North Chillagoe Mines Company.

(2) Despatch, dated 23rd August last, with enclosures, conveying thanks of Government of Italy for expressions of sympathy regarding the assassination of H.M. the King of Italy.

QUESTIONS.

STONE RIVER TRAMWAY LOAN.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) asked the Premier—

1. Is it true, as stated by Mr. Cowley in a letter to the Hinchinbrook Divisional Board, that the loan for the Stone River Tramway was only granted on the distinct understanding that the line, when constructed, should be leased to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company?

2. Is it part of the Government policy to loan money to local authorities for the purpose of enabling them to construct tramways which are to be leased to private corporations?

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*) replied—

1. I have no information as to the statements made in the letter referred to, but the knowledge that running rights over the line in question were to be granted to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company largely influenced the Government in their decision to advance the necessary funds for the construction of the tramway.

2. No.

MEMBERS OF CONTINGENT AS POLICE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

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

1. Has he received a cable message from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, asking if the Government has any objection to members of the Queensland contingent accepting positions on the police staff in South Africa?

2. If so, what was the nature of the reply he forwarded to Mr. Chamberlain?

The PREMIER replied—

1. Yes.

2. The answer was that the Government had no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. H. STEPHENSON.

Mr. LESINA asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

1. Is it true that a Mr. Herbert Stephenson, son of the hon. member for Ipswich, has recently been appointed to a position in the Lands Department without being asked to pass the usual examination?

2. If such an appointment has been made, is it approved by the Public Service Board or the Minister?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. B. H. O'Connell, *Musgrave*) replied—

1. The Mr. Herbert Stephenson referred to is temporarily employed as a supernumerary clerk in the office of the Land Commissioner, Brisbane. No examination is required in such cases

2. The approval of the Public Service Board is not necessary for the temporary employment of supernumerary clerks, the authority of the Minister being only required.

PRINTING OF "QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT MINING JOURNAL."

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*), in the absence and on behalf of Mr. Higgs, asked the Premier—

1. Is it true that the *Queensland Government Mining Journal*, hitherto printed in the Government Printing Office, has been given out to be printed by a private firm?

2. Were tenders called?

3. Is it not true that the Government Printing Office can turn out Government work cheaper than a private firm can do?

4. What is the reason for discontinuing the printing of the *Mining Journal* in the Government Printing Office?

5. What is the cost of printing the *Mining Journal* now?

6. What was the cost of printing the same in the Government Printing Office?

7. Is it proposed to give the printing of the *Agricultural Journal* to a private firm?

The PREMIER replied—

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Answered by questions 5 and 6.
4. Answered by questions 5 and 6.
5. The contract price is now £50 for the same work as included in August number.
6. The cost of August number, which was lower than that of any other issue, was £73 5s. 6d.
7. No.

INFRINGEMENT OF GRAZING FARMS PROVISIONS.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

Will he cause inquiries to be made of the various land commissioners as to whether they have any reason to believe that the provisions of the Crown Lands Act of 1884 or the Land Act, 1897, are infringed in respect of the selection of grazing farms or grazing homesteads?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

It is the duty of the various land commissioners to bring under the notice of the department any infringement of the Crown Lands Act of 1884, or the Land Act, 1897, in respect of all classes of selections. Their attention will be further directed to this matter as requested.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

SPECIAL TRAIN FOR MR. BELL.

Mr. LESINA: I beg to ask the Secretary for Railways, without notice—Whether there is any truth in the statement that Mr. Bell had a special train last Sunday week?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member had better give notice of the question.

Mr. LESINA: I will not give notice of that question.

PEARLSHELL AND BECHE-DE-MER FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. LESINA: I would like to ask the Premier, without notice—Whether the provisions of the Pearlshell and Bêche-de-Mer Fisheries Act of 1898 are rigidly enforced?

[No reply.]

MAPS OF FEDERAL ELECTORATES.

Mr. TURLEY (*South Brisbane*): I should like to ask the Premier, without notice—If he will cause maps of the federal electoral divisions to be printed and made available to the public after the passing of the Bill?

The PREMIER replied: Yes, that will be done.

CALLIDE RAILWAY BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 33.

Messrs. Philp, Dickson, Rutledge, Foxton, O'Connell, Dalrymple, Murray, Cowley, Macdonald-Paterson, Keogh, Curtis, Leahy, Moore, Story, Bell, Campbell, Forrest, Plunkett, Kates, Stephens, T. B. Cribb, Stephenson, Bridges, Forsyth, Stodart, Bartholomew, Hanran, Newell, Lord, Tooth, J. Hamilton, Smith, and Grimes.

NOES, 23.

Messrs. W. Hamilton, Kidston, Kerr, McDonald, McDonnell, Browne, Dunsford Hardacre, Maxwell, Jackson, Turley, Bowman, Dibley, Fitzgerald, Givens, Groom, Fogarty, W. Thorn, Ryland, Jenkinson, Lesina, Fisher, and Stewart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence by message in the usual form.

PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH ELECTIONS BILL.

SECOND READING.—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. GROOM (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): In resuming the debate on the second reading of this Bill, I desire to reciprocate the wish expressed by the Chief Secretary last evening, that it should be discussed entirely on non-party lines; that it should be laid down as an axiom that members of the House, no matter on which side they sit, desire that this Bill should be framed in such a manner as to give satisfaction to the electors outside, and at the same time assist in the return of the very best men Queensland can find to represent her in the Federal Parliament.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: When the candidates appeal to the electors for election there will be no party question for them to consider, inasmuch as it will be taken for granted that there will be no party question as far as the first Federal Parliament is concerned at its election whatever there may be afterwards when the whole of the members meet at Parliament House in Melbourne, and the first Federal Government, whoever they may be, bring forward their federal policy.

Mr. JENKINSON: What about the new association?

Mr. TURLEY: They have started on party lines already.

Mr. LEAHY: What about the Labour party's federal programme?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GROOM: In discussing this Bill this afternoon, I do not wish to be influenced in the slightest degree by any association which has been formed, or by any programme which that association may put forward.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: If I were a candidate for election to a seat in the Federal Parliament, I would not permit any association or any body of men to dictate to me what course I should take as far as that election was concerned, or what should be my policy after election. That is a matter that should be determined entirely between the candidates and the electors themselves without any outside pressure whatever. After thirty-nine years' political experience, I would be the last to pay the slightest attention to any political association, however eminent it might be. As one who, during the federal campaign, was regarded as an anti-billite, I desire frankly to say that I accept the verdict of the majority of the people.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: I am quite prepared as a citizen, and as a member of this House, to recognise that the voice of the people must be supreme, and that I am prepared to give federation whatever help I can. I hope it will realise the expectations that have been formed of it. Whether those expectations will be of the sanguine character which has been prophesied by some people, must be left entirely to the future to decide, but, as one who has lived so long in this colony, and who has many who are near and dear to him, and whom he will leave behind him as colonists in this land, I sincerely hope that everything that has been said, and that all the bright pictures which have been held forth to the people of Queensland, may be realised to the fullest extent.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: I take this opportunity also of emphasising what was said by the hon. member for Bulloo a few weeks ago in this House—that, as far as the election of members to the Federal Parliament is concerned, it is necessary that Queensland should send to that Parliament the very best men she can find.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: It will be no light work in that Parliament during the first few years.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: Already we have had conferences held—some in Melbourne and some in Sydney. I have been supplied from Sydney with a fiscal tariff which has been formulated by the Chamber of Manufactures. I suppose it is one of the most interesting documents that I ever had supplied to me, but I can only tell you, Sir, that if it were to become the tariff of the Commonwealth, it would mean a tax on the agricultural industry in all parts of Queensland which I am sure there is not a member in this House would tolerate for a moment.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: I only mention this incidentally, as it has nothing to do with the Bill, just to show how necessary it is in dealing with this question to take broad national ground. We must not be influenced in any way by sectional differences; but we must combine our united powers and our united wisdom to frame this Bill in such a way as to give satisfaction to the people, and, when it has become law, to see, as far as we can, that the electors choose the very best men we can find to represent us.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: We ought to recognise the very important fact that our voting power in the Federal Parliament will be comparatively small. New South Wales will have twenty-six representatives and Victoria twenty-three; the smaller colonies, combined, will scarcely be able to outvote the two larger States; and there is not theslightest doubt that Victoria, judging by the debates on their Electoral Bill similar to the one which the Chief Secretary has given to us for consideration, will select the very cream of the intellect of the colony to represent it in the first Federal Parliament. That being so, it is of the greatest importance that we should take every care to make this Bill as perfect as possible, and to discuss it thoroughly on non-party lines. I do not think the Chief Secretary was in the House when the first tabulated schedule of federal electorates that was prepared was published in the papers of the colony. I should have been pleased if he had compared that table with the schedule of electorates which was circulated among hon. members last night, and explained why there has been such a great alteration in the formation of the different electorates.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: Whether or not the hon. gentleman was aquainted with the publication of that statement, I do not know. I take it that there are two great principles involved in this Bill. One is with regard to the election of members of the House of Representatives, and the other is with reference to the election of senators. I am not aware that there was a single discordant note throughout the colony with regard to the schedule of the electorates for members of the House of Representatives which was published.

Mr. GIVENS: Oh, yes.

Mr. STEWART: There was at Rockhampton.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The first schedule was not issued authoritatively.

Mr. BROWNE: Yes. It was stated that it was issued on the authority of the Home Secretary.

Mr. GROOM: The schedule did not altogether bear the official stamp; but when the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government was asked who had supplied it, he frankly told the House that it had been supplied by the Home Secretary. I could not but compliment the Home Secretary on what I thought was a very excellent division of the colony, and which I thought was likely to secure fair and equitable representation. Now, at that time West Australia had not joined us, so that in that schedule provision was made for eight representatives. It was apparent that the Home Secretary, in that schedule, endeavoured to provide, as nearly as possible, 12,000 electors in each electorate. I do not know whether he had in his mind what was taking place in Victoria, where they appear to have endeavoured to approximate something like 10,000 or 11,000 electors for each division. Of course, it is impossible to arrive at an equal number in each case, even in a thickly populated colony like Victoria, and it is even more difficult in a sparsely populated colony like Queensland. In the original schedule, the electoral division of Brisbane contained the electorates of North Brisbane, Enoggera, Fortitude Valley, Toombul, and Toowong, representing 12,644 voters. The Oxley division.—Albert, South Brisbane, Bulimba, Logan, Oxley, and Woolloongabba, 12,581 voters. The Moreton division.

[4 p.m.] —Bundanba, Fassifern, Ipswich, Lockyer, Moreton, Nundah, Ipswich, and Stanley, 12,426 voters. The Wide Bay division.—Bundaberg, Burnett, Burrum, Gympie, Maryborough, Musgrave, and Wide Bay, 12,736 voters. The Darling Downs division.—Aubigny, Cambooya, Carnarvon, Cunningham, Dalby, Drayton and Toowoomba, and Warwick, 11,023 voters. The Warrego division.—Balonne, Barcoo, Bulloo, Gregory, Maranoa, Mitchell, Murilla, and Warrego, 9,102 voters. The Fitzroy division.—Clermont, Fitzroy, Leichhardt, Normanby, Port Curtis, Rockhampton, and Rockhampton North, 10,581 voters. The Herbert division.—Bowen, Cairns, Cook, Herbert, Mackay, Townsville, and Wouthakata, 10,723 voters. The Flinders division.—Burke, Carpentaria, Charters Towers, Croydon, Flinders, and Kennedy, 9,453 voters. Now, taking the opinion of the *Brisbane Courier* on that schedule of electorates throughout the colony, I find that this is what it states—

It is evident that there has been an endeavour to group the electorates according to their interests as far as possible. In the case of the Darling Downs division the area included is the whole of what has ever been known as the Downs.

Mr. LEAHY: Is the Rosewood electorate in that schedule?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. LEAHY: It shows what a random thing it is.

Mr. GROOM:

The Warrego has the distinction of being the largest constituency, while at the same time it has the smallest number of voters. It extends from the western boundaries of the Dalby and Carnarvon electorates

to the western boundaries of the colony. The Herbert division includes the coastal electorates in the North. The Flinders division, it will be seen, includes largely the goldfields. The total number of voters is 101,269.

Well, that not only has been circulated in the *Courier*, but in other papers throughout the colony. The hon. member for Bulloo interjected, Could I find the Rosewood electorate in that schedule? I do not think——

Mr. LEAHY: I wanted to show you how slipshod it is.

Mr. HIGGS: When did you discover that it is slipshod?

Mr. GROOM: I think it is scarcely fair for the hon. gentleman to say that the schedule is slipshod. I think the schedule as formulated was a very fair one, and it is quite clear that there is no chorus of approbation so far as the present schedule is concerned. That is a point I wish to make out. And in looking through the list I do not know why the referendum votes were taken by way of comparison between the number on the roll and the number who voted, because I do not think that was a fair test of the number of persons who voted. There was a far greater interest taken in the general election which preceded the referendum than in the referendum itself. If the Chief Secretary will look into the matter he will see that there is a very marked difference indeed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The plural votes were eliminated in the referendum.

Mr. GROOM: I think even then you will see a large difference, because in the country districts plural voting has not so much effect. According to the calculation made about the city of Brisbane, there were between 2,000 and 3,000 plural votes, which will disappear altogether with one man one vote, and in the country districts I do not think it applies to any great extent. Now, with regard to the divisions, I think each individual member knows the particular part which relates to himself. I will take the Darling Downs, and if any hon. member will glance at that map—[a map on the wall of the Chamber showing the electoral districts]—he will see it is natural that the electorate of Carnarvon should be comprised in the Darling Downs. I was surprised to see that it is not. My knowledge of the Darling Downs, extending over forty-three years, has led me to the conclusion that the electoral district of Carnarvon and the electoral district of Dalby are the natural allies of the Darling Downs, and their interests are in common.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: The electorate of Carnarvon has fruitgrowers, winegrowers, and tobacco growers, all of whose interests are distinctly agricultural. Why that electorate and the electorate of Dalby should be turned over with Thargomindah, the Bulloo, and Birdsville would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to explain.

Mr. TURLEY: Ask the member for Bulloo—he can tell you.

Mr. GROOM: The Hon. the Chief Secretary must accept the responsibility, not the member for Bulloo. What the electorates want is some explanation of why they have been gerrymandered in the way which has been suggested in this schedule? Now, in the first place, when the schedule came out, the electors of the places I have referred to were perfectly satisfied, and expressed themselves so in strong terms, but since they have discovered that they have been shunted from their natural allies, and attached to a district with which they are not in the slightest sympathy, and with which their interests are in no way indentified, I do not think it is surprising that a chorus of disapprobation has come from all parts of the electorates. Now, the *Border Post* of 13th October, which is published at Stanthorpe and is a journal which supports the Government, and therefore must be accepted as some authority, contains a report of a divisional board meeting. At this meeting—

Mr McQuaker said he saw by the *Border Post* of that morning that the Government proposed, in the formation of the federal electorates, to attach Carnarvon on to the Warrego, Bulloo, and other Western electorates. It was a great injustice to include them with a number of electorates with whom they were completely out of touch. The chairman agreed with what Mr. McQuaker said. Mr. Bamberry moved, "That the board, in the interests of the electors of Carnarvon, protest against Carnarvon being included in the Warrego federal electorate, and request the Hon. J. F. G. Foxton to have Carnarvon included in the Darling Downs." This was seconded by Mr. McQuaker, and was carried unanimously. The chairman was authorised to wire a copy of the above resolution to the Hon. J. F. G. Foxton.

In the same paper the writer of the leading article says—

The action of the Government in proposing to include Carnarvon with the Western electorates of Balonne, Bulloo, Murilla, and Warrego, in the federal electorate of Maranoa has, as we anticipated, called forth a protest from many places in the electorate. From Texas, Wallangarra, and other centres, we hear nothing but protests against the proposal, and this is only natural when the injustice that is being dealt out to the electorate is borne in mind. From every quarter comes the same query: What interests have we in common with Bulloo, Balonne, etc.? Why have we been included in an electorate which has no connection with us, outside the fact that it is part of the colony?

The same paper further says that they were pleased to be able to announce that a letter had been received from Mr. Foxton, the member for the district, which showed that he was in entire sympathy with the electorate in the protest made.

Mr. HIGGS: See how he votes when we come to that question.

Mr. GROOM: I only mention this because I feel that injustice has been done to the electors of Carnarvon, amongst whom I have many warm friends, some of whom have addressed letters to me on the subject, and I think it only right that I should express their opinions in this House. Then take another electorate. I now quote from the *Rockhampton Bulletin*, which is a journal of very high standing, and one of the best conducted provincial journals in Queensland. The editor of that paper has a judicial mind, and his leaders are always pleasant reading. This is what he says in connection with the schedule to this Bill—

A few weeks ago the Government published its scheme for the division of the colony into nine constituencies for the election of the nine representatives to the House of Representatives. That scheme was everywhere received as eminently fair, and opponents of the Government as readily acknowledged this as supporters. For ourselves, we stated at once that it was a thoroughly equitable division of the colony, and, judging by the Press, that appeared to be the general opinion throughout the colony. But this scheme is not to be found in the Bill which was presented to the Assembly last night. Of the nine federal constituencies only four remain as they were in the scheme first published by the Government. The other five have all been altered. No complaints have been made in public, either by public men or the Press, and yet the majority of the constituencies have been altered. Who has been pulling the strings, and for what purpose?

The Central division has suffered most of all by this alteration. Under the scheme as first published the ten electorates of this division were put into two federal divisions. Some of them formed a federal division by themselves, the division of Fitzroy, which thus became a purely Central electorate, and the other three were placed in the division of Warrego, which is now called the division of Maranoa, along with five Southern electorates. The result was that the Central division returned one purely Central member, and it had a three-eighths voice, measured by electorates, in the return of a second. Compare that with what is proposed in the Bill. Eight of the Central electorates now form the Fitzroy division, and as to the remaining two electorates, one is placed in a Northern and the other in a Southern division. The one placed in the North will be one electorate among seven,

and one in the South will be one electorate among eight. The result is that in each of these cases the Central voters will be utterly swamped, with the final result that in practice the Central division will have only one member in the Federal House of Representatives. Consider the constituency this member will represent. Under the scheme at first published the division of Fitzroy was to comprise the electorates of Rockhampton, Rockhampton North, Port Curtis, Fitzroy, Normanby, Leichhardt, and Clermont, all fairly coastal electorates, with a general community of interest. But in the Bill the electorate of Port Curtis is transferred to Wide Bay, and the two huge western electorates of Barcoo and Mitchell added to Fitzroy. Under the old scheme all the western electorates of the Southern and Central divisions were formed into one big pastoral electorate. Now they are split up, and two of them added to the Fitzroy electorate, with which they have no industry in common, while the electorate of Port Curtis, which is not only a Central electorate, but a coastal electorate, in complete community of interest with Rockhampton, Fitzroy, and Leichhardt, is cut off and added to Wide Bay. So much for the way in which matters are gerrymandered in the Central division as far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

I may tell the Premier that the *Townsville Bulletin*—a paper published in his own town—is just as emphatic on this point, and it goes so far as to say that if he persists in passing the schedule as it is now, it will be the means of alienating from him some of his most influential and ardent supporters. I mention this to show that throughout Queensland, there is a feeling of uneasiness about the division of the colony, while there has scarcely been one word heard in favour of it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Herbert division has not been touched.

