

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 1901

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 20 NOVEMBER, 1901.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 3.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I this day presented to the Lieutenant-Governor the Appropriation Bill No. 3, and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe assent thereto in the name and on behalf of His Majesty.

The SPEAKER further announced the receipt of a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, intimating his assent to the said Bill.

DEATH OF THE EMPRESS DOWAGER OF GERMANY.

MESSAGE FROM THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following message from his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor:—

In reply to the Address, dated 13th August, from the Legislative Assembly, presenting, for transmission to the King and to the Emperor of Germany, a resolution of the Assembly expressing sympathy with their Majesties the King and Queen and the Royal Family and with their Imperial Majesties the German Emperor and Empress on the death of the Empress Frederick, the Lieutenant-Governor acquaints the Legislative Assembly that the resolution has been laid before His Majesty, and that he has received His Majesty's commands to convey to the Legislative Assembly his grateful thanks for their kind and sympathetic messages.

Government House,
Brisbane, 20th November, 1901.

SPECIAL SALES OF LAND BILL.

ASSENT.

A message was received from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, intimating that he had assented to this Bill.

QUESTIONS.

INTRODUCTION OF BESSARABIANS.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*) asked the Premier—

1. Has he seen the statement in last Saturday's *Courier* that a report received from the British Consul at Odessa throws considerable doubt on the accuracy of some of the statements made by Mr. Klein, agent for Bessarabians?
2. Has he received any communication from the Agent-General casting any doubt on the *bona fides* of Mr. Klein?
3. Did the Government pay the passages of Mr. Klein and two other agents from Europe to the colony?
4. Did these agents receive free passes over the Queensland railways?
5. Have any grants of land been given to these persons; and if so, what is the area and where is it situated?

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

1. Yes. The report from the British consul at Odessa, of which a copy was forwarded to this Government, expresses doubt as to Mr. Klein being able to induce residents in Bessarabia to emigrate to Queensland.
2. Yes. But the correspondence since received, on which the Agent-General's telegram appears to have been based, does not disclose sufficient reason to doubt the good faith of Mr. Klein in making his proposals.
3. Yes.
4. Free passes were granted to Mr. Klein and one other agent.
5. No.

SPECIAL LEASES OF LAND.

Mr. GIVENS (*Chirms*) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many special leases of land were granted or authorised by the Executive Council from the 1st to the 16th of the present month, inclusive.
2. In what district or districts are such special leases situated?
3. For what purposes were such special leases granted or authorised?
4. How many of such special leases were granted or authorised to be issued to Chinese?
5. What is the area of such special leases?

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

1. Ten.
2. Hughenden and Cumnamulla.
3. Garden, slaughter-yard, and general business purposes.
4. Six.
5. From one to four acres.

POLICE MAGISTRATE AT CHARLEVILLE.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Warrego*) asked the Home Secretary—

When does he propose to send a police magistrate to Charleville?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*) replied—

An appointment has been made, but the officer has been unable to enter upon his duties, and it is probable that some other will have to be appointed to the position.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS—COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*): He was very sorry that he could not agree with the Council's amendments

in subsections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of clause 7. The reasons given by the Legislative Council in support of their amendment were—

Because it is not desirable to lock up lands under tramway leases from being mined from the surface, and may cause great hardship to miners having tramways over their holdings in the event of lodes running vertically between tramway lines from surface down to the point fixed by law above which no miner can work under a tramway line, and *because* the provisions for compensation amply protect the tramway lessee.

He could not conceive that any valuable discovery would be made in 15 feet of ground, and he thought it would be better to leave the Bill as it originally stood. He therefore moved that the amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to. This Bill was very necessary. When he brought it forward, he pointed out that on Charters Towers one of the mines there—the Day Dawn Freehold—was working almost on the boundary of a street, and in order to get through that street the owners of the mine thought that this Bill was necessary. Only yesterday he received a telegram from Charters Towers stating that they were at the boundary, and unless this Bill was passed a great number of men would be thrown out of employment. He hoped the Committee would assist him in insisting upon disagreeing with the amendments of the Council. Hon. members in the other Chamber said this clause would press very hard on the working miners, but he was sure that mining members in this House would see that no harm was done to them.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): He was very glad the Minister had taken the stand he had. He thought these amendments had been sent down from the Council under a misapprehension. In the message just read, reference was made to lodes running vertically from the surface down to the point fixed by law, but no such point was fixed by law. The hon. gentleman in the Upper House who made the speech referred to was evidently referring to clause 38 of the Act, which applied to mining for gold and silver on alienated land within the limits of a gold or mineral field; but that clause simply referred to freehold or leasehold taken up under the Crown Lands Acts. For tramway purposes there was no restriction whatever, as a tramway lease was a goldmining or mineral lease. As the Minister had pointed out, the miners were amply protected under this Bill as it stood. They could work within 15 feet of the line, work under it or all round it, as long as they did not endanger the tramway in any way. The amendment would only make the clause more complicated, and would not assist the miner. He was very glad that the Minister insisted on the clause as it originally stood.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES moved that the consequential amendment in subsection 8 of clause 7 be disagreed to.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES moved that the addition to new clause 7 be disagreed to. The new clause gave power to the Minister to grant permits for the carrying of passengers or goods, and the Council proposed that the Minister might revoke that permission at his discretion or upon the application of the lessee. That was too large a discretion to give, and he did not think there should be any power of revocation.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee insisted on their disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments, and disagreed to the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council in subsection 7 of clause 7.

The report was adopted.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, the Bill was ordered to be returned to Council with the following message:—

MR. PRESIDENT,—The Legislative Assembly, having had under consideration the message of the Legislative Council dated the 5th instant, relative to the Mining Act Amendment Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

Insist on their disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments in subsections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of clause 7, and to the addition of subsection 8, *because* only the surface of the land is locked up; the miner can go underneath at such a distance from the surface as will cause no damage. At present the lessee of a mining lease cannot mine within 40 feet in a horizontal direction, or 50 feet in a vertical direction, from a railway line without the permission of the Commissioner; and, as a matter of practice, no lease is granted within 3 chains of either side of a railway line. Besides, if the amendment is a plea for the working miner, it is improbable that such a person would be able to pay the cost of deviation.

And *disagree* to the Legislative Council's amendment in subsection 7 of clause 7, *because* when the permit is granted the lessee should convenience the public by carrying goods and passengers over the line.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*) moved that the amendment of the Council in clause 2, omitting the words "commence and take," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "be deemed to have commenced and taken," be agreed to.

Mr. BROWNE: Of course the amendments were merely formal. He would point out that there were a few words omitted from the end of the clause that appeared in the corresponding section in the Act of 1899—and to that extent shall have retrospective operation. He thought those words had been moved as an amendment in another place. He did not know whether there was any necessity for the words or not.

The PREMIER said that it made no difference, as nothing had been done since the 1st of November.

Question put and passed.

On clause 5—"Administration of the public service by Ministers of the Crown"—which the Council had amended to read as follows:—

From and after the commencement of this Act, all the powers, authorities and duties conferred or imposed upon the Public Service Board may and shall be exercised and discharged by the members of the Executive Council in their respective departments; and the term "board" when used in the principal Act shall be construed to mean the members of the Executive Council each in his respective department.

The PREMIER: The Council had amended the clause so as to provide that every Minister should be a member of the board, and he did not think that was a wise thing at all. He intended to propose to amend the Council's amendments by the insertion of the words "of whom not less than two shall form a quorum for the purposes of this Act," after the words "Executive Council," in line 4; by the omission of the words "in their respective department," in lines 5 and 6; and by the omission of the words "each in his respective department," in line 8.

