

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1900

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 31 OCTOBER, 1900.

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

PETITIONS.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*) presented a petition from the shearers and general labourers employed on Narine and Gnoolooma Stations praying for the introduction of a Compulsory Arbitration and Conciliation Act, similar to that in existence in New Zealand.

Petition read and received.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Warrego*) presented a petition of similar purport and prayer from the shearers, shed, and station hands employed on Welltown Station.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS.

SALE OF OBSCENE BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*), for Mr. Lesina, asked the Attorney-General—

1. Is he aware that in the Wesleyan Book Depot, Albert street, Brisbane, there are being sold and exposed for public sale certain obscene books and pamphlets purporting to be written by one Joseph Slattery, and that the sale of such books at such place is advertised in the *Courier* and *Telegraph* newspapers circulating in Brisbane?

2. Is he aware that for selling such books the said Joseph Slattery was prosecuted in Edinburgh, and that the prosecution was stayed only on his consenting to destroy the same?

3. Is he aware that for selling such books the said Joseph Slattery was sent to gaol, after trial, in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, United States of America?

4. Does he intend to prosecute the proprietors of the said Wesleyan Book Depot for selling or exposing for sale the said obscene books?

5. Does he intend to prosecute the said Joseph Slattery as publisher and author of the said obscene books?

6. If not, why not?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) replied—

1. I have heard, much to my regret, that books or pamphlets purporting to have been written by the person named have been advertised for sale at the Book Depot mentioned, and have also been credibly informed that such advertisements have been inserted in the *Courier* and *Telegraph* without the knowledge or sanction of the authorities of the said Book Depot. I have not seen or read any of such books or pamphlets, nor have I been informed by any person who may have read them or any of them as to the nature of their contents.

2. No.

3. No.

4. If the honourable member, who appears to have read the said books or pamphlets, is of opinion that the same or any of them are obscene, within the meaning of the laws relating to obscene publications, it is his duty to place himself in communication with the police, who, and not the Attorney-General, are the proper persons to institute proceedings for offences against those laws.

5. This question is answered by the reply to No. 4; but if the police, on information supplied, should be of opinion that a proper case for prosecution has been shown, I shall be prepared to furnish any necessary legal assistance for the conduct of such prosecution.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

6. See answers to preceding questions.

APPLICATION BY MESSRS. BURNS, PHILP, AND CO. FOR LAND IN NEW GUINEA.

Mr. DAWSON, for Mr. Lesina, asked the Premier—

1. Is it true that Messrs. Burns, Philp, and Co. have applied for 100,000 acres of pastoral land in British New Guinea under the last New Guinea Land Ordinance?

2. Has the application been granted?

3. If so, what are the terms upon which the sale or lease was made?

4. Has he any objection to lay all the particulars on the table of the House?

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

1. A letter has been received by the Lieutenant-Governor of British New Guinea from Mr. James Burns (of Messrs. Burns, Philp, and Co.), seeking approval of a proposal to form a company to take up 100,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Hall Sound in order to develop agriculture, to raise stock, and generally to test the suitability of the land for tropical agriculture.

2. No; the matter is still under the consideration of the guaranteeing colonies.

3. The application is made under the provisions of the British New Guinea Land Ordinance.

4. I lay upon the table the papers containing all particulars of this matter in the possession of the Government other than those already communicated to Parliament. (See "Votes and Proceedings," session 1899, vol. IV., page 920).

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF SOLICITORS.

Mr. DAWSON, for Mr. Lesina, asked the Attorney-General—

1. How many applications from Brisbane solicitors for temporary employment in the Crown Law Office have been received since the commencement of the year?

2. How many have been accepted?

3. Are any of the rejected applicants persons of long residence in Queensland?

4. Have any of the applicants who have been given temporary employment just recently arrived from England.

5. Name or names of such person or persons?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

1. Six.

2. One (Mr. Wilfrid J. Litley).

3. I cannot say.

4. In addition to the solicitor named above, one other person has been recently employed to do some copying work. I cannot state when, or from where, he came to Queensland.

5. See answers to above questions.

ENGAGEMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS.

Mr. REID (*Enoggera*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Is it true that the Chief Mechanical Engineer has arranged to secure the services of two mechanical engineers from England?

2. How long is term of engagement, at what salary, and is passage money to be paid?

3. Were applications invited in the colony for draftsmen to fill the positions?

4. Has the sanction of the Government been obtained for this action?

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

1. No; but the Agent-General has been instructed to engage two mechanical draftsmen.

2. Three years at £300 per annum, with second-class passages.

3. Yes; in this and the southern colonies, but no suitable applications were received.

4. Yes.

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table of the House, was ordered to be printed:—Application by Burns, Philp and Co. for land in British New Guinea.

SUGAR EXPERIMENT STATIONS BILL.

On the motion of the PREMIER, it was resolved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to provide for the establishment and control of sugar experiment stations,

PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMON-WEALTH ELECTIONS BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the schedule of the Bill, as follows:—

Divisions.	Electoral Districts.
Brisbane	Brisbane North, Enoggera, Fortitude Valley, Toombul, Toowong.
Darling Downs ...	Aubigny, Cambooya, Cunningham, Drayton and Toowoomba, Warwick.
Fitzroy	Barcoo, Clermont, Fitzroy, Leichhardt, Mitchell, Normanby, Rockhampton, Rockhampton North.
Flinders	Burke, Carpentaria, Charters Towers, Croydon, Flinders, Gregory, Kennedy.
Herbert	Bowen, Cairns, Cook, Herbert, Mackay, Townsville, Woothakata.
Moreton	Bundamba, Fassifern, Ipswich, Lockyer, Moreton, Nundah, Rosewood, Stanley.
Oxley	Albert, Brisbane South, Bulimba, Logan, Oxley, Woolloongabba.
Maranoa	Balonne, Bulloo, Carnarvon, Dalby, Maranoa, Murilla, Warrego.
Wide Bay and Burnett *	Bundaberg, Burnett, Burrum, Gympie, Maryborough, Musgrave, Port Curtis, Wide Bay.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): When the Bill was first before the Committee, it was the day following the second reading of the Bill, and he then submitted an amendment of the schedule to the Chief Secretary. Since then, having had more time, he had had his amendment printed and circulated amongst hon. members. It was as follows—

That all the words after "Toowong," on line 30, be omitted, with the view of inserting—

Divisions.	Electoral Districts.
Darling Downs ...	Aubigny, Cambooya, Carnarvon, Cunningham, Dalby, Drayton and Toowoomba, and Warwick.
Fitzroy	Clermont, Fitzroy, Leichhardt, Normanby, Port Curtis, Rockhampton, and Rockhampton North.
Kennedy	Burke, Carpentaria, Charters Towers, Croydon, Flinders, and Kennedy.
Herbert	Bowen, Cairns, Cook, Herbert, Mackay, Townsville, and Woothakata.
Moreton	Bundamba, Fassifern, Ipswich, Lockyer, Moreton, Nundah, Rosewood, and Stanley.
Oxley	Albert, Brisbane South, Bulimba, Logan, Oxley, and Woolloongabba.
Maranoa	Balonne, Barcoo, Bulloo, Gregory, Maranoa, Mitchell, Murilla, and Warrego.
Wide Bay... ..	Bundaberg, Burnett, Burrum, Gympie, Maryborough, Musgrave, and Wide Bay.

He might point out that this was exactly the schedule which appeared in the public papers about the 6th August, and which the Premier stated had been issued on the authority of the Home Secretary. The only alterations he had made in it were substituting the name "Kennedy" for the Flinders electorate, and "Maranoa" for "Warrego"—alterations which he had made on the suggestion of the Chief Secretary. He was not going to contend that the schedule was a perfect one. It would be very hard indeed for any man or body of men to frame a schedule that would satisfy everybody; but the schedule that was first prepared seemed to give general satisfaction. There had been no complaints about it. But since the new schedule had been put in the Bill, many hon. members

and nearly every newspaper had complained about it. There had been general growling over it. He might say at once that his amendment could not possibly be looked upon as a party question, because it treated every member in the House alike. He believed it would give general satisfaction, although, as he had said, it would be very hard for any hon. member to draft a schedule—no matter what political opinions he held—that would meet with general approval and fit the circumstances of every case. Hon. members had received lists of voters in the different electorates under the schedule at present in the Bill, and they would find that there would be a great deal more even apportionment if his amendment were accepted than there would be under the schedule in the Bill. According to his amendment the number of voters were: North Brisbane, 12,644; Darling Downs, 11,023; Fitzroy, 10,581; Kennedy, 9,453; Herbert, 10,723; Moreton, 12,426; Oxley, 12,581; Maranoa, 9,102; and Wide Bay, 12,736. They were very evenly apportioned there. Hon. members would observe that Brisbane and Oxley were the highest, and Wide Bay came next to Oxley.

Mr. JENKINSON: No; Wide Bay comes next to Brisbane.

Mr. BROWNE: Yes, that was so; but under the schedule in the Bill, Wide Bay would have 2,000 more electors than Brisbane. He would like to hear the opinions of hon. members on the matter, so he would not take up any more of the time of the Committee just now; but would simply move the amendment standing in his name.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*): He observed that the hon. member for Croydon, by his amendment, left the Brisbane, Oxley, Moreton, Herbert, and Flinders divisions untouched.

Mr. BROWNE: I call Flinders "Kennedy."

Mr. McDONALD: Gregory is attached to the Flinders division now; it was not so in the 1st schedule.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With regard to the new schedule suggested by the hon. member, it appeared that the statistics circulated some time ago had been issued without due authority. The matter had received since then very careful consideration by the Cabinet, and it had been deemed that the schedule attached to the Bill represented more clearly, not only the connection of interests in the different subdivisions of the colony, but also distributed more fairly the electoral power. Of course, as the hon. gentleman had said, and very properly, too, it would be quite impossible to frame any schedule which would give entire satisfaction. The schedule, like the Bill, was introduced without any desire that hon. members should view it as a party measure, and he left it to the Committee to say in what form ultimately it should go through. He could not accept the schedule as framed by the hon. gentleman, without testing the feeling of the Committee with regard to it, but he would be very glad if hon. members would discuss the matter so that he might learn what their opinions were. He had been prepared to accept their opinion on even more crucial matters than this. Of course he considered the two contentious points in the Bill were, first, the subdivision of the colony for senatorial representation, and, second, the boundaries of the representative electorates. Outside those matters he did not think there was very much to discuss. He was not going to depart from the idea that this should be dealt with as a non-party question. The division taken on the previous evening showed clearly that there was no preconceived action, and he was quite prepared, if the decision had gone the other way, to have followed it up with a list of amendments

which would have been rendered necessary. If the hon. member who had moved the amendment had made out his case he would have no hesitation in accepting the schedule or such other schedule as might be thought desirable. He thought the contention should be whether they should accept the schedule as proposed by the hon. member, or the schedule as originally proposed. He knew that during his absence in England the Home Secretary had devoted a large amount of time to the consideration of the best means of framing the schedule, and he fully recognised that after he had devoted so much attention to it, it was a matter for serious consideration whether the schedule as framed by him should be departed from. However, subsequent considerations induced him to introduce the schedule in the form in which it was introduced in this Bill. He was quite prepared to hear the opinion of hon. members on the subject.

Mr. CURTIS (*Rockhampton*): It would be much more convenient for him to take the divisions serially. He had an amendment which he wished to introduce, which he probably would not be able to do if the schedule were moved *in globo*.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What is the amendment?

Mr. CURTIS: He desired to move that the word "Fitzroy" be omitted, and the words "Central Queensland" inserted in its place. He also desired to include the Gregory and the Port Curtis electorates in the Central division. That would leave the Central division intact, and as they knew the representation of the different States would be on a population basis, Central Queensland would be just about entitled to a fraction more than one member.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Port Curtis is included in the Central division.

Mr. CURTIS: He also desired to have the Gregory included. The Barcoo and the Mitchell were already included. Port Curtis commercially and geographically belonged to the Central district, and he thought it should be included in it. That would leave the Central division as it was, intact, and he thought it would be much more satisfactory to the people of the Central division.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that if a blank is created, he can then propose his amendment as an amendment on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Croydon. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the schedule being taken line by line if it is the wish of the Committee to do so.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON (*North Brisbane*): pointed out that if they took the schedule in that way, some inconvenience might arise, because they might desire to take one electorate from a section which had been passed, and put it into another division. He thought it would be better to take the amendments in the order in which they were proposed.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): The hon. member for North Brisbane was perfectly correct. It might be necessary, if they wanted to take an electorate from one division and place it in another, to take it from a part which had been already dealt with. He thought they must deal with the schedule as a whole, and if a blank was created by the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon, the hon. member for Rockhampton could then move his amendment, as an amendment on that proposed by that hon. member. The matter could then be dealt with with greater simplicity. It must, however, be clearly understood that any amend-

ment which was moved must be part of a scheme contemplated by the mover of the amendment.

Mr. BROWNE believed that the first schedule that had been submitted was the [4 p.m.] best one possible. He referred to the one which appeared in the *Telegraph* and *Courier* of 6th August, and which on 9th August the Premier informed him had been published on the authority of the Home Secretary. Since then the Government had seen fit to alter the schedule; but a number of hon. members were strongly of opinion that it was not nearly as fair a division of the colony as the original one. If hon. members thought the schedule should be altered, a blank could be created, and there was then nothing to hinder an hon. member from moving an amendment in the amendment he proposed to substitute.

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): There were a number of other amendments to be proposed, and he would point out that, if the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon was put and lost, the schedule would then stand part of the Bill, and there could be no further discussion on it.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): Seeing there was general dissatisfaction with the schedule, a general discussion upon the schedule should precede any particular amendment. It was unwise to rush into a discussion of amendments at once without having any idea of the opinions of hon. members with respect to the schedule. If he had his way, he would remit the schedule to a select committee. He did not know who had framed it, but whoever had done so was a perfect marvel of ingenuity. He did not know what principle that individual had proceeded upon, or whether he had struck out a new line for himself, but he had not adopted any principle of representation which was known to their Constitution. Indeed, the whole thing was an outrage upon their present system of representation. Whoever was responsible for it ought to be ashamed of it. The Brisbane division contained 12,887 electors, while the area was 76 square miles. Further down the Wide Bay and Burnett division contained 14,161 electors, while the area was 30,685 square miles. One would have thought that, instead of having the larger number of electors in the bigger electorate, they would have been in the smaller electorate. That was according to the principles of representation as they knew them, but apparently those principles were to be completely outraged by the Government in the present instance.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether the hon. member is speaking to the question that the schedule should be put line by line, but he has not said that yet.

Mr. COWLEY: There is only one question before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the schedule, but I understood it was the wish of the Committee that it should be taken line by line.

Mr. COWLEY: No.

Mr. STEWART: He was speaking to the entire schedule. He understood that the schedule was before them.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is before the Committee.

Mr. STEWART suggested that the hon. member who had moved the amendment should withdraw it, and permit a general discussion on the whole schedule.

* Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): He was going to propose the adoption of the course which had just been suggested by the hon. member for Rockhampton North—that the whole question of the

schedule should be remitted to a select committee for report. They had numerous amendments before them, and they might talk away for a week and arrive at no conclusion, whereas in a select committee they could take into consideration the population of every one of the proposed divisions, and submit some feasible scheme to the Committee. The schedule to the Bill appeared to be entirely unacceptable to the Committee. They would find that the three divisions of Darling Downs, Maranoa, and Flinders had fewer electors than two other divisions. Now, as the Commonwealth Act provided for one man one vote, it followed as a matter of course that they should have one vote one value, as nearly as possible. It was absurd to think that any Committee could accept such a schedule as was proposed by the Government.

Mr. LEAHY: That is not the case in New South Wales, where they have one man one vote.

Mr. COWLEY: He did not know what had been done in New South Wales, but that did not affect the position. They should endeavour to get as nearly as possible the same number of electors in each division. He admitted that whatever they did now would probably be reviewed after the census was taken, and after the first election under the Bill. After the new census was taken they would be in a better position to frame a schedule than at present. What they had to do now was to make provision for the first election before a census could be taken; and, therefore, he thought, in order to enable them to act fairly and squarely in the matter, and frame a schedule on a basis which would be equitable to the colony as a whole, it would be much better to move the Chairman out of the chair, report progress, and commit the matter to a select committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): If the matter was referred to a select committee, would the House be bound by the report of the select committee?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Then there would be the same debate over again, and he thought they might just as well deal with the matter now.