Mr. LEAHY: Has the Herbert division been touched?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Stick to Maranoa.

Mr. GROOM: I am not referring to the Herbert. I give these quotations to show what the feeling in the country is on the matter. Knowing that the hon. gentleman desires that the question should be conducted free from all party bias, I think it is only right to let each hon. member know what public opinion is about the division of the colony as formulated by the hon. gentleman, because that is really the crux of the measure; the other matters are really details as far as the senatorial elections are concerned. In this matter we should consider the interests of every district and every industry equally. I am not going to say that the matter is not surrounded with difficulty. In a compact country like Victoria, where there are councils, and shires, and boroughs, and with a scheme for the election of representatives framed on English lines, it is not so difficult there to carve out twenty-three electoral districts, so as to bring together the districts and the various industries that are in touch with one another. But when you come to deal with a vast colony like Queensland —with its sparse population and its many conflicting interests—it is a very difficult matter to so adjust the districts as to give satisfaction to all. Surely some method can be adopted by which the strange anomaly may be removed of taking away from the Darling Downs district the districts of Carnarvon and Dalby, which certainly have interests in common with the Darling Downs, and tacking them on to a district with which they have nothing whatever in common. Surely no political or other exigency can justify such a strange amalgamation as exists under this Bill. I speak of that matter because I have personal knowledge of it. There are other electorates of which I have no personal knowledge, and in regard to which similar anomalies exist, as pointed out by the *Rockhampton Bulletin*. I trust these anomalies will receive the careful consideration of the Chief Secretary, and indeed I have every confidence that they will. I am personally quite prepared to give the hon. gentleman full credit for a desire to do what is a just and proper thing, and to make the Bill as perfect as it is possible to be made; and I hope he will take into consideration what hon. members may say upon this matter, and, if possible, when we get into committee, so amend the schedule as to give satisfaction to those electoral districts where at present great dissatisfaction exists. Before touching upon the question of senatorial representation, I may be permitted to refer to a remark of the hon. member for Bulloo, as to whether I saw that Rosewood was in the schedule, as supplied by the Chief Secretary. My hon. friend, the member for Wide Bay, has discovered that the word "Ipswich" appears twice where evidently Rosewood was intended. I have too high an opinion of the Home Secretary to believe that he would do anything improper, and I prefer to believe that it is merely a typographical error. I am told by the hon. member for Flinders that in the *Telegraph* of the 6th instant, the word "Rosewood" appeared; so that clearly it is a typographical error, and that is borne out by the fact that the number in the electorates are identical in each case. Now, with regard to the senatorial elections. The Chief Secretary, when he attended the conference of Premiers in Melbourne, came back to Queensland with what everyone considered was the only concession which that distinguished body of gentlemen were prepared to grant to Queensland—namely, that in place of Queensland being one electorate for the purpose of returning senators, it was to have the gracious privilege of dividing itself as it thought fit. I will not say a word about the possibility of obtaining any further concessions. The fact remains that that was the only concession which the hon. gentleman obtained, and I anticipated that in the framing of this Bill the hon. gentleman would have adhered to the terms of the concession which he obtained from the Premiers' conference. But the result proves that we were doomed to disappointment, and in certain quarters I admit that there has been a great deal of disappointment on the question. I am of opinion that in the election of senators the same principle should apply as is contained in the Commonwealth Bill itself. The principle embodied in the Commonwealth Act is equality of representation. Hence if you take the approximate population of the colonies at 3,500,000, and divide that by seventy-five, the number of members who will represent the people in the House of Representatives, you will have each member representing about 49,000 or 50,000 persons—that is, supposing you make an equal division of the electorates all through.

Mr. LEAHY: Fifty-one thousand.

A MEMBER of the Opposition: Who is going for Maranoa?

Mr. GROOM: Each colony, of course, according to the Act, has to devise its own means for the election of senators, and therefore you have to consider the interests of the individual centres of population. According to the schedule which the hon. gentleman has supplied he has endeavoured to apportion the population for the House of Representatives in a fair way, although it has not been carried out so accurately as I think might have been done if he had been guided more by his own figures. If you apply the principle of equality of representation to the Senate, then I say the proper course to take would be to take advantage of the concession which the hon. gentleman himself secured and divide the colony according to the present artificial divisions of North, Centre, and South, and give to each the election of two representatives. That is the opinion I have formed after due consideration, and in the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech I

contended that that was the proper course to take, because it would be carrying out the principle and spirit of the Commonwealth Act. In the hon. gentleman's Bill he proposes to make the colony one electorate, but he intimated that if that scheme was not acceptable to the House he was prepared to divide the colony into six divisions. According to that scheme the South would be entitled to three representatives, the Centre to one, and the North to two.

The HOME SECRETARY: What are the figures?

Mr. GROOM: Assuming the population of the North to be 90,000, it would be entitled to two representatives. The population of the Centre is given at 45,000 or 50,000, and it would be entitled to one representative.

Mr. KIDSTON: Sixty thousand.

Mr. GROOM: Well, as the Chief Secretary said last night in regard to the population returns, they are altogether unsatisfactory and unreliable. As a matter of fact, we do not know with any certainty what our population really is, and if there is a discrepancy of a thousand or two I think the hon. gentleman may be fairly excused, on account of having no absolutely reliable figures to go upon.

Mr. KIDSTON: The numbers in the North and Centre are probably underestimated.

Mr. GROOM: Well, I am taking the figures as I endeavoured to ascertain them this morning, and I give them for what they are worth. I may be underestimating the North and Centre, but I do not know with any certainty. However, in the South we know there are over 350,000 persons, of whom 110,000 are within a radius of 10 miles of the Brisbane General Post Office. So that if the hon. gentleman is correct in dividing the colony into six electorates, as shadowed forth, giving the South three representatives, the Centre one, and the North two, that would probably be a fair distribution.

The HOME SECRETARY: Eighty thousand would be about the quota per member for the Senate.

Mr. LEAHY: On the latest estimate?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, on the latest estimate Central Queensland would only be entitled to half a member or thereabouts.

Mr. GROOM: I have brought these figures before the House this afternoon so that they may afford food for thought to hon. members, and that we may discuss the matter from various standpoints, in order that when the Bill gets into committee we may arrive at some satisfactory adjustment in regard to the election of members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. I think the fairest and most equitable method for the election of senators would be to divide the colony into Northern, Central, and Southern divisions, and allow each division to return two representatives. I cannot altogether agree with the suggestion that the colony should be one general electorate for that purpose, because, although you apply to the election of senators the principle of one man one vote, you cannot get away from the fact that the preponderance of voting power is in the South, and that if there is anything like a combination for the election of six Southern representatives, the North and the Centre must necessarily be disfranchised. I do not see how you are going to avoid that if the colony is treated as one electorate. It is well that we should take these facts into consideration, and see how far the method suggested by the Chief Secretary himself is an improvement on the scheme proposed in the Bill. If I had my choice between the colony as one electoral district for the election of senators and the scheme formulated by the hon. gentleman last night of dividing the colony into six electoral districts, I should prefer the latter as a matter of justice, because it would secure some representation of those districts which might possibly—I do not say they will—be disfranchised if the colony is taken as one general electorate. I will render the hon. gentleman every assistance I can to pass this Bill in such a form as will give satisfaction to the electoral districts outside, and I hope that what the hon. gentleman said last night will be accepted by the House generally—that hon. members will discuss this measure without any party bias, and apart altogether from any personal or political considerations, animated only by an honest and sincere desire to pass a measure which I hope, trust, and believe will be a credit to the colony, and assist in sending down to the Federal House of Representatives the very best men to be obtained in the colony.

[4·30 p.m.]

Mr. LEAHY (*Bulloo*): Of course hon. members have had an opportunity of seeing for themselves a great deal of what the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba calls public opinion. I think they have had a better opportunity of seeing that than the hon. member has given them, because they have been able to see both sides of the question. However, I am not going to differ with the hon. member on that point. What I am most concerned with now is the conclusion which he drew from the premises he laid down at the beginning of his speech. We must all agree that the premises which he laid down were excellent—namely, that it is necessary that the colony should get the best possible men at their disposal as representatives in the Federal Parliament. The hon. member paid me the compliment of quoting some words which I used in this House some time ago. Hon. members at that time seemed to think that it would be a very easy thing to get very good men to represent the colony, and I said then that it would be very difficult, as we had not the leisured and moneyed class who could afford to leave their businesses in order to attend the Federal Parliament, and that consequently the selection would be more restricted than some hon. members thought. I think the events which are transpiring every day bear out the opinion to which I gave utterance on that occasion. The hon. member told us that the first schedule framed is an excellent schedule, and that it is based, among other things, upon a community of interests. That is the main point on which I wish to join issue with the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba. I say the first schedule does not represent a community of interests. But before we decide whether it does represent a community of interests, it is just as well to define the term. The expression "community of interests," like anything else, may have a very different meaning according to the set of conditions under which it is applied. A community of interests as applied to, say, the representation of the Darling Downs in this House is one thing, and a community of interests as applied to the representation of the same people in the Federal Parliament may be another thing, because there are only certain matters which may be dealt with by the Federal Parliament as affecting those people. The question is, how far the community of interests extends to representation in the Federal Parliament. Now, look at that map, and see the Mitchell district joining with the mining district of Kennedy, and say what interest has a person living in the district of Kennedy in common with a person living on the southern border of Queensland?

Mr. JACKSON: The Kennedy district is a pastoral district.

Mr. LEAHY: I know it is, but it is also a mining district. Central members have always maintained that Central Queensland should stand as a distinct entity in this House, and I

submit now that it has a right to be treated as a separate division and to have a representative of its own, more particularly as it has just about the exact number of persons which is described as a quota under the Commonwealth Act. But I am digressing. I want to get at this question of a community of interests. What are the matters referred to in the Commonwealth Act? First and foremost we find in section 51, subsection 1, trade and commerce with other countries and among the States. That is the matter on which the chief trouble will arise between the Federal Parliament and the Parliaments of the different States, and it is regarded as so important that an interstate commission is going to be appointed to regulate it. The trouble in that matter will be most intense where the different States border on each other; it will be particularly intense in the Southern portion of Queensland where rivalry will come in with regard to the trade between the two great ports of Sydney and Brisbane. What interest will the people of Mitchell, whose harbour or port is in Central Queensland, have in that question? There is no community of interests between the two districts I have mentioned except that the West happens to be a pastoral district.

Mr. TURLEY: Will not that matter be governed by the interstate commission?

Mr. LEAHY: Who is to appoint the interstate commission? It will be appointed by the Federal Parliament.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: By the Federal Government.

Mr. LEAHY: And who keeps the Government there? The Government are only the Executive of Parliament, and if they do not carry out the wishes of Parliament they can send them about their business at any time they like. The Government can only exist as long as they have the judgment to know what Parliament desires them to carry out.

Mr. KIDSTON: And how to keep members sweet.

Mr. LEAHY: Of course it is just as well for us to know what are the views of the hon. member for Rockhampton on this subject. He is an ex-Minister now, and from his experience he may think that if he is sent into the Federal Parliament he will be able to square persons when he gets down there, but I do not think he will have an opportunity of putting those obnoxious ideas in force in Queensland. I don't think it is a proper thing for a member of this House to talk about Governments or members who have occupied Ministerial office squaring their friends and keeping them sweet. It is a principle I did not expect to hear from an hon. gentleman who pretends to represent democratic ideas, like the hon. member for Rockhampton. But I am dealing with the question of community of interest. Look at that map. The whole of what is marked as Maranoa has a distinct interest in this question of the interstate commission and the manner in which trade will be conducted, and whether they will trade with Sydney or with Brisbane.

Mr. JACKSON: Won't the interstate commission be impartial?

Mr. LEAHY: It will be if it is appointed impartially and by the proper persons; but the proper way to attend to it is to put men into the House who will take care, through their personal interest in the matter and the interest of their constituents, that men are put into that tribunal who will possess all the qualities of discernment, judgment, and equality.

Mr. TURLEY: Will that be the member for Maranoa?

Mr. LEAHY: I don't know who it will be. Whatever member it will be I hope he will be able to conduct himself with more dignity than the hon. member for Brisbane South. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) Another question which will come largely into the Federal Parliament will be the Post and Telegraph Department. At the present time the mails of Southern Queensland pass either from Brisbane or New South Wales over the border to the Western districts; but the mails for Central Queensland go to Rockhampton and radiate from there over the whole of Central Queensland.

Mr. TURLEY: That is not so.

Mr. KERR: They go by Charleville a good deal.

Mr. LEAHY: They might into the Barcoo.

Mr. TURLEY: That is Central Queensland.

Mr. LEAHY: Do the mails for Boulia go from Charleville? Do the mails for any other part of Central Queensland, except Blackall and Tambo, go by Charleville?

Mr. TURLEY: The mails from Boulia go by Townsville.

Mr. LEAHY: They might since the line was extended.

Mr. TURLEY: Always have done.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LEAHY: At all events those are little isolated points that will not exactly fit in with anything, and I am speaking of the general run of Central Queensland. Will the hon. member for Rockhampton say that the great bulk of the mails of Central Queensland are not sent to Rockhampton, from which place they radiate in different directions? Of course they do. Exception was taken here the other day to the letting of mail contracts in a certain case. Mail contracts in future will be let by the Federal Government, and it will be necessary that there should be community of interests between the districts represented by the members of the Federal Parliament so as to bring about the best possible result from that point of view, and there is a direct community of interest in Central Queensland as apart from the people of South Queensland. Of course there are other matters in regard to which there is community of interest; but it is not necessary now to deal with matters that will not be dealt with by the Federal Parliament.

Mr. GROOM: What about the fiscal policy?

Mr. LEAHY: I say that even for fiscal purposes there is a greater community of interest amongst them, if combined as I say, than by any other arrangement. Are not the whole of these districts bound by a community of interest from that point of view?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. LEAHY: Is not Dalby a pastoral district? Is not the greater portion of Carnarvon a pastoral district? The hon. gentleman is only able to say that there is some fruit grown about Stanthorpe—and very excellent fruit, too—but on the whole it is a pastoral district. The hon. member for Murilla will bear me out in saying that district—ninety-nine-hundredths of it—is a pastoral district.

Mr. FOGARTY: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. LEAHY: I believe the last time the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty, travelled over that district, he saw two blades of grass where there was only one.

Mr. HIGGS: That is very severe.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member made a great deal of capital with regard to the schedules and the population which exists in the different districts of the colony. The first schedule read by the hon. member has 12,000 as a basis, and that would give a great deal more representation to the coastal districts than to the West for the simple reason that, either through ignorance or through negligence, the plural vote was not taken into account. If Brisbane, with 2,000 plural voters, was placed on the 12,000 basis, the Brisbane electorate would have a

decided advantage in point of voters; but the amount of electors on the roll is not the basis on which this Bill is framed at all. It is distinctly laid down in the Commonwealth Bill that the basis of representation in the Commonwealth Parliament shall be a population basis.

Mr. JENKINSON: It is a pity that was not supplied to us.

Mr. LEAHY: The population basis is distinctly laid down in section 24, in the second paragraph, where it says that the number of members chosen by the several States shall be in proportion to the respective numbers of their people. That is the population basis. The electors have nothing to do with it; but, of course, the electors to a very great extent are also in proportion in some districts where the conditions of settlement are similar. In the other colonies, possibly, the proportion of electors would bear almost an exact proportion to the population, but that is not the case in Queensland, and at present there is a Bill on the notice-paper of this House which is going to alter entirely the suffrage of Queensland, one of the essential features of which is that there shall be adult suffrage.

Mr. KIDSTON: When?

Mr. LEAHY: If the hon. member will give notice of a question to the Home Secretary he may tell the hon. member.

Mr. KIDSTON: I thought you were on the Government.

Mr. LEAHY: I am on the Government pretty heavily sometimes, when they don't do what I think is right. Seeing that the bulk of the adult female population of Queensland is situated in the Southern portion of the colony, the hon. gentleman must know that if this Franchise Bill is passed into law before these elections come off, however right it may be in itself, it would be radically wrong as a basis. There is nothing to go on except a population basis.

Mr. KIDSTON: You have not got the population before you.

Mr. LEAHY: We are not little boys. Most of us are bearded men sent here because we are supposed to have the faculty of discernment, looking up figures, and coming to conclusions. There are records of the House from which we can get the information we want, and the last returns laid on the table of the House under the Financial Districts Bill show that the population of the Central district is 56,000 or 57,000.

Mr. KIDSTON: Fifty-eight thousand.

Mr. LEAHY: It may be 58,000. The population of North Queensland is given at 95,000 or 96,000, making between them about 150,000. That is considerably less than one-third of the population of Queensland. In fact it is less than one-third by 50,000 or 60,000. These are the official figures, and they are as accurate as we can get them. Even if we get a census, it is not absolutely accurate.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is about 7,000 less than one-third.

Mr. LEAHY: What does the hon. member mean by that? Does he mean to say that, taking the population of Queensland as 482,000, the population of Central and Northern Queensland is only 7,000 less than one-third of the whole population of the colony? Is the hon. member's memory so short that he forgets that the Chief Secretary explained to the House last night that we should have a population of 512,000 or 520,000, if it was calculated on the basis adopted in connection with the Financial Districts Bill, and that there was 10 per cent. taken off that? If the hon. member is taking 482,000 as the basis of his calculation, he must take that 10 per cent. off the returns under the Financial Districts Bill.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is about 10,000 short of one-third.

Mr. LEAHY: I venture to say that it is about 20,000, according to the figures. At all events, as the hon. member admits that the population of these two divisions of the colony is 10,000 short of one-third of the total population of the colony, that is good enough for my purposes. As the districts are laid down on the map, they have certainly more than their fair share of representation, because there is a portion of Central Queensland put into Southern Queensland. Is not Port Curtis a portion of Central Queensland?

Mr. KIDSTON: A mere handful. It does not count.

Mr. LEAHY: Well, that is a matter of opinion. It is represented in this House, at all events, and it has as much say in determining the legislation of this colony as any other electorate. That gives the Central and Northern divisions still greater representation. I understand that there are reasons why those divisions of the colony should have a larger amount of representation than Southern Queensland, and I should be inclined myself to give them greater representation, for the simple reason that they are growing countries. It is a recognised principle in every country in the world—even in Great Britain—that the growing country districts should have a larger representation than the towns.

Mr. GROOM: That is so in London.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes; London has a larger population than Ireland, and yet is has only about twenty members, while Ireland has 104.

Mr. BELL: London has about forty members.

Mr. LEAHY: It all depends on where you draw the boundaries. One person may draw the boundary of Brisbane 5 miles from the General Post Office, while the hon. member for Toowoomba took it at 10 miles. But, even supposing that London has forty members, Ireland, with a smaller population, has more than two and a-half times as many representatives.

The HOME SECRETARY: On a population basis Ireland has about thirty members more than it ought to have.

Mr. LEAHY: That is so; but it has not thirty more than it is entitled to by reason of its intelligence and worth. (Laughter.) A few years ago, in Mr. Gladstone's time, when the redistribution of seats came on, the point was raised that there ought to be equal representation; but Mr. Gladstone and the bulk of the Liberals and Radicals recognised the principle that I am now endeavouring to set forth—that in the growing country districts they ought to have a larger representation in proportion to their population than the towns and more closely settled districts. I am perfectly prepared to admit the enterprise of the people of the North and West. That applies to Maranoa, Flinders, and Fitzroy.