The above amendments were all agreed to, and, the other amendments of the Council being agreed to, the clause then read as follows:—

From and after the commencement of this Act, all the powers, authorities, and duties conferred or imposed upon the Public Service Board may and shall be exercised and discharged by the members of the Executive Council, of whom not less than two shall form a quorum for the purposes of this Act; and the term "Board"

when used in the principal Act shall be construed to mean the members of the Executive Council so designated.

Clause 6—"Power to admit certain unclassified officers to classified divisions"—

The PREMIER said the Council had amended this clause by adding the following paragraph:—

In this section the term "supernumerary work" includes the work of messengers in the public service, and of Parliamentary messengers, and library attendants.

He had no objection to the paragraph, but it required a verbal amendment. He therefore moved the omission of "term 'supernumerary work' includes," with the view of inserting "words 'supernumerary clerical or professional work' include."

Mr. BARNES (*Bulimba*) was sure that the majority of the House were in favour of the addition now proposed, but he did not think it would cover some deserving cases. He knew departments in which there were officers in the unclassified division who had been in the service for fifteen years, but who would still be excluded if the clause passed in the form proposed. He thought the idea of the Committee, when the clause was originally passed, was to include all who had served five years at the time of the passing of the Act, and those which might serve hereafter for that term, and obtain the recommendation of their superiors. If he understood the matter correctly, now only those who had served five years already would be able to obtain the benefit of clause 6, and that would be a great hardship to those who had nearly completed that period of service. The idea should be to exclude those who might enter the service after the passing of the Act, not those who were already in the service, and who might at a future time complete their five years of service.

The CHAIRMAN: I will remind the hon. gentleman that he can only deal with the amendments that have been sent down to us from another place. He cannot go back and deal with another part of the Bill which has not been amended.

Mr. BARNES: He would ask the Premier if he could not by the insertion of some word or words provide for the case of those who were already in the service without touching upon any part of the Bill which had not been amended by the Council?

The PREMIER: The proposed amendment would cover all who had been working for five years in the unclassified division of the service.

Mr. BARNES: He had been speaking on behalf of some who were equally deserving who would be excluded. He knew, for instance, readers in the Government Printing Office, some of whom were in the unclassified and some in the classified division, who under the terms of this clause would be excluded.

The PREMIER: Anyone who had been fifteen years in the service would come under the clause.

Mr. McMASTER (*Fortitude Valley*): He understood that what the hon. member wanted was to cover the case of men who had been in the service nearly five years, say those who had been in it for four years and ten months.

The PREMIER: They will not come under it.

Mr. McMASTER: He considered it would be a hardship to exclude men who had been in the service for four years and some nine or ten months. Some provision should be made to enable them to come under the Bill on completing their five years of service. Surely the Attorney-General or the Home Secretary could insert one or two words which would enable these officers to obtain the benefit of this legislation.

The PREMIER: When the Bill was brought into the House it was much more liberal than it

was now, but the House insisted upon limiting this provision to officers who had been five years in the service, and he had had to accept it.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*) asked the Attorney-General whether under the wording of the clause the term five years did not mean five years any time after the passing of the Bill?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*): The words were too clear. It did not matter how long a man had been in the service more than five years, but if he had been five years in the service before the passing of the Act he was eligible. If he had been three years in the service before the passing of the Act and he served two years afterwards he would not come under it.

Mr. TOLMIE (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): When he moved this new clause—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member cannot go back to any other clause of the Bill except the portion which has been amended. The question is that the Legislative Council's amendment be amended by omitting the words "term 'supernumerary work' includes" with a view to inserting the words "words 'supernumerary clerical or professional work' include."

Amendment (*Mr. Philip*) put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had [4:30 p.m.] agreed to one of the Legislative Council's amendments, and had agreed to others, with amendments.

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

ELECTIONS BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowoong*): The few remarks I have to make on the second reading of this Bill will not occupy the House at any length. In common with some hon. members who have already spoken on this Bill, I very much regret that this measure is being proceeded with at the present time. The impossibility of bringing its provisions into operation at the coming general election has been admitted on all sides. I think that that fact renders the measure of less urgent importance at the present time than much of the business which is on the paper, and of less importance than the business which has yet to come before us. I do not think that any fair-minded man will attach any blame to the Home Secretary or the Government for the reasons which have operated to prevent the establishment of electoral reform prior to the coming general election. These reasons are as simple as they are extraordinary. The hon. member for Wide Bay, however, sought to cast some blame on the Government by suggesting that if the Bill had been introduced at an earlier period of the session, and had been rapidly rushed through, its provisions would have been applicable to the coming election, notwithstanding that certain preliminaries have to be gone through before the Royal assent can be obtained to the measure. I do not think the result the hon. member anticipated could have been brought about, for in the first place the measure is one of considerable magnitude and importance, and I do not think that hon. members generally would care to see such a subject treated rapidly. I venture to say that it would take the greater portion of the session to get this measure through the legislative mill. And even if the measure were passed, and the Government were successful in getting it through the preliminaries necessary before the Royal assent could be obtained, and they did obtain the Royal assent in time, there would still be a

great deal of work to do with regard to the reconstruction of the rolls, and also a great deal of time would have been necessary to enable the women of Queensland to get their names on the rolls.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: They will have to give their ages. That will bar them.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have nothing to do with that now. Considering the susceptibilities of hon. members on the other side, including the hon. member for Wide Bay himself, I am very much inclined to think that we could not have got the Bill through up to the present time. I am prepared to submit that there is no show of getting this measure through this session, and I do not think that any hon. member ever thought there was any show of getting it through this session. And it must not be forgotten that there is another measure which is necessary before the reforms proposed by this Bill can be given practical effect to. The principal reform proposed in this Bill—leaving out of consideration for the present time the provisions with regard to the family vote—is that of one adult one vote. Part of that reform is provided for in this measure, but I submit that another Bill is necessary to complete that reform, and I very much regret that that Bill is not before us now in order that the whole matter might be considered at one and the same time. The two measures are practically inseparable in their nature, and one cannot be given practical effect to without the other. I do not know whether it was possible to have introduced a Bill dealing with the alteration of the electoral districts until the census returns were in a more advanced state than they were at the commencement of the present session. Possibly it might have been, but I doubt whether the subject could have been dealt with as satisfactorily as it could be with complete census returns available. Another reason why we should be slow in proceeding with electoral reform in the present position of matters is that, apart from the difficulties which have so unexpectedly arisen, it is suggested that the number of members of this House should be reduced on account of the changes which have been effected by federation, and if I mistake not that subject will come up for discussion at the next general election, and the next Parliament might find itself in the position of having to go into the whole question again. As I have said, leaving at one side for the present the family vote, the principal reform which this Bill seeks to give is one adult one vote, which practically means equality of political power. The very idea of one man one vote is to get rid of the objections to the plural vote—the vote particularly aimed at is the plural vote given for property. I contend that, in addition to the plural vote given for property, we have another plural vote—that is, the plural vote which arises by reason of the very unequal electoral system we have in this State at the present time. It may be said, "Why should we not proceed with this Bill, and get one portion of electoral reform?" Well, I think that if we pass this Bill through as it stands now, so far as it relates to one adult one vote, we shall find it very difficult to get the other and very necessary complement of the system. In fact, looking at the House as it is now constituted, I believe that the second measure would not go through, and we should then find one-half the system in vogue, and the other half not in vogue, the populous districts of the State would have surrendered their rights, and the country districts would not have done so, and in all probability would not do so. In order to show how unequal the representation is at the present time, I have obtained from the office of the

Principal Electoral Registrar a list of electorates, and the number of electors in each up to and including the additional (October) roll for 1901. It may be convenient if I read that list now, so that we may have it on record for discussion, and in a form convenient for reference, and afterwards explain the calculations which I make on that document. The return to which I refer is as follows:—

LIST OF ELECTORATES AND NUMBER OF ELECTORS IN EACH UP TO AND INCLUDING THE ADDITIONAL (OCTOBER) ROLL FOR 1901.