Mr. STEPHENS (*Brisbane South*) thought they had a select committee in the Government of the colony. If they could not deal with the matter, the sooner a new Government was got the better.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): He did not think the Executive of the colony could possibly be as fair as a select committee. Hon. members had only to look over the electorates as arranged to see party bias right through. The whole thing had been framed to gerrymander the electorates so that the Government would get a majority of supporters. Townsville and Charters Towers certainly ought to be in one electorate, but in order to secure a Government supporter, Townsville had been put in the Herbert division. Charters Towers, which was within 80 miles of the eastern coast, was included in the Flinders division, which extended right over to the Gulf country, and included an area of about 250,000 square miles. It appeared to him that the whole thing had been looked at from a Government point of view. The seats held by Labour members were scattered all over the colony, and it had been a difficult matter for the Government to manage so as to secure seats for themselves. If the Labour party had been equitably distributed amongst the various divisions, the Government would have had a difficulty in catching any of those seats, and an attempt had been made to put every Labour seat in the colony into the two divisions of Flinders—which he understood was to be known as “Kennedy”—and Fitzroy. Of the seven electorates comprising the division of Flinders, six were Labour; and in the Fitzroy

division there were six Labour seats and two Opposition. They had been told that this was a non-party question, but they knew very well that that was all humbug. They had only to cast their eyes over the map and the schedule to see the party brand as plain as possible. They could not have a stronger illustration of the fact that it was a party question than the action of the hon. member for Mackay, Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, last night. That hon. member was requested by his constituents to take a certain course, and rather than vote against party he walked outside.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: By some of them—what you would call syndicates.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member for Flinders had certainly endeavoured to import into the discussion a party feeling. He believed the hon. member for Herbert had a sincere desire to improve the Bill, and in that light he rose to reply to the hon. member's request for a select committee. How much further would they advance the matter by referring it to a select committee? It would be several weeks before the result of their deliberations would become known, and not a single hon. member would be bound to accept their decision. In addition to that, he found that there were considerable difficulties in the way of referring to a select committee a portion of a Bill which had already been considered in Committee of the Whole House. If the question had been raised when the Bill was initiated in committee they might have referred the whole thing to a select committee; but he was informed on good authority that there was no precedent when a Bill had been dealt with in Committee of the Whole, for taking out the schedule and referring it to a select committee. Even supposing they were to establish a new departure in the matter, it would tend to unnecessary delay. The members of this Committee were as competent as a select committee to determine what were the best divisions, and there was no use in wasting time over the matter. He entirely deprecated the remarks of the hon. member for Flinders about the divisions having been made to suit party purposes. He contended that the schedule was framed with no such intention. If time permitted to refer the whole question to a select committee, and to have fresh electoral rolls, there might have been some force in the argument, but time prevented any such new formation being considered. They were confined to the lines of State electorates, and it was for them to consider how they could commingle those electorates so as to afford fair representation. The true principle would be that all the present demarcations should be at once swept away, and some tribunal should be appointed to compile fresh rolls for the nine divisions of the colony; but that would be a work which would occupy an immense amount of time, and certainly it could not be finished by the time the elections would be required to be held. Therefore they had to take the rigid lines of demarcation existing at the present time, and see how far, by assimilating and amalgamating, they could form nine electorates which would give expression to the true representation of the colony. They were as competent to do that as any two or three hon. members appointed to form a select committee, and, seeing that it all involved delay, he must oppose what he believed the hon. member for Herbert had advocated in what he conceived to be the true interests of providing the best possible arrangement.

* Mr. COWLEY: To his mind there was no insuperable difficulty in referring the matter to a select committee. However, if the Government determined to oppose that course, he would be in favour of the amendment of the hon. member

for Croydon, whose schedule was much better than that of the Government. The reason why he wished to refer the question to a select committee was because there were so many amendments before them, not only those of the hon. member for Croydon, but others relating to the names of electorates, and all those questions could be decided by the select committee. He was satisfied that, if the committee was chosen from among members on both sides who had a desire to arrive at a definite conclusion, it would greatly facilitate business. He did not for a moment suppose that the recommendations of the committee would be accepted absolutely by the House, but he did believe that their report would be the basis of a common understanding, and that business would be expedited to a great extent. He failed to see that his proposal would take anything like three weeks, as the Chief Secretary said. It would more likely take three days. As far as he could ascertain the population of each proposed electorate under the proposed new schedule was much more equal, and as that was the first time when Queensland would vote under the principle of one man one vote it was desirable that as nearly as possible they should give the electorates equal voting power. For that reason he should support the hon. member for Croydon's schedule if nothing better was proposed.

* The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): It seemed to him that the appointment of a select committee could have no other object than that of eliciting information, but they already had before them whatever information was desired. They knew approximately the population, and they knew accurately, according to the latest returns, the number of electors in each of the State electorates. He did not see that a committee could give them any more information than they had got on that point. It had been pointed out also that no member of the House would be bound to follow or support the conclusions which might be arrived at by a committee. The select committee would probably be composed of members who held different views on the subject, and he failed to see that they would be one bit further forward when their report was presented than they were at the present moment. He wanted to say a word or two about the question raised by the hon. member for Flinders in connection with the fact that Charters Towers was placed in the federal electorate at present called Flinders. As had been before mentioned, he (Mr. Foxton) was primarily responsible for that fact, and for the original schedule of electorates as it was submitted to the Press some months ago. In that connection the remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton North, in which he described the federal electorate of Herbert as a monstrosity or something of that sort, also applied. Now, so far as the boundary between those electorates was concerned there was no difference between the schedule proposed by the Government and that proposed by the hon. member for Croydon. The boundary between those two electorates remained the same in both schedules. He believed himself that it was a perfectly legitimate boundary to adopt, because the interests on the two sides of that boundary were distinctly different. It might be, and no doubt it was the case, that the Herbert was a peculiarly shaped electorate, but it was a coastal electorate, and embraced all the interests on the coast which might be said to be covered by the term "tropical agriculture."

Mr. McDONALD: What about the mining industry?

The HOME SECRETARY: The mining industry was not of very great importance in that particular portion.

Mr. McDONALD: Not the Chillagoe and the Palmer?

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member would consider for a moment it was difficult to arrive at any other boundary there without a great disturbance of the proportional electoral power for the different electorates. For this reason: As had been pointed out by the Chief Secretary, they would be for the present, and practically for all time, bound by the conditions which obtained with regard to the State electorates so far as their boundaries were concerned. It would never be found convenient, he believed, for this colony to have a separate compilation of electoral rolls for the Federal Parliament. To a large extent it seemed to him unnecessary, and there was not the slightest doubt that it would be a very complicated and very expensive matter. The compilation of the rolls for election to this Parliament cost a very large sum of money yearly, and the compilation of a complete and separate set of electoral rolls for the federal elections—assuming that they did not follow the boundaries of the States electorates, and the rolls could not be used for the double purpose—would also cost an equal amount. In his opinion that was a very grave objection to adopting any such course, unless there was very serious necessity for doing so. They could not of course pick out the different interests in each electorate, and give them separate representation. That was not practicable. They must take as far as possible the lines which, roughly speaking, would embrace in any particular electorate the leading industries of that electorate. Charters Towers, Ravenswood, Croydon, Georgetown, and Cloncurry were all mining centres. A large mining interest existed to the west of the line which divided Herbert from Flinders; and, unquestionably, the member for Flinders, or Kennedy as he might be termed in the Federal Parliament, would be distinctly a mining member. Of course, they knew that it was also a large pastoral district, but the pastoral interest there was a mere fleabite in comparison with the mining interest as far as voters were concerned. Charters Towers alone, in population, would swamp the whole of the rest of the electorate. Undoubtedly, the man representing that electorate in the Federal Parliament would be returned by the miners in the district, although there were other industries there. In exactly the same way take Herbert. The man who represented that electorate would practically represent the sugar industry, although there were other industries in the district of Herbert. There was the pastoral, and to some extent the mining industry in that district. Of course they could not make divisions which were absolutely perfect with regard to the industries and interests in any electorate; but roughly speaking he was certain no better line could be adopted without great disturbance of the relative numerical value of the electorate as far as the electors in it were concerned. It seemed a very peculiarly shaped electorate, but nevertheless it was one which commended itself to the colony as a whole.

Mr. McDONALD: Why alter it and put the Gregory into it?

The HOME SECRETARY: He was speaking of the particular boundary between the Herbert and Flinders, which the hon. member for Cairns and the hon. member for Rockhampton had referred to as being an outrage. It was the boundary which was adopted in both schemes. He thought it was possible to arrive at a conclusion in the matter without referring it to a select committee.

Mr. COWLEY: But there are so many other amendments necessary in order to make the whole harmonise.

The HOME SECRETARY: They could not expect to get a select committee which would embody the views of the House as a whole; they would merely have the views of five or seven members submitted to the House, and the facts and information would not be added to in any way.

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*) argued that a select committee was desirable, not for the purpose of getting information, but for the purpose of settling details which it would be very inconvenient for that committee to settle. At present they could only properly discuss the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon, and if that amendment was defeated that would end the discussion, and the schedule as it stood would be passed. He wanted neither the schedule as it stood nor the schedule of the hon. member for Croydon.

The HOME SECRETARY: If you create a blank, other amendments can be moved.

Mr. COWLEY: If there is no blank created, what then?

The HOME SECRETARY: Then the majority of the Committee will be in favour of the schedule in the Bill.

Mr. KIDSTON: The schedule would be carried as part of the Bill, and that would end the matter. He did not think it was fair to ask hon. members to decide only between the schedule in the Bill and the schedule proposed by the hon. member for Croydon, when perhaps they did not want either the one or the other. If a select committee was appointed to revise the schedule, they would go over it again and again in a way which that Committee could not do, for a Committee of the Whole House could deal with only one question at a time. It was said that if a select committee was appointed, the same discussion would take place again when they submitted their report. His opinion was that if a select committee was appointed, and consisted of, say, three members from one side and four members from the other side of the House, and they brought up a schedule, in all probability it would be accepted without discussion.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. KIDSTON: In any case it would in all probability be a fairer schedule, not only to all parties, but also to all districts in the colony, than either of the schedules at present before the Committee, because it would have the consideration of members of both parties in the drafting of it. The Government might very well allow the hon. member for Croydon to withdraw his amendment, move the Chairman out of the chair, report progress, and then refer the matter to a select committee. There was nothing to prevent a select committee from bringing up a report on Tuesday, and even if the adoption of that course did delay the Bill a little, it would certainly give a great deal more satisfaction to the House and the country. They would at least know, even if they were not satisfied with the schedule ultimately adopted, that an attempt had been made to have it settled on fair and equitable lines.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*): There was a good deal in the contention of the Home Secretary that it was almost impossible to mark out any schedule which would give universal satisfaction to every interest in the colony, and provide for equality of voters, equality of population, and community of interests in each electorate. At the same time he agreed with the hon. member for Rockhampton North that whoever marked out the particular electorate in question committed an outrage on any known system of representation. The hon. gentleman asked what community of interest had Charters Towers, Croydon, and those other places, with Townsville, or Cairns, or the Woothakata electorate?

He would ask, in reply, what community of interests had Charters Towers with the pastoralists away on the South Australian border? They had no community of interests at all, commercially or otherwise. On the contrary, the miners of Charters Towers had commercial interests with the people of Townsville, which was their port. The interests of the two places were so interwoven that it was impossible to separate them.

The HOME SECRETARY: How are you going to get the required number of electors in Carpentaria without that division?

Mr. GIVENS: Croydon and Burke, and the mining districts west of Cairns, had far more community of interests with the port of Cairns than they had with the squatters on the South Australian border. It was nonsense to say that all those electorates included tropical agricultural interests. The electorate of Woothakata had valuable mining interests, and in time to come they would probably be the most valuable mining interests in the colony. From what the hon. gentleman said, that would come under the head of tropical agriculture industry. And the electorate of Cook also, its present and prospective importance almost entirely depended on a mining basis. It had no interest whatever in tropical agriculture. The proposed federal electorate there was the largest in the colony; it had a strip of coast 1,000 miles long.

The HOME SECRETARY: And for 500 miles there is scarcely an elector on the coast.

Mr. GIVENS: It was self-evident that the electorate had been framed for the express purpose of returning a representative to the Federal Parliament of the same political colour as the present Government, and for no other purpose. He wished to point out that an electorate could be formed here which had the requisite population and number of electors, and which had an almost perfect community of interests. If the Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Woothakata, Charters Towers, and Kennedy electorates were grouped together, there would be the requisite population, and one of the most compact electorates in the colony. The number of electors was 13,252, with very large interests in common.

Mr. JACKSON: Which industry would predominate?

Mr. GIVENS: If there was any predominating interest it would be the mining interest. Townsville relied much more on the mining industry than on the sugar industry. Indeed, there would be hardly any Townsville at all but for the mining industry. Yet the Home Secretary had grouped the electorates in the proposed Herbert division on the ground that they had a community of interests. They had a community of political interests, and the grouping had been made from that point of view and none other. As far as the Gulf electorates were concerned, it was to their interests to be connected with the coastal district, which was their commercial outlet. As a matter of fact the time was not very far distant when their principal outlet would be on the eastern coast. With Cairns, Burke, Croydon, Carpentaria, and one or two others to make up the requisite number of population and electors, there would be another very good federal electorate, and political bias would not be shown as it was in the way that electorate was marked out at present. From communications he had received, he was satisfied the people there were not satisfied with the electorate as proposed. At Cairns the people were entirely dissatisfied at being shut off from the electorates immediately to the west of them, while they were attached to electorates to the south of them, with which they had very little community of interests. There were only three

sugar-mills in the Cairns and Woothakata electorates, so that it could not be said that the paramount industry there was tropical agriculture. Both there and in the Cook the mining industry largely predominated, and their future prosperity depended upon it. The hon. gentleman had no ground for saying that the Northern divisions had been marked out in the schedule because they had a community of interests. Anybody looking at the map, and knowing anything about the facts, could see that the closest possible connection existed between Bowen, Townsville, and Charters Towers. As he had said, Townsville would hardly exist but for Ravenswood, Charters Towers, and the mining districts of the West.

The **HOME SECRETARY**: The hon. member wants Charters Towers to swamp the whole electorate.

Mr. **GIVENS**: He did not want anything of the kind, and it was unlikely anything of the kind would take place. Mackay, Bowen, Herberton, Charters Towers, Townsville, and Kennedy, would make one of the most compact electorates in the colony, with a perfect community of interests, and it would contain 13,252 voters. The number of voters at Charters Towers was 4,826, and if 4,826 could swamp 13,252 it was a thing quite new to him. Revision was undoubtedly required, and for that reason he was in favour of the suggestion of the hon. member for Rockhampton North, that the matter should be referred to a select committee. That seemed to him the best way out of the difficulty. No one could arrive at a decision that would satisfy all parties, but it was possible for a select committee to arrive at a better solution than any they had had yet. A select committee chosen from both sides of the House would go into the matter thoroughly and impartially, without being handicapped by any political bias, and they could devise a scheme of federal electorates which would be more acceptable to the House and to the country generally than either the one before them or the alternative proposed by the hon. member for Croydon. That seemed to be the opinion of hon. members on both sides, and the Chief Secretary might very well agree to it.

Mr. **SMITH** (*Bowen*): This was a most important question, and there was no use in hon. members opposite trying to make out that it was a party question, when the Government said it was not a party question. He wanted to say that they were getting very little further forward, and if they continued as they were doing there would be a great deal of discussion, and nothing would be done. The question before the Committee was that the words proposed to be omitted should stand part of the schedule, and they could not discuss the whole question as it ought to be discussed on that motion. If that motion was lost there would be no further opportunity of discussing the schedule, and they wanted to discuss it fully and see what should be done. It was absurd to say that the lines marked on the map provided for electorates with a community of interests, and he was very sorry the Chief Secretary opposed the suggestion to refer the schedule to a select committee. He was not aware whether the schedule of a Bill could be referred to a select committee.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: That is the difficulty.

Mr. **SMITH**: If that was so it was a pity, as the Committee of the Whole could not consider a question like that which required that the facts and figures should be carefully gone into, and the map carefully studied.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: He was anxious to make some progress with the Bill, and suggested that the Committee should consider the schedule, division by division. If the hon. member for Croydon would withdraw his

amendment the original schedule could be proposed division by division, and then the hon. member could propose the inclusion of electorates he wanted included in a certain division. The present discussion was aimless, and he wanted to make some progress.

Mr. **BROWNE**: He also wanted to get on with the Bill, but he did not think the proposal made by the hon. gentleman would make much difference. What he suggested was that the words proposed to be omitted should be omitted, and then, when they had created the blank, they could fix up the new schedule division by division, and any hon. member could propose any amendment he liked.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** reminded the hon. member that the apprehension of the Committee was that the blank would not be created.

Mr. **KIDSTON**: That is the danger.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: And if the words remained in there would be no opportunity of further dealing with the matter. He suggested, therefore, that the hon. member should withdraw his amendment and let the original schedule come before the Committee, and be dealt with division by division.

Mr. **BROWNE**: If the feeling of the Committee was against the creation of the blank, what was the use of going through the farce of proposing amendments on the schedule line by line? If the Committee agreed to create the blank, then any motion might be made to fill it, and any other amendment would be the same as his amendment, as the matter would then be in the hands of the Committee to make the schedule what they pleased.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: The Government had no objection to allow the blank to be created.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the schedule—put and negatived.

Mr. **STEPHENS**: Divide! Let us see what the Committee wants.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: You are too late.

Mr. **BROWNE** proposed to adopt the suggestion made, and would move his amendment division by division. He proposed, as the first words to be inserted in the blank created, the following:—

Division: Darling Downs—Aubigny, Cambooya, Carnarvon, Cunningham, Dalby, Drayton and Toowoomba, and Warwick.