Mr. TURLEY: Why should Maranoa have the smallest number of electors of any electorate in the Southern portion of the colony?

Mr. LEAHY: I do not know whether it has the smallest number of electors or not.

Mr. TURLEY: If you look at the table in your hand, you will see.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member might as well ask me why some other district has the largest number of voters. I do not know which has the largest and which has the smallest. I do not care if they put another electorate into the Maranoa to make it bigger. I have no interest in that electorate. I know it has been said in the Press that a brother of mine is going to stand for Maranoa, but that is no business of mine. If he takes my advice, he will not have anything to do with it. That is the advice I gave him, and,

if he is a wise man, he will stop and mind his business, the same as I intend to do; so that, if hon. members think I have any personal interest in the matter, they are entirely wrong. I am not responsible for what appears in the Press.

Mr. FISHER: Put that on one side.

Mr. LEAHY: I cannot, because it has been interjected across the floor of the Chamber half-a-dozen times this afternoon. I do not want to introduce these things. At any rate, I am not my brother's keeper.

Mr. REID: Well, you ought to be.

Mr. LEAHY: It has been interjected across the floor of the House four or five times, "Who is going to stand for the Maranoa?" Well, if hon. members interject, I have no objection to giving them my opinion on the matter. The hon. member for Toowoomba said that the principle of equality of representation has been adopted in Victoria. I am free to admit that Victoria did not take the population basis, but Victoria is a settled country, and the electors there bear an almost identical proportion to the population. At the same time, Sir George Turner and others fought for the principle of which I am speaking—that there should be a distinct difference between the metropolitan districts and the country districts. They contended that the proportion of representation should be as 13,000 to 9,000, while the Government insisted that it should be about 11,000 all round. Now, if you abolish the plural vote about Brisbane, I think it will be found that the ratio between Brisbane and Maranoa will be about 10,000 to 8,000.

Mr. FISHER: Apply that rule to Wide Bay.

Mr. LEAHY: If you have to divide this colony into only nine electorates, there are so many mining centres scattered over the colony that it is absolutely impossible to frame districts that will not have some large mining centre in them which will disturb the equality of representation. Of course, if you had twenty or twenty-five electorates, you could get over that difficulty to a great extent; but under present circumstances we cannot get over it. It is very easy to pick holes in this thing. No scheme can be devised that another person, who has not half the ability of the person who devised it, cannot pick holes in. The question is to propose a better scheme than the one which you condemn.

Mr. CURTIS: The first scheme was better.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member says that the first scheme was better. Does not everyone know the indignation with which the hon. member would rise in this Chamber if Central Queensland was not kept separate for all purposes? The hon. member is always contending that it should be a separate State.

Mr. CURTIS: It ought to be a separate State.

Mr. LEAHY: Well, what would happen at a later stage of the proceedings if we allow one portion of Central Queensland to be added to the Northern division, and another portion to be incorporated with the South? What will then become of the hon. member's contention that the Central division should have separate representation in the Senate?

Mr. KIDSTON: You look after Maranoa.

Mr. LEAHY: I can assure that hon. member that he has indulged in an amount of vulgarity this afternoon which I thought the [5 p.m.] hon. member was above, with reference to the part I have taken in this matter. I never saw the Chief Secretary upon this matter, and I have never interviewed the Premier about it. Beyond chatting to them in this House, I have never said anything to them about it, and I never went outside of this House to see them about it. If I could do all these things, which hon. members seem to think I can do, I can assure them that I would make things a little livelier than they are. Of course, I regretted very much to see my friend, the hon. member for Toowoomba, at the conclusion of his speech, depart from the high-sounding principle with which he started. He explained that he had very warm friends at Carnarvon and very warm friends at Dalby. Well, it is no discredit to the hon. gentleman if he has warm friends there, or anywhere. I am prepared to admit that the hon. gentleman has friends, and warm friends, all over the colony. The hon. gentleman has rendered long public service to the colony, and a very great deal of useful service, although at times he has not been able to see beyond the range of the Darling Downs. I think on an occasion of this sort he ought to try and see a little outside of the Darling Downs.

Mr. GROOM: So I do.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. gentleman says that he does, but I am afraid I must join issue with him on that point. Now, I do not intend to say a great deal more on this portion of the Bill. I think we are all agreed that this Bill shall pass its second reading. In fact it is pretty well understood that there will be no division on the second reading. Anything further I wish to say I can say pretty well when we get into committee. I only wish to say, in connection with that portion which relates to the House of Representatives, that there is no absolute necessity that the colony should be divided into electorates at all. It is not an absolute necessity that this Bill should be introduced into this Chamber for Queensland to take part in federation under the Commonwealth Bill as all. If necessary, this country could proceed as one electorate under the Commonwealth Bill; and I may say a very serious discussion took place in Victoria as to whether that colony should be represented as one electorate in the House of Representatives as well as one electorate in the Senate.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is just about the size of one electorate.

Mr. LEAHY: However, I am inclined to think that the balance of advantage is to be obtained by endeavouring to harmonise the different interests, and bringing them into line as much as possible for the purpose of electing representatives to the Federal Parliament, as is to be done in the Bill which we have before us at the present time. Now, just a word about the Senate before I sit down. I know of no country in the world where they have federation, where the Senate does not represent the whole of the States.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. LEAHY: In the United States, which is the principal model upon which this Commonwealth Bill has been based, in most cases it is not a matter of the State returning senators to the Senate, but of their being appointed by the Parliaments of the States, not elected by the people. There is no such thing as dividing the States into electorates for the purpose of electing representatives in the Senate. In Canada that cannot arise for the simple reason, in Canada the Senate are appointed for life. The Senate must be the States' House. I want to know what is the principle of have a States' House at all, and how it can be a States' House, if the country has to be divided up into electorates almost corresponding to the electorates for the House of Representatives? Is not the use of the Senate to be a House representing the whole of the Australian colonies? Every member who represents Queensland in the Senate should have a direct interest in every industry in Queensland, and not be the representative of the industries of a particular district. The tobacco-growers of the South, the wheatgrowers of the Darling Downs, or the sugar-growers of the North

should be represented by the senators elected by the colony. Each representative should represent every interest in Queensland, and should take care, so far as it is possible, having due regard to the interests of the other States, that they have a fair show and proper treatment. He cannot do that if he is returned by a separate constituency.

Mr. TURLEY: Why not?

Mr. LEAHY: I might in a sense represent South Brisbane although returned for Bulloo. I do that now, and I say that I represent South Brisbane better than the hon. gentleman opposite does sometimes. But I am speaking of the duty a representative owes to the electorate that he represents. Human nature has not altered very much in the past, and it is not likely to alter very much in the future, and while human nature is human nature members of Parliament will be bound to the interests of the electorate that they represent unless you get high-class politicians like myself. (Laughter.) At all events, getting away from that, I want to say a word or two to hon. members who represent North Queensland in relation to this particular matter. If Queensland is divided into electorates we certainly cannot proceed on the basis of giving two representatives to each of the States of Queensland.

Mr. KIDSTON: Why not?

Mr. LEAHY: Because it would be absurd. As I have said already, the basis of representation—that is to say, if there must be separate representation for the Senate at all, which I say is wrong, and I am only arguing it hypothetically—cannot be that the portion of Queensland which has less than a third of the population shall have twice as much representation as the part that has over two-thirds of the population. This would give them four times the representation of the South in proportion to the population. I think someone said—the hon. member for Toowoomba, I think it was—that we should allot two members for each of the three divisions of the colony.

Mr. TURLEY: He said he would rather support that than have the whole of the colony one electorate.

Mr. KIDSTON: Hear, hear!

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member for Rockhampton says, "Hear, hear!"——

Mr. KIDSTON: I should think so.

Mr. LEAHY: However, if the proportion of representation was four to three, or three to two, you might get over the difficulty, but that one portion of the colony should be represented in the Senate four or four and a-half times the extent of another portion, I don't think such a system would be tolerated. What I want to impress on hon. members is this: Supposing any member of community was elected to the Senate for the Darling Downs; he would be elected mainly to represent the direct interests of those persons who are distinctly concerned in the fiscal question—the tariff—but supposing the sugar industry came up, what would the Darling Downs representative say on that question? He would be absent. It would be a troublesome question, and he would do nothing that might interfere with his chances at the next election. I say that every member who stands for the Senate must represent every industry in this colony. There is no escape from that. I tell hon. members now representing Northern constituencies, if they want their industries to be properly represented in the Senate, they must elect men who will represent the interests of the colony as a whole; men who have no other claim——

Mr. KIDSTON: They could not have any other claim.

Mr. LEAHY: They would have this claim: Human nature has not altered, and so long as the colony is represented as one electorate, every representative must conserve the interests of every industry in the colony.

Mr. KIDSTON: A man cannot serve two masters.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then a man cannot represent two electorates.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes. It has been said by the hon. member for Toowoomba—and it is nothing new—it has been stated in the Press—that if the colony is to be one federal electorate, that Brisbane will swamp the rest of the colony.

Mr. GROOM: I said the Southern portion of the colony; not Brisbane alone.

Mr. LEAHY: Very well. Does not Toowoomba swamp Drayton and Toowoomba electorate? Do not cities and towns swamp the districts surrounding them? Is not the population of Sydney and Melbourne large enough and just as likely to swamp New South Wales and Victoria respectively in proportion as the capital of Queensland is likely to swamp the rest of Queensland? How is it that these men who were elected to represent New South Wales and Victoria at the Federal Conference were unanimous in their opinion that New South Wales and Victoria should be one electorate respectively for the purposes of the Senate? Was it not apparent that Sydney would dominate the rest of New South Wales, and Melbourne the rest of Victoria, if they felt so inclined, but they did not.

Mr. JACKSON: That is the objectionable part of it.

Mr. LEAHY: At any rate that was the will of the people of these colonies.

Mr. JENKINSON: They could not help it.

Mr. LEAHY: Of course they could not help it.

Mr. JACKSON: Every Parliament protested, but it was overridden.

Mr. LEAHY: Whatever Parliament did, these men were elected by the whole of the people of Australia.

Mr. KIDSTON: No.

Mr. LEAHY: I am speaking of the whole of Australia. Of course West Australia was not then in it, but they have only a small population there. Now we hear hon. members here complain that Queensland is not getting this, that, and the other. But who are the hon. members who so complain? The very members who used all the forms of the House to try and block Queensland being represented at the conference which drafted and devised the Commonwealth Bill for Australia. They blocked it at every turn, and now they are complaining that Queensland is not getting all she should get. The hon. members for Rockhampton and Toowoomba tried to block this in every shape and form.

Mr. GROOM: I did not.

Mr. KIDSTON: I don't think I did.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member did. Some other hon. members opposite stonewalled, and so did some hon. members on this side. But that is not the question. We are now face to face with federation, and we have to deal with the question before us the best way we can. It is now our duty to see that we get the best representatives we can, without, as the hon. member for Toowoomba said, gerrymandering all over the country. I submit that hon. members should recognise the broad principle that, while the different interests of the respective States are to be represented by special representatives, the senators should be elected by the different States as single electorates, thereby securing the election of the best possible men. Look at the constitution of the conference that framed the Commonwealth Bill? There was not a man among the representatives who met at that conference that any country might not be proud of. But if the colonies had been divided into different districts we would have found,

probably, that men with a bit of popularity, who shouted and spent a few pounds; men who had no ability, or very little ability, would have beaten some of the best men who represented New South Wales and Victoria on that occasion.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. LEAHY: And if we are going to divide Queensland in the same way, that result would be sure to happen, and we shall not get the first intellect of Queensland. But if we make the colony one electorate we shall be able to get the best possible men—the cream of the intellect of the colony, as the hon. member for Toowoomba put it—to represent us in the Senate. This is the only chance we have of making ourselves effectually heard in the Upper House of the Commonwealth. Notwithstanding all that has been said about Toryism and a fossilised Upper House, this Upper House is going to be the strong House of the Commonwealth. It will block any measures passed by the Lower House that it does not consider are going to serve the best interests of the several States concerned. I shall have more to say on this matter in committee. I now wish to impress upon Northern members that they should go for all they are worth in having their senators elected by the colony as one electorate.

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): I agree with the hon. member for Bulloo that it is no good in our proclaiming the disadvantages that Queensland will be placed under on her entering into federation. We made a bargain last year, and we will have to take it for better or worse. That has nothing to do with the present Bill, which simply deals with the detail of how the representatives of Queensland are to be elected. There is practically no difference of opinion about the second reading of this Bill, and matters of detail can be discussed and settled in committee. The Chief Secretary told us that it was most important that we should combine and prepare to elect representatives that would fittingly represent Queensland in the Federal Parliament. The hon. member for Bulloo followed in the same strain, and I do not think there is any difference of opinion upon the point that we should try to get representatives who will effectively represent Queensland in the Federal Parliament, although there will probably be a great difference of opinion as to who those fitting representatives shall be. I suppose when the Chief Secretary and a number of his colleagues were at that meeting the other night, he was taking the broad-minded way of getting his particular views given effect to in the choice of fitting representatives. I am very glad that the Government have decided to make this a non-party measure, because it will take the hobbles off hon. gentlemen onposite to some extent. They will be able to consider the interests of the constituencies without having the fear placed before them of displacing the Government.

Mr. LEAHY: You will never get there again.

Mr. KIDSTON: That has nothing to do with the present question. I am glad the hobbles have been taken off hon. gentlemen opposite, because it will give them freedom of action. The bogie of the Labour party is removed for the moment, and they will be able to serve the constituencies according to their best lights. I do not think I am betraying any confidence when I say that this party, too, look upon the matter from a strictly non-party point of view, and can vote according to our convictions just as hon. gentlemen opposite can. So that on this occasion we shall probably see some very strange results.

The HOME SECRETARY: The stiffness remains all the same.

Mr. KERR: From the use of the hobbles?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. KIDSTON: I am sorry that the Chief Secretary did not try to explain the reason which induced the Government to alter the arrangement of electorates that was given in the schedule as first published. It has caused a great deal of comment in my own district that the Barcoo and Mitchell should have been taken out of the Warrego and placed in the Fitzroy division. I was very pleased to hear the disclaimer of the hon. member for Bulloo on that subject, because it was pretty generally asserted outside that the Government had made this alteration to conciliate the hon. member for Bulloo. The Government were having a rather troublous time with the Labour party, and very much required the assistance of the hon. member for Bulloo, and this thing happening at the time it was asserted outside that they had made this alteration to insure the loyalty of the hon. gentleman.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LEAHY: That is a most unjustifiable remark.

Mr. KIDSTON: I am only saying what is said outside, and I am glad to have the disclaimer of the hon. gentleman. But it was rather notable the very great amount of interest which the hon. member gave to this question. He laboured altogether ineffectively to show that Dalby and Carnarvon ought to be in the Maranoa. Now, I think if it was a question of community of interest and industry, the Barcoo and Mitchell are much more akin in general interest than are Dalby and Carnarvon. But I am not very largely concerned about the matter. I would much prefer to allow Southern members to arrange their own electorates to please themselves. I will not attempt to interfere because I think the people of the respective districts and their representatives should know what they want, and what is likely to suit them best. With regard to the inclusion of the Barcoo and Mitchell in the Fitzroy, the hon. member for Toowoomba read a quotation from the *Rockhampton Bulletin*, which plainly said that it was very much displeased with the change, and strongly objected to it. I have the greatest respect for the *Bulletin*. I have a personal liking and high respect for the editor, but in this matter I take my own opinion and say that no person can look at the map without seeing that the electorate of Fitzroy as it is set out now is the most convenient of the large electorates into which Queensland has been divided. Whether you consider the facilities that members will have in contesting the electorate, or the general community of interest of the different parts of the electorate, I think it is a very proper arrangement, and I should be very glad to see Port Curtis included in it also. It is quite true that it is a very large electorate—the second largest in the colony—but as I will show in a minute, I would not have been at all displeased if Port Curtis had been included, and if it had been made larger still, because it would then really contain all that was left of Central Queensland since the completion of the Winton Railway. I have no personal interest in the matter. I can afford to look at it from an entirely impersonal stand point. I am only interested in seeing that the district, part of which I have the honour to represent, gets a fair share of the federal representation. Provided that is given, I have very little further interest in the Bill. I say that district will certainly not be fairly treated under this Bill, and if I thought that the Bill was likely to pass in its present form I would be inclined to oppose it at every possible stage, and in every possible way, because I do not think it would be at all fair to the people of Central and Northern Queensland.

Mr. JACKSON: You are not tired of stonewalling then?

Mr. KIDSTON: I am not at all tired. If I ever stonewalled, I am as fresh as I ever was. Queensland will have fifteen representatives in the Federal Parliament—nine members of the House of Representatives and six senators—and if this Bill becomes law, Southern Queensland will have twelve of them. She will elect six representatives, and the whole of the senators. I would like to refer to what was said by the hon. member for Bulloo about population being the only fair method of apportioning representation.

Mr. LEAHY: I said it was the principle under the Commonwealth Act.

Mr. KIDSTON: Unfortunately we have only an approximation of the population of the three divisions of the colony. We even have no correct figures regarding the population of the whole colony, and the statisticians of the other colonies have reduced the estimate made by our statistician by some 27,000. That is a very material difference. The growth of the [5·30 p.m.] Centre and the North during the past year has been manifestly much greater than the growth of the South, and it is quite possible that next year we may find that the population of the North has reached 100,000, and that of the Centre 60,000. But I take the number of electors, as we have definite information on that point.

Mr. LEAHY: No.

Mr. KIDSTON: Well, we have definite information as nearly as it is possible to get it on that matter.

Mr. LEAHY: What about plural votes?

Mr. KIDSTON: The plural votes, I have been assured by the most reliable authority on the Treasury bench, do not amount to more than 2,000, and that it is absurd to place the number at 5,000. On one occasion last year, when I placed the number of plural votes at 5,000 for the whole colony, the hon. member for Bulloo scoffed at me, but now, when it serves his purpose, he would put the number at what? At 10,000 or 15,000. He would make plural votes as numerous as the rabbits in the Bulloo. But, in any case, the number of electors furnishes us with the most definite figures we can get in regard to this matter. The schedule before us gives the number of electors in Southern Queensland as 69,000, and those 69,000 electors are to have twelve representatives in the Federal Parliament—that is one representative for every 5,753 electors.

The HOME SECRETARY: How twelve representatives?

Mr. KIDSTON: I have already said that, if this Bill becomes law in its present form, the South will have six representatives, and will elect the whole of the six senators.

Mr. JACKSON: That is assumption.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is quite true that it is an assumption, but I do not think there can be any serious doubt that only the men who are satisfactory to the great body of electors in and about Brisbane will have the remotest chance of being elected to the Federal Senate in the event of the Bill becoming law as it now stands. Even the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, who is a Southern man entirely, admits that, if this Bill becomes law, the South will elect the whole of the six senators, and I do not think there is anyone who seriously disputes that.

Mr. JACKSON: It all depends on the system of voting.

Mr. KIDSTON: It does not depend on the system of voting at all. However, that is what I say is likely to take place if this Bill becomes law. For every 5,753 electors Southern Queensland will have one member, while Central Queensland will only have one member for every 13,000 electors, and Northern Queensland only one member for every 10,800 electors. But even if we do not assume that the South will elect the whole of the six senators, if we just take the members of the House of Representatives alone, then we find that this schedule provides that 69,000 electors in Southern Queensland shall elect six members, which is one member for every 11,500 electors, while Central Queensland will have only one member for 13,000 electors.