Albert	1721	Gympie	3572
Aubigny	1629	Herbert	1296
Balonne	1448	Ipswich	2342
Barcoo	1631	Kennedy	1067
Bowen	910	Leichhardt	905
Brisbane North	3418	Lockyer	1935
Brisbane South	3758	Logan	1166
Bulimba	2666	Mackay	2222
Bulloo	730	Maranoa	1665
Bundaberg	1647	Maryborough	2442
Bundamba	1291	Mitchell	1815
Burke	522	Moreton	1922
Burnett	1657	Murilla	827
Burrum	1708	Musgrave	1425
Cairns	1539	Normanby	888
Cambooya	1708	Nundah	1571
Caruvaron	1010	Oxley	1668
Carpentaria	650	Port Curtis	1331
Charters Towers	5411	Rockhampton	3160
Clermont	1675	Rockhampton North	1536
Cook	1040	Rosewood	1201
Croydon	1145	Stanley	1252
Cunningham	1855	Toombul	2207
Dalby	1247	Toowong	2518
Drayton and Toowoomba	3642	Townsville	3649
Enoggera	1682	Warwick	1076
Fassifern	1354	Wide Bay	1560
Fitzroy	2515	Woolloogabba	2276
Flinders	1814	Woothakata	1964
Fortitude Valley	4065		
Gregory	891	Total	111,613

Of course I am aware that the total includes the plural property vote; but for the purposes of the deductions which I wish to draw, and the calculations I desire to place before the House, I do not think that vote makes any appreciable difference. Dividing the total number of electors in the colony by seventy-two, the number of members constituting this House, we find that the average number represented by one member should be 1,550 if equal representation were in force. Taking those which range between 1,500 and 1,600 as the average, we find that there are six members in this House who represent the average number of electors. On the same basis we find that there are thirty-six members who represent a number of electors in excess of the average, and thirty members who represent a number of electors below the average. The electorates which are below the average range from Burke, with 522 electors, to Balonne, with 1,448 electors, or from 7 per cent. to 66 per cent. below the average. The electorates which have a number of electors above the average range, from Aubigny with 1,629 electors to Charters Towers with 5,411 electors, or from 5 per cent. to 75 per cent. above the average. The latter calculation is based on giving Charters Towers 2,705 electors for each member. These figures show that the hon. member who represents Burke is the lowest in the list, and that the electors in his constituency have five times the political power in this House that the electors in Charters Towers possess. In other words, it practically means that the electors of Burke have five votes to one as compared with the electors of Charters Towers. I seriously think that the plural vote for property has no appreciable effect on the result of an election in this State at the present time, and I am certain that if both parties were equally organised it would have no effect at all. But I venture to think that if the other portion

of the reform is brought in in the form of equal representation, it would make a very serious difference in the result of the elections in this colony. It is hardly reasonable to ask that we should have one portion of the reform without the other part of the reform. I know that there are very strong reasons to be urged why the country districts should have possibly a larger representation in this House than the populous districts. There is a great deal to be said either way; but if those who are agitating for one adult one vote are really serious in their agitation, and desire to have it, then they have got to take it with all its consequences.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: And I take it that the majority of the members of this House—as far as I know, at any rate—are pledged to that, and I take it they are pledged to go the whole length.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: Equal representation?

Mr. MACARTNEY: Equal representation. I say you cannot have one adult one vote without involving equal representation. I know some people have tacked on the words "one value" to that short description, but I do not think for one moment that those words have been tacked on because it is something new. I consider they have been tacked on as a short expression to give the full meaning to the whole idea—as a matter of convenience, and not because it adds anything new to the idea at all. Looking back on the arguments that have been used in the past in support of one man one vote and one adult one vote, I find they are founded on the idea that, by reason of the plural vote, the minority rule the majority; but I venture to say that if we give one adult one vote the meaning which this Bill will give—without the necessary accompaniment which is to be provided by another Bill—will still enable the minority to rule the majority, and to a much greater extent than the property vote now exercises an influence in that direction.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: Is there any colony in Australia where they have one vote one value?

Mr. MACARTNEY: Yes. I thank the hon. member for Gregory for the question. When I was in New South Wales a few months ago, during the elections, I was particularly struck with the fact that there the single electorates rule, and they are as nearly as possible equal electorates. I have not gone into the system in vogue in New South Wales, but I noticed that nearly every result gave the approximate number of electors, and on making further inquiries I found that the system of equal representation and single electorates was the necessary result of one man one vote in that colony.

Mr. HARDACRE: The result is that the country seats are disfranchised, and Sydney rules the colony.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: That is what you have been clamouring for.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The majority rules.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am quite prepared to admit that there may be a good deal in what the hon. member for Leichhardt says, but that is what I understand the hon. member and the party he belongs to have been asking for.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: That I understand is what anyone means when he asks for one adult one vote. I am pledged to one man one vote, and I understand my constituents generally are desirous of having it. But all who want it must take the logical conclusion of what they want. If hon. members do not want that result to follow, then they must be prepared to admit—

as the hon. member for Gregory admitted at an earlier period of the session—that circumstances that are applicable to a closely populated place like the United Kingdom are not suitable in a country like Queensland. I do not know whether hon. members opposite are prepared to carry the principle of one adult one vote at the present time to its logical conclusion; but, speaking as the representative of a populous district, I have certainly no qualms of conscience in accepting the principle of one adult one vote. I quite admit that it is in favour of the more populous districts.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: So is the suffrage altogether.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Quite so. Looking at the position of hon. members on the other side, I quite understand that it is quite possible that they do not want one adult one vote pure and simple, and if that is the position, the sooner the electors know it the better.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: And when we go before the electors in a few months we will know exactly what it is they want, and know exactly what we shall have to put up with if we get it. If the introduction of the Bill at the present time has no better result than to give rise to a discussion on this particular phase of the question, it may be useful. I have said that once we get one adult one vote the position will be very much aggravated in that particular direction. We will find that the electors in the centres of population will be practically doubled, whereas in the outside districts they certainly will not increase to anything like that extent.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: And we shall certainly have a very anomalous set of figures to look at when we are supposed to have equal political power. Of course, if the family vote is agreed to, the position will be still more accentuated in the centres of population. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. W. HAMILTON: Why don't you advocate one baby one value in the Bill?

Mr. TOLMIE: Two babies one value.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I do not wish to go into this matter at any great length. I quite recognise that there are a great many important principles in the Bill which will stand a great deal of discussion, but they are matters which may, and in all probability will, if the Bill goes any further, be better discussed in committee. I would only like to refer particularly to the family vote. As I said before, it seems to me that the idea of one adult one vote is founded on the principle of doing away with the plural vote; but it seems to me that this family vote is practically a plural vote. While I am pledged to one man one vote, I do not know that I can reconcile my conscience to support a proposal which will create a plural vote, which is at variance with the very idea of one adult one vote. I am prepared to admit that there is a great deal to be said in favour of a vote for thrift. (Opposition laughter.) But at the same time I am prepared to admit that there is a great deal to be said against it. There is a great deal to be said against the proposal in the Bill as it stands at present, and, at any rate, until I can understand that the matter has been submitted to the country, and until I can understand that I have the direction of my constituents to support a vote of this kind, I am certainly not going to do it.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: It is the best part of the Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am qualified to get this additional vote, but I am not going to allow

any personal consideration to enter into the matter. If the Bill gets into committee, I shall certainly, in deference to the opinion I have already expressed, propose an amendment postponing the operation of the provisions of the Bill, so far as they relate to one adult one vote, until that other Bill is brought forward and dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): I think it is always a pleasure to listen to the hon. member for Toowong; but, unfortunately,

[5 p.m.] that hon. member does not speak as frequently as many hon. members would like him to do. I cannot congratulate the Government on the support they are getting on the Bill from their own supporters. Only two private members on the other side have spoken on the Bill—the hon. member for Balonne, who condemned one of the vital principles—namely, female suffrage—and the hon. member for Toowong, who condemned another vital principle—namely, the family vote.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member for Balonne condemned the family vote, too.