The **CHAIRMAN**: There seems to be some difficulty about discussing the schedule line by line; but I may tell hon. members that they can move any amendments on the amendment; that the amendment before the Committee will now be treated in the same way as the main question.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** moved that the words "Carnarvon" and "Dalby" be omitted from the Darling Downs division, with a view of placing them in divisions subsequently to come under consideration.

Question—That the word "Carnarvon," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the amendment—stated.

Mr. **MCDONALD**: It appeared to him that the Chief Secretary was really proceeding to insert the original schedule of the Bill.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: That is for the Committee to decide.

Mr. **MCDONALD**: The Committee had already decided to knock out the schedule of the Bill.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: To create a large blank.

Mr. **MCDONALD**: It amounted to the same thing. He thought it would be really better to discuss the original schedule, and that should

have been done at the very first. The Committee were now being asked to discuss the matter in a back-hand sort of way. What was the use of creating a blank if they were going to fill it up with what had been omitted? He could see the difficulty the Committee was in.

Mr. GROOM (*Drayton and Toowoomba*) would like the hon. gentleman to state his reasons for striking out the words "Carnarvon" and "Dalby." The Committee had decided to create a blank, and it seemed to him that the hon. member for Croydon had been caught in a trap. As had been said by the hon. member for Herbert with regard to the original proposal, there had been a laudable attempt to make the whole of the electorates equal in point of population, so that there would be an equalisation of representation—not that one member going into the Federal Parliament would represent 4,000 electors and another 9,000. The hon. member for Croydon sought to obtain equal representation.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. GROOM: He could say from personal knowledge, that the Darling Downs would be one of the most easy constituencies in the whole group for candidates to contest, because they would be able to reach every centre in that division by rail; but by adding Carnarvon and Dalby, they would have to travel 300 or 400 miles by coach or buggy in order to reach every centre. But he took a higher stand than that. Hon. members were bound to take into consideration the interests of the electors themselves, and in Carnarvon, Dalby, and the Darling Downs, there was a community of interests, which should be recognised by the Committee. The Darling Downs should be treated as one comprehensive whole. It should be borne in mind that the electors in Carnarvon had communicated with their member, the Home Secretary, protesting against the injustice of omitting Carnarvon from the Darling Downs division, and their case should be taken into consideration. They had been assured that this was not a party measure, and he contended that the interests of the electors were paramount—above every other consideration. He believed the hon. member for Dalby's sympathies were with the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon, and if that were so he hoped the hon. member would express himself to that effect. The interests of these electorates would be seriously involved with regard to the tariff question, and it was important that they should have an opportunity of electing representatives who would put their views fairly before the Federal Parliament.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was very glad to hear the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba give information as to the desirability of including Dalby and Carnarvon in the Darling Downs electorate, but he wanted hon. members to understand that, in bringing in the schedule, it was merely done with a view to facilitating discussion with respect to the different divisions. He had not said that he would abandon the scheme which he had proposed, but if he had insisted upon rejecting the hon. member's amendment, and on the acceptance of the schedule in the Bill, hon. gentlemen would have been prevented from any subsequent discussion. With a view of meeting hon. members, not with a view of abandoning the electorates as set out in the schedule, he had proposed the omission of Carnarvon. The schedule which had been introduced by the hon. member differed from his, as it gave a descriptive appellation of "Kennedy" to a large district which, in the Bill's schedule, was called "Flinders." He was prepared to make that alteration, but he thought it was far better to consider this clause *de novo*. He was not breaking faith with hon. members when he endeavoured, so far

as he could individually without making it a party matter, to remain true to his original proposals. He might explain, in reply to the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, that the reason why Carnarvon was not included in the Darling Downs was that it was considered more of a pastoral than an agricultural district, and therefore might be incorporated with the Maranoa. Dalby, from its geographical position, was also supposed to be outside the true Darling Downs region. For those reasons, and in order to equalise the representation, it was considered that those districts should be placed in the Maranoa electorate.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): He would certainly disabuse the hon. gentleman's mind of that idea. He would like to know under what influences that impression could have got inside the hon. member's brain at all. He thought Dalby—

The CHAIRMAN: If you will allow me, the word proposed to be omitted is "Carnarvon." That of Dalby will come as a second amendment.

Mr. GROOM: He mentioned both of them.

The CHAIRMAN: We must take one amendment at a time.

Mr. BELL: He was not in the Chamber when the question was put, and he had been informed that the words were "Carnarvon" and "Dalby." As the Chairman said that was not so, he would reserve his remarks until "Dalby" came on.

Mr. LEAHY: He would like to know how they were to consider the question at all unless they were to take Dalby and Carnarvon together? They were really one question, and ought to be considered as one question.

The HOME SECRETARY: The one necessarily decides the other.

Mr. LEAHY: They could not take a step of this kind, unless they knew what the next step was going to be. This opened up a very large question. The hon. member for Croydon had given notice of a certain motion, which he withdrew afterwards.

Mr. BROWNE: I have not withdrawn any motion.

Mr. LEAHY: No, a blank had been created with a view to certain thing, and the hon. member for Croydon intended to propose certain things. He said that, although the question before the Chair at the present time was one, there was another question which was identical with it. They must discuss the question of Carnarvon in connection with Dalby.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a test question.

Mr. LEAHY: What he wanted to say was this—and if he was not in order he was prepared to test the matter—he had no objection to Carnarvon and Dalby both going out of the Maranoa and going into the Darling Downs, but he wanted it recognised that South-western Queensland was a district by itself, as well as the Northern and the Central. If the South-western district was to be allowed to form a separate electorate, he would have no objection to Dalby being included in the Darling Downs. Of course it would not have a large proportion of electors, but it would not be so much behind some of the electorates in New South Wales. If Carnarvon and Dalby were added to the Darling Downs electorate, taking into account the enormous area which the South-western district contained, and the very large interests which were concerned, he thought there would be a very respectable proportion. Taking into consideration the way in which they had worked it out in New South Wales, it would compare with the same electorate in New South Wales, where there were large centres of population. They wanted to consider exactly where they were. If it was considered that South-western Queensland had

not a sufficiently large population to form an electorate, what were they to put into it—what were they going to substitute in the Maranoa district for the districts which were excised from it? Suppose they put the Gregory into the Maranoa, what community of interest would there be with it? What community of interests could there be with a district which traded with Townsville, and a district which traded with Brisbane, Central Queensland being in between?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will see now the confusion the Committee will get into if we allow more than one amendment before the Committee at a time. My duty is clear. The only amendment before the Committee is the omission of the word "Carnarvon." We cannot propose to omit one word in one place, and another word in another place. We must take them one after the other. It may certainly be permitted to discuss two together, but if we allow amendments to be proposed all over the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon, we shall fall into the difficulty that the hon. member is now falling into of going into other divisions. It will be much clearer to keep to the one question before the Committee.

Mr. LEAHY: The position was as clear as mud.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the remark of the hon. member is not respectful to the Chair, and the hon. member is in duty bound to withdraw that remark.

Mr. LEAHY said that he was referring to the whole position, and not to the Chairman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: The remark was made just after I made my explanation, and I consider it was a most improper one and most disrespectful to the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY: He was not referring to the Chairman's remarks at all, but to the general position. He had occupied the chair himself, and hoped he knew his duty to the Chair. He was referring, as he said, to the general position. The schedule had been before them in its original form, then it had been withdrawn by the Government, and now it was brought in again. It was a hopeless muddle. He had made no proposition for the consideration of the Committee, so that he could not be exactly out of order. He was discussing the amendment proposed by the Chief Secretary on the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon. They were not going to proceed in the dark. They must consider what would follow the acceptance of the amendment, as the question would arise whether it was better to leave things as they were, or to agree to the Chief Secretary's amendment. He was not mixing up any other proposition with the question of the omission of Carnarvon and Dalby, but they were so closely associated that it was impossible to separate them. If the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon remained as it was, then they would have to consider what would be the position of Maranoa. It would have to have tacked on to it a district with which it had no community of interest, as it traded with Townsville. Of course, if the Committee liked to do that, it had the power. He had no interest in the matter at all, but what he and other hon. members complained of was that they were proceeding very slowly, and a great deal of the want of progress was the fault of the Government. If the Government had any functions to perform, one of them surely was to bring measures before the Chamber in a concrete form, and they should know what they wanted. The Government brought in one schedule, and immediately said that they were prepared to accept another. What was the use of trying to carry on on party lines if the Govern-

ment did not know what they wanted themselves? They might sit there for twelve months, and be no "forrarder," as the little boy put it. He did not care what divisions were made, provided that some business was done; but no business would be done on the lines on which they were proceeding. What was the use of the Government saying it was not a party question, while the other side said it was a party question? Any side could make it a party question. He was afraid that, in his desire to avoid getting up frequently, he had mixed up a good many things, and that was the reason why he might appear to be somewhat boxed. He did not care two pins how the electorates were carved out; but they ought to be carved out so as to pay some consideration to community of interests.

The PREMIER thought the hon. member for Bulloo was hardly fair in his criticism. The Bill was not a party measure, and he did not believe that a single member thought it was.

Mr. CALLAN: I am certain it is a party question.

The PREMIER: Well, it ought not to be.

Mr. McDONALD: It is now.

The PREMIER: The Government believed that they would get the opinion of the Committee by proceeding as they were doing, and taking the divisions one by one. No hon. member wished to make an unfair division. The Government did not profess to have the whole of the knowledge of the community, but they believed that the division they proposed was as fair as it was possible to devise. The hon. member for Cairns talked a great deal about Woothakata, but it was not possible to divide that electorate, although part of it was coastal and part mining. With regard to Gregory, he maintained that the bulk of the trade of that district was done through Winton, and it ought to belong to Flinders. Flinders was devoted to mining and pastoral pursuits, so that there was a community of interests there, and there was the same identity of interests in regard to the Central division. There was as much reason that the South should have a division of its own. It was impossible to make a division which would please all portions of the colony, so long as they had only nine electorates, but the Government had made as fair a division as could be made under the circumstances. They had tried to please the South; they had tried to please the Centre; and they had tried to please the North. The hon. member for Flinders said that Charters Towers and Townsville ought to go together, but it would be impossible to get the number of electors required in the two divisions in the North if that were done.

Mr. McDONALD: Their interests are common.

The PREMIER: He admitted that, but, on the other hand, on the coast north from Mackay, they had a big district devoted to tropical agriculture, and certainly the whole of that country ought to be in the one electorate. He thought the Maranoa ought to be the Southern division, for the reason that there was a community of interest in the different electorates which it was proposed to group together in that division. There would be the interstate commission by

and by, and the member representing Maranoa should certainly represent a group of electorates having a community of interests in matters to be dealt with by that commission. Many hon. members wanted the colony divided into three for the purpose of electing senators, and now the Government wanted to give representatives for three parts of the colony they said it was unfair. He did not see how it was unfair if they wanted to preserve, to a certain extent, the divisions of North, Centre, and South.

[4:30 p.m.]

* Mr. BELL pointed out that a matter being a non-party question did not mean that the Government should abrogate its functions of leading the House. It meant that the Government brought forward a definite proposal, but did not attach any particular significance to the result if the proposal was not adopted.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: He thought there was some truth in the suggestion of the hon. member for Bulloo that there was a want of push on the part of the Government in the conduct of their business in regard to this particular Bill, and he was not sure that the criticism might not be extended a little beyond this Bill. He suggested to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, and to the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, that, though they regarded the Bill as a non-party one, nevertheless they were in charge of the business of the House, and no opportunity should be lost of pushing it along. He hoped he might be permitted to refer to the inclusion of Dalby in the Maranoa division without being ruled out of order; and in the hope that it might be an example which some other hon. members would follow, he would make his remarks as brief as possible. The reason why he considered that the suggestion of the Chief Secretary should not be adopted in regard to the amendment was that Dalby was undoubtedly a Darling Downs electorate, climatically, geologically, and in every other aspect. The scenery of the district and the nature of the employment of the inhabitants were typical of the Darling Downs, and undoubtedly diverse from what prevailed to the westward. It was not a very good thing to impute motives, but he was disposed to believe that in some of the amendments and speeches made in regard to the arrangements of the electorates there was something else than pure disinterested patriotism. He was not prepared to question the *bona fides* of any hon. member, but he was not sufficiently calculating as to be able to look into the future, and say it would not be a good thing for him to see Dalby in this or in that division. He preferred to look at the main question as to whether the particular electorate had a community of interest with the division in which it was proposed to include it; and he was insistent in regard to Dalby being included in the Darling Downs division. He imagined that after the Commonwealth Government was formed we would find ourselves engaged in a fiscal war, with the representatives of the agricultural industries on one side advocating protection, and probably the representatives of the Western and pastoral districts in favour of a tariff which, if it was protectionist at all, would be much less protectionist. If they included Dalby—and he imagined that this applied also to Carnarvon—if they were included with purely pastoral electorates, they would be out of touch, out of sympathy, and out of interest with the policy that the bulk of those Western electorates would be disposed to support; whereas, if they were included with the rest of the Darling Downs electorates, there would be an absolute identity in regard to fiscal proposals made in the Federal Parliament. That seemed an overwhelmingly strong point in regard to the question whether Dalby should be included in the Western pastoral division or in an agricultural division such as the Darling Downs. And no doubt that applied also to Carnarvon. He thought the hon. gentleman at the head of the Home Secretary's Department deserved some sympathy in the position in which he found himself. Judging by the Press, there was an overwhelming feeling in the electorate of Carnarvon in favour of being included in the Darling Downs division, and they

knew that the Home Secretary was responsible for the original schedule which included Carnarvon in the Darling Downs, but the hon. gentleman, in deference to what was no doubt a legitimate Cabinet arrangement, since the return of the Chief Secretary to the colony, found himself, in obedience to a well recognised constitutional principle, obliged to subordinate his personal opinion and scheme to the majority of his colleagues. Though he was acting constitutionally, the hon. gentleman deserved sympathy, and no doubt the hon. gentleman would be glad in his heart if he found that the amendment of his colleague was not adopted and Carnarvon was included in the Darling Downs.

The CHIEF SECRETARY desired to express the opinion that he should not have been treated to the strictures just passed upon him, seeing that he had afforded the hon. member for Dalby an opportunity of voicing, in his eloquent style, the claims of Dalby to be included in the Darling Downs division. If he had insisted on adhering to the schedule of the Bill as introduced, the hon. gentleman would not have had that opportunity, and he ought to have been thanked by the hon. gentleman for affording him an opportunity of making a speech which was a very valuable contribution to the debate.

Mr. BROWNE said his amendment had been before the hon. members for days, and several had promised to support the omission of the present schedule and the insertion of the former schedule. In accordance with that the question was put to the Committee and a blank was created. Then he moved his amendment and the Chief Secretary then started to move amendments upon his amendment. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government in referring to the matter had again said that it was not a party question, and he practically left it to the Committee to adopt the schedule of the Government or that which he had proposed with any amendments in it which the majority might agree to. With regard to the present amendment he took it that if one, two, or three places were proposed to be omitted or inserted they would have to discuss the whole schedule and the bearing of the amendment on the whole schedule. The hon. members for Drayton and Toowoomba and Dalby had expressed their opinions on the amendment from the point of view of the Darling Downs. He would not go into that further than to say that he thought they had made out a very good case, and that there was no community of interest between Carnarvon and Dalby and the Western electorates. The Chief Secretary had referred to the question of numerical representation, but he thought the figures he had before quoted were approximately as fair as any that could be given by the hon. gentleman. The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman would make the present disparity even greater. At the present time, the Darling Downs, one of the most important districts in the colony, would contain 11,023 voters. Under the amendment, as moved by the hon. gentleman, it would contain only 9,095 voters, and only 6,601 voters who voted at the referendum. He would give the figures again to show, approximately, what the different electorates would contain. Brisbane, 12,644; Darling Downs, 11,023; Fitzroy, 10,581; Kennedy, 9,453; Herbert, 10,723; Moreton, 12,426; Oxley, 12,581; Maranoa, 9,102; and Wide Bay, 12,736. According to the schedule which they had omitted, Wide Bay had 14,000 voters, or 2,000 more than Brisbane. He did not think the hon. gentleman would contend that that was fair. He thought the Darling Downs being left in the schedule with 11,023 electors would be much the fairest and most equitable proposal.

Mr. HIGGS (*Fortitude Valley*): Hon. members might feel a little bit restive because more progress was not being made, but as a matter of fact they were proceeding very rapidly, in view of what the Chief Secretary said—that if the Bill went to a select committee the schedule would take three weeks to decide. He thought they were entitled to have heard from the hon. gentleman when he proposed that Carnarvon should be struck out where he proposed to reinsert it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Restore it to Maranoa.