Mr. LEAHY: How would you divide the other member?

Mr. KIDSTON: I shall show the hon. member how I would divide the other member. I do not think that the House of Representatives and the Senate are so very different but that the one may compensate for the other, and I am of opinion that if Central Queensland gets one senator and one representative she will have her fair proportion in the Federal Parliament. It has been proposed to give two senators to the South, two to the Centre, and two to the North. If Tasmania with its small population gets six senators, the same as New South Wales with her population of 1,250,000, then I say the three Queenslands, although they vary in their population——

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not three Queenslands.

Mr. KIDSTON: They are three Queenslands, having separate interests; they are three in one. If the majority in the South were as generous to the minority in the Centre and the North as the larger States in the South have been to the smaller States in the matter of representation in the Senate, then we might expect to get two senators for the Centre and two for the North. But I do not expect that, I do not even ask it, because I know there is not the slightest chance of getting it, although it would be a fair thing. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill professed to be very open-minded on this matter, and said he was willing to accept an amendment to divide Queensland into six electorates for the election of senators. But that is not sufficient. A general promise of that kind is not sufficient to redeem the hon. gentleman's honour in this matter. The hon. gentleman last year took up such a position in this matter that he distinctly pledged his honour as a public man to make provision for the division of the colony for that purpose when he introduced this Bill.

Mr. JACKSON: He was Premier then.

Mr. KIDSTON: Yes, he was Premier then.

Mr. JACKSON: He is not Premier now.

Mr. KIDSTON: I cannot help that. When the hon. gentleman came back from the meeting of Premiers he boasted, and I think fairly and legitimately boasted, that he had got certain advantages for Queensland, and one of those advantages was, as he himself put it, the permission for Queensland to divide the colony for the purpose of electing senators. The hon. gentleman at that time said—

> I think hon. members will agree with me that this is a concession to Queensland, which, considering the great extent of our territory and the various interests of this colony, will be a considerable improvement in the Bill.

Mr. LEAHY: Is that a pledge?

Mr. KIDSTON: I think it is a pledge.

The HOME SECRETARY: Oh!

Mr. KIDSTON: I think no honest man viewing the circumstances could understand anything else by this—that it was the hon. gentleman's belief and that it was his intention to divide Queensland for the Senate. In any case in Central Queensland and in Northern Queensland the hon. gentleman's words were taken to mean that, and men were advised to vote for federation in Central Queensland because they would get two members in the Senate. The supporters

of federation in Central Queensland distinctly quoted the hon. gentleman on those matters, and showed that every fair interpretation of the hon. gentleman's words meant that Queensland was to be devided for the Senate. Whether the hon. gentleman meant it or not, the circumstances surrounding that statement, and what followed, pledge the hon. gentleman to implement that implied promise by dividing Queensland for electoral purposes for the Senate.

Mr. SMITH: It was no pledge.

Mr. CURTIS: It was an implied promise, anyhow.

Mr. KIDSTON: As the hon. member for Wide Bay reminds me, unless the hon. gentleman meant to carry out this concession to Queensland—this great concession—where was the great concession unless he was prepared to take advantage of it?

Mr. SMITH: The House can take advantage of it.

Mr. KIDSTON: If the hon. gentleman had introduced the Bill in accordance with his expressed ideas on the matter, and the House had refused to accept the Bill, and altered it and made it one electorate, no one could have blamed the hon. gentleman; but if the House accepts this Bill, I say it is a distinct breach of faith on the hon. gentleman's part, and a distinct blot on his public reputation.

Mr. SMITH: He says we can alter this Bill.

Mr. KIDSTON: I was rather amused when the hon. gentleman was speaking last night, because when he is speaking about the matter he takes up very much the same position as he took up last year; but when he is drafting a Bill on the question—if he did draft the Bill—it is different with him. Speaking last night, he said he impressed on the other Premiers the desirability of granting to this large territory the right of dividing itself for the election of senators. The hon. gentleman's argument evidently convinced the Premiers of the other colonies. I wish he would address them to the hon. member for Bulloo. I don't know whether he used this as a decoy for the Central and Northern people. I may say that it did not decoy me, because I told the people of Central Queensland that they would not get two senators—that there was an exceedingly small chance of getting one senator—that for my own part I was hardly able to believe that the Southern majority in this House were so fair that they would concede even one senator to the Centre, and I will be pleased——

The HOME SECRETARY: Then they voted with their eyes open.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is not because they have not their eyes open. The hon. gentlemen who represent Southern constituencies in this House have their eyes open in their dealings with the Centre, and they never manifested any blindness so far as their own interests were concerned. That is what I thought then. I hope, in spite of what I then said, hon. members who represent Southern constituencies will show they are better than I thought—that they are prepared to do a fair thing by their neighbours in the North and Centre, and give us something like a fair share of representation in the Federal Parliament. I think that apart from the Chief Secretary's promises, or implied promises, in this matter, the equity of the thing demands an alteration of the present Bill. When I first read the Bill I thought of an amendment for dividing the colony into three electorates for the election of senators, giving three senators to the South, one to the Centre, and two to the North. I believe that would be a fairly equitable division. What I thought would be an equitable division would be this: I would take Port Curtis into the Central district, adding it to the present Fitzroy division, and that would leave 67,582 electors in Southern Queensland. If they had nine representatives —six for the House of Representatives and three senators—then, taking the two Houses together, 67,582 electors would give 7,509 electors per member.

Mr. LEAHY: You know that basis would be all upset when the women get votes next month.

Mr. KIDSTON: Just so; but we are dealing with facts as we have them now, and if we cannot deal fairly with facts as we have them now, we can hardly deal fairly with the supposititious facts which the hon. member for Bulloo imagines may be here next year or at some future time.

Mr. LEAHY: Population is the basis, anyhow.

Mr. KIDSTON: The Centre, with Port Curtis added, would have 14,750, and that would give 7,285 electors per member—just about the same as the South; while the North, with 21,685 electors and four members, would have 5,421 electors per member. I think while that seems to give an undue preponderance to the North, it would be a very fair apportionment of the representation in the Federal Parliament. There is a very great difficulty in dividing Queensland into nine electorates for the one House, and into six electorates for the other, so that the division in each case will be equitable, and yet combine the different industrial interests and the different local interests. In this case, if the division was made as I suggest, Central Queensland—because it would really be Central Queensland then—would have one representative and one senator, and, although her population does not entitle her to one senator, yet the excess of population over and above the quota required for a member of the House of Representatives would quite compensate for her lack in regard to the quota required for a senator. I have shown that, taking the two Houses together, that would be a fair and equitable distribution as between the South and the Centre. As a matter of sentiment, I would prefer to see Queensland divided into three for the Senate rather than into six, as suggested by the Chief Secretary last night; but I recognise that the division which the hon. gentleman suggested would give the people I represent all that they really want, and I shall have the greatest pleasure in accepting the hon. gentleman's suggestion if he himself will move the amendment when we get into committee, and do his best to get it accepted, because it does not matter what we say about this not being a party measure, the hon. gentleman knows quite well that if the Government go for the provisions that are at present in the Bill they will carry them. If the hon. gentleman has the courage of his own convictions, and if he is desirous of implementing the understanding which he gave rise to last year at the Premiers' Conference, he will make an honest effort to alter the Bill in the direction which he indicated last night. I would just like to say a word with reference to proportional representation. So far as Queensland is concerned, I suspect that proportional representation is proposed for the purpose of inducing the Centre and the North to permit the senators to be nominated in one bunch. I do not think that that will suit the circumstances of Queensland at all, and, indeed, I think it would take this House a week to decide which system of proportional representation we should adopt. If that system of representation should prove successful, all it can result in is to give us a fair share of the representation. But we can get a fair share of the representation in a much simpler way, and that is by adopting the suggestion made last night by the Chief Secretary, and dividing the colony into six electorates for the Senate. There will be no need for proportional representation

then. There can be no mistake at all. Each of the great divisions of the colony will have a fair share of the senators. I would just like to say, that if the Southern members in this Chamber are determined to keep the election of senators in their own hands, I would rather that they would make no pretence about proportional representation. I hope they will do it openly, and make no bones about what they are doing. I hope that they will put in a clause prohibiting electors who have the misfortune to reside in Central and Northern Queensland from voting for senators altogether. One thing which struck me in looking over this Bill was with regard to the names of electorates. The Government, or whoever drafted the Bill, showed wonderful poverty of imagination. They could not invent any new names at all, but simply adopted names which are already the property of electorates for our local Parliament. It would have been better to have called each of the electorates after one of the Ministers, and the ninth one after His Excellency.

The HOME SECRETARY: Or yourself.

Mr. KIDSTON: That would not have been a bad idea, now. It would have given——

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: A tone.

Mr. KIDSTON: It would have handed my name down to posterity. I wonder that it did not occur to Ministers, when they looked at the electorate that they call Flinders on the map, to call it "Never-Never." It would have been a most appropriate name.

Mr. MCDONALD: Why not apply aboriginal names right through.

Mr. KIDSTON: The electorate of Fitzroy ought to have been named Capricornia, because the Tropic of Capricorn runs right through it. Certainly it would have been better than calling it by the name of one of the electorates in the group.

Mr. RYLAND: Why not have an aboriginal name?

Mr. KIDSTON: You can have an aboriginal name for Gympie.

Mr. RYLAND: Gympie is an aboriginal name.

Mr. KIDSTON: It will be good enough for them. I hope that the Government mean to do honestly by the Centre and the North, with regard to the election of senators. I do not think they have acted honestly by them in introducing the Bill in this form at all. I am very pleased at the attitude taken up by the Chief Secretary; but, unless the Government are prepared to support the division of the colony, we know quite well that we will not get it. It is no good of them to introduce a Bill like this, and say they will leave it to the House. Why did they not introduce a Bill providing for three or six divisions, and then leave it to the House to make it one if it wished? I do not think the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill will do justice to himself unless he uses his very best efforts to persuade this House to consent to the division of the colony for the election of senators. The hon. gentleman said last night that he wanted the opinion of the House. Well, he has had my opinion pretty straight in regard to this matter. If clause 3 is carried in its present form I shall consider it my duty to oppose it in every possible way, because it will be a gross injustice to the people I represent. It will be a gross injustice to the whole of Central and Northern Queensland, and I sincerely trust that every Central and Northern member will speak out on this matter with no uncertain sound.

* The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): I do not propose to occupy much time in discussing the matter of the Bill which is now before the House, but I think there are some arguments which have been used from the other side of the House, more especially with reference to the senatorial elections, which are worthy of a reply from those who hold views contrary to the ones which have been advocated. Before, however, I do that, I should like to refer to one or two matters which were dealt with by the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, especially in the latter portion of his speech. Taking the last first, I would like to say a word or two about the nomenclature of the electorates for the House of Representatives. To a certain extent, I am responsible for the names of these electorates, which, with the exception of the substitution of the Maranoa for the Warrego, are much in the form in which I first submitted them to the Cabinet for consideration some months ago. Of course, I was quite aware of the probability that exception would be taken to the fact that some of the electorates which bear names which are identical with the names of electorates for this Chamber; but, on full consideration, it appeared to me that there was really no objection whatever on that score, for we have the same thing occurring already here without any inconvenience or confusion; that is to say, we have electorates for the return of members to this House bearing the same names as districts, of divisional boards, and also of municipalities; but, seeing that the two things are always referred to in totally different connections one from the other, there is no resulting confusion or anomaly. I certainly do not see why there should be any confusion or anomaly in reference to the same state of things, as concerning either the State Parliament or the Federal Parliament. If a man is referred to, for instance, as the member for Oxley, presuming that the Bill is passed, the two electorates would never be referred to in such a way as to bring about confusion, and it would be generally supposed that the hon. member for Oxley in this Chamber was intended to be referred to, and not the member for Oxley in the Federal Parliament. There is this further recommendation, perhaps not for the identity of names, but, at all events, for the names as they appear, and it is this: that they convey something to the outside mind, and indicate the particular locality for which the member will sit. It has been said that it would be better to adopt native names. Well, they would be utterly meaningless as indicating the locality, at all events, for a very considerable period. As it is, we have endeavoured to give names to the electorates to indicate the particular portion of Australia which the member referred to represents. The Flinders, to which objection has been taken, is of course a very large extent of country, and Charters Towers and Ravenswood undoubtedly would control that electorate so far as voting power is concerned, but at the same time it would be very invidious to call the electorate Charters Towers, or to call it by any name which would be purely local, so far as the district immediately surrounding Charters Towers is concerned. The desire was to get the name of some well-known natural feature, such as the Flinders River, which flows right through the electorate, to indicate the electorate.

Mr. DAWSON: What about the Burdekin—that drains more country than any river in Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Burdekin is a coastal river—I mean an eastern river. It is on the eastern watershed, and the great bulk of what we call the Flinders electorate is on the western watershed. The Burdekin, before it reaches the sea, actually flows through another electorate altogether.

Mr. JACKSON: The greatest portion of the population is on the eastern watershed.

The HOME SECRETARY: That may be, but it would not do to call the electorate Charters Towers, for instance.

Mr. BROWNE: Why not Carpentaria?

The HOME SECRETARY: I should say that Carpentaria would be a very good name but it suggests to me the locality of the great extent of territory which lies immediately on the Gulf of Carpentaria, and it would to a very considerable extent ignore the existence of Charters Towers, the controlling factor in the electorate.

Mr. DAWSON: Charters Towers has the population.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so. In seeking for the names you have to put yourself in the place of the members of the House of Representatives, who are elected by other States, representing people at the other end of Australia. Charters Towers, which would be the controlling power of the electorate, would be completely ignored in the adoption of the name of Carpentaria, which would indicate that it was some sort of Never-Never country. Indeed, I think someone suggested that it should be called the Never-Never electorate.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Is there not another Flinders in Victoria?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; and my own feeling is that the proper name of the electorate would be the Kennedy, because it——

Mr. JACKSON: Charters Towers is in the Kennedy.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. It is a considerable district, and it indicates that the representative of that electorate would practically be representing the goldfields and not, I will not say, the almost unknown, but the very sparsely-populated pastoral area which is immediately adjacent to the Gulf of Carpentaria.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: Kennedy is the name of a pastoral district and an electoral district, too

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so. The member for Kennedy in the Federal Parliament would never be confused with the member for Kennedy in this House, because they will be referred to in totally different connections, whenever either is referred to as the member for the Kennedy. Of course that would apply to the name Carpentaria as well. I think it is desirable that instead of adopting new names or unknown names, we should adopt names which will indicate to the members of the Federal House of Representatives, the locality and the nature of the interests represented by the member who may be referred to under the name of his constituency. Now, I wish to refer to what the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, has mentioned as a breach of faith, or the breach of a pledge, on the part of my hon. colleague, the Chief Secretary. I certainly thought that when he went so far as to say that, that he would have given us something more tangible than the quotation from a speech of the Chief Secretary which he did give us, and which is really only an expression of opinion that the concession that has been obtained from the conference of Premiers was one that would be of advantage to Queensland. No pledge whatever was given that the colony would be divided in pursuance of that concession. There was no such pledge actual or implied. When you come to boil down the contention that there was a pledge—which I do not admit—it comes to this: That some sort of pledge was given to divide the colony into six, or three, or four, or any other number of electorates.

Mr. GIVENS: Three.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was no pledge at at. My hon. colleague inclines to the idea that if there are to be any subdivisions the number should be six. With that I do not agree, and I shall have something to say on that presently. I do think that some better arguments should have been given in alleging that there has been any breach of faith on the part of the Chief Secretary; if not, the charge of the hon. member, Mr. Kidston, must fall to the ground. It may be that electors in the North and Centre of Queensland voted "Aye" on the referendum in the hope that some such subdivision would follow the concession granted by the other colonies, but the hon. member for Rockhampton himself, when speaking on the subject of federation at that time, took good care to inform the electors that they could not expect anything of the sort—that any hopes of that sort were illusory; so they must have voted with their eyes open. There was a possibility, notwithstanding the concession, that when Queensland entered into federation she would stand on the same footing with regard to senatorial elections as the other colonies.

Mr. BROWNE: I made a strong point of that.

The HOME SECRETARY: I can understand any hon. member having made a strong point of it; but certainly no pledge was given that advantage would be taken of this concession, because it would be necessary to indicate the particular form which the fulfilment of that pledge would take—with regard to the number of electors and to the basis on which the electors were to be represented. Another point which may seem to some hon. members to be an *ad captandum* argument is this: That at the time the Chief Secretary made the statement quoted by the hon. member for Rockhampton, which the hon. member says was a pledge—which I deny—the hon. gentleman was then Premier of the colony. Had there been such a pledge, it certainly would have been a breach of faith on his part then not to have carried it out or tried to have given effect to it. But since that time there have been two changes of Government, and the Chief Secretary is no longer Premier. The senior member for Charters Towers has intervened as Premier, and now there is a third Premier. It is true that the Premier does and must largely control the policy of his Government; but it cannot be said that every individual member of the Government is to control the policy of the Government. That would be a contradiction in terms. Whatever policy the Premier enunciated must be the policy of the Government, although, possibly, other members of the Government may disagree with him as to details of measures. We are all loyal to the Premier, but no set of men—no three men, let alone eight or nine—can be found who are unanimous on every matter of detail in every measure that is brought before them.

Mr. KIDSTON: You specially selected the Chief Secretary to bring in this legislation.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; but this Bill is more especially controlled by the Premier. I am going to introduce, to-morrow I hope, a Bill dealing with factories and shops; but in every detail it is not the Bill I would like to introduce, if I were wholly untrammelled. I don't say that is so, and perhaps it is not a good illustration, because my colleagues are prepared to accept my recommendations in every particular. Let us take the Elections Bill now before the House. We may differ on some of the details in that Bill, to which the Premier has given his *imprimatur*. The mere fact that the Chief Secretary has introduced this Bill does not make it his Bill exclusively and solely. It is the Bill of the Government. Therefore, even if any such pledge had been given by the Chief Secretary, he has been absolved from that pledge. I may take another illustration to prove what I am endeavouring to impress on hon. members. It

is this: In this very Bill I should prefer to see some of the details different to what they are. I am not disclosing any secrets which I should keep to myself when I say that I feel, as probably the people of Dalby feel, that my constituents have been coupled with and joined on to electorates which are entirely out of sympathy with their interests—whose interests are not identical with theirs. But the Government in its wisdom thought otherwise, and, of course, I, as a loyal member of the Government, submit. Hon. members will understand that the reason why I say I am not committing any breach of confidence is that it is generally known that the first arrangement of constituencies was my own, and personally I should have been glad if my colleagues had been able to see their way to adopt that. I should have been glad, because I know it would have met the views of my own electors.

Mr. BROWNE: And the electors of the colony, generally.

The HOME SECRETARY: But I have to look at the Bill as a whole, and as a whole it has my unqualified approval, for the reason that without this Bill Queensland will not be represented in the Federal Parliament. Now, as to the way in which we should be represented, more especially with regard to the Senate, I have a word or two to say. I will leave the question of representation in the House of Representatives to those who will be able to give better reasons for the present arrangement of the electorates than I am able to give. It is true that a so-called concession was made at the instance of the Chief Secretary in connection with the scheme of representation in the Senate. For my own part I do not hesitate to say that from the first I never regarded that concession as being anything which would lead to any practical result, or be of any practical value to the colony, because from the first I have foreseen that the only practicable and practical method to be adopted by this colony for representation in the Senate is to make Queensland one electorate in exactly the same way as all the other colonies will be one electorate. Now, the arguments which have been used to enforce the opposite view have really tended, in my mind, in the opposite direction. The hon. member for Toowoomba mentioned the fact that there were something like 57,000 people in the Central district.