Mr. JACKSON: That only makes my point all the stronger. Seeing the kind of support the Government are getting from members on their own side, I would advise them to withdraw the Bill as soon as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Aren't you going to support it?

Mr. JACKSON: Does the hon. gentleman expect me to support it?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It gives you female suffrage—adult suffrage.

Mr. JACKSON: I will explain my views about female suffrage before I conclude my remarks. With regard to the attitude taken up by the hon. member for Toowong, I don't think that this party is in any way pledged to equal representation, nor am I aware that hon. members on the other side are pledged to anything of that sort. Many hon. members on both sides are pledged to one man one vote and to adult suffrage. The hon. member for Toowong seems to think that one vote one value, or equal representation, must necessarily follow on adult suffrage, but I don't think the hon. member has made out any kind of a case for taking up a position of that sort.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is there any reason why it should not?

Mr. JACKSON: I could give reasons why one vote one value should not follow from adult suffrage.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It ought to.

Mr. JACKSON: I don't think it should follow necessarily in a colony like Queensland. There might be a good deal to be said in favour of equal representation, if such a thing is possible, but I doubt whether such a thing is possible, even in an old settled country. In a young country like Queensland one vote one value might work very injuriously. If you have adult suffrage, one vote one value will apply to women as well as men. In the settled districts—in the Southern part of Queensland—there would be a very large female vote under adult suffrage, and, generally speaking, it is the men and not the women who do the pioneering work in a new country, and we should find that the votes of the women, who do not do development work, would altogether outweigh the votes of the men—those who open up the country in the way of doing mining, prospecting, and other work.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why not, if they are more numerous?

Mr. JACKSON: I have given a reason why not—simply because the men do the pioneering work in a young country, and should receive more consideration.

Mr. McMASTER: You give them a plural vote in this House.

Mr. JACKSON: I don't see how I give them a plural vote in this House. I was very much interested in the figures the hon. member for Toowong gave showing the inequalities of representation at the present time. There is no doubt that those figures are very striking, though I suppose we all knew that there were these inequalities. I am perfectly convinced that we should have a Redistribution Bill; but it does not follow because we should have a Redistribution Bill that we should have a system of one vote one value. It would have been more to the point if the hon. member had shown how the inequalities of representation work out as regards the three divisions of the colony, but he did not do that. He showed that some of the Northern constituencies have few constituents on the roll, and that some have a very large number, such as Charters Towers, but he did not give figures to show how the North, Central, and Southern divisions would compare with each other. That would have been more to the point, seeing that the interests of the Northern constituencies are, generally speaking, on all-fours, and the interests of the Central constituencies generally go together—though not altogether, because we have the sugar industry on the coast line and the mining industry away back. As a general rule I think the interests of the three divisions are not always the same, though the interests of the Northern constituencies as a whole are fairly identical, speaking in a general way. I may point out in connection with the system of equal representation—or unequal representation, such as we have now—that country electorates, though they have sometimes a very small number of electors on the roll, should be entitled in this House to representatives to voice their particular interests. They are handicapped in this way as against metropolitan constituencies. Metropolitan constituencies, or large constituencies like Townsville or Toowoomba, very often have advocates outside of this House, such as chambers of commerce and other public bodies, who bring their interests before the country and before Parliament more forcibly than country constituencies have an opportunity of doing. So I think a very good case can be made out in favour of the present system—though some of the inequalities that exist now ought to be wiped out. The Bill has been treated by many hon. members—on this side at any rate—from the point of view of ridicule and jest. Ridicule, of course, is a very effective weapon in the way of criticism, but ridicule and jest may be overdone, and it is possible that people outside this House may think that if the members of this party are giving so much time to ridiculing and joking over this Bill the provisions of the measure may not be so iniquitous after all. I hope that people outside will not take that view of the case. Of course, I recognise that many hon. members on this side have dealt seriously with the Bill and have pointed out some of the clauses that will work very injuriously. I am not going to deal with the provisions of the Bill in detail, because I recognise that it is more in committee that the details can be dealt with and the obnoxious provisions shown up. They can be shown up by illustration and in many other ways better in committee than can be done on the second reading. As I pointed out before, the hon. member for Balonne opposed the principle of woman suffrage. We all know that the Secretary for Agriculture has been in the past a very strong opponent of

woman suffrage, and a very strong advocate for plural voting. I have been wondering whether during the debate on the second reading of this Bill the Minister for Agriculture would get up and denounce the Government for having included provisions such as this in the Bill. I have been wondering whether the hon. member will get up and tell the Premier that his loyalty is being strained in the Ministry when he finds the Home Secretary in the Government to which he belongs introducing a Bill with a provision in it to abolish plural voting. I do not think the Minister for Agriculture is likely to do any such thing, although this Bill proposes to establish female suffrage. I do not think he will get up and denounce the Government for introducing these obnoxious principles, because I believe herecognises that, although the Government appear to be conceding something, they are also taking something away. They appear to be making concessions, but after all the concessions, if there are any, are nothing compared to the obnoxious provisions that this Bill contains. When we consider the provisions of this Bill, such as the family vote, the postal vote, the declaration, the attestation clauses, the interpretation of residence clause, and so forth—when we consider these details, I think the conservative element in this colony will be amply compensated for all the concessions they have made. I am not sure that the concession of woman suffrage will in any way react against the conservative party. Although I have advocated female suffrage, I am not at all sure that the female vote will be in any way solidly cast in support of the party that has advocated it so long. However, that does not affect me. It does not matter how the female vote may go. I should be still in favour of giving one adult one vote. However, I shall have a little further to say upon that presently. I take it that we want to attract population from the south. When this Bill circulates among people of the other colonies, it is not likely to attract them to Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not likely to attract?

Mr. JACKSON: No.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: All the young couples will come. (Laughter.) A great attraction, I should say.

Mr. JACKSON: Of course I quite admit that young couples are an attraction or should be an attraction to the colony. We all want the young married people here. Surely the Minister is not likely to argue that giving one vote for two babies is likely to attract many people generally. It has been said by an eminent English statesman that the laws of a country should make it easy for people to do right and difficult to do wrong, and in the same way the electoral laws of a country ought to make it easy for a person to get on the roll, and difficult for persons to be struck off the roll, so long as that provision exists. I do not know whether the Government, in introducing these obnoxious provisions, were desirous of creating a lot of malcontents in the colony. Mill has pointed out that if persons have no votes and no chance of getting votes those people will be turned into either permanent malcontents or into persons who are apathetic as to the government of the country. What object has the Government in view? Do they wish to create a permanent class of malcontents in this colony, or do they wish to make people apathetic with regard to political matters? I do not think they wish to create malcontents throughout the country, and not only in the country but in the towns. Therefore I am forced to suppose that they wish the people to become apathetic as to

the government of the colony. That is not a desirable thing. We do not want political power to be in the hands of a few people. Political power in the hands of a few people generally results in the advantage of the few, just in the same way as political power in the hands of the many results in advantage to the many.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You mean you object to them bossing the show.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not care about being bossed any more than the Minister for Railways does, but I suppose we have all to submit to discipline. No doubt the Hon. the Minister for Railways has to submit to his boss occasionally. He has one in this House. I think the Premier is the hon. gentleman's boss, and I dare say he has to do sometimes what the Premier tells him to do.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Premier never told me to do anything yet, anyhow.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not blame the hon. gentleman for obeying the orders of his chief.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He never gave me any orders yet.