Mr. HIGGS: He thought there was a very unequal division of votes throughout the colony according to the second scheme proposed by the Government. The first scheme was far more in keeping with the principle of one vote one value. The hon. member for Bulloo had said that in New South Wales, although they had one man one vote, they did not recognise the principle of one vote one value. That was a mistake, because when they adopted one man one vote they cut up the constituencies so as to contain as nearly as possible 2,000 voters. Under the Chief Secretary's proposal they should have about half the number of voters in Maranoa as were in Wide Bay. Maranoa would contain 7,574, and Wide Bay 14,161. In the schedule proposed by the hon. member for Croydon there would be something like 10,000 or 11,000 in each. If there was a more equal division of votes he took it there would also be a more equal division of interests. He was perfectly well aware that they could not get anything like perfection in any division that might be made, but surely they could devise some means of getting rid of such discrepancies as he had mentioned, especially when the discrepancy was arrived at by placing two electorates in Maranoa which claimed to have interests altogether apart from the majority of interests in that electorate. The proposed inclusion of Dalby in the Maranoa instead of in the Darling Downs electorate would create a diversity of interests, and at the same time establish a very great discrepancy by giving the people of the Maranoa electorate double the representation given to other districts in the schedule. A select committee would discuss the schedule without firing little quips about party feeling across the Chamber. The appointment of the hon. member for Croydon, the hon. member for Rockhampton, and the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, as representing that side of the House on such a committee would give great satisfaction to members on that side, and hon. members opposite could select four members for themselves, and he was sure that they would arrive at a better decision than that Committee. The probability was that members would become so tired and restless under the long discussion that finally they would vote according to party, and pass the schedule as proposed by the Government with all its defects and faults.

Mr. REID (*Enoggera*) thought the Chief Secretary would have done very much better if he had stuck to the original schedule, and was opposed to the amendment which had been moved by the hon. gentleman. It was well known to almost everybody in Queensland that Dalby was in the Darling Downs.

Mr. LEAHY: Have you ever heard of Goondiwindi being included in the Darling Downs?

Mr. REID: He would refer to that matter presently. He had never heard that any doubt existed in the mind of anybody in Queensland as to whether Dalby was in the Darling Downs. The feeling of the people there was to buy several large estates, and have them cut up into agricultural farms, so that there was evidence of a community of interests between them and the residents of the Darling Downs. The Government claimed that they desired to secure com-

munity of interests in the different electorates. The great fight in the Federal Parliament for a number of years would be over the tariff, and each industry would contend for its own ends. The South of Queensland would fight against the Centre and North. The Western part of the country was "freetrade"; but Dalby, like Darling Downs, was "protection," and to include it in the Maranoa would be to do a great injustice to the people of that district. With regard to Carnarvon, the Darling Downs end of it was in the Darling Downs. The Goondiwindi division was clearly distinct from the Stanthorpe and Inglewood end, and the people of the Goondiwindi district could vote in the Maranoa electorate with those interested in the pastoral industry. That could be done without the slightest difficulty, as the rolls were compiled in divisions. The schedule which was originally submitted by the Home Secretary was well received by the whole colony, and he could not understand why it had been altered by the Chief Secretary on his return from the old country, for no argument had been advanced in favour of the alteration. The only argument used was that the Goondiwindi interest was pastoral, and that difficulty could be easily remedied. The people of Stanthorpe and Inglewood were against being included in Maranoa; and he would suggest that Dalby and those two divisions be included in the Darling Downs, and he trusted the Government would see their way to agree to that suggestion.

The HOME SECRETARY: As representative of the district which was more immediately concerned, it was just as well that he should say a few words on the subject. He was really obliged to the hon. member for Dalby for so happily putting before the House and the country his (Mr. Foxton's) unfortunate position. Two-thirds of the electors in his district were very anxious to be joined on to Darling Downs, as they recognised that they had always had a community of interest with the Darling Downs. It would not be very long before that part of his electorate would be essentially a farming district. He regarded the vote which would be given on the amendment purely as a test vote. If Carnarvon was accepted as part of the schedule, and the amendment of the Chief Secretary was rejected, then he took it that would practically mean the acceptance of the schedule proposed by the hon. member for Croydon.

Mr. LEAHY: No; not at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: At all events, he wished to say that he did not see how he could vote with his colleagues on that question. The furthest he could go with them was to refrain from voting at all, knowing what a very strong feeling existed in his electorate.

Mr. FOGARTY (*Drayton and Toowoomba*) said he could not support the amendment

[7 p.m.] moved by the Chief Secretary because

he thought the motion proposed by the hon. member for Croydon was a very proper one. The interests of Carnarvon and Dalby were identical. The chief centres of population in Carnarvon were Stanthorpe, Texas, Inglewood, and Goondiwindi, and, speaking from personal knowledge, he could say that nine-tenths of the people in those districts were engaged in agriculture. He challenged anyone to disprove that statement. Dalby was not far from the centre of the Darling Downs, and anyone who knew the country must be convinced that it should form part and parcel of that electorate. It was true agriculture might not be so extensive in the neighbourhood of Dalby as most of them would like to see, but the reason for that was the land in the vicinity of Dalby had not been cut up for agricultural settlement. Speaking as one

representing an agricultural centre, he affirmed that the interests of Drayton and Toowoomba and Dalby were identical, and why they should be connected with the far West he was at a loss to know. The first proposal submitted by the Home Secretary with regard to the Darling Downs electorate was a very wise one. The hon. gentleman evidently recognised the community of interests, and grouped those electorates together which had one common interest, the interest being the agriculture. No doubt, if better facilities were offered, Dalby would become very closely settled indeed. Around Stanthorpe there was an immense fruit-producing country. On the banks of the Severn, in the neighbourhood of Texas, there was some of the most magnificent land in Southern Queensland, though circumscribed in area. A considerable amount of settlement had already taken place, and now it was the intention of the Government to resume certain runs in that locality, that would lead to the additional settlement of people who would devote the whole of their energy and capital to the extension of agriculture. Why the second proposal was submitted he could not understand. The interests of agriculture, whether in the vicinity of Drayton and Toowoomba, or on the banks of the Severn, or in the neighbourhood of the Bunya Mountains were exactly alike. For some time to come the principal problem before the Federal Parliament would be the framing of a tariff, and the member representing the Downs in the Federal Parliament should go there as the member of an agricultural electorate; he should have no divided, and possibly conflicting, interests to serve. Without speaking disparagingly of any other electorate, he believed the most important in the colony would be that of the Darling Downs, the interests of which were almost entirely confined to agriculture. And agriculture there was only in its infancy. It was only a matter of time—and a very short time—when the present population there would increase at least tenfold, and it was absolutely necessary that the member representing such an electorate should see that agriculture was encouraged, and its interests safely guarded. No country could be prosperous without permanent agricultural settlement, and for that kind of settlement Carnarvon and Dalby were eminently suitable. The Government were evidently becoming aware of the fact that land in those electorates was too valuable to be devoted to stock raising. The resumption of Glenelg would lead to largely increased settlement, and the same might be said of the magnificent country at the head of Trevorton Creek. Country of that sort was never intended to remain as a sheepwalk till the end of time. The same thing applied to the Warroo country, and though there was beautiful black soil country there he ventured to say it was in the same state now as it was fifty years ago. That was not at all desirable, and, as the land was fit for any class of agriculture, they wanted settlement to take place there. The same argument would apply also to Welltown if the rainfall there was better. Under those circumstances he could not see why Carnarvon should be coupled with Thargomindah, as the interests of the two districts were not at all in common, and they knew there was country in the neighbourhood of Thargomindah that was not worth a peppercorn rental. He had said enough to show that he intended voting for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Croydon, and against the omission of Carnarvon from the Darling Downs electorate.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) thought the discussion should have gone on long enough to convince the Chief Secretary of the desirability of including Carnarvon in the Darling Downs electorate. The

hon. members for Drayton and Toowoomba were in favour of it, and the strongest evidence in its favour had been given by the Home Secretary. He hoped the Chief Secretary would accept the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon and let the business go on. He must say that when that schedule was originally announced he thought it filled the bill, and he had heard no objection to it.

Mr. STEWART thought it would take the ingenuity of a Philadelphia lawyer to unravel the want of principle upon which the schedule of the Bill had been founded.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The question now before the Committee is the omission of the word "Carnarvon," on the 1st line of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Croydon. The original schedule of the Bill is gone.

Mr. STEWART could not understand the reason for desiring to omit Carnarvon from the Darling Downs division and include it in Maranoa.

Question—That the word "Carnarvon," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the proposed amendment—put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was prepared to accept the decision of the Committee to include Carnarvon as carrying with it also the inclusion of Dalby.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On "Division Fitzroy—Clermont, Fitzroy, Leichhardt, Normanby, Port Curtis, Rockhampton, and Rockhampton North?"—

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Looking over this division, which covered a very large extent of country, he thought they might improve upon "Fitzroy" as a fitting designation, and he moved that the word "Fitzroy" be omitted, with a view of inserting "Capricornia."

Mr. GLASSEY (*Bundaberg*) asked the Chief Secretary to inform the Committee why he desired this amendment, especially as the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, had given notice of a similar amendment. He thought "Fitzroy" was an excellent name for the division, and he would like some explanation for the proposed change from Fitzroy to "Capricornia." If it was merely to tickle the fancy of some people, by giving the division a fancy high-sounding name, he would vote against the amendment of the Chief Secretary. Was there any other Fitzroy in any of the other colonies?

Mr. CALLAN: Yes; in Victoria.

Mr. GLASSEY: That was a reasonable ground for the change, and "Capricornia" would suit as well as any other name.

The CHIEF SECRETARY thought the name "Capricornia" was more appropriate than "Fitzroy" for this division, because the tropic of Capricorn ran right through the heart of that electorate—much more so than the Fitzroy River did. He would be guided entirely by the opinion of the Committee in the matter, as he was not absolutely wedded to the change.

Mr. CALLAN (*Fitzroy*) pointed out that there was another "Fitzroy" in Victoria; and so if the name of this division was "Fitzroy," there would be two members in the Federal Parliament sitting for electorates of that name. He agreed with the proposal to change the name to "Capricornia," because he did not think that the name "Fitzroy" deserved to be perpetuated. It was the name of one of the Governor-Generals of Australia in times gone by, who was not celebrated for anything that should cause his name to be held in esteem.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) pointed out that it was necessary to change the name "Fitzroy" to "Capricornia," because it would be better to

have a separate name for each of the federal electorates throughout Australia, and again it was a more appropriate name than "Fitzroy."

Amendment agreed to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that before the word "Clermont" the word "Barcoo" be inserted. Later on he intended to move the insertion of the word "Mitchell" after the word "Leichhardt." That was to bring the Barcoo and the Mitchell into the Capricornia division—to restore the original Fitzroy division to the shape in which it appeared in the schedule in the Bill.

Mr. BROWNE explained that he did not claim that there was anything original in his amendment. In fact, they were two Government proposals; and he affirmed that the original schedule was the best on the whole, and he was going to vote for that schedule, which he had moved by way of amendment.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) intended to support the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon, which reverted to the original schedule, which, as had been pointed out, had given general satisfaction. There was a greater community of interests between the districts mentioned in the Fitzroy division in the original schedule than there was between any other districts in the schedule, and he believed they would give general satisfaction.

Mr. CALLAN intended to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. In the first schedule it had been proposed that Port Curtis should be part of the Fitzroy division. The Government left that out, and the hon. member for Croydon proposed to bring it in again. The Government left Port Curtis out, although they knew there would be a railway from Rockhampton to Port Curtis, which would bring the trade and commerce in those districts into unison. He thought that they had made the greatest mistake in trying to bring the [7.30 p.m.] Barcoo in with the Fitzroy, and he would oppose it in every way. The interests of the Barcoo were totally different from those of the Fitzroy. The Barcoo naturally belonged to the Western country, and its people wanted to be joined with districts with which they had a community of interest and feeling. Therefore he would support the proposal of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. KIDSTON: He had much pleasure in supporting the amendment proposed by the Chief Secretary. He thought, so far as Fitzroy or Capricornia were concerned, the second choice of the Government was decidedly better than the first. He thought that the division, as shown with the Barcoo and the Mitchell included, was a much more natural and proper grouping of Central Queensland electorates than the one which was first suggested. Anyone who knew anything about these districts, knew that practically all the trade and commercial intercourse of the Barcoo and Mitchell was with Rockhampton, and that very fact made a common interest between Rockhampton and the West, and indicated that they ought to be, as far as possible, associated together politically. He was quite willing to see Port Curtis included; but he would rather see Port Curtis left out than that the Barcoo and the Mitchell should be left out.

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*): It was amusing to him to hear the members of the coastal districts dealing with Western electorates. The member for Rockhampton of course contended that Rockhampton was the port of the West. It was the natural port no doubt, but what the hon. member wanted to do was simply to boost up Rockhampton. As a Western man, however, he was about tired of Rockhampton, and he felt it was about time the Western members combined and had a Western division.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FITZGERALD: He maintained that it was much more natural that Port Curtis should be included in the Central division than the Western district should be. Rockhampton would always be a coastal district, and its whole political influence would be on the coast, because the towns of Rockhampton and Mount Morgan would naturally control the whole voting power of the district. The interests of a place like Rockhampton and Mount Morgan were identical with those of Gladstone and Port Curtis. If, however, hon. members looked 300 or 400 miles out West they would not find any agricultural or mining like there was on the coast, but simply rich pastoral districts, which for years and years would be nothing but pastoral districts. Going north to the Gregory, and south to the Warrego, it was all purely pastoral country. Did it not strike hon. members that it would be more natural and convenient, and more to the interests of the residents of the far West, if those districts were joined with districts which had identical interests with their own? If they did not, the fine Western districts would be represented by a man who, like the hon. member for Rockhampton, knew nothing about the West or its requirements. If those districts were banded together, they would be able to send at least one member down to the Federal Parliament who would represent their interests. He appealed to the members of the Committee to consider that. The Western districts had not a very big voting power at the present time, and they were consequently shuttle-cocked out of everything, but in a case like this, when they were trying to do the best for the future, hon. members should go into the matter carefully, and see that the Western districts were grouped together, as they were proposed to be by the leader of the Opposition. He did not wish to raise any illfeeling between the Western people and the coastal residents, but he really thought that if the proposal of the Chief Secretary was accepted, the representatives of the Central districts would be elected by the large majority in the coastal towns. The Barcoo, the Mitchell, the Gregory, and the Warrego, comprised the grandest pastoral country in Australia—perhaps in the whole world—and their interests should be considered. He thought that the Barcoo and the Mitchell should both be included in the Maranoa division, and for that reason he supported the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) intended to support the original suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition. He could not see why Port Curtis should not be included in the division of Capricornia. It was proposed to connect Rockhampton with Gladstone by rail in a short time, and when that was accomplished the interests of the two places would be identical. It would be a very unwieldy electorate if it included Barcoo and Mitchell in addition to Port Curtis.

The PREMIER: They are all connected by rail.

Mr. GIVENS: It would then be the largest electorate in the colony, and would have over 14,000 electors. As had been pointed out by the hon. member for Mitchell, the interests of the people in the interior were by no means identical with those of the people of Rockhampton. The coast towns appeared to be under the impression that the interior existed for the convenience of the coast towns, whereas the converse was the truth. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Croydon was simply the original proposition of the Government, who must have had some good reason for dropping it. He would ask the Chief Secretary what was the particular reason for the Government altering

their minds on the subject? The hon. member for Gregory suggested to him that he should ask the hon. member for Bulloo, as he would be more likely to get the information from him.

Mr. LEAHY: You will never get any information from the hon. member for Gregory, anyway.

Mr. GIVENS: The only man to whom he would look for information was the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, who, so far, had given no sound reason why his amendment should be accepted instead of the proposition of the leader of the Opposition.

The PREMIER: They are connected by rail.

Mr. LEAHY: That is an argument used by you to-night.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. member wanted to pin him down to that argument, but he would ask if the hon. gentleman would be willing to apply the same argument when they came to discuss the Herbert division? The fact of districts being connected by rail was a good argument in connection with community of interests, but it had its limitations. It must be limited by the size and population of the proposed divisions. If it was to hold good in every case, it was an argument for including both Gladstone and Cunnamulla in the same electoral division as Brisbane, because they were both connected with Brisbane by rail. All those arguments had their reasonable limitations, and he could not see why the original schedule had been departed from by the Government. The scheme of division proposed by the leader of the Opposition should commend itself to the judgment of hon. members in preference to the scheme of the Government. The districts of Barcoo and Mitchell should be joined on to the Maranoa division, otherwise it would be a very small division, and the only reason which had been suggested why that should not be done was that it was desired to make the Maranoa a certainty for some gentleman to be nominated by the other side of the Committee. With the single exception of the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, all the Central members were in favour of the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, as well as a great many Southern members. Before he recorded his vote, he would like to know the reason which had induced the Government to change their minds, and why it should be proposed to make Capricornia by far the biggest electorate in the colony, at the same time destroying the compactness of an adjoining electorate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The reason why the Government had reconsidered the matter was that Barcoo and Mitchell had always been regarded as belonging to the Central portion of the colony, and the same held good of Port Curtis. He did not intend to move the deletion of Port Curtis; but some hon. member might choose to move that it be omitted. Hon. members seemed to run away with the idea that these were permanent divisions for the representation of Queensland in the Federal Parliament. That was a mistaken impression. They were merely formulating a tentative scheme under which presentation would be given; but, when the census was taken next year, there was not the slightest doubt that there would be a redistribution of seats, and that Queensland would have increased representation, which would necessitate an entirely different arrangement.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Carpentaria*) intended to support the proposal of the Chief Secretary. He looked upon the Capricornia division as the most compact of the lot except the metropolitan division, and if the Mitchell and the Barcoo were

taken out it would spoil the division. The idea with some hon. members was to get as nearly as possible the same number of electors in each division, but he did not think that was a matter of so much importance. In New South Wales the numbers ranged from 9,568 to 15,936, and in Victoria from about 9,000 to about 14,000. He thought the country electorates should always have less than the towns.