Mr. KIDSTON: Sixty thousand in round numbers.

Mr. GROOM: The numbers are 60,000, 90,000, and 350,000.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, I want to point out that, for the purposes of senatorial election, it is a matter of absolute indifference what the number of electors is in any division. It has nothing whatever to do with it. It is flying in the face of the principle on which the senators will be elected. If you once introduce the principle of population or electorates into the election of senators, you fly in the face of the very justification for a Senate.

Mr. GROOM: Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? The Registrar-General's figures are 101,000, 60,000, and 357,000.

The HOME SECRETARY: If you take population into consideration, and adhere to the three great divisions of the colony, what sort of proportion do you get? I say that population as a basis is utterly absurd. How many senators would the North be entitled to? They have about 20,000 more in population than the quota, which is 80,000. I arrive at it in this way. There are 480,000 people in Queensland, and six times 80,000 is 480,000; therefore, 80,000 must be the quota. Northern Queensland has 20,000 more than the quota, and I am allowing a liberal margin. One hundred thousand is very much nearer 80,000 than 160,000, and you cannot divide a representative by cutting off an arm here and a leg there. One hundred and sixty thousand would be two quotas, and 80,000 being much nearer 100,000 than it is to 160,000, you must give the North one representative. The Centre has a population of 60,000, or 20,000 less than a quota. We will set that against the other, and allow one member. The South would be entitled to return the remaining four. What sort of proportion would that be?

Mr. KIDSTON: Much better than none.

The HOME SECRETARY: But is one better than six?

Mr. KIDSTON: No; but it is better than none.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will come to that presently. Would it be satisfactory to take such a false and illogical basis on which representation shall take place? It might satisfy the Centre, part of which is so ably represented by the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, but would it satisfy the North, which is 20,000 over the quota? What is wanted in the Senate is that every member in it should represent the State. Owing to the advanced nature of the Constitution, hon. members, and the public to some extent, have been led away as to what the true functions of the Senate are. Senators, as a rule, represent the legislatures and the States. The United States is the most striking example of that.

Mr. TURLEY: This is a departure from their system.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is, and the departure has apparently led the public and some members of the House away from the senatorial idea, and, instead of asking that the senators should be representative of the legislatures and the States as a whole, they are asking actually that the State House should be composed of men who ought to be in the House of Representatives—local men. What is wanted in the Senate is the best men we can get to represent the State as a whole—not to represent any particular narrow industry, or interest, or locality. Now, I come to the point as to whether the North and Centre would or would not be disfranchised in the Senate. I say unhesitatingly that there is no reason to believe that they would be under the proposed system. I can, on the spur of the moment, name four men of the same
[7·30 p.m.] political persuasion as myself, who are essentially, in their interests, Northern or Central men, and who have always been considered such, and who would yet stand an excellent show of being returned to the Senate with a very large vote in South Queensland.

Mr. DAWSON: Who are they?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not mind telling the hon. member who they are. I will take my own colleague, the Premier, for one; Mr. E. V. Reid for another; Mr. John Moffat, of Irvinebank, for the third; and Mr. Villiers Brown for the fourth. I say, unhesitatingly, that if those men offered themselves as candidates for election to the Senate they would stand as good a show of being elected as any four men who could be named.

Mr. LEAHY: And Mr. Ferguson.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, and Mr. John Ferguson, of Rockhampton, is another. I am speaking now of men who are essentially Northern or Central men. When the electors cast their votes for the election of senators they will, I venture to say, look beyond the narrow limits of the comparatively paltry electorates which we represent in this House; they will look beyond the more extended electorates which are to be provided for the election of members to the

House of Representatives in the Federal Parliament, and they will ask themselves who is the best man to represent Queensland as a whole? Who is the man who knows most about our industries and our interests, about the wishes and desires of the people of the whole colony? Who knows most about the colony, and can best speak for it?

Mr. DAWSON: I do.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course I have always accepted the hon. member for Charters Towers as an authority on that matter. I say that failing the election of senators by the legislatures of the States, which is impossible under the Commonwealth Act, the proper principle is that they shall be chosen or elected by the whole body of electors. Every senator should represent every elector in the colony. That is the only sound principle on which to elect senators under the Constitution by which we are bound. The concession which has been made allowing Queensland to be divided into three electorates for the election of senators could only be accepted and acted upon by this colony on the principle which will govern the election of senators in the other States, and which will necessarily govern the election of senators in this State if it remains one. Undoubtedly the object for which that concession for dividing the colony into three electorates for the purposes of senatorial election was granted was that those divisions, North, Centre, and South should for such purposes be, so to speak, regarded as three separate colonies. If you take that principle, and it is a true one, you must necessarily give to each of those three colonies equal representation in the Senate in the same way as Queensland with its 500,000 people and Tasmania with its very much smaller population have the same representation in the Senate as New South Wales with its population of 1,250,000. That is the only true principle on which the States' House can be constituted. If once you depart from that and make it a question of population you depart from the whole principle which underlies the constitution of the Senate.

Mr. KIDSTON: What harm would that do?

The HOME SECRETARY: The harm would be that those men would be local men, narrow-minded men; they would naturally be so from the circumstances of their election.

Mr. KIDSTON: Are you a narrow-minded man?

The HOME SECRETARY: No. I am not speaking in a personal sense. But if I went into the Senate as the representative of Carnarvon only I could not be otherwise than a narrow-minded man if I did justice to the men who elected me and expected me to look after their interests. The most broad-minded man possible must necessarily be influenced in that way by the circumstances of his election, and, as I have already said, that is not desirable. And how much more would the evil be accentuated if you had six electorates? You would have the same, or almost the same, local influences at work in the election of those senators as you will have in the election of members of the House of Representatives. Moreover, the electorates for the two Houses would overlap each other in the most incongruous way. For the reasons I have given, I contend that such a scheme is unsound, illogical, inconsistent, and an anomaly as applied to a House which is supposed to be, and will be, so far as the other colonies are concerned, representative of the States as such, and not of mere sections of the States. If Queensland were divided into three electorates, then, of course, the only logical way in which the senators could be elected for those three subdivisions of the colony would be by giving each division two senators, irrespective of its population or the number of its electors. Certainly that is the only way that would satisfy the North, and I believe that would satisfy the Centre. But would that satisfy the South? I do not think it would satisfy the South so far as it is represented by Southern members in this House. Of course that could be tried. I say that if the principle of subdivision is to be adopted at all, that is the only logical and true way in which it could be adopted. I have said more than I intended, but I would like to add one word in connection with some interjections made by one or two hon. members—the hon. member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Wide Bay—while the Chief Secretary was speaking last night in regard to the question as to whether those hon. members and others who thought with them and voted with them on the referendum were anti-billites or anti-federalists. It is a mere question of name after all, and the Chief Secretary was correct in saying that it matters not what hon. members or persons outside choose to call themselves—anti-billites or anti-federalists. I can imagine that 90 per cent. of the electors of Australia were anti-billites in one sense, that is to say, that the Bill did not satisfy them in every particular—90 per cent. at all events is a very fair estimate. In that sense I was an anti-billite, but I deny altogether that I was an anti-federalist. The difference between the hon. member for Wide Bay and myself is that I voted for federation and he did not.

Mr. JENKINSON: How do you know that? I had the courage of my convictions to oppose what I did not believe, and that is more than you did.

The HOME SECRETARY: What? (Laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: I had the courage of my convictions to oppose what I did not believe in altogether, and I opposed it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am glad the hon. member said that. When I told him he did not vote for federation he had not the courage of his convictions to say that he did not. He said I could not prove it.

Mr. JENKINSON: I did not.

The HOME SECRETARY: He said, "How do you know?" wanting to imply that possibly he might not have done so. Where is the courage of his convictions now? I voted for federation because I believed it would be impossible to get the exact Bill I wanted, and that is the reason why everyone who voted for federation did so—because they knew that if they waited for 100 years—perhaps 200 years—they could not get exactly what they wanted. The hon. member cannot get exactly what he wants in any Bill that is introduced, and yet he votes for the second reading or opposes it as a whole; and if he waited until he got a measure in accord with every view he holds he would never vote for one at all. That seems to have been the principle on which he and others proceeded at the referendum—because they could not get exactly what they wanted, they would not vote for it—and therefore they said they were not anti-federalists but anti-billites. I never called them either anti-federalists or anti-billites. I always recognise very little distinction between the two. The true test was whether a man voted for it or not. I can understand a man being an anti-federalist—being opposed to federation under any consideration—and I believe there were some in the colony.

Mr. FOGARTY: It is humiliating.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am sorry for the hon. member. I say it is unpatriotic. It was not the action of a federalist to vote against the Bill merely because he was opposed to some minor principle in it, though it may have been a very important one. There were half-a-dozen points in regard to the Commonwealth Act which

I would have bitterly opposed if I had had an opportunity of doing so in a conference, and therefore, I regret exceedingly that Queensland was not represented in order that our views might have been put forward.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: But having lost our opportunity, and the Bill being there for acceptance or rejection, its rejection throwing back federation indefinitely, its acceptance hastening federation, which even anti-billites apparently desire, I voted for it. So much for the distinction between anti-billites and anti-federalists. Whatever may be done by this Chamber in connection with the electorates for the House of Representatives, I certainly do ask hon. members to seriously consider before they decide to cut up Queensland into more than one electorate for the purpose of choosing senators.

* Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*): I heartily agree with those who say that this Bill should be regarded from a non-party aspect; but I can hardly help thinking from the way in which the colony has been cut up into electorates that it has been done with the view of getting into the Federal Parliament representatives that will be of the same way of thinking politically as hon. members on the front Treasury benches, and I am therefore constrained to believe that they were animated largely by party feeling in so cutting up the colony. Another thing, when I know that there is in Brisbane North an association formed for the express purpose of prohibiting anybody becoming a federal representative unless he is of the same political brand as the present Government, I can hardly believe that the Government in introducing this Bill are animated merely by a desire for the general good of the colony, and that they are not viewing the matter through party spectacles at all. The leader of the Opposition interjects that the Federal Electoral Association has been established in Brisbane for the purpose of suppressing the present Chief Secretary. That may be so, but its avowed object is to prevent the return of any man as a representative of Queensland unless he is imbued with the same political principles as hon. members on the front Treasury benches. Knowing these facts, I can hardly believe that this Bill has been introduced as a non-party measure. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down told us that this Bill might not have been what any one particular member of the Government thought best for the colony, but embodied the policy of the Government as a whole.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member is mistaken.

* Mr. GIVENS: That it was introduced as what members of the Government believed as a whole, and not what any particular member of the Government believed at all. As to the way in which the colony has been cut up into electorates, there are several that I believe could not be improved upon—Brisbane, Oxley, Moreton, Wide Bay and Burnett, and Fitzroy. I believe they are about as good as could be got.

Mr. JENKINSON: No, they are not.

Mr. GIVENS: I believe that those divisions are about as good as could be got, but I do not believe that of the Darling Downs, Maranoa, and Flinders divisions, and notably of the Herbert division. Other hon. members have dealt with the Darling Downs and Maranoa divisions, so that there is no necessity for me to say anything about them, but I will direct the attention of hon. members to the Herbert division. In that electorate they will find some of the most closely peopled districts in North Queensland, and it is the longest electorate in the whole colony. It is more than 1,000 miles long, and includes electorates which have no community of interests whatever. Will any hon. member say that the interests of Charters Towers, Kennedy, and Townsville are not more identical than the interests of Mackay and Cooktown? Then why has the electorate been cut up in the manner it has been? Simply to make sure, by putting in so many electorates that return Government supporters, of the return of a man of the same political brand as the hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House. They knew very well that if North Queensland was divided in any sort of fair way it would return thoroughly democratic representatives, and not reactionaries, the same as the Government members are.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are all democrats.

Mr. GIVENS: It is self-evident that the interests of the Kennedy electorate, the interests of Charters Towers, and the interests of Townsville are identical. They are all on the same line of railway; all their trade and commerce is between the one and the other. Then how is it that they have not been included in the same group of electorates? Simply because the Government knew that the very large democratic vote on Charters Towers would swamp the reactionary vote in Townsville and some of the other coast electorates. I say that, on the face of the Bill itself, hon. gentlemen opposite were animated purely by party interests in introducing this Bill, and the most glaring example of that is the way in which the Herbert has been mapped out. We only need to look at the map to see that it takes in a narrow strip of the coast country between Charters Towers and the coast. On the face of it, it is an inequitable division of electorates, and it has been done solely with a view to party interests. I challenge hon. members on the other side to deny that. What interest has Cairns in common with Townsville? As a matter of fact, their interests are diametrically opposed to each other.

Mr. NEWELL: Not at all. In what way?

Mr. GIVENS: Simply because Townsville aspires to be the octopus of the North, and wants to freeze out every other port in the North.

Mr. FORSYTH: You know nothing about it.

Mr. GIVENS: I assure the hon. member I know a great deal more about it than he does, although he comes here as a representative of the firm of Messrs. Burns, Philp, and Co., the octopus of the North. All their interests are in Townsville.

Mr. FORSYTH: They are not. They have interests in Cairns also.

Mr. GIVENS: Yes, and they are trying to kill every industry in the place by their charges for wharfage and everything else. The people of Kennedy, Charters Towers, and Townsville have a community of interests which does not exist between Townsville, Cairns, and Cooktown. If I were to offer a suggestion, I would say that the interests of the electorates to the west of Cairns, Port Douglas, and Cooktown are more in common with the interests of the coast electorates in that portion of the colony than they are with the interests of the Gregory and the country right away to the borders of South Australia and New South Wales. I believe I will be borne out in that by the hon. member for Burke and the leader of the Opposition, who represents Croydon. The Fitzroy division is one of the best. It will be seen that it comprises all those electorates which are on both sides of the Central Railway line, and which transact their business with Rockhampton, so that there is a big community of interests between all the people in those electorates. Why did not the Government make an equally good selection in regard to the North, and group

together all the electorates along the Northern Railway? Instead of that, they put all the north-western and central portion of that district into one electorate, coming within 70 miles of the coast, so as to include every mining centre, so that the democratic vote would not prevent the Government getting in a representative of their own political brand in North Queensland.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: It does not affect the Government of Queensland.

Mr. GIVENS: I am quite aware of that fact, but it shows that they looked at it purely from a party point of view and in the interests of their own party. As a matter of fact, the Townsville people themselves are opposed to the way in which the electorate has been mapped out, and anyone who looks at the Townsville papers will see——

Mr. HANRAN: How do you know that?

Mr. GIVENS: I have read the Townsville papers.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: What is the difference between a newspaper and one man's opinion?

Mr. GIVENS: Not much, but newspapers are generally representative of public opinion to a greater or lesser extent. I contend that in mapping out that electorate a better plan could have been adopted. For instance, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Herbert, Charters Towers, and Kennedy have just about the requisite number of electors, they have a community of interests, and anyone looking at the map can see that they would make a nice compact electorate. With regard to the senatorial election, I contend that if the colony is not divided into three electorates it will be a distinct breach of faith with the people of Queensland. No matter what hon. members opposite may say, there was a distinct understanding at the time of the referendum on the Commonwealth Bill that the people of Central and Northern Queensland would be protected by having separate representation in the Federal Senate. I have heard the Chief Secretary say, on the floor of this House, that he got that proviso
[8 p.m.] inserted in the Federal Bill because he knew it would make the Federal Constitution more acceptable to the people of Queensland—with that proviso in the Bill, the people of Queensland would be more likely to vote in favour of it. That is the real reason why the hon. gentleman got that proviso inserted in the Bill, and I give him all credit for it. It was a very good proviso—a distinct improvement in the Bill. Now, why did the hon. gentleman get that proviso inserted in the Bill? Simply because he knew there was a feeling in Queensland that the three divisions of the colony should have distinct representation in the Senate. That was the only ostensible reason he had for getting that proviso inserted.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: A bit of political diplomacy.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. gentleman may call it diplomacy if he likes, but a diplomat in my opinion should be guided also by a sense of honour. The only reason that he could have was that he knew there was a clear understanding that there should be three divisions, and it was never hinted that there should be six divisions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There was no understanding at all.

Mr. GIVENS: I could turn up the hon. gentleman's speeches, and show that he viewed it in that light at the time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No such thing.

Mr. GIVENS: It has been spoken of on the floor of this House time and again. Why did the hon. gentleman get that proviso inserted in the Bill? Had he any idea at the time that there were going to be six electorates, or that it was desirable that there should be?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I always thought so.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. gentleman says that he always thought so. Then he did not take the members of this House into his confidence, when he asked them to accept the Federal Constitution Bill. It is a great pity that he did not, for he had no right to reserve anything to himself on that occasion. When he put his case before the House, he had the right to make a clean breast of it, and make the colony and this House acquainted with all the facts that he knew, and if he did not do that, he was guilty of a breach of faith in keeping back such a reservation.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: There is a great difference between a duty and a right.

Mr. GIVENS: My line of perception is not keen enough to perceive the difference between a duty and a right. I say that if it is my duty to do a thing, I have a right to do it. Everything that it is the duty of a man to do, he has a right to do; and he has not fulfilled his duty if he does not do it. Now, if the colony is not divided into three electorates for the senatorial elections, what will be the result? The result will be that the North and the Centre will not be represented in the Senate at all, because the large voting of the metropolis and the Southern portion of the colony will swamp the Northern vote, and there will only be Southern men to represent the Northern portion of the colony; and the Senate will, in no true sense, be representative of Queensland but only of Southern Queensland interests. The interests of the North are not identical with the interests of the South. There is always a feeling in Northern and Central Queensland, that their interests are not in accordance with the interests of the Southern portion of the colony, and I think it is desirable that the population in the North and Centre—who occupy a very vast territory—should have a separate and distinct representation, seeing that they have not a community of interest with the people of the Southern portion of the colony. I agree with the Home Secretary when he stated that if, in the elections for the Senate, we proceed on a population basis, we should be flying in the face of the principle embodied in the Commonwealth Bill for the election of the Senate. There are six senators for the smaller States, just as there are six and no more for the larger States. Little Tasmania has six, just as New South Wales and Victoria have, and as Queensland with its half-a-million of population is to have. This colony is to have six, just as New South Wales, with three times the population, is to have that number. That shows that it is not on a population basis that the senators are to be elected. They are to represent each State as a whole. The principle, I take it, is that while in the House of Representatives we shall have one-man-one-vote, if we have the same principle carried into the representation for the States, each State will have equal voting power in the Senate. If that is so, the Home Secretary was perfectly right in saying that the most equitable basis, if we are to divide the colony into three electorates, is to give the North two, the Centre two, and the South two.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: No; he did not say that.

Mr. GIVENS: Excuse me, the Home Secretary distinctly said that.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He gave that as a hypothesis.

Mr. GIVENS: He stated that if we were to divide the colony into three States, for the purpose of electing senators separately for those States, the only equitable basis to go upon would be to give two senators to each of the three divisions.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: The only logical arrangement.