Mr. JACKSON: Now, coming to the question of the family vote. This is one of the vital principles of the Bill. I listened to the Home Secretary's speech when he introduced the Bill with a great deal of attention. The hon. gentleman argued very ingeniously in support of the family vote, but not in my opinion very ingenuously. The Home Secretary pointed out that there was no perfect system of franchise—that in the past in his boyish days manhood suffrage was the one political cry, then later on it was one man one vote, and later on one adult one vote, and now it has become one adult one vote, with an extra vote for every two babies, dead or alive. The Home Secretary pointed out that our franchise has always been going through a process of evolution in support of his argument, but when the hon. gentleman came to deal with the absurdities and inconsistencies in connection with the one vote for two babies—and, of course, it is full of inconsistencies—he threw evolution overboard, and said we must have a hard-and-fast line somewhere, and he began to talk about what magic is there in twenty-one years. The Home Secretary should not blow hot and cold in that way in support of his contention.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you think you are arguing ingenuously?

Mr. JACKSON: I think so.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not.

Mr. JACKSON: I think I have stated the position quite fairly. At any rate, if I have not, someone on the opposite side will be able to correct me. The Minister for Agriculture is listening, I believe, very attentively, and the hon. gentleman will be able to get up and point out where I have been misrepresenting the Home Secretary. I have not looked at the Home Secretary's speech in *Hansard*; I am speaking from notes I took at the time and from my memory, and I do not think I am misrepresenting the hon. gentleman by my arguments. It seems to me that there is no magic in the number 21, as the Home Secretary has said. As far as I know that is the age at which it is generally believed an adult should be able to obtain the franchise, but the age may be made twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three, or twenty-four, or it may be set down at nineteen or twenty. There is no magic in these figures, so long as a certain age is fixed for everyone—male and female—in the community. No injustice could be done by making the statutory age twenty-two or twenty-three, or any other age, but twenty-one is recognised as the legal age, and many men and women frequently take the responsibilities of

married life on their shoulders about that age. It seems to me that the universal custom has been to select twenty-one as the reasonable period at which persons arrive at an adult age. Now, I do not think there is any justification for giving an extra vote to any person. It may be argued that intelligence or property should warrant a person in getting an extra vote. There may be something to be said in favour of a vote for intelligence, but still that would not be satisfactory, for a person may be endowed with great intelligence and at the same time he may have a very bad character. Intelligence and character should both go together, and I would ask the Secretary for Agriculture what test can be applied as to character. Is such a test possible?

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A much more reasonable test for that can be found than a test with regard to babies.

MR. JACKSON: I admit there is a test that way, but the inconsistency and absurdity of the family vote has already been pointed out, and here we have the Minister for Agriculture defending this vote. However, as I was pointing out—

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not defended it.

MR. JACKSON: Well, the Minister will be able to defend it by and by, when he will, in his usual way, enliven hon. members; but I hope he will not speak to-morrow afternoon, because I have a motion to bring on then. I say that there can be no possible test as to character. There may be as to intelligence, for a man who has obtained a scholarship or a University degree may be said by some people to be entitled to an extra vote. In connection with this vote for two babies, I would ask when war occurs, who is it that fight the battles of the country? It is not always the married men with two babies; most of the fighters are single men. Most of the men who have gone to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa are single men, and if Queensland was attacked, it would be the single men for the most part who would be called out. And yet the Home Secretary proposes to put a slight on the single men of the colony by giving married men with two babies an additional vote. Nothing could be more inconsistent or more absurd.

THE HOME SECRETARY: You must remember that a man can begin to fight at eighteen, but he does not get a vote at eighteen.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Women cannot fight at all.

MR. JACKSON: I recognise that eighteen is the age under the Defence Acts of Queensland at which a man can be called out to fight. And under the Mining Acts a man can obtain a miner's right at eighteen—he can hold mines—so that, as I said before, there is no magic in the age of twenty-one, so long as the specified age will apply to every male and female adult. But I think this question can be better dealt with in committee than on the debate on the second reading of this Bill. When the hon. member for Balonne was speaking about female suffrage he seemed to make a great point when he said that if female suffrage was established it would cause a great deal of dissension in families—that it would break up many happy homes in Queensland. As far as I have been able to ascertain from the inquiries I have made, this vote to women has not had that effect in South Australia and in New Zealand, where this suffrage has been in existence for some time.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do they have more divorces there?

MR. JACKSON: I don't think so, but even if they have, I do not think the Secretary for

Agriculture can trace that to the establishment of female suffrage. The argument the hon. member for Balonne used with regard to the female franchise has made me think what will happen if the family vote is established. Let me place this point before the House—I do not think it has been stated by any other hon. member, although the leader of the Opposition in a jocular way said that children might quarrel among themselves if this family vote was established. One might say, "I got an extra vote for father," and so on, and this is very likely to happen. Supposing there are two sons in a family who had grown up to seventeen and eighteen years of age; these boys may not hold the same political views as the father, as very often happens, and yet the father will get the two votes for these two children, if the proposal in the Bill is accepted. The father may be a supporter of the Government, and the two sons may be supporters of the Labour party, and yet the father will be able to vote for them. This is a way in which a lot of dissension may arise in families. (Laughter.) I am not joking now. I think it may reasonably be assumed that such a thing might happen. Coming to some of the points the Home Secretary made, I think he was very half-hearted in his support of the female suffrage. At any rate, he seemed to have had some doubt in his mind as to the efficacy of the establishment of this vote. He thought it would probably be a good thing, although he had some objection to it. I think the Home Secretary had in his mind that the postal vote would enable some women to vote who would not otherwise vote. The assumption of the hon. gentleman I think was that when women were confined to domestic duties, both the wife and the husband could not vote, but they will be able to vote through the post. The working women of the State may consider that reason of the Home Secretary's in a serious way; but I think they will regard this proposal of voting by post is made for the wives and daughters of the wealthy classes of the community, who would not care personally to be seen in a polling-booth. I do not know whether the wives and daughters of the wealthy classes of Queensland have any serious objection to recording their votes.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I never said so. You are putting words into my mouth that I never used.

MR. JACKSON: I think the Home Secretary has misunderstood me. It appeared to me that the hon. gentleman thought that if there was female suffrage and voting by post, it would enable many women to vote who would not otherwise vote. But I think the working women will take a different view of this postal vote.

THE HOME SECRETARY: It is more for the working women than any others.

MR. JACKSON: There is nothing in going and recording a vote. I have never seen any rowdiness outside polling-booths in the North. My experience has been at Ravenswood and at Charters Towers; I cannot speak much of the South in this respect. But from what I have seen in the North, I think if women went to record their votes, they would be treated with the utmost respect. The Home Secretary has said that there has been no agitation on the part of women to obtain the franchise. I don't know whether the Home Secretary expects women to riot in the streets in favour of the franchise. The Home Secretary said there had been no petitions, or few petitions, from the women of Queensland praying for an extension of the suffrage to them. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I do not remember saying anything of the sort.

Mr. JACKSON: I am not prepared with *Hansard* to verify any allusion I [5:30 p.m.] may make, but I am quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's correction that he did not refer to the fact that few petitions had been sent to the House. I think there was some reference to the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY: As far as I recollect what occurred was this: Somebody mentioned the fact that there had been a petition signed by 10,000 women, and I said that 10,000 women out of the whole female population in Queensland was a very small percentage.

Mr. JACKSON: I am perfectly willing to accept that statement. I admit that 10,000 women is a rather small proportion of the whole number in Queensland, but still we should remember that very large petitions were sent down to the Federal Convention from the women of Australia—I do not know whether any went from Queensland or not. I think there was only one petition sent to the Federal Convention against female suffrage, and that was signed by about ninety-six persons. The hon. member for Warrego reminds me that one petition, signed by 60,000 women, in favour of female suffrage, was presented by a member of the New South Wales Parliament.

The HOME SECRETARY: That shows how much more apathetic they are in Queensland than in New South Wales.