Mr. TURLEY: What about Wide Bay and Brisbane?

Mr. FORSYTH: Wide Bay had a very large number, and he would be prepared to reduce the number; but what they wanted was to get the community of interests settled, and he could not see that the Balonne and Bulloo had anything to do with the Mitchell and the Barcoo. The whole of the Mitchell and Barcoo trade went to Rockhampton; the interests of those districts were identical with the interests of other electorates of the Central district, and he saw no reason why they should be put into another division. He would not vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon under any circumstances.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): Anyone who knew the Central district knew there was no community of interest between the Mitchell and the Barcoo districts on the one hand, and Fitzroy and Rockhampton on the other. As to the trade going to Rockhampton, there was a very large amount of the trade of the Barcoo and Mitchell districts that went to Charleville, and then on to Brisbane, owing to the rates on the railway. With regard to the alteration that had been made from the original schedule, it had been publicly stated that the hon. member for Bulloo had a good deal to do with the alteration.

Mr. FORSYTH: He says he had not.

Mr. KERR: If they wanted to put electorates that had community of interests into the same divisions, he claimed that the Warrego, Barcoo, Mitchell, Gregory, Balonne, Bulloo, and Maranoa districts had a community of interest. The people there were largely engaged in pastoral pursuits, and they had also a community of interest in being Crown lessees. If he were to consult his own individual opinion, and he were standing for the Federal Parliament, he would say that under the proposal of the Chief Secretary it would be a very compact electorate; but he was there to consult the interests of those who sent him to represent them, and they believed that the first schedule framed was the one they ought to be under. Therefore he would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon. If there was a redistribution at some future time, after the census was taken, and the people of the Mitchell and Barcoo districts considered that it would be better for them to be included with Rockhampton and the Fitzroy, they could then be included in those electorates.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Warrego*) intended to support the proposal of the hon. member for Croydon. He thought the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Herbert respecting one vote one value were worthy of consideration, and since the Darling Downs had been altered by the inclusion of Carnarvon and Dalby, that naturally weakened one of the divisions they had to take into consideration. Now, in the schedule proposed by the leader of the Opposition, the Fitzroy would have 10,959 votes and the Warrego 9,582, and if the proposal of the Chief Secretary was carried out in reference to the Gregory, it being in the Flinders division, then the Maranoa would have 5,484 voters, which was altogether out of proportion. Taking the proposal as submitted by the Chief Secretary, the Fitzroy would have 14,249 votes, which was out

of proportion. The Barcoo, Mitchell, and Gregory could well come within the scope of the Maranoa electorate.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*): He might be allowed to say, as a man who knew something about the matter, that there was no community of interest whatever between the Barcoo and Mitchell, and the Bulloo and Balonne. Everyone who lived in the West knew that travelling was now done from west to east, and the people from west to east knew one another. There was no travelling from north to south. The Barcoo and Mitchell were as foreign to the Bulloo and Balonne as the Gulf country was. The only time they saw men from the North was when they were coming down with cattle and sheep. He considered it was a very happy division when the Southern and Western Railway was taken as near the partition as it was possible to take it. It was impossible to make the railway the northern boundary, because it ran through the Warrego and Murilla districts, but they stopped at the northern boundary of both those electorates, and they made the country from the Southern and Western Railway to the border a perfectly compact electorate, where people knew one another, and where their interests were identical. The Warrego belonged to them. They knew the Charleville people, and from the far western boundary to the Thargomindah district, as far as Dalby at any rate, they knew one another well, and they knew the Warrego people well, because they had to pass through their district in their travels to come to the capital. North of that, they knew nothing at all about the people, and had no interests in common with them. In electing a member, it was well for the districts to be so regulated that the best men should be well known. He did not think the hon. member for Barcoo would be able to point out who were the three or four leading men in the Bulloo, Balonne, or Maranoa districts. He was sure the hon. member for Warrego could point them out at once. On the other hand, he (Mr. Story) knew nothing about the leading men in the Barcoo and Mitchell. He was altogether of the opinion of the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, that the division had been made as well as it was possible to be made, as it was not possible to make the division exactly on the line of the railway.

Mr. LEAHY: As the Chief Secretary had pointed out, they must adhere as nearly as possible to the different boundaries which had been impressed upon them, certainly ever since he had been in the House, and which would probably remain for many years after he left it. There were three great divisions in the colony, and the contention was that, as nearly as possible, they should group the electorates with contiguous boundaries to those great divisions.

Mr. BROWNE: He said he wanted to wipe out the divisions.

Mr. LEAHY: Only with regard to the Senate. Now, there were 150,000 people in the Centre and North of Queensland, and that was considerably less than one-third of the population. All those districts could claim therefore was one-third of the representation, and that would be more than their share. Central Queensland had exactly got the quota, which was one-ninth part of the population, and he thought that the whole of Central Queensland should go into one electorate.

Mr. BOWMAN: How would that apply to the Senate?

Mr. LEAHY: That would apply to the Senate equally as well as to the House of Representatives if the principle of representation was the same, which it was not. The difference between the two was that the Senate was supposed to represent the whole State, while the

House of Representatives represented the sections of the community with a community of interest. But the question was whether Barcoo and Mitchell should be excised from Fitzroy, and he did not wish to be drawn off that. It had been said a thousand times that if they took Barcoo and Mitchell out of Central Queensland there would be nothing left. The Mitchell was Central Queensland. What they had to consider was whether the three great divisions were fairly represented in the people's House, and it seemed to him that Central Queensland wanted to encroach very much upon Southern Queensland. He was prepared to give the Centre a large representation in the House of Representatives, and the Committee were giving them that, but they were not satisfied, and wanted to get a patch of Southern Queensland as well as of Northern Queensland. There was neither reason nor argument in the proposal of the hon. member for Croydon in that instance, and he was very pleased to see that the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, who was certainly a most intelligent member (Opposition laughter)—He did not see why hon. members opposite should be so anxious to seize an opportunity of poking fun at one of their most prominent members; the great bulk of them had reason to be jealous of him, but he did not think they would display their jealousy by indulging in derisive laughter when he was spoken of as an intelligent member—at any rate he was very pleased to see that he did not support the proposal of the hon. member for Croydon. As the hon. member for Carpentaria pointed out, the Central division was a most concise division, and he trusted that whatever difference might arise between the hon. member for Rockhampton and the hon. member for Fitzroy, the Committee would see that justice was done to that division. The senior member for Rockhampton had time after time brought forward motions affirming that the whole of Central Queensland should be preserved intact for the purposes of election of members to the House, and made a motion to that effect the previous day.

Mr. TURLEY: Why did you oppose it?

Mr. LEAHY: He did not oppose it, and he promised the hon. member that he would support it.

Mr. JENKINSON: You told me so.

Mr. LEAHY: He told the hon. member for Wide Bay so, because it represented an exact quota of the population of Queensland. He had friends and some solid interests in Central Queensland, and he objected to the proposition of the hon. member for Croydon, and hoped the Committee would not agree to it.

Mr. BROWNE: The hon. member for Bulloo successfully tried on a little leg-pulling with one of the hon. members for Rockhampton the other day; but he did not think the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, would suffer his leg to be pulled in the same way as his colleague had done.

Mr. LEAHY: There was no leg-pulling; but you laughed at my speaking of him as an intelligent member.

Mr. BROWNE: They laughed at the awkward way in which the hon. member tried to pull the leg of an astute member like the hon. member for Rockhampton. The hon. member for Bulloo, referring to the question before the Committee, said he hoped that hon. members would not allow those two electorates to be taken out of the Central division. The amendment under consideration proposed nothing of the sort, and it was proposed, not by him but by the Chief Secretary. The subject under consideration was the original schedule published by the Government, and it did not include the Mitchell and the Barcoo in the Central division. The Chief

Secretary proposed, as an amendment on that schedule, that those two electorates should be taken from the Warrego or Maranoa division and put into the Central division. It was all very well to talk about those electorates being along the railway line, and about their making the division compact; but if that argument had any weight, then Cunnamulla and Gladstone should be grouped with Brisbane, seeing that there was railway communication between those places and the metropolis. The Chief Secretary said he was sticking to the Government proposals; but he was doing nothing of the sort. In the latest proposal Port Curtis was omitted from the Central division, and now the hon. gentleman said he was going to insert it in that division, so that he was not sticking to even that proposal. The inclusion of Barcoo, Mitchell, and Port Curtis in the Fitzroy division would give that division a population of 14,249 electors, or over 2,000 more than there were in the Brisbane electorate. No hon. member who knew the Western country could say that there was any community of interest between it and Rockhampton. The *Rockhampton Bulletin*, the leading newspaper in the Central district, approved of the original schedule, but unreservedly condemned leaving out Port Curtis, and including the other two districts which had been mentioned so often during the discussion. He did not think any sufficient reason had been given for including Barcoo and Mitchell in the Maranoa.

Mr. COWLEY: While admitting that there was a great deal of truth in what the hon. member for Bulloo had said, and that it would be very desirable, if possible, to keep those two districts in the Central electorate, he failed to see how it would work. If they took out the Barcoo and the Mitchell, the same argument would hold good with regard to the Gregory; and the Gregory must certainly go, too. According to the published table, the population of the Maranoa was only given as 9,102, and the votes polled at the referendum were 5,769. If they took out the Barcoo, the Mitchell, and the Gregory, that would leave Maranoa with only 5,191 electors. If Gregory was to be restored to Kennedy, what was proposed to be given to Maranoa? While leaving Maranoa with only 5,191 electors, it would give to the Capricorn electorate 14,462, or nearly three times the number. Surely they could not accept that, and unless the Chief Secretary could show that if those were to be deleted he was going to substitute some others to be included in Maranoa, he should support the schedule as proposed by the hon. member for Croydon.

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): The hon. member for Bulloo evidently wished to play the same game that he had endeavoured to play amongst hon. members on his own side. He sought to throw the apple of discord amongst the members of the Labour party so that they would play one off against the other, but he did not think their vanity was so great that they would allow him to do anything of the sort. The hon. member had been pouring treacle down the back of the hon. member for Rockhampton because he did not agree with the motion submitted by the hon. member for Croydon. They had had one experience of the hon. member's tactics, and they did not want any more. They were not inclined to allow him to exercise any influence over them again.

Mr. LEAHY: Then you admit I did influence you once.

Mr. TURLEY: He would admit that to some extent they were once fooled by the hon. member. They took his word for what it was supposed to be worth, but they found out what the actual value of it was, and consequently they

did not intend to accept it any more. The hon. member asked them to look at the size of that particular electorate. What had the size of the electorate got to do with it? The hon. member might just as well ask them to look at the size of the Oxley electorate.

Mr. LEAHY: Your own side has been advocating it to-night.

Mr. TURLEY: Not on account of area, but from the fact that there were a certain number of people living in that electorate, and a certain number of voters who were likely to record their votes for the person who stood for that division. That was the main thing they were taking into consideration at present. They knew what the hon. member's politics were. When it was a question of rabbits in the south-west it was a deplorable country, not worth 5s. a mile, but when it was a question of railways being constructed out there it was the best portion of Queensland, and worth any amount of money to the State. The hon. member was endeavouring to play the same sort of game in connection with those electorates. One or two evenings ago the hon. member was not solicitous for the protection of his own particular interests in the Central district. Now he told them that what interests he had in Central Queensland he wished to see protected.

Mr. LEAHY: I did not.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member said he had a large number of friends in the Central district, and he had considerable interests in the Central district; and that was the reason why he wanted to see—

Mr. LEAHY: I did not say that was the reason.

Mr. TURLEY: He took down the hon. member's words at the time: That he had a solid interest in the Central district, and because of that—

Mr. LEAHY: No.

Mr. TURLEY: What was the reason of the hon. member saying that, unless it was the motive actuating him in separating electorates whose interests were identical. It did not matter whether a person lived in the Warrego, or the Barcoo, or the Mitchell, the Bulloo, or the Balonne, their interests were identical as graziers. That was the chief consideration, and it made not the slightest difference where their wool went for shipment or whither their cattle travelled so long as they reached a market.

Mr. LEAHY: That shows your ignorance.

Mr. TURLEY: Their particular interest was the representation of the pastoral industry in the Parliament of the Commonwealth, and that was the object they had in view. It had been pointed out by the Home Secretary that the reason he had divided the North in the way he had was because in one of the divisions there was the great bulk of the mining industry. He pointed out that it was impossible for him to include the whole of the mining industry in the one electorate; but he had endeavoured, as far as possible, to centre the one interest in the one electorate. Now, the hon. member told them that the interest of a man away out on the border of South Australia was the same as the interest of a man living on the Darling Downs. Had the hon. member ever said that before in discussing any legislation affecting the Western country? They knew that on such occasions the hon. member had pointed out the diversity of interests. If the persons living in the Carnarvon and Dalby electorates felt that they had a grievance because the boundaries had been altered, their representatives should give effect to their views, and the hon. gentleman had interjected, so long as those people were satisfied, why should anyone else interfere. He denied that doctrine altogether. If a small number of people in one portion

of Queensland thought certain things would suit them, though they might be opposed to the best interests of the rest of Queensland, the hon. gentleman said, "Whose business is it, so long as they are satisfied?" That was not the sort of thing that should be tolerated in Queensland politics. It was not a question of whether the people of the Thargomindah district or the person who was supposed to run for that electorate were satisfied with the division or not. The question was one which must be decided by the House, and he did not think they would find any number of people who would be satisfied with a division under which there would be 7,000 persons in one electorate returning a representative, and 14,000 in another also returning only one representative. Did the hon. member mean to say that a person living in the Barcoo, Bulloo, or Balonne was of such superior intelligence that his opinion would be worth twice as much as that of a man living in the Wide Bay district?

Mr. LEAHY: Twice as much as yours on some subjects.

Mr. TURLEY: And possibly twice as much as the hon. member's on other subjects. But if the hon. member, voting for his own interests, as he led them to believe he was—and as the hon. member made the statement himself, he had no right in that House to deny it—

Mr. LEAHY: You know very well that I have denied that twice, and that by the rules of the House you should accept it.

Mr. TURLEY: He had said that the hon. member made a statement.

Mr. LEAHY: And I say I did not.

Mr. TURLEY: Then according to the forms of the House, as the hon. member had said, he must accept the hon. member's denial, but the hon. member certainly said something very much like it, and so like it that it was very hard to take anything else out of it. The contention of the hon. member for Croydon was correct, that the number of people had to be considered, and their object should be to secure that the representative of each division they made should represent as nearly as possible the same number of people. As nearly as possible it had been admitted that the first schedule issued met that, but when the second schedule was issued they found that only 7,000 people in the particular part of the country the hon. member for Bulloo represented were to return one representative, while from 12,000 to 14,000 were required to return a representative in another part of the colony.

Mr. LEAHY: It is the House said it should be so.

Mr. TURLEY: The House had not said it should be so. The first and second schedules issued had been issued on the authority of the Government, and the House had had no say in either of them. What the House had done was simply to leave out the division the hon. member was working so hard to get because the House did not think it just that the vote of a man in one part of the colony should have twice the value of the vote of a man in some other part of it. The question now to be considered was whether the Committee was going to restore the schedule which it had already decided should be left out. What influences might be at work with the hon. member or anyone else he did not know, but he was satisfied that the opinion of the bulk of the people outside was that the different divisions should be as nearly as possible representative of an equal number of electors.

Mr. LEAHY: He did not know that a personal attack upon himself had anything to do with the contents of that clause, but evidently it had, from the remarks which the hon. member had just made.

Mr. TURLEY: You started it.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member had accused him of not keeping his word, and had referred to a certain matter that had cropped up last year. He had only to say, in reply to that, that if the hon. member would look at a certain letter which appeared in the *Worker*, from the then Prime Minister, and the hon. member's leader, Mr. Dawson, he would see that what he had said was absolutely untrue, and that Mr. Dawson said that he (Mr. Leahy) had never said a word to him that he did not keep. That was the reply he had. The hon. member had said a great many other things about him that he need not refer to now. He need only say—and he thought every member of the Committee would agree with him—that a man whose character was known to be fairly good could not be traduced or disparaged by the bad tongue of a third-rate politician. (Opposition laughter.) Most men had done some things they would rather not have done, and amongst the many things he had done the one he was most sorry for was that which had the effect of placing the hon. member on the front benches of that House. He regretted that for the sake of the hon. member himself, for it had given the hon. member a swelled head from which he would never recover. (Laughter.) Politicians would not be always members of the House. He might have to go outside and look for his living again, and the hon. member might have to do the same, and he would not like that an ex-Minister of the Crown should be hanging around the Government offices for a job at 30s. a week. That was one of the things he was sorry for, and no action of his again would ever tend to make the hon. member's head larger than it was at the present time.