Mr. GIVENS: The only logical and equitable arrangement. I say that that would be the only equitable system of representation—the only logical system of representation as pointed out by the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple. We do not ask for that because we know that the people of the South would not be satisfied with that. We know that, although the South would not be willing that Queensland should have a smaller representation in the Senate than New South Wales, which has three times the population, yet she is not willing to concede the like privilege to anyone else, though she admits it for herself. Therefore we are willing to meet the Southern portion of the colony halfway, and adopt some system which will at once give an ample share of representation to the Southern portion of the colony, and come nearer to an equitable division on a population basis. For that reason we advocate that there should be two representatives for North Queensland, one for the Centre, and three for the South, although it is less than one-third of the colony.

Mr. LEAHY: On a population basis?

Mr. GIVENS: On a population basis—as a compromise—I appeal to the Home Secretary that we cannot possibly go wholly on a population basis without flying in the face of the principle embodied in the Commonwealth Bill. I believe that the arrangement I have suggested, which has been generally accepted throughout Queensland, and which was the arrangement under which the North and the Centre accepted federation, is the best and the most equitable that could be devised. We are not dividing the colony for to-day or to-morrow; this division will probably last for a long time, and, moreover, the population of the North and the Centre of Queensland is increasing in a far greater ratio than that of the South. If we adopt this compromise, it is possible that in a few years, even on a population basis, this would be an equitable distribution—when the Central portion of the colony would have one-third of the population of the South, and the Northern two-thirds of the population of the South, and it is very reasonable to expect that will be so in fifteen or twenty years. If so, this would be an absolutely equitable distribution on a population basis. It is undeniable that the tendency will be to make it more equitable.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: The Federal Parliament will decide that afterwards.

Mr. GIVENS: I shall be very pleased when the Federal Parliament decides that matter; but I would be better pleased if some independent body decided it now, because I believe the North and the Centre would get a greater measure of justice.

Mr. TURLEY: The Federal Parliament will not have a say in the matter at any time.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, it will.

Mr. GIVENS: I may say at once that the North will be satisfied with no other arrangement. I don't know whether Central Queensland will be satisfied with any other arrangement, but I know the North will not. I agree with the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, that, rather than lump with the South, we in the North and Centre are willing to accept less than our share of senatorial representation, because, if the North and the Centre are lumped with the South, they will be practically disfranchised by the overwhelming majority in the South as far as senatorial representation is concerned. We know that the desire of the South is to have Northern and Central Queensland bound on to its wheel for all time. The South has always resisted any attempt for Northern and Central autonomy, and they will always resist any such attempt. Knowing that there is that spirit of resistance and antagonism on the part of Southern Queensland, we may be sure that the South will elect representatives to the Senate who will be in favour of Southern interests, and who will be antagonistic to the North and the Centre. The Southern people will derive all the benefit. Let the Chief Secretary or any other hon. member say what they like, the fact remains that both the North and the Centre accepted federation on the distinct understanding that there would be separate representation for their respective divisions, and it will be a gross breach of faith and absolutely unfair if the North and the Centre are deprived of senatorial representation, to which they are justly entitled. I don't wish to occupy too much of the time of the House in discussing this Bill, but there are one or two other points I would like to draw attention to. In the first place, I am pleased to see a provision in the Bill, carrying out the mandate of the Federal Constitution Bill, that no elector shall be entitled to vote more than once, but there is no provision in it enabling every adult male to record his vote. Again, I think a man should be allowed to vote at any polling-place in the colony. Take my own case. Under the Federal Bill, I am an elector for the Herbert, and it may very likely happen that I may be in Brisbane when the federal elections take place; but there is no provision to enable me to record my vote in Brisbane.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes, there is.

Mr. GIVENS: I can't see it, and I have read the Bill very carefully.

Mr. LEAHY: The State law applies to that. It gives power to the Governor in Council to make regulations.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There will be the same procedure as is followed in an ordinary election.

Mr. GIVENS: That makes the matter much simpler, but I intend to move an amendment in this Bill similar to that I moved in the Federal Referendum Bill, to enable the Governor in Council to make regulations so that any elector, no matter in what portion of the colony he may be, will be entitled to record his vote for his own particular electorate, so that no elector will be disfranchised.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If you will point out where the Bill is deficient in that respect, it will be amended.

Mr. GIVENS: It is just as deficient in that way as the Federal Enabling Bill was before my amendment was inserted. With the leader of the Opposition, I am glad that this Bill is being discussed without any party feeling; and as I know other hon. members desire to speak on this important matter, I do not wish to monopolise any more time. But I think the provisions of the Bill can be improved in many respects; and I shall make an effort to improve them in committee. I am decidedly of opinion that in order to keep faith with the people of the whole colony and to do an act of justice the three divisions of the colony should get separate representation in the Federal Senate. If the hon. gentleman will agree to an amendment of that nature it will materially assist in passing the Bill, and he will do himself credit by performing an act of justice. I am pleased to find that federation is about to be consummated. I did my best in assisting to pass the Commonwealth Bill. I will do my little best in helping to pass this Bill, and in returning the best representatives for the division in which I have a vote. So far as I can I will endeavour to make federation the grand success which we all hope to see it, and assist by every means in my power to make Queensland one of the brightest stars in the Federal Commonwealth.

* Mr. CURTIS (*Rockhampton*): Of course, I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, as it is essentially necessary that we should make provision for the representation of Queensland in the Federal Parliament. At the same time, I must express my surprise at the form in which the Bill has been introduced. The two main features of the Bill are the proposal to constitute the colony as one electorate for the purposes of the Federal Senate, and the grouping of the electorates for the purpose of electing representatives for the House of Representatives. In view of what took place in the part of the colony that I represent, and the attitude taken up by the Government organ at the time of the federal referendum, it seems to me that it would be a great breach of faith if Central and Northern Queensland do not get separate representation in the Senate. I do not know what transpired in the North at that time, but I have not the least doubt the people there looked upon the concession obtained by the Chief Secretary at the Premiers' Conference as an assurance, or at least an implied promise, that the three great divisions of the colony would be adhered to, and that they would be given distinct repreesntation in the Senate. I know as a matter of fact that the Government organ in Rockhampton repeated over and over again that view. It called attention to the fact that the Government had secured that concession, that there was not the slightest doubt that they intended to give fair play to the Central division and the North, and that it was extremely probable, indeed almost a certainty, that the Central division would have two representatives in the House of Representatives and two senators. Now we find, according to the grouping of the electorates, that the Centre will only have one member and a fraction of another in the House of Representatives, and that the whole of the representation in the Senate is virtually proposed to be given to the South. I am convinced that the people of Central Queensland will not approve of Port Curtis being taken away from the Centre and added to the South for the reason that it is both commercially and geographically connected with the Centre. I am in hopes that in committee we shall be able to rectify that error and restore Port Curtis to the Central division. I have noticed leading articles in the *Courier* in which it was said that after having divided the colony into nine electorates for the House of Representatives it would be an absurd thing to constitute six other electorates for the purpose of electing senatorial representatives, and that it would be better to recognise the three great divisions of the colony for that purpose. But subsequently, I am sorry to say, that that journal changed its mind, and said it would be better for the colony to be one electorate for the purpose of electing senators; and in order that the minority might secure representation the Hare-Spence system of proportional voting should be introduced. I notice that the Chief Secretary deprecated the idea of introducing that system, on the ground that the electors were not familiar with it, and that it would not work satisfactorily; besides which we have already in operation in Queensland the contingent vote. It has been pointed out that the States were supposed to be represented as States equally in the Federal Parliament, and that there was to be no representation of sectional interests, but I submit that the circumstances of this colony are altogether different to those of the other colonies, and that as a matter of fact there are very important sectional interests which should be observed. I do not see how we can ignore them by a subterfuge of that kind—by stating that because the other colonies are to be represented as States pure and simple in the Senate, therefore Queensland should follow suit. I submit that for almost thirty years it has been recognised that there are three distinct entities in Queensland—three separate communities. Ever since the first Financial Separation Bill was introduced in 1870, by Sir Arthur Palmer, and time and again since, those three divisions have been recognised. When introducing the Bill providing for representation at the Federal Convention in 1896, Sir Hugh Nelson divided the colony into three sections, and proposed to give us adequate representation. I submit that Queensland consists of three distinct entities—three separate Queenslands—and considering that the States are to be represented equally in the Federal Parliament irrespective of size or population, the North and Centre are justified in asking that they should have equal representation with the South in the Federal Senate. Of course our population is not so large. The total population of the Centre and North, I think, represents about one-third that of the South; but when we look into the question of trade and commerce, the Central and Northern divisions contribute a much larger proportion than the South compared with their population. While the Central division has only one-eighth of the population, it contributes one-fourth of the entire trade. That, surely, should be taken into consideration. At all events, unless it is going to be argued that this great colony is to remain one and indivisible for all time, the representatives of Southern constituencies should be prepared to recognise the fact that for thirty years past Queensland has virtually been three States. Of course, I know that there are many Southern people who have an unconquerable aversion to any division of this great colony. But while we were demanding the management of our own affairs, it was recognised by Southern Governments, and by two Secretaries of State, that we were entitled to separation, and we were advised to wait until federation was accomplished, when it would be granted. Federation is now almost accomplished, and when we ask for some recognition of our claims, we are met with all sorts of objections, and told that we have not sufficient population. We used to be told that the time was inopportune, and I know that, so far as the Southern people were concerned, it never would be opportune. They naturally wish to retain control over those divisions of the colony as long as

[8·30 p.m.] they possibly can, but it is short-sighted policy. If the colony is divided into three districts for the purpose of the election of senators, that will show to the other colonies that we desire eventually to break up into three separate States and to secure adequate representation in the Federal Parliament. Sir Henry Parkes, who was one of the greatest statesmen that Australia has produced, over and over again stated in public addresses, and he also stated it in his book on "Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History," that it was undeniable that the great colonies of Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia should be divided before federation, in order that we might obtain greater equality of federal power. We are told that the States of America are equally represented in the Senate. But we know that they are broken up into a large number of States. There were thirteen States originally, but some twenty States have since been carved out of them, and others out of the territories, and that has operated beneficially for the States as a whole. There are some gentlemen who say that Queensland is always to remain one and undividable. I say that would be short-sighted policy, and would not be conducive to the interests of the colony or the Commonwealth. If we are to secure that equality of federal power

of which Sir Henry Parkes spoke, we must divide the large colonies, and if the three great divisions of this colony are constituted the electorates for the election of senators, that will be a recognition of the principle of separation. I do not suppose that separation will eventuate in my time, but it will come ultimately. In 1890 or 1891, Sir Samuel Griffith, as the head of the Government at that time, brought forward a proposal for dividing the colony into three self-governing provinces, each with its own Parliament. In 1892, he brought forward a Bill for the purpose of constituting the colony into three self-governing provinces, with the intention, as stated by him in one of his speeches, that those three federated provinces should merge into the Australian federation as separate States. But it seems to me that we are going backwards instead of forwards in this matter of self-government.

Mr. LEAHY: It is a pity he did not pass that measure.

Mr. CURTIS: It is a great pity it was not passed. I had not a proper appreciation of the proposal at the time, but since then I have recognised its value, and now I think, as Sir Thomas McIlwraith did, that it was a wise and philosophical arrangement. Lord Knutsford said that if that scheme, after being discussed a second time, was thrown out by the opposition of Southern members in this House the time would have arrived when, in his opinion, the Imperial Parliament would no longer delay in giving effect to the desires of the people of Central and Northern Queensland. That shows that for many years past it has been recognised that there are three separate entities in the colony. In view of the representations made by the Government in Central Queensland during the time the referendum was taken on federation, I say it will be a political fraud on the people of Central and Northern Queensland if the colony is constituted one electorate for the election of senators, for that will mean that the people in the South will return the whole of the senators. The *Courier* says there should be unity in this matter. But how can there be unity if two portions of the colony are practically disfranchised? You can only have unity by giving the people fair representation. The hon. member for Bulloo expressed the opinion that the Senate would be the stronger of the two Houses in the Federal Parliament, and that, I contend, is a sufficient reason why the three great divisions of the colony should have equal representation in the Senate. Personally I would prefer the tripartite division of the colony; but if I cannot get that I would accept the division of the colony into six electorates. I do not, however, like the idea so much, because it has not the suggestiveness which attaches to the division of the colony into the three great recognised divisions. There is no significance in the division of the colony into six electorates, and all that it will do will be to give the Northern and Central divisions certain representation in the Senate. How much better it will be for Queensland later on if it is represented in the Federal Parliament as three States with something like adequate representation, power, and influence. It is a great blunder to enter the federation as one State, because in doing so Queensland will be deficient in voting power and in influence in the Commonwealth Parliament. Sir Thomas McIlwraith, in 1890 or 1891, told the federal delegates distinctly that provision would have to be made for the incorporation of Queensland as three provinces or States before she could be expected to come into the federation.

Mr. JENKINSON: You have been betrayed.

Mr. CURTIS: The hon. member for Wide Bay says we have been betrayed. I hope not; I hope that we shall be able to remedy the defects to which I have referred in committee. At the same time I say it is not a fair thing to introduce this Bill in the way it has been introduced—that is, constituting the colony one electorate for the election of senators. The very fact that the Hon. J. R. Dickson, as the representative of the Government at the meeting of Premiers, secured the concession he did with regard to the division of the colony of Queensland, shows, I think, that the hon. gentleman had in his mind the three great divisions of the colony.

Mr. JENKINSON: He said so in his speech last year.

Mr. CURTIS: I am very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman stated that last year after he returned from the Conference of Premiers.

Mr. STEPHENSON: If Parliament so decided.

Mr. CURTIS: That being the case, the Bill should have proposed to constitute the colony into three divisions for the election of senators, and the Government should have asked Parliament to agree to that proposal. That would have been keeping faith with the people of Central and Northern Queensland. I took a very prominent part in opposing the Commonwealth Bill when the referendum was being taken, not because I was opposed to the Bill generally, but because I was opposed to one clause which was not fair to the Central and Northern divisions of the colony. I was in favour of federation. I was a better federalist than the great majority. I was prepared to go a great deal further than the majority, I think. I was in favour of the federation of the people of Australia, not a federation of the States.

Mr. BELL: A unification.

Mr. CURTIS: I was in favour of a national Government, the colonies being constituted as provinces, not States, each province with its own Parliament, with a great supreme Parliament in the country to exercise supreme control over the whole of Australia in the way the Imperial Parliament has exercised control in the past. The framers of this Constitution set out with the idea that these colonies should be sovereign States; they had the example of the thirteen American colonies before them; but the position of the American colonies was entirely different from ours, and there was nothing to justify us in following their example to the extent we did because they were sovereign States.

Mr. LEAHY: No.

Mr. CURTIS: They had just secured their independence, and it was natural that they would safeguard their sovereignty as they did. But in Australia it is a very different matter, because we were all self-governing colonies recognising allegiance to the Imperial Parliament. A federation of the people of Australia would have been far better for the people of Australia than anything likely to grow out of this Constitution. Under this Constitution, with the clauses to which I have strongly objected, the State rights will simply mean the rights of the capital cities of the colonies. I have several times pointed out that the three divisions of the colony are legally recognised in various ways, and I consider that it is an exceedingly unfair thing that the Central and Northern divisions, which enabled the federalists to carry the referendum, should be virtually disfranchised by this Bill from representation in the Senate of the Federal Parliament. Allow me to remind hon. members that the vote in Central and Northern Queensland carried the referendum, and we would not have this Bill before us to-night but for the vote in Central and Northern Queensland.

Mr. HIGGS: You cannot claim credit for that.

Mr. CURTIS: I do not claim credit for it. I have explained all about that; and I consider that I was right. I gave great consideration to

the subject—not merely a cursory examination of the matter. I looked deeply into the philosophy of the thing, and I say that we have made a great mistake in allowing this great colony to be incorporated as one State, subject to the obnoxious clauses to which I have referred, under which the people of Central and Northern Queensland will be robbed of their birthright. If there had been a clause like that in the New South Wales Act, Queensland would never have had any existence to-day. I recollect when the report of the select committee in the New South Wales legislature was brought up for consideration, the late W. C. Wentworth being the chairman, there was a clause similar to this—providing that there should be no further separation without the consent of New South Wales. Immediately the news reached Brisbane, which had a population of about 5,000 then, an indignation meeting was called to protest against it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CURTIS: And the obnoxious clause was struck out.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CURTIS: People are guided to a great extent by self-interest, and, I suppose, it will be so as long as human nature is what it is; and it is wonderful how interest overcomes reason. I regret that this Bill does not provide what was virtually promised to the Central and Northern districts by the Government.

Mr. FISHER: And yet you support that Government.

Mr. CURTIS: Yes; when they bring forward measures I approve of. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) Supposing an hon. member, like the Labour party did last year, brings forward a motion to displace the Government, what would be the use if he could not form another Government? Talk about supporting the Government. The hon. gentleman knows very well—without wishing to lose sight of the errors and imperfections of the present Government—that there is only one possible Government at the present time, and we know who is responsible for it. I am here to give my support to any reasonable measure the Government may bring forward, and not give a factious opposition to anything I may not approve of, especially when I know that nothing better can be done. The matter rests with the party to which the hon. member belongs, and they can rectify it if they like. If the hon. member comes to me I will tell him how it can be done. I submit that what has been done by the southern colonies is not an absolute guide for us. We have to deal with Queensland in accordance with the circumstances of Queensland, and I respectfully submit that they are altogether exceptional, and we should deal with them in a wise and statesmanlike manner, and not allow our feelings to be warped by prejudice or anything of that kind. Queensland demands equal representation in the Senate with New South Wales and Victoria, notwithstanding our smaller population.

Mr. GLASSEY: Queensland did not demand it, unfortunately. The generosity of the southern colonies granted it.

Mr. CURTIS: I don't know whether generosity is the proper term to use. They were anxious for Queensland to come in, and I think they would have been prepared to concede a great deal more to induce Queensland to come in. They knew the thing would be lop-sided and imperfect without Queensland, and I am certain that if we had stood out in the meantime until the Commonwealth Parliament met and treated to come in as three States, we would have been in an infinitely better position than we are at present. In the future, after we have had experience of conflicting interests between the different States, and we have gone down every time owing to our small representation, we shall find when we desire to secure more representation, that we shall have excited the jealousy and opposition of the southern colonies and it cannot be done. I need say nothing more at this stage. When we get into committee, I may be prepared to bring forward amendments myself. I do not like the idea of dividing the colony into six, though I would prefer that to having it one division, but I would infinitely prefer the recognition of the three great divisions—the tripartite division, which we have recognised ourselves in our own Acts of Parliament from time to time. That will have a special significance in this case. It will be an intimation to the other colonies that at some future time we shall require more adequate representation in the Federal Parliament, and shall demand that those two great divisions shall be admitted as separate States. The idea may not be palatable to Southern members, but I do not see why it should be distasteful to them, bearing in mind the great example of the United States of America, which at first only contained thirteen States, but now number some forty-five or forty-six, and form the greatest federation that the world has ever seen. Why there should be anything obnoxious to Southern members in the idea I cannot understand, unless it is that they have not given the subject proper consideration, and have not studied the philosophy of it; but I am perfectly certain that, if they did, they would see that we would be going in the right direction, and that we would be doing what Sir Henry Parkes advocated so strongly. He said it would be infinitely better for the proposed federation, for its dignity and national importance, and for the interests of each individual State and for the whole collection of States, if the national union was inaugurated by twenty States instead of by five. I shall read two or three lines of a quotation with regard to Sir Henry Parkes that I have here—

> Sir Henry Parkes, in his best moments an Australian patriot, considered excessive area both unnecessary and positively detrimental to national growth and development, and he distinctly affirmed the necessity of dividing Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia.