Mr. JACKSON: Even though the women of Queensland may be to a certain extent apathetic on the subject, that would not warrant us in refusing them the suffrage. Those who ask for the franchise should have it, and those who do not want it need not exercise it. We should not wait until people get up agitations in favour of an extension of the suffrage before we grant them that extension.

The HOME SECRETARY: That tells in favour of the family vote.

Mr. JACKSON: Let me quote what the late Mr. Gladstone said in 1864, about which time there was an agitation in the old country in favour of extending the suffrage. Mr. Gladstone said—

We are told that the working classes do not agitate for the suffrage, but is it well that we should wait until they do agitate? In my opinion agitation by the working classes upon any political subject whatever ought not to be made a condition previous to any parliamentary movement, but on the contrary is to be deprecated, and, if possible, prevented by wise and provident measures.

Let the Home Secretary ponder over those words of Mr. Gladstone. Even supposing there is no agitation from the women of Queensland in favour of the extension of the suffrage to them, let us not wait until they do agitate. Slaves do not always petition to be free. When do we hear of slaves petitioning in favour of freedom? They may have done so in some few cases, but as a rule they do not petition for their freedom. The reason which I am giving a little attention to the question of female suffrage is that in the past I have taken up a pretty strong attitude in favour of conferring the franchise on women. When I first became a candidate for Parliament in 1893, I advocated female suffrage, and I believed in it for years before that. In 1894 I made a speech on female suffrage in this House, and advocated it very strongly. The reason why I am dwelling more particularly on this aspect of this Bill is because it is with some little compunction that I feel compelled to vote against a measure which provides for female suffrage. I have here "A Suffrage Catechism prepared by the New York Constitutional Campaign," in which the case for woman suffrage is set out in about as able a manner as I have seen it stated, and with the permission of the House I shall read that catechism. There may be one or two points in

it that even advocates of female suffrage may not agree with, but on the whole I think it will be found to be a very fair statement of the case in favour of female suffrage. The catechism is prepared in the form of question and answer, and is as follows:—

Q. Under a representative form of government, such as ours, who should make the laws?

A. The people.

Q. Do the people make the laws?

A. No; half of the people are relieved (:) from making the laws.

Q. Who make the laws?

A. Men.

Q. Who gave men the right to make the laws?

A. Men.

Q. Do not the laws concern women?

A. They certainly do.

Q. May women not take part in making the laws which they must obey?

A. They may not. Men alone make the laws for women and men.

Q. If a woman transgress the law, who decides the penalty, tries, convicts, and punishes her?

A. Men.

That seems to imply that we should have female judges and magistrates to try female offenders. I am not advocating that, although I am inclined to think that if women had sat on the bench in a recent case where a woman in the electorate of the hon. member for Carpentaria was summoned for burning a child's hands, that woman would have got a much severer sentence than she did get. But those who framed this catechism evidently think that men sitting in judgment on women are rather inclined to err on the side of severity. The catechism goes on—

Q. Who sit on the juries before whom men and women are tried?

A. Men only.

Q. Is this what the constitution means by "the judgment of his [or her] peers"?

A. Manifestly not.

Q. May not mothers help to make the laws that decide their legal relations to their children?

A. No; men make the laws.

Q. Why is the law so one-sided?

A. Because one sex alone has been making the laws.

Q. Who make the laws that decide the rights of husband and wife in case of separation?

A. Men only.

Q. When a husband brutally assaults his wife, who make and enforce the laws that punish him?

A. Men.

Q. Who make the laws concerning the property rights of husband and wife?

A. Men.

I believe that some improvement might be made in these laws. At the present time a woman may assist her husband to accumulate property, as she very often does in such a business as that of hotelkeeping or storekeeping, and yet the husband has full control over that property, and may will it away to a stranger if he chooses. If women took an interest in the politics of the colony, matters of that sort would be brought under the notice of Parliament much more strongly than they are at the present time. The catechism continues—

Q. Who pay taxes?

A. Men and women.

Q. Is the property of women taxed the same as that of men?

A. Higher, as a rule.

Q. Who makes the laws governing taxation?

A. Men.

Q. Who may say how tax-moneys collected from men and women shall be used?

A. Men only.

Q. May not a capable woman who runs her own farm or other business have a vote in elections that concern her interests as much as those of any man?

A. No; but the most incapable man in her employ may.

Q. May not a woman of education, who understands the questions of the day, vote?

A. No; but the most ignorant of men may.

I may just digress here for a moment to state that a year or two ago, when I was looking up

some information in connection with female suffrage, I found that the matter had been before the House of Commons, and that a vote was taken on it, and though there was not a majority in favour of female suffrage, yet there was a very large vote for it.

Mr. TURLEY: It was carried by a majority on one occasion.

Mr. JACKSON: I think there was a motion carried by a majority in the House of Commons on one occasion; but there is no doubt whatever that, although female suffrage is not the law in the old country, yet there is a very strong public sentiment in favour of it. Just about the time that I am speaking of—two or three years ago—there was a letter signed by some of the leading women in the old country, advocating the franchise. That letter was signed, amongst others, by Mrs. Garrett Anderson, Miss Balfour, Mrs. Leonard Courtney, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. W. E. H. Lecky, Lady Henry Somerset, Mrs. Sidgwick, Countess of Selborne, Mrs. Temple, and Lady Trevelyan.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Out of about 5,000,000 women.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not say they were the only ones who signed the letter.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: But, being "toffs," I suppose, you select them.

Mr. JACKSON: I was only pointing out that business women and women of education are in favour of the franchise being granted to women, just as much as working women are. The letter of these ladies stated, amongst other matters—

Measures are brought forward every year in the House of Commons bearing on domestic, educational, and industrial questions on which women can bring special experience to bear. Moreover, we believe the interests of the community at large suffer from the present total exclusion of that experience from the representation of the country.

As I have just pointed out, in connection with the husband being able to will away his property, if women were allowed to have representation in Parliament, many matters of vital importance to women would be called attention to that are not attended to at present. The catechism goes on further—

Q. May not women who teach the boys in our schools vote?

A. No; but the boys they instruct, when twenty-one, may vote.

Q. May mothers who have given sons to the State and nurtured them in the fear of God and love of country—may they not vote?

A. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Because they are women.

Q. Why does a conscientious woman want to vote?

A. So she may help to enact laws that will better the conditions of society.

I believe that states the position of the women of this country who want a vote very fairly. They want it, not for selfish ends but in order that better legislation may be passed in the interests of women generally, and in the interests of their children. Just in conclusion let me in a few words summarise the reasons why I am very strongly opposed to this Bill. I am not only going to vote against the second reading, but I can assure the Home Secretary that, if the Bill gets into committee, I shall oppose it to the best of my ability, and I believe the same may be said for most hon. members on this side. The Home Secretary surely, after the speeches which have been made from this side, and from the speeches from his own side of the House, ought to recognise that the Bill does not meet with the approval of the House. It certainly will not meet with the approval of people outside the House. The Government have a great many supporters outside Parliament who do not particularly believe in the policy of the Government, but they are not prepared to support the Labour party. They

may object to the Labour party for sentimental reasons. They may think that the Labour party is a class party. They may object to the name. They give all sorts of reasons why they cannot support the Labour party, but they are not particularly strong believers in the Government, although they support it. Now, that is the class of people that the Government are going to alienate. They are going to lose the support of those democratic people outside who do not belong to the Labour party, if they insist on trying to put a Bill like this through Parliament.