Mr. STEWART: The anxiety of certain hon. members on the Government side to maintain the integrity of the Central division, appeared to him very amusing after what had happened in the Chamber during the last few days. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill and others associated with him had told hon. members that they desired nothing better than that the term "Central division," as a geographical expression, should be wiped out, and it had been wiped out. And yet these hon. members were now peculiarly desirous of continuing the integrity of that division when it appeared to suit their own purposes. He was very much amused at the arguments brought forward by the hon. member for Bulloo, because he seemed suddenly possessed with an extraordinary desire to serve the Central division. But in what way did he propose to show kindness to that division? He was so kind as to propose to give the people there less political power than the voters in any other part of the colony, because that would happen if the Chief Secretary carried his amendment. His (Mr. Stewart's) desire was that the people in the Central division should have as much political and voting power, man for man, as the people in any other part of the colony. It had been shown that Capricornia would be the largest electorate in Queensland if the Chief Secretary's amendment was carried. It would have 14,250 electors, whereas in Brisbane there would only be 12,000, and in the Maranoa there would only be 5,000 or 6,000 electors. Nothing showed more clearly than that the contempt hon. members opposite had for the people in the Central division, and he could come to no other conclusion than that they thought that two electors in the Central division were equal to one in the Maranoa. He desired no such stigma placed on the people in the Centre, because they were as intelligent as electors in any other part of the colony. Those were the reasons why he intended to support the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon. The

hon. member for Rockhampton appeared to take an opposite view and he had given his reasons. Probably he wished to perpetuate the Central division, but he (Mr. Stewart) was not going to throw away the substance for the shadow. The Centre should have two members, but instead of that they were only getting one member for over 14,000 people, while another electorate would get one member for 7,000 people. That was not dealing fairly with the Central division. There had been a lot of talk about the community of interest between the Barcoo, Mitchell, and Rockhampton; but there was no such community of interest, except that the wool from the Barcoo and the Mitchell came down the Central Railway and passed along the Fitzroy to the open sea, and supplies went by the same route. If a railway were constructed to the Gulf, all the wool from those two districts, would, he was sure, go to Normanton, or whatever port there might be in the Gulf. They were dealing with something more than mere geographical areas; they were dealing with human beings, voters, and men—and he hoped that women would be included in the term "voters" in the near future. They were not dealing so much with breeding of sheep, or the growing of wool, or the digging of gold—those things were only accessories to human beings. His contention was that as nearly as possible every male adult in the colony should have the same voting power as every other male adult voter in the colony. If they could not carry that out in its entirety they should make some attempt to get as near as possible to that desirable ideal. He intended to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*): The hon. member for Rockhampton North had fairly placed his finger on the weak spot of this proposal during his few remarks. Looking at the map, it appeared that the two electorates referred to really belonged to the Central division; but looking at the matter from a population point of view—and it should be borne in mind that they were not dealing with acres but with electors—it appeared to him most unjust to attempt to incorporate these two electorates in the division of Capricornia. There would be 14,249 electors in Capricornia; but there was another corollary; as he understood it was the intention of the Chief Secretary to endeavour to get Gregory taken from the Maranoa and reinstated in Kennedy—that would reduce the number of electors in that division to 5,484. He maintained that that would be altogether out of proportion to the main ideal that they should have before them; and that was—as mentioned by the hon. member for the Herbert—to have one vote one value as near as they possibly could. He believed that the amendment of the hon. member for Croydon would go as near to that as they could possibly get, and therefore he intended to support it, and vote against the amendment proposed by the Chief Secretary.

Amendment—That the word "Barcoo" be inserted before "Clermont" (the Chief Secretary's amendment) put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 30.

Messrs. Philp, Dickson, Rutledge, Murray, Foxton, O'Connell, Dairymple, Bell, Macdonald-Paterson, Boles, Glassey, Moore, Forsyth, W. Thorn, Keogh, Mackintosh, Hanrair, Bridges, J. C. Cribb, T. B. Cribb, Bartholomew, Tooth, Stodart, Armstrong, Lord, Story, Stephenson, Stephens, Leahy, and J. Hamilton.

NOES, 27.

Messrs. Browne, Hardacre, Dawson, Fisher, Turley, Kerr, Bowman, McDonald, Lesina, Reid, Maxwell, Dibley, Givens, W. Hamilton, Jenkinson, Groom, McDonnell, Fogarty, Fitzgerald, Campbell, Callan, Dunsford, Ryland, Higgs, Jackson, Stewart, and Cowley.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved the insertion of "Mitchell" after the word "Leichhardt."

Mr. BROWNE: Of course he was going to offer his protest against this proposal. The members representing that portion of the country had already entered their protest, but as the Government seemed determined to disfranchise the Central district to a certain extent, he supposed they must do it. He thought that the people of the Central district ought to know that the Government thought so much of them that 14,249 electors there were only as good as 5,000 and some few odd ones in the Maranoa. For what purposes they did that he did not know. It showed the respect the Government and their followers had for the representative of the Central district in the Ministry. He entered his protest against it, but he did not see that it was much use discussing it to any extent.

Mr. CALLAN: The Chief Secretary had carried his proposal to include Barcoo in Capricornia, and he now proposed to also [9 p.m.] include Mitchell. It was no good saying that it was a non-party question, because it was a party question all through; and the result of the Chief Secretary's action would be to give the whole of the Central division to the Labour party.

Mr. FISHER: But we are opposing it.

Mr. CALLAN: He was deeply interested in getting a candidate to stand for the Central division, but there was no use in it now. He had given up night after night to the Government, but he would never again give them a single hour of his time. He considered that the Chief Secretary had sold the whole of his party, either through ignorance or through something else. Those who had borne the brunt of all the recent night work had been thrown over by the hon. gentleman, and he stated emphatically that the course adopted by the Government that evening was one that made him utterly averse to them. The trouble was that there was no one else whom he could support, but at the same time he was not going to put himself out a single bit for the Ministry any more. He entertained the greatest respect for the Premier, but the way the Government had dilly-dallied over the business of the country for the last two or three months was enough to make any man say that he would not support them. The Chief Secretary knew that he was doing wrong. He thought that the hon. member for Croydon was making a mistake from his point of view, although he took advantage of the hon. member's amendment; but the whole of Central Queensland had now been thrown over to the Labour party, and so far as he was concerned, he would not support the Government any more.

Mr. KERR thought the hon. member for Fitzroy had given the whole thing away. He had openly stated that it was a party question.

Mr. STORY: There was no occasion for him to say that. The voting showed that. There was not a single Labour member over here.

Mr. KERR agreed that it was a party question, but it was not regarded as such by members of the Opposition.

Mr. STORY: Ask the hon. member for Flinders.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Fitzroy pointed out that the inclusion of Barcoo and Mitchell in Capricornia made that a safe Labour seat, but at the same time both he and the hon. member for Mitchell had protested against the inclusion of their electorates in the interests of their constituents. There was no doubt that the Government had made Capricornia a safe Labour seat.

Mr. STEPHENSON: You ought to be overjoyed, then.

Mr. KERR: They were not overjoyed. They were not fighting the Bill on party lines—(laughter on the Government side)—but in the interests of the electors who sent them there. He quite sympathised with the hon. member for Fitzroy for the way in which he had been treated by his fellow-members on the other side, and he was very pleased that the action of the Government had made such a secure seat for Labour in Central Queensland.

Mr. FITZGERALD: After the vote that had just been given, he could do nothing more than enter his protest against the inclusion of his electorate in Capricornia. They were creating a division with over 14,000 electors, while just next door to it they proposed to create another with only some 5,000 electors. If the hon. member for Fitzroy wanted to find out the reason for the action of the Government in including Barcoo and Mitchell in Capricornia, he had only to look at the Maranoa division. That was a nice compact little district now, but it might have been made a Labour seat if Barcoo and Mitchell had been included in it, whereas, in its present form, it was a safe seat for some nominee of the Government.

Mr. BOWMAN: He will have to fight for it.

Mr. REID asked the Government what they intended to do with regard to Maranoa? They must see how ridiculous it would be to send down to the Federal Parliament the member for Capricornia representing over 14,000 electors, whilst the member for the adjoining electorate of Maranoa would only represent some 5,000 electors. The Government might give Mitchell and Gregory to Maranoa to make the position a little more equitable. The Government were getting themselves into a ridiculous position.

Mr. McDONALD thought that under the circumstances they ought to have some explanation from the Government. Surely they were not going to have one electorate with 5,000 electors, and another alongside of it with 14,000 electors.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): It appeared to him that the Government were not treating members fairly in refusing to give some adequate explanation in regard to creating two constituencies with such a disproportion of voting power. The Maranoa would send to the Federal Parliament a man who would speak on behalf of 5,000 electors, while the member representing the neighbouring division would be speaking on behalf of 14,000 or 15,000 people. That was a division that would be condemned generally throughout the country. It appeared to him a shameful job. There was no doubt that the Government had striven to satisfy the desires of certain members who had relatives outside intending to run for the Federal Parliament in creating this constituency.

Mr. LEAHY: You have no right to mention anybody.

Mr. LESINA: He did not mention anybody; but if the hon. member liked to fit the cap on he could do so.

Mr. LEAHY: I didn't have a halter on.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member might have a halter on too by and by. Why should one man in the Maranoa have three times the voting power of a man in the Fitzroy? He was satisfied that the Government would have to amend this, and if the question were taken outside party politics he was satisfied that members on the Government side would vote for another distribution of the Fitzroy division.

* Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: Having been absent from the Chamber for a short time before the division was taken, he wished to say that he was informed by a technical man—an hon. member of this House—that in one electorate there would be 11,800

electors, and in the other there would be 13,800. That was not a very great disparity, hence he voted with the Government. So far as the new amendment was concerned, rather than allow such a thing, even temporarily, until after the census was taken, he would vote against the Government proposal. He regretted that this explanation was necessary. He did not care the value of the lead pencil in his hand whether the seats were captured by Labour men, conservatives, or moderate men. What he wanted was that evenhanded justice should be dealt out as nearly as possible having regard to the basis of population and the number of electors.

Mr. LEAHY: It was all very well for hon. members to talk about the disparity between the numbers in different divisions, but who was responsible for that? The Government proposed a measure which would give a fairly even representation to the two districts in question, and hon. members opposite knocked it out. Who then was responsible but those hon. members? Under our present system there was much less representation in proportion to the population in the thickly populated coastal electorates than in such electorates as the Maranoa and others in the interior. That was a well recognised principle. In the Bulloo there were about 500 electors; in the Gregory about 600.

Mr. REID: About 800.

Mr. LEAHY: In the Carpentaria electorate there were about 500. That would be an average of about 550 for the Gregory, Bulloo, and Carpentaria; whereas the average for the whole of the electoral districts in the colony was about 1,500. The hon. member for Carpentaria had shown that the largest number of electors in any division in New South Wales was 16,000, and the smallest about 9,000—a difference of about 7,000, or nearly 2 to 1.

Mr. TURLEY: Here it is 3 to 1.

Mr. LEAHY: But New South Wales was six times as thickly populated as Queensland. Queensland had twice the area of New South Wales, and that colony had twice the population of Queensland, so that New South Wales had six times the density of population that there was in Queensland.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman said that members on that side were responsible for the difficulty that had arisen, when nobody knew better than he did that it was the other side who were responsible. If the hon. gentleman spoke his mind he would blame the Government.

Mr. LEAHY: I would not.

Mr. McDONALD: In proof of that, they had the speech which the hon. gentleman had delivered during the afternoon. The hon. gentleman attempted to show that things were fairly equal, owing to the area of the country and the population. Why, in the case of Flinders, the voters would number 10,488, and in the case of Maranoa, 5,000. There was a portion of the colony of much smaller area than the Flinders, yet with the representation of two to one, so that the hon. gentleman's argument would not hold water. By the original scheme, published by the Government, an attempt was made to classify certain industries, and make the voting power fairly equal. By that scheme there was only the difference in voting power represented by 9,000 and 12,000. Then the Government came down with a schedule which made the difference as between 7,000 and 14,000, and did not attempt in any way to give equal voting power in each electorate. Under those circumstances he thought some explanation from the Government was necessary. The actual figures were 5,484 in the case of the Maranoa and 14,040 in the case of the Flinders. That was too large a discrepancy altogether. Surely if the hon. gentleman was

desirous of making the Bill as perfect as possible he would not contend that that was a fair representation for the Maranoa.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The whole trouble had arisen through disturbing the scheme originally proposed by the Government. When once that was disturbed the whole equilibrium was destroyed. Had they allowed Carnarvon and Dalby to remain in Maranoa and not be tacked on to the Darling Downs, they would have maintained the proper quota for the Maranoa; but, having taken them out, that reduced the number below 7,500, which it was originally proposed should be the lowest number represented by any constituency.

Mr. McDONALD: The original proposal was 9,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The schedule attached to the Bill represented the Maranoa division as including Carnarvon and Dalby, and its number of electors would have been 7,574. Having taken those two electorates out, of course they reduced the number, and proportionately increased Capricornia. Although there might be some discrepancy between the numbers, that was inherent in any electoral system. Go to the mother country and they would find a great preponderance of voters in the towns as against the small quota in the provinces which were equally represented. If hon. members had allowed the schedule to remain as it stood they would have no cause at that stage to make complaint, but once it was altered, then the whole scheme on which it was based fell to the ground.

Mr. FISHER: The explanation of the Chief Secretary regarding the cause of the trouble was certainly not a sufficient one, because he admitted by accepting the scheme of the leader of the Opposition that his own scheme was not good. He accepted it because he saw that the consensus of opinion was in favour of the amendment which was more just to all concerned than the proposal which had been made by the Government. An arrangement had been come to by a unanimous vote of the Committee, and it was the hon. gentleman himself who was disturbing it by moving that Barcoo be added to the new schedule, and he justified that on the plea that he was endeavouring to get back to his original schedule. The Committee distinctly agreed to the schedule moved by the leader of the Opposition, although he recognised the fact that amendments had been made in particular electorates. The Chief Secretary stated that the scheme of the Bill was as nearly as possible

[9:30 p.m.] equitable and proportional with regard to the number of electors in each electorate. That was a misstatement. Whether it was a wilful misstatement made with the view of misleading outside people who did not know the circumstances, he was not in a position to say. The original schedule provided that the Maranoa should have one member for 7,574 electors, while the Wide Bay and Burnett district was to have one for 13,161. If that was the best effort the Government could make to devise a scheme under which one vote one value should obtain, then it was a very bad effort. He had protested against the scheme of the Government, and he protested more strongly against the Chief Secretary trying to mislead the public into believing that the Government scheme was an equitable one, and that it had been disturbed by the leader of the Opposition. The scheme of the leader of the Opposition was a much more equitable one than that of the Government. The greatest disparity in voting power under his scheme was not more than 2,000 votes, while in the other case there was a disparity of over 6,000 between the Wide Bay and Burnett electorate and the Maranoa electorate.

*HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON understood the Chief Secretary to allege that one reason why the Government proposed to incorporate the Barcoo and Mitchell electorates with Capricornia was because they had a community of interests with other parts of what had previously been called Fitzroy, and because the products of those two electorates went through Rockhampton. That was an argument which would not hold good with any of the other electorates in the North-west or in the South-west. A community of interests did not lie in the channel of traffic for wool outwards. The community of interests in the several electorates was labour on one side and the squatters and other employers on the other side. The wool-producer, whether he was a grazing farmer or a Crown lessee, did not care one pin what his port was as long as he got the cheapest port, and he did not want the route to port to interfere with the political equilibrium in an important question like that before the Committee. Part of the outward traffic from Flinders went to Townsville, part to Bourke, and part to Normanton, while the traffic of the lower portion of the electorate, down to Boulia and towards Birdsville, went to South Australia; and the supplies for those districts were received from the same ports. The Maranoa sent part of its products to and received supplies from South Australia and New South Wales. There was not a great deal of it went to Cunnamulla or Charleville. The community of interests argument was shattered to atoms as applied to the incorporation of Barcoo and Mitchell with Fitzroy, and he thought the ultimate duty of the Minister would be to recommit the Bill. He wished it to appear in *Hansard* that on the misrepresentation of a member of the House he made a mistake in the previous division, and he sincerely hoped that Maranoa would be augmented—he did not care whether it was partly from the south, partly from the north, or partly from the east. What they had to consider was the interests of producers, irrespective of where they sent their products, and to have regard to the number of human beings and the number of electors in each electorate. One hon. member had said that it had been the rule to give a greater representation to outside districts. The principal argument in favour of that was that those districts were wealthy, that they contained millions of sheep and cattle, and that property should be represented. But those millions of sheep and cattle had disappeared, and property could not be represented in the present instance, because it was not there. With regard to the argument that that was only a tentative measure, and that when the census was taken they would have a Redistribution Bill, he considered they would be setting a bad example now by giving 6,000 or 7,000 electors to one electorate, and from 12,500 to 15,000 to another; and he would set his face against any such proposal. He did not believe in following the example of New South Wales or Victoria in this matter. He could not get away from the idea that there should be, as nearly as possible, parity of population between all the different electorates.