I shall read a quotation from a letter which I have received from a friend of mine in the Rockhampton district, who is a relative of one of the law lords of the United Kingdom—Lord James of Hereford. He says—

> If it be true that the division of Queensland into three senatorial districts is likely to favour the future formation of sub-centres of political responsibility, anyone who takes a statesmanlike view of Australian requirements ought to favour the plan. The Senate might be well informed as to the necessity or advisability of creating new States, and the best way to secure this is to have Queensland senators whose practical knowledge will make up for the lack of information on the part of Tasmanian and other senators.
>
> Again, the Senate exists partly to protect the rights of minorities, and if the interests of three sections of Queenslanders are really so diverse as to make a tripartite representation in the Senate dangerous, then Queensland ought to be divided. If the interest of the three parts is properly identical, then moderate-minded senators are not likely to fall out and sacrifice Queensland by disunion. In short, the presumption of statesmen in this matter ought to be not against, but in favour of, at least three senatorial electorates.

I favour the three divisions, but I would rather have six than one. If a proposal is brought forward in the first instance for the division of the colony into six, and it is defeated, I shall then be prepared to bring forward an amendment to constitute three divisions, with such representation in the Senate as it may be possible to secure later on.

Mr. LEAHY: If the proposal to have six divisions is carried, your chance of three is gone.

Mr. CURTIS: I shall consider the matter, and when we get into committee I shall be prepared, if necessary, to move such amendments as may seem to me to be advisable.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): It might be thought that it is scarcely worth while quarrelling very seriously as to the way in which Queensland shall be represented in the Senate, seeing that the concession which Queensland has obtained is only of a very temporary nature; that the Federal Parliament can, as soon as ever it thinks fit, take the whole matter into its hands and decide how elections shall take place in the different colonies, both as regards the House of Representatives and the Senate. But it is for that very reason that the Northern and Central members should, at this stage, see that their districts have a fair representation, not only in the House of Representatives, but in the Senate, because when the Federal Parliament does think it desirable to introduce legislation, if the Centre and the North have their representatives there, they will be able to show both sides of the question to the Federal Parliament, and advocate their particular aspect of the case. I agree with a good deal that the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Curtis, has said. I admit that, on account of the population difficulty, it is a rather serious problem that we have to face in deciding how many senators shall be given to the two great divisions of the North and the Centre. I have not been present during the whole of the debate, so that I do not know whether any hon. member has pointed out that Sir Hugh Nelson, when he introduced one of the Federal Enabling Bills, provided that the members who should represent Queensland at the Federal Convention should be elected by the three divisions of the colony. Sir Hugh Nelson on that occasion pointed out that the North and the Centre had their own aspirations, and for that reason they should elect their own representatives to the convention which was to draft a Constitution for the whole of Australia. It follows, logically, that if it was desirable that Queensland should be represented at the Federal Convention as three divisions, it is all the more important now that the North and Centre should be represented, in accordance with the area or the population of those divisions, in the Federal Parliament. Before entering upon the discussion of the Bill I would like to make a few preliminary remarks. Leaving on one side the federal movement of 1891, I think that when the historian of the future comes to write the history of the present movement, he will divide it into seven stages. First of all, there was the election of the representatives to the Federal Convention. Some reference has been made to that this afternoon. I think the hon. member for Bulloo pointed out that the way in which that business was managed in Queensland did not redound to our credit. I think the hon. member's remarks were perfectly justified; but, at the same time, the principle to go upon is to "let the dead past bury its dead." It is no use recriminating and finding fault with each other because Queensland was not represented at any of the conventions. The second stage would be the drafting of the Commonwealth Bill by the delegates from all the colonies except Queensland. Whilst I was not able to support that Bill, I have always claimed to be a federalist, and I am quite willing to admit that the drafting of that Constitution was a remarkable piece of work. No doubt every hon. member could find some fault with the Federal Constitution,

[9 p.m.] but, as a Northern member, I felt it was my duty to oppose the acceptance of that Constitution, because of the injury I thought would result to Northern Queensland. The third stage, in my opinion, would be the ratification of the Constitution by the people, and the fourth stage would be the ratification of the Constitution by the Imperial Parliament. There was no hitch so far as the ratification by the people in Australia was concerned, and I think that the voting conclusively proved that a large majority of the people of Australia were in favour of the federation of the Australian colonies. There was a slight hitch in connection with the ratification of the Constitution by the Imperial Parliament, but, happily, it turned out all right. The trouble, as the Chief Secretary could explain, was in connection with the appeal to the Privy Council, and I think the matter was settled to the satisfaction of the people of Australia. Now we have arrived at the fifth stage—that is, making the provision for the election of the representatives of the colony. We are doing now exactly as the other colonies are doing for the election of representatives and senators to the Federal Parliament. The next stage that the historian of the federal movement would probably take, would be the proclamation of the Commonwealth, which is to take place on 1st January, and the seventh stage would be the federal elections. Now, coming to the Bill itself, the hon. members who have spoken have taken up the position that the elections to the Senate should not take place by the colony voting as one electorate, but as three, four, five, and six electorates. I am not particularly strong which way it is to be decided. If anything, I lean a good deal to the division of the colony into six electorates. I certainly think it ought to be divided into three. It has been pointed out that in Victoria there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with the method of electing senators in that colony, and of course it is compulsory, under the Constitution Act, that the elections to the Senate shall take place in all the other colonies with each of the colonies voting as one electorate. In Victoria the people are dissatisfied with that, and, as a remedy, they propose a system of proportionate voting, a system that has been made familiar to us lately by the *Courier's* articles on that system of voting. Well, if in a small colony like Victoria they are dissatisfied with the system of voting of taking the whole colony as one electorate, is it not to be expected that in an immense colony like Queensland, which has had strong separationist feelings in its different provinces for a long period of years, there will be a great deal of fault found with the present Bill, which proposes that the voting shall take place as one electorate? There is no comparison at all between the two colonies. If we have the voting here as one electorate, with our present system of voting, which is known as the block voting, I do not think it is disputed that it would be possible for the South to return the whole six of the members of the Senate; and the *Courier*, in its fairness, suggests that we should have proportionate voting.

Mr. GLASSEY: Do you not think the South will have the sense to select the best men whether they represent the North or the South?

Mr. JACKSON: I will deal with that later on. I may state that I thoroughly believe in the system of proportionate voting, but not as applied to circumstances such as those of an immense colony like Queensland.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is too complicated.

Mr. JACKSON: No; my objection to it is not altogether that it is too complicated. I think the system is not at all suitable for such a wide area, as would be the case if we take Queensland as one electorate. It would be very suitable to a city like Brisbane. The system advocated by the *Courier* is what is called the Hare, or the Hare-Spence system.

Mr. BROWNE: That is obsolete now.

Mr. JACKSON: It is rather news to me to hear that it is obsolete, because it is only two or three years ago that the Federation Convention was sitting, and that system was advocated by some of the leading members of that convention. If it is obsolete, it has become obsolete during the last three years.

Mr. BROWNE: It has been improved upon.

Mr. JACKSON: I think there was some slight improvement made on it in Tasmania, but that is only a small matter of detail. What I wish to say is that I believe thoroughly in the system of the representation of minorities. I think it is a democratic system. It is all a question as to how we shall proceed to give the minorities due representation—whether we shall adopt the Hare-Spence system, or whether we shall take simply the system of proportionate voting—allowing each elector to give six votes to one candidate or divide those six votes as he likes, giving two to one candidate, or three to one candidate and the balance to another candidate. There are various systems of proportionate voting, and I may say here that John Stuart-Mill, who the members on this side look upon as an authority on representative government and voting, thoroughly approved of the Hare-Spence system, and condemned the system of allowing an elector to give his six votes to one candidate.

Mr. GLASSEY: It is the system in vogue so far as school boards in the old country are concerned.

Mr. JACKSON: Which system—the one I mentioned last?

Mr. GLASSEY: Yes, and a very bad one.

Mr. JACKSON: It is just possible that giving the electors six votes and allowing them to use them as they think fit may be a much simpler system so far as the electors are concerned, and that argument of course is a very important one. I was going to point out that a system of proportionate voting would be very applicable to a city like Brisbane, where there will probably be ten members to be returned, and where the candidates and the electors can be brought face to face. And even in a small colony like Victoria, seeing that all centres down there are connected by rail, that system of electing senators may work fairly well. The real question at issue in connection with this Bill is whether the colony shall be divided into a number of electorates or whether it shall be one electorate with some system of proportionate voting. I do not think that anyone will contend, if the colony is to be a single electorate, that the ordinary system of voting should be observed. I do not know whether my hon. friend the member for Bundaberg will contend that.

Mr. GLASSEY: I believe in the colony being one electorate, and every man giving his vote as he chooses.

Mr. JACKSON: I understand from the hon. member's interjection, that he is in favour of the colony being a single electorate, and that an elector should be allowed to give his six votes to one candidate.

Mr. GLASSEY: No. I don't believe in the block vote at all.

Mr. JACKSON: I certainly object to the colony being one electorate if we are to have the present system of voting for parliamentary elections. If the colony is divided into a number of electorates, then the principle of one vote one value might be advocated by Southern representatives. It has not been advocated so far, unless the Home Secretary meant that in one of his arguments. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Bulloo say that the principle of one vote one value should not necessarily apply. He admitted that outside districts should have rather more representation than districts more settled, or nearer the capital. I remember Sir Horace Tozer used to take up a position strongly in favour of one vote one value. When the question of one man one vote was before the House, Sir Horace Tozer argued that one adult one vote practically meant one vote one value. If Southern members argue in that way, theoretically they have a good case—if they go on population basis, or on the basis of the present electoral rolls. But if we go on the basis of the return furnished to the House, then the North and the Centre together cannot claim more than two senators. As has been pointed out, the North is entitled to more than one, but according to the electoral rolls the Central division is not entitled to one. Of course, anything can be done with figures—it all depends on how they are used; and, seeing that this return is so complicated—because we cannot tell how many plural votes there are in the South—it is very unsatisfactory to argue from these figures. But, going on these figures, we find there are, roughly, 69,000 voters on the rolls in Southern Queensland, 13,000 in the Centre, and 21,000 in the North, the total number of votes being 103,337. If we divide that number by the six senators to be elected, we get a quota of 17,000, and then we are face to face with rather a difficult problem as to how the senators shall be allotted to the Northern and Central divisions. If the North and Centre were to amalgamate, the problem would not be so difficult, because they would have a total of 34,000 voters—that is, twice the quota of 17,000, which would entitle them to two members. Of course, the Central people might object to this amalgamation, because they might say that the North would be able to return the senators.

Mr. KIDSTON: They might as well amalgamate with the South.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not agree with the hon. member. The North and the Centre have common interests which the South and the Centre have not. For instance, the North and the Centre, I take it, would be freetrade; but the South and the Centre would not be so. If the North and the Centre amalgamated were able to return two Opposition candidates—I won't say Labour men—that would certainly be rather rough on the Ministerial candidates in those divisions. I say this because I believe in the representation of minorities. Of course, as I said before, it is a very difficult matter to determine how minorities are to be represented. Our present system of voting usually pans out satisfactorily, because we have a large number of electorates, and a minority in one electorate gets transformed into a majority in other electorates, and both parties manage to get fairly well represented. But for the purposes of federation it is proposed that the colony shall be one single electorate, so a different set of circumstances will spring up. I think myself that the Federal Constitution ought to have left the several States the right and power to divide themselves into as many electorates as they thought fit. That concession, of course, has been granted to Queensland, but as regards all the other colonies, that right and power is taken away from them, and I think that is one of the mistakes in the Constitution. I have recently taken the trouble to turn up the convention debates where the question was discussed as to whether the different States should be one electorate or not, and while a majority was on the side of making the States one electorate for senatorial purposes, I must confess in looking through the arguments I thought the weight of argument was on the other side. There is not the slightest doubt, in my opinion, that the members of the Federal Convention were influenced in coming to that decision, from the fact that when they were returned to the

Federal Convention it was on the same system of voting—that is, each colony was taken as one electorate. I think it was Sir John Forrest who pointed that out, and who said that members were influenced by that fact. Now, we had a pretty strong speech this evening from the Home Secretary. I think it was the strongest speech we have had from the Southern point of view, but the arguments the hon. gentleman urged in favour of the colonies being one electorate were certainly not satisfactory to my mind. Mr. Barton, who was leader of the Federal Convention, argued that if the different States were divided for senatorial elections, it would give too much power to locality, and that we would lose the principle of united action. In order to decide whether there is anything in that objection we ought to consider what are the functions of an Upper House. I think that the principle of giving power to locality is not ignored in the Upper Houses of the various colonies. For instance, in our own Legislative Council, the Government recognise the principle of the North and Centre being represented, although there is no fixed proportion, and I would say by the way that in my opinion the North is not sufficiently represented in that Chamber. In South Australia the colony is divided into four electorates for the purposes of election to the Upper Chamber. I believe that some years ago the voting was taken in the colony as a whole, but that was found to be unsatisfactory. I am not sure how many electorates there are in Victoria for the Upper House, but there are a considerable number. What is the principle of the Senate? I think the principle of the Federal Senate is to protect State rights. Surely it will not be argued by hon. members that because members are returned from Central or Northern Queensland they will not be just as anxious to protect the State rights of Queensland in the Federal Parliament as if they had been elected by the whole colony! I do not think that argument can stand good for a single moment. So that it seems to me there is nothing in the objection about giving too much power to locality. Where it is necessary for the senators to act in unison in the interests of Queensland we will find them acting together. Let us take by way of illustration the question of the apportionment of the surplus. That will be one of the questions to come up before the Federal Parliament, and a very complicated question I believe it will be. We cannot possibly conceive that because two senators are returned from North Queensland, and one from Central Queensland, that they will not act together in the interests of the whole colony. I do not intend to take up much more time, because I recognise that the questions of the division of the colony and of proportional voting will come up for consideration in committee, and that it will depend upon the views of Southern members as to whether the colony will be divided. They have the voting power, and they have power to decide that the colony shall be one electorate. If they decide upon that course, I am quite sure their sense of honesty and justice will compel them to adopt some system of proportional voting. I think that discussion on those two items can better take place in committee. I am very doubtful whether many members have really studied the question of proportional voting, or the Hare-Spence system, as it is called. I remember only two or three years ago, in reading the debates of the Federal Convention, I came across a discussion on the subject, and Sir William Lyne admitted that he knew nothing about it. He apparently had never heard of it. So that there is some excuse for hon. members not being familiar with it. Personally I may say that while I do not pretend to be an expert on the matter, and do not even claim to be quite sure whether I thoroughly understand it in all its details, yet a good many years ago I read "Mill's Representative Government," in which he deals with the Hare system, and recommends it very strongly. Having read Mill on the question, I have always taken a keen interest in the question of the representation of minorities. I will say no more upon the question now, but I shall be glad to take my part in the discussion in committee if Southern members should decide upon insisting that the colony shall be one electorate. I may point out, although the Premier is not here now, that the *Townsville Bulletin*, which is a strong supporter of his, wrote a very vigorous article only a few weeks ago protesting against the colony being taken as one electorate for the senatorial elections, and that paper can hardly understand how the Premier could give his consent to a Bill like this being introduced. Of course, we are told that it is open to alteration, and that it is not a party question. That may, to a certain extent, shield the Premier from blame, but I think his constituents will expect him to take up a decided attitude on the matter, and support a proposal for dividing the colony either into two or more constituencies. If that is done, it will cause a considerable feeling of satisfaction in the Northern district, and it may be conducive even to the interests of the South that it should treat the North with a large amount of consideration on this question. Of course I admit that on the population basis the North and Centre are not entitled to three

[9·30 p.m.] senators, but if the South can see its way to concede so many I am quite sure that the North and Centre will appreciate the concession. And it might be good for the South in this way, that it would prevent any agitation being got up in those districts for a division of the colony. Under the present Constitution it will no doubt be a very difficult matter to cut up Queensland, but still such an agitation may be got up at some time, particularly if the North and Centre are not treated liberally so far as representation in the Federal Parliament goes. So that, looking at the matter from that point of view, I think the South can very well afford to be generous to us in this matter, and give us a liberal share of representation, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*): I am very pleased to see the amount of interest taken in this matter by hon. members opposite.

Mr. FORSYTH: On both sides.

Mr. FITZGERALD: On both sides of the House; but still this side, being less numerous, I think it is better represented than the other side.

At twenty-eight minutes to 10 o'clock,

Mr. HIGGS called attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. FITZGERALD, resuming: I really hope that this House is not going to follow the ideas of the hon. member for Kennedy with regard to proportionate voting. I have had a good deal of experience in reference to elections, and I can say that so many informal votes have been recorded in using the contingent vote that it has been the custom in the district from which I come to advise electors to record their primary vote only, and to leave the contingent vote alone. There is not very much time between now and the federal elections for the public to learn the intricacies of the Hare-Spence system, and I think it is better to leave things as they are.

Mr. JACKSON: I only advocated it as a last resource.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, for the representation of minorities is far more feasible, and that is to divide the colony into six electorates for the election of senators. However, I merely rose to say a few words with regard to the way in which the electorates in the far West seem to be shunted from one division to another. Of course we Westerners are so accustomed to this kind of thing that it does not affect us very much, and, as we have not a very big voting power in the House, we have to submit. The first schedule proposed for this Bill was really a very fair one, as it grouped together the mining districts, the coastal districts, and the pastoral districts. But now under this proposal the electorates represented by my friends the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Gregory and myself are shunted into different divisions. I do not see why that has been done. It has been argued that no Central member should object to the Barcoo being placed in the same division as the Fitzroy, as it is in the Central division. But if that is the principle on which the divisions have been made, how is it that the Port Curtis district has been withdrawn from the Fitzroy division and placed in another district? How is it that a big portion of the Gregory has been taken from the Centre and placed in the Flinders division? The hon. member for Bulloo said it was not fair to place electorates like the Mitchell and the Barcoo with the present Maranoa electorate, and said we had no interest in matters of rivalry on the border which would have to be settled by the interstate commission. I contend that a question of that magnitude affects the people in my electorate just as much as it does the people on the border. It affects the whole of the colony, and every member of the House of Representatives will have to consider such questions. I cannot see any reason for altering the system of division originally proposed, and I hope that hon. members like the hon. member for Dalby and the hon. member for Carnarvon, who is a Minister, will see that justice is done to their constituencies, and that their electorates are grouped in the divisions first proposed. Let the Barcoo, the Mitchell, and the Gregory be put back into the Western electorate, which was originally called Warrego, but which is now called Maranoa. The interests of those districts are all identical, they are pastoral districts, and if grouped together they will have one member, whether he is a Government member or a Labour member I do not care, who will be a representative of the interests and industries of the Western country. But if those districts are included in the Fitzroy division that will simply mean that the big centres of population, Rockhampton and Mount Morgan, will dominate the election. I do not think that a member elected by those centres, a Rockhampton man for instance, will be able to do justice to the far Western districts, and I will vote for any amendment which will have the effect of grouping those electorates in the manner I have suggested. With reference to the Bill I do not think members can much object to its provisions. It has struck me that the general rules as to voting and the use of the contingent vote as given in clause 9 are insufficient for the purpose intended, but that is a matter which can be discussed in committee. Indeed, almost the only questions that arise for discussion on the Bill are questions for committee. The one thing I got up for was to protest at the way we in the West have been hunted about from one place to the other to suit someone—I do not know who. I remember that when the first scheme for division of electorates appeared in the papers, I could not find a single member who had any objection to it.