Mr. FORSYTH: Let the Bill go through, then.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member says let the Bill go through in that case in order that the support of those people may be alienated from the Government. Still their support may not come to the Labour party; and, besides, we do not play that sort of game. That is not the sort of motive we are actuated by. I said a few moments ago that, although the effect of woman suffrage would be that the Labour party might lose ground in this House, I should still support the principle. That does not affect me one bit. My reasons, summarised, for opposing the second reading are these: I am going to vote against the second reading, in the first place, because I believe the unlimited postal vote is bad, although I am sorry to hear that the leader of this party rather believes in the postal vote. I do not agree with the hon. member at all. I believe that the unlimited postal vote is decidedly bad. I would not object to a postal vote on the lines of South Australia, where there is a minimum distance limit of 15 miles. That would be a very reasonable proposal, but I cannot support an unlimited postal vote such as is proposed by the Bill, as I believe it will lead to canvassing and a great deal of other shady work, and therefore it ought to be condemned. It may not infringe the secrecy of the ballot, still it is an objectionable feature. Secondly, I am opposed to the Bill because it does not place woman on an equality with man as regards the franchise. Thirdly, it gives some men two votes, and thus casts a slight on those married men who are so unfortunate as not to have two children. (Government laughter.) Hon. members do not need to jeer about that, because there are members in this House who are in that position, and there are hundreds of men throughout the country who see no reason why they should be stigmatised because they are so unfortunate as not to have had two children.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why, you are stigmatising them.

Mr. JACKSON: The Government may say they will give a vote to married men who are or have been the fathers of two children born in Queensland, and surely anyone can see that they are thus casting a stigma on those married men who have not been the fathers of two children born in Queensland. Fourthly, the Bill casts a slight on members of Parliament. It debars them from attesting claims when no attestation should be required. This point has not been referred to, I think, before by any hon. member. Now, if a constituency thinks them good enough to elect to be members of this House, surely to goodness we ought to consider them good enough to be allowed to witness an electoral claim! Why should there be any attestation of electoral claims at all?

The HOME SECRETARY: Why debar them from doing many things because they are members of Parliament?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They cannot take Government contracts.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: I quite recognise there are limitations of that sort; but surely it cannot be

seriously argued that because a member of Parliament witnesses an electoral claim he is interested in it in any special way.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Some are. Mr. JACKSON: I have witnessed scores of claims, and I have never yet asked a man what his politics are, and I trust that other members act in the same way.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You confer a sort of favour on him, and trust he will repay it.

Mr. JACKSON: Fifthly, I am opposed to the Bill because the family vote is absurd and arbitrary, and as that is a leading principle in the Bill the second reading should not be passed. Sixthly, under clauses 21 and 30 of the Bill, enormous difficulties will be experienced by men and women in town and country in getting on the roll, whilst bushmen and prospectors will be altogether disfranchised.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: Now, that last objection is the most serious of the lot, speaking from my personal point of view, and I think the hon. member for Cook will agree with what I have said in that respect.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: About the stigma on married men?

Mr. JACKSON: No, I am referring now to clauses 21 and 30—the interpretation of residence and the attestation—the application first and the declaration of claim afterwards. The hon. member for Cook would never, I am sure, face the miners of Cook after voting for proposals such as are contained in this Bill. It may be said by hon. members opposite that these are details of the Bill, which can be altered in committee; and they may justify voting for the second reading on that ground, but my experience is that when the second reading passes the Government majority is always solid on the details—on the clauses.

Mr. SMITH: Oh, no!

Mr. JACKSON: That is the general rule. We know that the Government side always stick together and the Labour side stick together. I am not casting any reflection on members personally. Surely the hon. member does not think the Government won't make this a party measure. I am certain it is a party measure, and that being so, the Government are bound to insist on the clauses going through practically as they are introduced. I have said nothing about the nomads out West, and I don't want to dilate on all the points in the Bill. I have summarised my objections, and I hope the Government will not persist in pressing the measure through. Even if they get it through this House, I am doubtful whether they will be able to get it through the Council, and I would recommend the Home Secretary to consider the position and withdraw the Bill gracefully.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): I am very much pleased that this Bill has been brought forward by the Government. I know it is in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the colony, and I am decidedly in favour of one adult one vote. Some of my friends on this side of the House are not prepared to endorse some portions of the Bill; but I decidedly think there should be adult suffrage throughout the colony.

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*): I did not expect to see this Bill come on at this late stage of the session. It is a most contentious measure, and if it is gone on with we shall be sitting here till after Christmas. One objection I have to the Bill is that it cannot apply at the next election, so it will be practically of no use except to prepare for another time, and I think it would be more reasonable to wait till next year and let the electors think over it during the coming

campaign, and let us come back with the views of the electors on the Bill. I hope the Minister in charge of the measure is not going any further than the second reading. I do not want to repeat the arguments that have been brought forward already by several hon. members; but there is one little point to which I think attention has not yet been drawn, and that is the change in the qualification. The household qualification has been left out of this Bill altogether, and I want to draw attention to this. If the Bill passes in that way, the Local Government Act will have to be amended. Under that Act, when a new municipality is formed, the first election is taken on the electoral roll so far as it relates to the locality comprising the new municipality. The persons qualified to vote at the first election are the persons on the roll as freeholders and householders; but if the Minister takes away householders from the electoral roll, it will simply stultify the first election in the case of new municipalities. We have been thinking at Longreach of getting separation and forming a municipality. There are few people there who are on the roll for freehold qualification—most of them are household—and if an election comes on for municipal honours there will be about half-a-dozen people qualified to vote. Therefore, if the Bill passes as it is, the Minister will have to amend the clause at all events referring to municipalities. Outside of that, this household claim is a sensible claim. It is one that gives some opportunity to the small property owner, to the father of a family, or the father of a household, to get on the roll in an easier fashion than he could otherwise. I was not here when the Minister made his speech on the Bill, but I don't think he explained why he proposed to take the household vote away. I hope he will explain it when he speaks in reply. It may be argued that the person who is a householder is generally either a freeholder or a leaseholder. He may be a freeholder and his property may be worth £1,000, but it may be mortgaged within £100 of its value, and that man cannot get on the roll as a freeholder. Neither can he get on as a leaseholder, because he has no lease. Though it is practically his own property, the result is that he will be disfranchised. Looking over the Act at present in force, I find there are six qualifications. One is [7 p.m.] for residence, another for freehold, and another for the householder. The latter includes not only the man who resides in a place, but shops or offices or other building of annual rental value of £10. Then there were different claims under the leasehold qualification, and there was one for lessees of Crown lands. With reference to the householder's qualification, we know that there are a great many owners of property who get that qualification. Now these men will be debarred or they will have to come under residence or the leasehold qualification. They may not have those qualifications, or they may not be able to prove a sufficient length of residence in one place, and under these circumstances there will be many an instance in which it will be hard for small holders of property to get on the roll. The trend of legislation should be to simplify our electoral laws, to make it more easy to get on the roll, not to make it more difficult. This is only one instance, and in this I say, instead of progressing, we are going back. There is another point, and that is the right of appeal. We have had some experience of these registration and revision courts and of their definitions of the word "residence." We have had a very bitter experience of those courts, and much time in this House has been taken up in discussing grievances that have been brought

about in that way. If the hon. member for Barcoo should speak on this second reading he will be able to instance some of the most scandalous things that have ever happened in Queensland, right out in the wilderness—near Windorah. It is not in the settled towns, where there are plenty of solicitors, where there are police magistrates, and where there are telegraphs, or where you can get solicitors quickly—it is not in places like that where trouble arises. It is right away in places like Isisford and Windorah, or out in the “Never Never,” where the trouble comes in. A constable is sent out there as electoral registrar. I do not know whether he gets any instructions or not about how he is going to act, but he bosses the bench; he orders the bench about; he tells them that they must do this and they must do that, and the bench, consisting of justices of the peace, who, I am sorry to say do not seem to have much spirit of their own, let him do with them what he likes. The result is that men who are qualified to be on the roll are not allowed to get on. That is under the present Act, and bad as the present Act is, this will be worse. Under the present Act we have the right of mandamus; we can go to the Full Court. It is very expensive, but the right is there, and we can avail ourselves of it if we like. Here it is provided that the decision of the bench shall be final. There is no appeal—that is to a higher court. There is a bit of appeal which I think is very silly, and that is from one revision court to another. That is like appealing from—

The HOME SECRETARY: You have misread that.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The appeal is from one registration court to another?