The PREMIER: They had already decided that Barcoo should belong to Capricornia, and the question now was what should be done with Gregory. He would suggest that it be put into Maranoa.

Mr. BROWNE said he would pass that question by for the present. He was not going to allow the Chief Secretary to throw the onus upon him of disturbing any arrangement. They had had two different propositions put forth by the Government—one last August, and the other in the present Bill. This afternoon he moved the omission of the latter one, and the

Committee unanimously agreed to do so. Therefore the proposition now before the Committee was the acceptance of the Government's original schedule, and it was the Chief Secretary who was wasting time by introducing amendments to disturb the arrangement to which the Committee had agreed. One of the hon. gentleman's arguments in favour of his amendment the hon. member for Brisbane North had partly dealt with. The hon. gentleman said there was no question of community of interests; they must take into consideration the channels through which trade passed. If that were so, he would ask the Premier, who represented Townsville, how it was that Charters Towers, which was only 82 miles from Townsville, and with which it was connected by rail, was included in the Flinders electorate, the natural outlet of which was Normanton, 400 miles away, and with which there was no direct communication. Then with regard to Port Curtis, there was no channel of trade between Port Curtis and Rockhampton. They were rival ports right opposite one another. Such an argument could only be described as absurd. The hon. gentleman was going to stick to his programme. Well, let them see if the hon. gentleman was game to omit Port Curtis from the Central division, and if he did not, what became of his argument about the channels of trade? In the case of Barcoo the principal towns were not on the railway as the Premier had said.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Barcaldine, the largest town on it, is on the railway.

Mr. BROWNE: Were Tambo, Blackall, Isisford, and Jundah on the railway line?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Their trade all comes in to the Central line.

Mr. BROWNE: It did not; but admitting that it did, were the Government on that argument prepared to accept the proposal of the hon. member for Cairns, and put Charters Towers and Townsville in the one electorate? They had made a big mistake in including Barcoo in the Central district, and the Premier said that Mitchell being north of Barcoo, it would be absurd to propose that it should be included in the South; but he went on to say that it was quite a sensible proposal to put Gregory, that was north again of Mitchell, into the South.

Mr. LEAHY: Gregory is south of Mitchell, too.

Mr. BROWNE: The biggest part of it was north of the Mitchell, and had not the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government made it a part of the north when he diverted the line from Hughenden to Winton? And now he proposed to go right round outside Mitchell and Barcoo and join the Gregory on to the South, though he had previously claimed that it did not belong even to the Centre. The original schedule proposed by the Government was a sensible arrangement, and every amendment moved upon it by the Chief Secretary only made matters worse.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was due to himself to emphatically repudiate the statements made by the leader of the Opposition, and by the hon. member for Gympie, who had preceded him. The arrangement which had been made this afternoon was this: The schedule, as printed in the Bill, was before the Committee, and the hon. member for Croydon had moved the original schedule upon it as an amendment, with the result that a discussion was taking place on the two schedules at the same time, and the Committee was becoming thoroughly confused with the two schedules before hon. members, and no blank created. If no blank had been created, the schedule as printed would have remained, and there would have been no opportunity of amending it. It was with a view of allowing hon. members to deal with amendments upon the schedule proposed by the hon. member for

Croydon, that he had agreed to allow the omission of the schedule of the Bill to go on the voices. But he had not thereby indicated his acceptance of the schedule the hon. member proposed in its entirety. He distinctly claimed the privilege of moving amendments upon that schedule, with a view of bringing it as nearly as possible into line with the schedule as appearing in the Bill. He thought under the circumstances it was very ungenerous that it should now be represented that the Committee had accepted the hon. member's schedule *in toto*, and that he had been a party to its acceptance in that way. If he had maintained the schedule as printed in the Bill, they would probably be till now discussing the question as to whether the blank should be created. Possibly when a division occurred no blank would have been created, and all the amendments since moved and that had been proposed, would have had no effect. By the course adopted they had made a useful amendment in including Carnarvon and Dalby in Darling Downs, and that would have been wholly lost. It was not right to say that the Committee or himself had accepted the hon. member's amendment without the opportunity for further consideration, when what he had done had been simply to withdraw the original schedule of the Bill, with a view to enable the Committee to consider the hon. member's schedule upon its merits.

Mr. BROWNE: He did not contend that the hon. gentleman was taking any unfair advantage at all in moving amendments he had a perfect right to move, but he objected to the hon. gentleman saying that it was he who was interfering in introducing amendments when he had done nothing of the sort. He had not moved a single amendment of the schedule as he had first submitted it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I never said so.

Mr. HIGGS: That trouble would never have arisen had the Government adhered to their original proposal. After what had been said, there was no doubt that the original scheme had been arrived at after weeks of deliberation, and what had made the hon. gentleman alter his scheme? Who had waited on the hon. gentleman and asked him to make the alteration?

Mr. STEWART: Who commanded him?

Mr. HIGGS: Who commanded him? Was there any member of the Committee a follower of the Government who had ordered that that should be done? He had never seen such an exhibition of weakness and hesitancy as had been exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. members on his side had been charged with not following their leader, but they did give something like allegiance. They had one leader, but hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to have four or five. They had reason to complain of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, who said, "This is our second scheme, but we are in the hands of the Committee." How could they say they were in the hands of the Committee when the hon. gentleman representing the chief constituency of the colony complained that he had been deliberately misled by a tactical manager on the other side? He felt satisfied that the

[10 p. m.] time had arrived when they should surrender the reins of government to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HIGGS: No doubt he was slightly out of order; but the incapacity on the part of the Government had prompted that remark. The best thing the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill could do would be to intimate to the Committee that he would ask that the Bill be recommitted, and then put Barcoo in the Maranoa. It would be necessary, in order to prevent a great anomaly, to put Mitchell in

with the Gregory. Mitchell would then join with the Maranoa, and that would mean that candidates would have to travel over a great deal of country, but, as they would have to do that whether they liked it or not, 1,000 miles or so would be neither here nor there. He hoped the hon. gentleman would not feel piqued because the first suggestion of the Government had found favour with hon. members of the Opposition. He should feel only too glad to see that the result of the first deliberations of the Government had given great satisfaction to the general public and to the Press—he should be quite charmed that the *Courier* had been gratified with his first proposition.

Mr. REID felt very strongly on the question. The ridiculous position the Committee were placed in was owing to mismanagement on the part of the Chief Secretary, and he seemed to be unable to get out of the difficulty. He could not see why the hon. gentleman could not accept the suggestion with regard to the Mitchell. There were only really three principal towns in the Mitchell, and that country was easy to travel over; besides, there was a coach travelling in that district three times a week. Everything was in favour of putting the Mitchell and the Gregory in this division to equalise matters. By taking Port Curtis out of Wide Bay and putting it into Fitzroy, and by taking Mitchell out of Gregory and putting it into the Maranoa, the difficulty could be got over. He could not understand the indifference of hon. members opposite on the question, for if they passed the schedule as it stood, the public would think they were drunk or mad. He thought the Government should reconsider the matter.

Mr. McDONALD: If the hon. gentleman wished to get on with business, he should assure the Committee that the Bill would be re-committed, and then the Barcoo and the Mitchell could be put in the Maranoa. That would be an easy way out of the difficulty. The hon. gentleman must admit that a mistake had been made, and when the Committee found that such a mistake had been made, it was the bounden duty of hon. members to try and put matters straight as soon as possible. It appeared to him that the hon. gentleman thought there was no way out of the difficulty. He hoped the Chief Secretary would accept the suggestion. He would make another suggestion, seeing the tangle the Committee had got into—

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no tangle.

Mr. McDONALD: Did the hon. gentleman really mean to say that it was a fair and equitable distribution of have 6,200 in one electorate and over 14,000 in another? There would be a difference of about 8,000 between the Maranoa and the highest number in any electorate in the colony. That was too great a difference. He suggested that they should adjourn, so that the Government could reconsider the matter and then come down with some more equitable arrangement.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He had been waiting for an opportunity to make some suggestions, not exactly on the lines of the last speaker, but founded upon what had fallen from the lips of the Chief Secretary and the Premier, that they were prepared to put the Gregory in with the Maranoa. The Premier had also observed that at the present time it was almost impracticable and unwise to try to put the Mitchell in the Maranoa, seeing that the Barcoo intervened geographically between the Maranoa and the Mitchell. If hon. members had understood the relative positions of the electorates in the list, the last division would not have been as it was. He was prepared to accept the suggestion of the Premier that the Gregory

should be added to the Maranoa, subject to the Bill being re-committed, and Barcoo was also added. Then they would have the Mitchell discussed on its merits. He thought that the Bill should be re-committed, and the Barcoo included in the Maranoa, on the understanding that the Gregory should immediately pass into that electorate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Premier had already intimated that the Gregory would be added to the Maranoa. The leader of the Opposition had introduced the Gregory into his amended schedule as being part of the Maranoa. Therefore, the hon. gentleman's desire concerning the Gregory would be gratified. He could not, however, hold out any expectation of the Bill being re-committed. The Government had very carefully considered the matter, and determined that these two electorates were part and parcel of the Central districts, and in that light they intended to continue to regard them.

Mr. McDONALD: Under the circumstances he certainly thought that the speech of the hon. gentleman was not in the interests of federation nor in the interests of the representation of this colony in the Federal Parliament. When the hon. gentleman started to brush aside the large differences in the numbers in the different electorates, he was not very sincere in his advocacy of this colony being fairly represented in the Federal Parliament. He contended that the first time that the electorates were mapped out the division of population was fairer than any way in which it had been mapped out since. What was the cause of the alteration of the whole scheme? There was some great secret behind the Government in doing it or the Government would never have allowed themselves to be led into making the change. They had said that they would now endeavour to equalise the disproportion a little, but what was the object of not including the Barcoo?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have already decided it.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman knew that the Bill could be re-committed, and that, as a matter of fact, not a line in the Bill was decided until the third reading had been passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You have your remedy at that time if you want it?

Mr. McDONALD: It was no use the hon. gentleman talking in that way. If he thought that, he would not take up the peculiar—the extraordinary position that he had assumed. He had actually allowed his own schedule to be wiped out, and the schedule of the leader of the Opposition put in its place; and he was in the humiliating position of having to move amendments in someone else's schedule. That was the position in which he ought to have forced the leader of the Opposition. What he (Mr. McDonald) wanted to know was why the hon. gentleman had allowed the matter to get into this awkward position? Taking the figures as they stood, the position was simply ridiculous. Supposing their ordinary State electorates were in such a position—

Mr. STORRY: So they are. Compare Bulloo with Oxley.

Mr. McDONALD: How many electors had Oxley got?

Mr. STORRY: Four times as many as Bulloo, at any rate. We cannot help that.

Mr. McDONALD: They could help it in connection with that Bill. He believed that if there was a more equal distribution of the number of electors they would have far better representation. The two members for Mackay represented about 2,000 electors, while the two members for Charters Towers represented about 4,000 electors. Those two hon. members represented as many as half-a-dozen members on the Government side.

At the general election the two sides polled about the same number of votes, and yet the other side had fourteen or fifteen more members. Even if the Gregory was included in the Maranoa, the number of electors in that division would be very small, and the Chief Secretary ought to re-commit the Bill for the purpose of making the number of electors in the different divisions more equal.

Mr. STORY: In order to make equal electoral districts, the hon. member for Flinders would have to take some of those who lived in the densely populated coast districts and put them into Western districts; but that would be the most absurd jumble possible. Although there were a great many more electors in some of the present electoral districts than in others, they secured better representation than they would by dividing the total number of electors by seventy-two. It might happen that there were really larger interests in a sparsely populated district than in a thickly populated district. He did not object to the inclusion of the Gregory in Maranoa so much, although they had little in common.

Mr. REID: The Gregory has the same industry as the Maranoa.

Mr. STORY: If he had had anything to do with the matter he would have suggested that the colony should have been divided from West to East right across the colony, because then there would have been an identity of interest in the various divisions, and the people would all know the conditions under which the others lived; but the proportion that was made by hon. members on the other side would lead to putting in the same division people who knew nothing of each other, and there would be a scramble for the seat among a lot of strangers. He was perfectly sure that, if they attempted to form electorates on the basis of an equal number of electors, they would have worse representation than they had now.

Mr. McDONALD: He did not think it would be a good thing under the circumstances to put the Gregory in with the Maranoa.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is Mitchell that is now under consideration.

Mr. McDONALD: Without Gregory, Maranoa would have something over 5,000 electors, whilst, including Mitchell and Gregory, it would have 8,053 electors, and that would make a fair electorate. He could not see what objection the Chief Secretary had to that, but he, for one, would object to Gregory being put into Maranoa unless Mitchell was also included.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: I will object, too.

Mr. McDONALD: After leaving Winton, the next place that they would come to would be Cunnamulla, if Mitchell was not included. If the Mitchell was put in anyone [10:30 p.m.] could go from Winton to Muttaborra and Aramac and on to Longreach; and if the Barcoo had been included in the Maranoa division, as originally intended, he could go down to Blackall and Tambo as well without going into another electorate. The Gregory had always been recognised as being in the Central district, and he did not see why it should not be left in the Central district. They were there to get the best representation possible.

Mr. BOLES (*Port Curtis*): The arguments used by hon. members in regard to equalising the number of electors as much as possible would apply very well if they were dealing with elections for the State Parliament; but it must be remembered that the members going into the Federal Parliament would represent Queensland as a whole; and he did not think it mattered very much whether one man represented a few thousands more than another so long as there

was community of interests in the electorates comprised in the division he represented. There was no affinity of interest between the Mitchell and the Warrego, except that both were pastoral districts; but the Mitchell and Barcoo both belonged properly to the Central district. There were many other things to be considered besides population in connection with representation.

Mr. FISHER: It was all very well for the hon. member to talk about men going from Queensland to the Federal Parliament to represent Queensland as a whole, but it must be admitted that most of the important questions to be considered in the Federal Parliament would be decided on party lines, and in electing the members of the Federal Parliament, those who believed in one fiscal policy, for instance, would vote for the candidate advocating that policy, while electors believing in a different policy would vote for a different candidate. The hon. member seemed to think it did not matter much if there were 5,000 electors in one division and 15,000 electors in another division; but the 15,000 might be in favour of one side on a fiscal question and the 5,000 might take the opposite side, and the 15,000 would have no more power in the Federal Parliament than the 5,000. If the hon. member applied his argument to the Senate there would be some reason in it, because the senators were supposed to be elected to represent the interests of the State as a whole; but there was no doubt that a member of the House of Representatives would consider he was representing the electors of his district best by voting with the party whose policy he considered best in the interests of Australia as a whole. For that reason it was laid down that representation should, as near as possible, be on a population basis. He trusted as liberal a view of the question as possible would be taken, so that there might be as few inequalities in the representation as could be arranged for.

Mr. GLASSEY: He had given his vote on the last occasion for the addition of Barcoo to the Central district, and he would give it again for Mitchell being added, because he thought the addition of Mitchell and Barcoo would make the electorate more compact than it would be without them. No doubt they should provide as many facilities as possible for candidates reaching the electors by making the districts compact, and in that instance there would be special facilities with 400 miles of railway running through the district. That would enable candidates to come in touch with the electors in most parts of the district. A considerable amount of heat had been shown over the disparity in the number of electors in one district and in another, and whenever they could equalise such matters it was no doubt their duty to do so, but the inequalities which existed were as nothing when compared with the inequalities which existed in the case of the Parliament of which they were all at present members. What were the facts as far as that House was concerned? The Toowong electorate had 2,363 voters, Toombul had 2,104, while Murilla had 745. Woolloorgabba had 2,209 electors, while Burke had 578. These three electorates together had 6,676 electors, while Murilla, Bulloo, Burke, Gregory, Carpentaria, and Normanby had only 3,971 electors. Yet hon. members had got terribly excited because there was going to be some disparity between the number of electors in one federal electorate and another, though they were prepared calmly and quietly year after year to allow the present state of affairs to exist in the local Parliament. It was only on such occasions as the present when their enthusiasm broke out, and they were prepared to insist that each electorate should contain an

absolutely equal number of electors. He admitted that the population in the various federal electorates should be equalised as far as possible, and perhaps the schedule which first appeared was the best under all the circumstances, but, inasmuch as that had been disturbed, surely hon. members ought to be content to have the districts carved out in as moderate size as possible, and with such equality of electors as was possible under the circumstances. Hon. members should recognise the facts of the case, which were that this colony, with its immense territory and sparse population, could not be carved into a number of districts which would have absolutely similar number of electors.