Mr. BROWNE: The Press of the colony approved of it, too.

Mr. FITZGERALD: As the hon. gentleman says, the Press of the colony was unanimous in approval of it, and I want to know why, at this stage, when we want to get on with public business, anyone should bring on a new scheme which will give rise to a lot of discussion and a lot of ill-feeling. This is not a party Bill, and, I suppose, every member of the House wants to get on with the business of the country. I know I do—that is, with the public business—and the fewer obstacles placed in the way of the Bill passing the better. I would urge upon the Chief Secretary to look into the matter in the meantime, and see if he cannot revert to the scheme of division originally proposed. I hope the few words I have said will induce him to do so.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): There is one thing in connection with this Bill with which I cannot thoroughly agree, and that is the naming of the different electorates. It will be very confusing to have the federal electorates called by the same names as the State electorates. Hon. members will not like to be distinguished as "the hon. member for Little Wide Bay" and "the hon. member for Big Wide Bay," and such a thing will have a tendency to depreciate the local Parliament. It is better to get appropriate names for the federal electorates, different from those used to describe the State electorates. I intend to try and rectify the oversight when we get into committee, because I believe it is an oversight on the part of the Government.

Mr. KERR: Have you any names to suggest?

Mr. RYLAND: It would not take much to suggest better names than those at present proposed.

Mr. HIGGS: We might call one "Closure."

Mr. RYLAND: For instance, I think a better name for the proposed Flinders electorate would be "The Gulf Electorate." All that country is known as "The Gulf Country" or "The Gulf District."

The PREMIER: Some parts of it are a long way from the Gulf.

Mr. RYLAND: Then take Fitzroy, and I think a better name for that would be Capricorn. The tropic runs through it, and everyone would know where the electorate was. Then Thargomindah would be a better name than Maranoa, and would be more characteristic of that part of the country. I heard that name mentioned long before I came into the House. As regards the Herbert electorate, a much more appropriate and characteristic name for that electorate would be Chillagoe.

Mr. HIGGS: It would disgrace it for ever.

Mr. RYLAND: When we get into committee I believe I shall be able to find names far more appropriate than those now attached to the electorates. As regards the district in which I reside, I could run over many more characteristic and appropriate names for it than "Wide Bay and Burnett." That is not a good name at all, and it is too long.

Mr. JENKINSON: What would you suggest?

Mr. RYLAND: There is a very nice mountain in the district called the Bunya Mountain, and we might call it the "Bunya" electorate.

Mr. KERR: Call it "the Glass Houses."

Mr. RYLAND: They are not in the electorate. The "Bunya" electorate would be a very appropriate name, as recalling the annual feasts of the aboriginals when the fruit of the bunya was ripe. It was known throughout the district when the fruit were ripe from the fat condition of the aboriginals.

Mr. JENKINSON: What about "Durramboi"?

Mr. RYLAND: "Durramboi" would be a very good name, and it is known throughout the district as the name applied to a white man who resided with the blacks for years, got into the habits of the aboriginals, and forgot to use his native tongue. I do not see why we should not now return the compliment, and call the electorate "Durramboi," and call a blackfellow's country by a blackfellow's name.

Mr. KENT: Don't insult our electorates.

Mr. RYLAND: No, it is a whitefellow's name, because "Durramboi" was a white man.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: The little boys at school know that.

Mr. RYLAND: Many of the boys at school know more than some members of this House, who have forgotten what they learned when they were young. I make these few suggestions with the intention of moving amendments in this direction when the Bill gets into committee.

Mr. HIGGS (*Fortitude Valley*): I have a few remarks to make.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. HIGGS: Hon. members seem to think that I am going to make a long speech, but such is not my intention. This is public business, and I propose, by way of a few brief remarks, to allow public business to be prosecuted—business which I think is likely to be beneficial to the country. When other business comes on which I think is not likely to be beneficial, then I may try to make a long speech. Some hon. members appear to be very much troubled as to the class of candidate who is likely to get into the Federal Parliament. I do not know whether those hon. gentlemen, who appear to be exercised by so much fear and trembling are afraid that the general public will not properly estimate their character and ability, and decline to put them in; but for my part, I have no fear as to either the number of candidates that will offer themselves, or their abilities. I feel satisfied that, even if no member of this House comes up as a candidate, the outside public will be able to furnish an ample number of candidates from which to make a judicious selection of fifteen men to represent Queensland. The discussion this evening has almost wholly centred round the Senate. I confess that transient circumstances might induce a man to hold to the opinion that we should cut up the colony, but notwithstanding what the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, has said, I must say that I am inclined to the idea of electing six senators with the colony as one electorate. I admit that there is a good deal to be said on both sides, and it is, I think, mainly because we have no experience to guide us that we find such a difficulty in making up our minds. I am willing to concede a lot to the arguments offered by the hon. member, but the plan of a Senate and a House of Representatives appears to me to demand that the senators should go down representing Queensland as a whole. Central Queensland and North Queensland will have their local candidates in the divisions in the House of Representatives. They will bring forward in the Federal Parliament the legislation they think specially necessary for those particular parts; then, the senators, who represent the whole of the colony, will ask themselves whether this local legislation proposed by the House of Representatives is likely to suit Queensland as a whole or is of such a national character that it should be made law. I think the fear of hon. members that sending the senators down representing the whole colony, and the necessity for canvassing the whole colony would be detrimental to certain political parties in this colony is mistaken. A very great fear has been expressed as to what the South will do in the matter. I have not such a great deal of fear as to what the South will do. I am satisfied that the South as a whole is as democratic and far-seeing as the North and the Centre. It seems to me that hon. members who advocate the division of the colony and demand that the Centre shall have one representative, and the North two, and the South three, are getting slightly away from the principle of one man one vote. It is asked that 60,000 people in the Centre should have one representative, and that means at least two values. I submit that the great objection to federation in the South was the unequal representation shown in the Senate, where six representatives represent Tasmania, and the same number represent New South Wales with its population of 1,250,000. Each senator in New South Wales represents 200,000 people; the senator the hon. member for Rockhampton wants for the Central district would represent 60,000 people. There is nothing of the one man one vote about that. I take the view that the Senate is to represent the whole of Australia, and that the senators represent their particular States as a whole. They take up the position of the nation against a portion of the nation—the State against a section of the State—and I feel satisfied that when the Federal Parliament is in working order, the hon. member will find that the interests of everybody are conserved by the election of the senators by the colony as a whole. If Queensland divides her colony into six divisions, the men who go from this colony will not have the same influence and cannot demand the same respect as the men who represent New South Wales or Victoria, because they would be elected as local representatives, and when we come to think that one man's vote can sometimes decide an important question, and that an individual representing 60,000 people in the Centre could decide the policy for the whole of Australia on a certain matter, surely the hon. member would not demand that 60,000 should have the right to decide what should become law.

Mr. KERR: The majority must rule.

Mr. HIGGS: But the great majority of the people of Australia might be in favour of a certain course, and because we cut up our colony into six divisions for the purpose of electing senators, one man, representing the Centre, with a population of 60,000, may be of a certain opinion and the wish of the majority may be set at nought. Queensland will have nine representatives to represent the local portions of the colony, and the six senators will represent Queensland as a whole. I feel that we can trust the people of the colony to do the fair thing, and select the men who will do the best for Queensland as a whole. There may be something in the objection that a poor man cannot canvass a whole State. If hon. members would take up that attitude, I would consider they were on surer ground. A poor man will have great difficulty in letting the general public of Queensland know that he is a candidate; and I should like to see some clause introduced into the Bill to provide that the electors of Queensland shall know who are up as candidates for the House of Representatives. I feel sure that if something is done to give that publicity that was given at the time of the election for candidates for the Federal Convention in New South Wales and other colonies, the poor man will not labour under many disadvantages. Mr. Trenwith, one of the Labour party in Victoria, was returned to the convention at an expense of £3 3s.

[10 p.m.]

Mr. KERR: He travelled cheaper then than he did when he was in Central Queensland.

Mr. HIGGS: And Mr. Barton, who got something like 90,000 votes in New South Wales, said that his election cost him £100 less than any local election he had ever taken part in, so that if the Ministry will consent to the insertion of a clause providing that a slip of paper shall be sent to every elector in the colony, giving him all the particulars concerning the election, such as the polling-places, the date of election, the names of the candidates, and so forth, it will do away with any advantage that a rich man might have. Of course, if we are going to argue that a rich man will have a better chance than a poor man, I think a rich man might buy a small constituency, but it will be a very difficult matter for him to buy a whole colony, so that I do not feel very anxious to see any change made. As I say, I have no experience to guide me in coming to a decision, but I believe that a great deal that has been said against having the colony as one electorate will prove to be fallacious.

Mr. GLASSEY: Hear, hear!

Mr. HIGGS: If it turns out that injustice is being done, the Federal Parliament can do what South Australia did, when it was pointed out that the fact of the colony being taken as one electorate for the return of members to the Upper House permitted money to play a too important part in the elections. The Federal Parliament can step in and divide the States into certain divisions. I regret that there is no provision in the Bill to prohibit a member of the State Parliament from holding a seat in the Federal Parliament. I do not think it is at all desirable that any member of Parliament should hold both seats. If any hon. member of this House considers that he can do his duty by his local constituency and also by a federal division then he has a much higher opinion of his own capacity than he ought to have. It will not be possible for any member of this House to do his duty by his constituency while he holds a seat in the Federal Parliament. The Federal Parliament will no doubt meet in June, and will sit until November. This House will meet in June, and may sit until December.

Mr. FISHER: Meet in June, did you say?

Mr. HIGGS: Well, as a rule, this House meets in June. It has sometimes met in May; and it is only under the control of the "Continuous Ministry" that we have not been called together until July. I think the usual time for Parliament meeting in all the colonies is June, so that the Federal Parliament will be sitting during the same months as this House. Now, how can it be possible for any member to do his duty by his constituency? It is expected that the question of the tariff will occupy the attention of the Federal Parliament for at least two years. There will be over 100 industries to deal with, and something like 2,500 articles about which an opinion will have to be expressed as to whether there should be a duty imposed or whether it shall be allowed to come in duty-free. There will be very keen competition in the Federal House between the freetrade party and the protection party, and no member who goes down to the Federal Parliament can be away an hour, if he does his duty by this colony. Why, then, have the Ministry not got a clause in the Bill prohibiting a member of this Parliament from holding a seat in this House as well as in the Federal Parliament?

Mr. KERR: Some want to have a try for both.

Mr. HIGGS: I do not know the candidates who want to have a try for both. I do not know any hon. member of this House who wants to hold both positions. If any hon. member does, I hope that when we get into committee a clause will be framed which will prevent him doing so. I do not think that a member should even be permitted to hold his seat after being elected to the Federal Parliament till the next general election for the Queensland Parliament. I do not go so far as the leader of this party, and advocate that he should resign his seat in this House immediately he becomes a candidate for the Federal Parliament. That would operate very harshly. No member of this House would stand if he had first to resign his seat in this House.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: They prefer a certainty.

Mr. HIGGS: Yes; they prefer the bird in the hand. I know I should.

The PREMIER: You are not singular in that respect.

Mr. HIGGS: No, I suppose not. I think that a candidate who is successful in his candidature for a seat in the Federal Parliament should not even hold his seat in this Parliament till the next general election, because his constituency will be disfranchised. There can be no doubt that while he is in the Federal Parliament his constituency here will have no voice in this Chamber. He might come up on an emergency to save the Government, or to take part in an important division, but he would have to travel 1,200 miles to do it. He will have to travel to Melbourne for some years before the Federal capital is built. Of course hon. members have said that it would be objectionable to put a constituency to the trouble of a by-election, but I think a constituency would prefer to be put to that trouble rather than be disfranchised for a whole session. I hope that the Ministry will be prepared, in committee, to insert a clause to deal with this matter. I am very anxious to assist in the passage of public legislation with all rapidity, and I am not going to take up any more time, except to say that I am very glad to find that during the twelve months that have elapsed since the federal vote was carried Queensland has not gone back at all. As far as our own city is concerned, Brisbane has gone ahead during those twelve months. Buildings are going up everywhere, property sales are brisker, and we may feel satisfied that business is better than it has been for some years, at all events, before the vote was taken. I still hold the opinion I held before the vote was carried, that a great many of the fears expressed regarding the consummation of federation will prove to be groundless. There is one other hope I have, and that is that the clause in this Bill directing that no person shall vote more than once in an election will find a place in our own electoral laws. I hope the Government will not hold that out as a bunch of carrots for many months or years longer, but will bring it down and pass it through the House very soon. We shall then feel in a more equitable state of mind, and might not offer so much obstruction to syndicate railways.

Mr. KERR (*Burcoo*): I have only a very few remarks to make on this Bill. I think the first schedule of electorates that was given was a much better one than the schedule we have at present. The Western electorates had certainly far more in common under the Home Secretary's schedule than they have now. But that is not what I wish to speak about. We are told that this is to be a one man one vote election. The Chief Secretary must be aware that during this month and next month a large number of men in the colony will be disfranchised. A number of men whose names are on the rolls for Mitchell, Barcoo, Clermont, or Leichhardt, have, in the course of their business, removed from one electorate into another, and hundreds of them have been struck off in consequence. But although those men are within the federal electorate they will be deprived, according to our electoral laws, of casting their votes for a member of the House

of Representatives. I do not see why those men should be deprived of their votes; they are still residents within the federal electorate, and my object in rising is to suggest to the Chief Secretary that some means may be found in committee to enable them to vote for a member of the House of Representatives. They have merely moved out of the electorate for the State Parliament, and have been challenged on that ground only, and it should not be too difficult a task to enable them to vote for the federal member. With regard to the election of senators, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley referred to the fact that the senator for Central Queensland, though representing a very small number of electors, might be in a position to give a casting vote on a very important question. But the same thing happens in the State Parliaments. The votes of the hon. members for Bulloo, or Carpentaria, or Burke, who represent a very small number of the electors of the colony, have just as much weight in this Assembly as those of the hon. members for Charters Towers, or North Brisbane, or Rockhampton.

Mr. HIGGS: Supposing we had an Upper House elected by the whole colony, what then?

Mr. KERR: It is no use supposing a thing that does not exist, and is not likely to exist. The Chief Secretary informed us last night that he was not wedded to the present form of the Bill, and that he was rather in favour of dividing the colony into six electorates for the Senate. Other hon. members have advocated its division into three electorates, with two representatives for each division. In my opinion that would be asking too much. On the population basis the Southern division is entitled to a greater number of representatives than the Centre and North put together, and I think it would meet with general approval if the South had four members and the other two divisions one each. I intend to vote, if it is moved in committee, as I understand it will be, that for the election of senators the colony be divided into six electorates.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I must also protest against the argument of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley that Queensland should be one electorate for the election of members of the Senate. There are not only the population bases but commercial reasons why Northern and Central Queensland should not be placed completely at the mercy of the manufacturing interests of Southern Queensland. Furthermore, these federal elections are going to determine largely the fiscal issue—the question of freetrade and protection. The people in the North are almost to a man freetraders, while those of the Southern portion are protectionists. If you are going to give the Southern portion of Queensland the right to elect these six senators, you will debar the freetraders of the North from sending in any representatives to the Senate at all. That is another reason, to my mind, why we should divide the colony into three electorates—or into six electorates if we cannot get three—for the election of our senators. The argument has been used that the Senate is a State House and that the interests which it will represent are altogether apart from the interests which the members of the House of Representatives will consider or take under their protection. I cannot see exactly how the fact of the Senate being a State House is affected by returning senators for the three divisions of Queensland. If the persons who framed the Federal Commonwealth Bill had thought that that argument had any weight at all, they would not have agreed to the Chief Secretary's amendment giving power to the Queensland Parliament to subdivide Queensland into three or six electorates for the election of the members of the Senate.

Mr. LEAHY: They never did agree to it; it never came before them. It came before the Premiers' Conference.

Mr. LESINA: Well, it came before the Premiers' Conference. One of the reasons why I objected to the passage of this Bill was because I regarded that as a secret conference of Premiers, who sat in secret conclave representing nobody but themselves. I do not see why we should not adopt the recommendation of the Chief Secretary and the other Premiers, and divide the colony into three or six electorates for the election of senators. I shall certainly vote for the division of Queensland for the election of senators. There is one other point. The hon. member for the Valley pointed out that a rich man could buy a small constituency, but he could not buy up the whole of Queensland. Surely after all the talk we have heard about federal brotherhood and trusting each other, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley does not assume that federal politics are so corrupt, that a candidate can buy up a constituency? The American senators have succeeded in doing that, but that is a bogey which I think we should not take very much notice of. Another statement the hon. member made, by the way, was that Mr. Trenwith, the Victorian Labour man who came here, had stated that when he was elected to the Federal Convention it only cost him £3 3s. Well, Mr. Trenwith was selected by *The Age* and the ruling party in Victoria, and I am quite sure that if that had not been the case, Mr. Trenwith would have been beaten. They could not leave him out, because he is a very popular moderate Labour man, who has a big following right throughout Victoria, and there were no particular issues at stake when he was elected to that convention. Larger issues will be at stake when we come to elect the candidates who will sit in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is likely that there will be a good deal of feeling imported into the contest, and when rival interests start to fight each other they will spend money, and I am quite sure that Mr. Trenwith could not get in for any senatorial division in Queensland for £3 3s. Another thing, I think we should adopt the suggestion made by the New South Wales Government, and limit the expenses of candidates. In the old country there is a law which limits the expenditure of candidates at election times, and if it can be proved that more has been spent than has been authorised by the Act of Parliament the candidate is liable to be prosecuted. In New South Wales they propose to do the same thing. Of course it might be hard to determine what a candidate's expenses should be; but I think the difficulty might be surmounted, and a limit fixed which would be a protection both to rich candidates and poor ones. By a provision of this kind the candidates might be relieved of the hangers-on and harpies who look to making a harvest at election times. I would like to see our Parliament place a limit in this Bill upon the expenditure of candidates. There is another thing I would like to see incorporated into this Bill, and that is that members of our present House of Parliament shall not occupy also the position of members of either the House of Representatives or the Senate in the Federal Parliament. I think we ought to have a clause to that effect, and I agree with the hon. member for Fortitude Valley in most of his speech bearing upon the injustice of permitting a member of this House to occupy a dual position. I would not suggest that a member should resign the moment he announces that he is a candidate, but in the event of his being returned to either the Senate or the House of Representatives, he should place his resignation as a member of

this House in the hands of the Speaker. A man cannot serve two masters. I may say in conclusion that I am very pleased to see the Government introducing this measure. It was not before it was required, because, if I may venture the remark, I think we are a little behind the other colonies in the passage of legislation bearing upon the federal elections. Although the members on the other side and the newspaper Press behind them, have blamed us for the delay, I believe no one is so much to blame as the Government. I hope we shall see much more Government legislation brought forward, and I am sure it will go through as rapidly as the second reading of this Bill.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at thirty-one minutes past 10 o'clock.