Mr. FISHER: It was very nice for the hon. member for Bundaberg to lecture younger members of the House on their want of warmth in not attacking the system of representation which now prevailed in the colony, but the hon. member must know that they were not all constituted alike, and could not always get warm and heated on a subject which was not before the House. The hon. member had discovered that worse anomalies existed in our present system of representation than would be established under that schedule, and as a reformer he was prepared to continue such anomalies in federal representation. As to the argument of the hon. member that if Barcoo and Mitchell were added to Fitzroy it would be more convenient for candidates to get round the district, that was a very poor argument to come from an hon. member of the capacity of the hon. member for Bundaberg. They were not legislating for the convenience of candidates, but for the convenience of the electors, and for the convenience and welfare of the colony, even though candidates should be put to great inconvenience. Such an argument was unworthy of the hon. member.

At four minutes to 11 o'clock,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under Standing Order 171, I call upon Mr. Stephens, the hon. member for Brisbane South, to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. STEPHENS took the chair accordingly.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that one of his reasons for approving of Barcoo and Mitchell being attached to the Central division was that it would afford candidates greater facilities for getting around the electorate. Well, it was proposed to attach the Gregory to Maranoa. If that was done, a candidate who wanted to go from Winton to Charleville, would have to traverse two intervening electorates? Was there ever such a ridiculous proposition made as that? They had got into a bungle, and their great mistake was in not accepting the amendment of the leader of the Opposition *in globo*. As the member for the Gregory, he would have supported the Gregory being attached to Barcoo, Mitchell, and what was formerly called Warrego, because they had community of interests, but he would enter his protest against it being attached to Maranoa.

Mr. REID: The Government had got them into a mess by deciding to leave Maranoa with a little over 5,000 electors, while the adjoining electorate had 14,000, and the Wide Bay electorate 13,000, and they did not seem to have the sense to get out of the mess. What members on that side were anxious to see was a fair and equitable distribution of representation according to the interests and numbers of the people. With reference to the airy way in which the hon. member for Bundaberg had lectured members of the House, he might say that the hon. member handled that question in the same way as he usually handled figures. The hon. member had sought to show that there

was a disparity in the number of voters in several electorates as represented in that House. The hon. member wanted Gregory to be included in the Central division, because it

[11 p.m.] would make it more compact. They were there to do justice to the industries and the people of the colony, and from that point of view it did not matter whether an electorate was complete and compact or not. Not very long ago, under similar circumstances, the hon. member for Bundaberg would have been thundering against the Government for bungling. Now he got up almost every night to defend, and to say how intelligent and good and wise they were. The best thing the hon. member could do would be to go over to the other side altogether.

Mr. GLASSY: The hon. member for Bundaberg will accept no dictation from the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. REID: The Government were so well aware of the hon. member's failing that he did not suppose they would take him as a present. Even the hon. member must admit that they had got into a bungle, and the trouble was how to get out of it. If that was all Parliament could do, the sooner it was sent about its business the better. But the Government persisted in ignoring the bungle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The bungle exists only in the hon. member's imagination.

Mr. REID: Was it not a bungle to create one electorate with only some 5,000 or 6,000 electors, while the adjoining electorate would have over 14,000, Wide Bay 13,000, Brisbane 12,000 and so on? He was sorry the Government could not or would not see their way to get out of it. As a member of the Committee he would be ashamed to let that go forth as their handiwork when they had not heard a single intelligent reason to support it. He urged the Chief Secretary to adjourn the debate and take the night to think over their position, and when they came back the Bill could be recommitted and they could put the Barcoo and the Gregory into the Maranoa and the Mitchell into the Fitzroy.

Mr. HARDACRE agreed with the hon. member for Enoggera that the Committee should adjourn. He had been at first in favour of the Barcoo and Mitchell being in Capricornia, until he found that that would leave the Maranoa with so small a number of electors that it would not be fair. The Chief Secretary admitted that he had got the Committee into a bungle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; I do not.

Mr. HARDACRE: The hon. gentleman did admit it until he found it convenient not to admit it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I never admitted it.

Mr. HARDACRE: The hon. gentleman had admitted that the Committee had got into a bungle when he was speaking of the disturbance of his own proposal by members on the Opposition side. It was a tangle—a grotesque farce—to have one small electorate like the Maranoa with about 5,000 electors, and a large electorate like Capricornia with 13,000 or 14,000 electors, and another very large electorate like the Flinders with about 10,000 electors. The biggest portion of the Barcoo electorate was not in the Central district.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that the Barcoo has already been dealt with.

Mr. HARDACRE: Exactly, but he was speaking of the tangle they had got into, and he thought they should adjourn the debate. There was more reason for the Mitchell going into the Central district than the Barcoo, but it was clearly ridiculous to put the Barcoo into the Central district and the Mitchell into the

Maranoa. The Chief Secretary admitted that the initial mistake had been to put the Barcoo into Capricornia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY : No.

Mr. HARDACRE : It was a mistake, and the onus of the results caused by the disturbance of the hon. gentleman's arrangements was not with members on his side, but with members opposite, who insisted upon carrying out the ridiculous results of the disturbance. He intended to move that the Chairman leave the chair, and let the full breath of common sense blow on the circumstances, and they could come back to-morrow prepared to deal with the difficulty. The Barcoo was not altogether in touch with the Central district.

The CHAIRMAN : I have already pointed out that the Barcoo has been dealt with.

Mr. HARDACRE : He knew that ; but it bore on the question of including the Mitchell, and, the Committee having made a mistake, it was no use hon. members being stubborn, and carrying it further to a ridiculous conclusion. The Bill should be recommitted, and if the Barcoo were put into Maranoa then there would be a community of interest between those electorates. Then if they threw Mitchell into Capricornia, and Gregory into Flinders, as proposed by the Chief Secretary, that would be a rational boundary geographically and as to population and community of interests. A big portion of the Barcoo trade went southwards, and there was just as great a feeling of antagonism in the Barcoo to Rockhampton as the North felt towards Brisbane. It appeared to him that the Government were going on the American gerrymandering principle in carrying out these divisions.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : I trust the hon. member will confine his remarks to the question before the Committee. The question regarding the Barcoo has been settled.

Mr. HARDACRE : This was a question concerning the boundaries of Central electorates, and he moved that the Chairman leave the chair, and report progress, with the view of recommitting the Bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : Do I understand that the motion of the hon. member is that the Chairman leave the chair and that the Bill be recommitted ?

Mr. HARDACRE : Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : The hon. member cannot move that motion. It will be out of order, because no Bill can be recommitted until it is finished in committee.

Mr. HARDACRE : His motion was that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, but what his reasons were for so moving were his own concern. He thought the Government should consider the whole of circumstances which had led to the disturbance of the Chief Secretary's arrangements, and an adjournment would give them a chance to reconsider the whole position. The hon. gentleman could come back to-morrow with fresh and more equitable proposals, and he (Mr. Hardacre) would then bow to the wish of the majority of the Committee. He did not think the matter should be rushed through now.

Mr. GLASSEY : When he spoke previously, he did not attempt to defend the anomalies that existed ; therefore, the statement made by the hon. member for Enoggera did not apply to him. He had said that he thought the present arrangement was the best that could be made.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : Did I understand the hon. member for Leichhardt to move that I do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again ?

Mr. HARDACRE : I moved that motion.

Mr. GLASSEY : In connection with the disparity that would exist under the present arrangement, there was an element that had not been touched upon, and which was of some moment.

Mr. REID : Is the hon. member in order ?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : I cannot tell what the hon. member's argument will be. The question is that I do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The hon. member for Bundaberg must confine his remarks to that motion.

Mr. GLASSEY : He was giving some reasons why the Chairman should not leave the chair—why the debate should be continued, and the matter settled before the House rose. There was certainly a great disparity between some of the electorates, but he would point out that Maranoa was a settled district, and there were a larger number of women and children who would be represented by the electors there than would be represented in pastoral districts. If they took 1,000 voters in the pastoral districts they would not represent, by a long way, as many persons as 1,000 in the Maranoa would, and he desired to see the electorates so arranged as to give an equality of voting power as far as possible. All through he had treated federation as a non-

party question, and he objected to [11:30 p.m.] it being said that, because his views on any matter happened to agree with those of the Government, he should take his seat on the other side. He was independent of the Government, as he was of any other party. With regard to the settlement of this great question, it was their bounden duty to get the best elect-rates carved out that they could, and to secure as equal terms as possible. Members had to devise the best means of accomplishing that object, and they had to consider how they could increase the number of the electors of the Maranoa electorate, and at the same time make it accessible and convenient.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN : I think the hon. member is talking upon the main question. The question is that I leave the chair.

Mr. GLASSEY : He thought that they should settle this question without the Chairman leaving the chair. Let them settle with regard to the Mitchell, and it was possible that they might come to some other arrangement with regard to other electorates being added to the Maranoa. He would be willing to render whatever assistance he could to achieve that object. In the meanwhile he trusted the hon. member would not press his motion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY : He thought the hon. gentleman could hardly expect them to adjourn, after having devoted so much time to the consideration of the schedule, without concluding it. To his mind, they had not got into such an inextricable tangle that they could not pursue the matter to a legitimate conclusion. He would point out that, when the Bill reached the report stage, it was competent for any hon. member to introduce any question affecting the electorates, and if the hon. member availed himself of that opportunity—though he did not promise his support—it would be quite within his province to raise a point as to the electorates which should form the Maranoa electorate. Having that opportunity, he thought the hon. member might allow them to conclude the Bill, and to-morrow, when the report stage was reached, he could propose what he thought desirable.

Mr. HARDACRE : He did not want to insist upon the motion. There was no doubt, as the Chief Secretary had pointed out, that they could rectify the matter at the report stage, but he would like to remark that not only had they to discuss this electorate, but the anomalies which

existed with regard to other electorates. The Charters Towers question would be sure to arise, and the disturbance which had been made in the schedule by this amendment would have to be considered.

The PREMIER: Only the Maranoa is affected by this alteration.

Mr. HARDACRE: He thought it would be wise to reconsider the whole position in view of the results, which had occurred from the alteration which had been made. With the leave of the Committee he would withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Question—That the word "Mitchell" be inserted after "Leichhardt"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Messrs. Philp, Rutledge, Dickson, Foxton, O'Connell, Murray, Dalrymple, Glassey, Keogh, Boles, Mackintosh, W. Thorn, Story, Bartholomew, Stodart, Bridges, Leahy, Forsyth, Armstrong, Moore, Petrie, Hanran, Grimes, J. Hamilton, and Tooth.

NOES, 18.

Messrs. Dawson, Fisher, Browne, Turley, Maxwell, Bowman, Kerr, Reid, Hardacre, Jenkinson, Fitzgerald, Ryland, Lesina, Stewart, Higgs, Givens, W. Hamilton, and McDonald.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Messrs. T. B. Cribb, Newell, Lord, Stephenson, and J. C. Cribb.

Noes—Messrs. Jackson, Kidston, Dunsford, Groom, and Fogarty.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved the omission of the word "Barcoo" in the Maranoa division, and he would follow that up by moving the omission of "Mitchell." That was consequential on the action just taken by the Committee.

Mr. GIVENS said that he had an amendment to move earlier than that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You have not given notice of it.

Mr. GIVENS: He could not have given notice, as he did not know that another schedule would be adopted. He wished to move an amendment in order to make a readjustment in the Herbert division.

Mr. JENKINSON: The hon. member for Gympie has an amendment before that.

Mr. GIVENS: He was quite willing to make way for anyone who had an amendment prior to his, but it was unfair of the Chief Secretary to try and rush through the Bill.

Mr. RYLAND: He had an amendment to move which had been printed to omit the word "Kennedy" with the view of inserting the word "Gulf." It was advisable that the federal electorates should not have the same names as State electorates. Everyone would know where the Gulf division was located.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What meaning would "Gulf" have in Melbourne?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Chief Secretary has moved an amendment, and until that has been withdrawn, the hon. member cannot discuss another amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY was prepared to give way, although he really thought the hon. member was taking up time unnecessarily.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RYLAND moved the omission of "Kennedy" with the view of inserting "Gulf."

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. RYLAND moved the omission of the word "Herbert" with the view of inserting "Barrier." He thought that would be a better name. The

division was parallel to the Barrier Reef, and the name was to a certain extent suggestive of locality. It was undesirable that the names of federal electorates should be the same as those of State electorates.

Mr. GIVENS suggested that the name "Bartle Frere" would be better than "Barrier." It was the name of the highest mountain in the division, which was also the highest in Queensland.

Mr. HARDACRE thought the name "Barrier" was a good one, because it was suggestive of the locality.

The HOME SECRETARY: It might be called "Torres."

Mr. HARDACRE: Either Torres or Barrier would be better than Herbert, which was suggestive of nothing at all.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: If it were asked how the name Herbert got there, he would say it was in consequence of that being the name of the first Premier of Queensland. He thought "Coralia" would be a very pretty and suitable name. There was also Cape York in that division, and the name "York" might be given to the division in honour of the Duke of York.

Mr. MAXWELL objected to this barracking over words. As far as a name for any Gulf electorate was concerned, he would rather call it "Blanket Flat" than be splitting hairs over a word.

Mr. RYLAND: If the word "Herbert" was omitted, he would prefer to insert [12 p.m.] the name suggested by the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Macdonald-Paterson, instead of inserting "Barrier."

Question—That the word "Herbert," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the amendment—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 26.

Messrs. Philp, Foxton, Rutledge, Dickson, O'Connell, Dalrymple, Murray, Grimes, Armstrong, Leahy, Petrie, Hanran, Moore, J. Hamilton, Bridges, Stodart, Tooth, Bartholomew, Mackintosh, Boles, Story, Campbell, Forsyth, Browne, Keogh, and W. Thorn.

NOES, 15.

Messrs. Hardacre, Fisher, Macdonald-Paterson, Reid, Bowman, Kerr, McDonald, W. Hamilton, Lesina, Stewart, Jenkinson, Fitzgerald, Ryland, Higgs, and Dawson.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Messrs. T. B. Cribb, Newell, Lord, Stephenson, and J. C. Cribb.

Noes—Messrs. Jackson, Kidston, Dunsford, Groom, and Fogarty.

Resolved in the affirmative.

At five minutes past 12,

Mr. GRIMES took the chair.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, had moved an amendment which had the effect of precluding him from moving one which he was very desirous of moving. He objected altogether to the electorate of Herbert as at present devised. He saw no community of interest whatever between the various places which had been grouped together. Herbert was a coastal electorate, but hon. members knew that there was the keenest rivalry between the various coastal towns. If the arguments used in favour of including Barcoo and Mitchell in Capricornia were good, they were equally good for including Charters Towers and the Kennedy in the electorate which comprised Townsville. Townsville would be nothing without the back country trade which it got from the Western electorates. He believed that if it had not been for partisan reasons the Government would have made a better selection of electorates for that division. The people of Cairns and Woothakata had no

community of interests with Bowen or Townsville. Cooktown, Port Douglas, and Cairns, which were rival ports to Townsville, would much prefer to be in an electorate by themselves; and he was perfectly satisfied that the people of Townsville were not pleased at being shut off from the Western districts with which they had their chief trade.

Mr. BRIDGES: With the view of preventing any clashing between the present Moreton electorate and the one mentioned in the schedule, he moved that the word "West" be inserted before "Moreton."

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. RYLAND moved that the word "Oxley" be omitted, with the view of inserting "Nerang."

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON was sure that if the hon. member who proposed that amendment understood that Oxley was one of the greatest explorers and early pioneers of Southern Queensland, long before the colony was separated from New South Wales, he would be extremely glad to maintain the word "Oxley." Oxley was a name to conjure with, but Nerang meant "very little."

Amendment put and negatived.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved, as a consequential amendment, that the word "Barcoo" in the Maranoa division be omitted.

Mr. BROWNE objected to that amendment as he had done to all other amendments proposed in the original schedule, because he held that they should adhere to the original proposition of the Government.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. W. HAMILTON objected to the way in which the Gregory had been put into the Maranoa, as it was very unfair to the electors about Winton, Kynuna, and other places in the Gregory electorate that they should have to go through two intervening electorates in order to get into Maranoa.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that the word "Mitchell" in the Maranoa division be omitted.

Amendment put and passed.

Question—That the proposed amendment, as amended, stand part of the schedule—put and passed.

Question—That the schedule, as amended, stand part of the Bill—put.

Mr. BROWNE said the way the electorates had been manipulated reminded him of the first pair of pants he made when a lad on board a man-of-war. The legs were where the seat ought to have been, and everything was topsy-turvy from top to bottom.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said the Government were not at all ashamed of the form in which the Bill had passed through the House, and he was certainly of opinion that the amendments which had been introduced were improvements.

Question put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

The consideration of the report was made an Order for a later hour of the day.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn. To-morrow, after consideration of the report on the Commonwealth Bill, we will take the Railways Act Amendment Bill, and after that the Pastoral Leases Bill in committee.

Mr. BROWNE: I should like to ask whether there is any chance of the Electoral Reform Bill coming on this session. I notice it is very nearly at the bottom of the business-paper.

The PREMIER: I certainly hope to pass it this session, but I would remind the hon. member that we are getting on very slowly with work. I had hoped that to-night, in addition to what we have done, we should have advanced one or two other Bills a further stage.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at half-past 12 o'clock.