The HOME SECRETARY: No, that is an appeal from the electoral registrar to the next revision court.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Then it is always to the same court?

The HOME SECRETARY: Oh, no, it is from the electoral registrar to the next court.

Mr. FITZGERALD: That is only in the first instance.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Then I was giving the hon. gentleman credit for more than there is in the Bill. There is no appeal at all. Once the bench decides that a man has not a residence qualification, the decision of that bench is final. There is no appeal left at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: What appeal would you have?

Mr. FITZGERALD: I want the Minister to allow us to have the appeal that we have got at the present time.

The HOME SECRETARY: So you have.

Mr. FITZGERALD: It says that the question of residence qualification is a question of fact, and the decision of the bench on that question will be final. That cannot be in the present Act, because otherwise we would not have had the decision that we had in the Isisford case. In that case the bench found, as a matter of fact, that the men were not resident, and a judge in the Supreme Court afterwards decided that they were, and they ought to be placed on the roll again. Now this Bill comes along again and says that this is a question of fact, and the moment the bench decides men are not residents that is final. That is a point that has not been spoken of so far, and I think it is a most important one. It is taking away the liberty of the subject, taking away the right of the citizen to go to a higher court and get justice. It is simply leaving the whole question of a man's franchise to a lot of ignorant justices of the peace. I suppose I should not say ignorant justices of the peace, because my own opinion of the justices

of the peace in my district is a very high one. There are some, no doubt, however who are ignorant, and who are not fit for the positions which they hold. With reference to the Bill generally, I think the hon. members on the other side say that it is a one adult one vote Bill. I say it is nothing of the kind. My idea is that the Ministry have brought this Bill up for the second reading in order to make us oppose it, and be able to go round the country and say, “Here, these Labourmen, who have been always calling out for electoral reform; they have been calling out for woman suffrage, for votes for the police, and for one adult one vote, and now, when we come along with it they say they don't want it.” That is a very good election cry of hon. members opposite; but let me tell them that they cannot gull many people with that kind of talk. I say that this measure is not a one adult one vote Bill. What we mean by one adult one vote is that every adult, every citizen male and female of sufficient age, should have one vote and only one vote. Under this Bill hundreds and hundreds of adults will have no vote at all. Through the residence qualification being made so stringent in this Bill, it will be utterly impossible for many men who have lived in Queensland for years to get on the roll. This Bill does not abolish plural voting, but it recognises plural voting in its worst form, for there is the two babies two votes provision. That is what I call it. If a man is going to get an extra vote because he happens by good luck to have two children born to him on Queensland soil, I want to know where the consistency of the Bill is. How is it, for instance, that a Queensland native like myself, and having been here pretty well all my life, except a few years for educational purposes—I want to know how it is I do not get two votes?

The HOME SECRETARY: If you go the right way to work you will get them. (Laughter.)

Mr. FITZGERALD: I have got four children. To be consistent, the hon. member should give me my own vote and one for each two of my children; that means I should have three votes. Now, these two children must be born in Queensland—if they are born over the border you get no extra vote. I do not see that myself, at thirty-five years of age, am not better than two little kiddies two or three years old. So that to be consistent I contend that the hon. member should also give us Queensland natives an extra vote, too. To be consistent also, if he gives an extra vote for two children, he should give two votes for four children, and so on *ad infinitum*. Then, with regard to legitimation cases. Suppose a man has a child before he is married, and he afterwards marries the mother of that child, and then he has another child by that same woman, will that man get two votes? That is a conundrum, but there are conundrums all over the place in this Bill. The further you go into this measure the more complicated it becomes and the more silly it looks. Once you get away from manhood and womanhood suffrage you get into abysses of darkness. The whole thing will be unworkable, but I understand this question has been pretty fully dealt with. Then there is the question of the definition of residence. Why does not the Minister leave this definition as it stands now? It is perfectly well understood now. There have been decisions in the Full Court, and we all know what residence means now. Then why complicate matters, and why disfranchise such a lot of men who are deserving of votes? The definition of residence is very much the same as is contained in a circular sent to the electoral registrars some time ago. That was supposed to contain the opinion of the then Attorney-General, the late

Hon. T. J. Byrnes. It decided that so long as a man was in the country for three or six months he could have a vote. But this is really a domicile vote, not a residence vote. And this Bill will make it very hard for a great proportion of real residents in different portions of the colony to get on the roll; and if it is passed, I am sure it will create a great deal of ill-feeling. We had enough ill-feeling during the strikes of 1891 and 1894, and now in the West and in mining districts men look upon their votes as of value—as something worth having. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there are men camped in my district waiting to get on the roll by living there two months out of the seven—men who have been there for a long time; and there are men in the Barcoo waiting in the same way. That shows the interest they take in their votes, and if the franchise is taken away from them it will create a lot of ill-feeling. Just now there is a nice feeling between the capitalists and the working men, and I would be very sorry to see that disturbed. Why should we be anxious to take away votes from carriers, some of whom have £100 or £150 or £200, and instead of putting it into property they put it into wagons and horses. They come in to Longreach, say, and they camp on a vacant allotment; they wait for goods to come up by train, and they then go away for perhaps months, as far perhaps as Windorah or the border. They may be delayed through droughts or floods for months. They come back, and camp again on the same vacant allotment. Some of them are married men, and they take their wives and families with them. They have been in the district for years and years, and they are entitled to a vote. Take shearers! I know a man who has been in the Longreach district for years; he has sheared there every season, at stations all round. When he comes into town he always stops at the same hotel, and he comes to me or to any other person and asks to get his name on the roll. I write out the claim form, but under this Bill I cannot say that his place of abode is at that hotel. His residence must be a place like a home, and he must have the intention of returning to that hotel when he goes away; but he just waits there till the next season. Under this Bill he will be deprived of a vote. There is another little matter that has to be considered in connection with this question. Suppose a man who is a shearer has been in Queensland for twelve months. He has first to send in a claim to be enrolled. That claim has to be attested, and in it he has to state where he has been residing during the twelve months. Why, it would take a whole sheet of foolscap to give that information in the case of a man who shifts about from one place to another as a shearer does. What is the use of requiring that information when he has to show under this new definition where he has been residing during the six months after he has sent in his claim? Is that simplifying the law? No, it is making it more puzzling, so puzzling that very few people will be game to try to get their names on the roll. After a man has signed his first claim, got it attested, and lodged it with the electoral registrar, he has to wait for six months and not longer than nine months before sending in his declaration. During that time, if he shifts about from one shed to another, he has to notify the electoral registrar of his whereabouts, otherwise he will cease to be qualified. He will actually have to carry a bundle of notice-papers under his arm or on an extra pack horse, in order that he may be able to send the required notice to the electoral registrar from every little station or place at which he stops informing him where he is. Then at the end of six months he has to send

in a declaration, and that declaration must be attested by a justice of the peace or some other person authorised to attest these documents. If the justice of the peace signs that declaration, and it happens to be false, then the justice has to go to gaol without the option of a fine. Suppose a man has registered his claim at Longreach, and he goes sneaking out West—to Westlands, Ernestina Creek, or Arrilalah—and he has sent messages to the electoral registrar from different places telling him where he is, then after six months he asks a justice of the peace at Westlands to attest a declaration that he has been six months in the district since he sent in his claim. The justice of the peace would probably ask, "When were you registered?" The man would say that he was registered on a certain date. But how can a man travelling about like that remember the date on which he put in his claim? If I got registered in Brisbane, and then went off home for six months, and at the end of that period asked a magistrate to attest my declaration, how should I remember the date? I could not do so without carrying a memorandum about with me, and it is not fair to ask any man to do that. Well, if this man who had been registered at Longreach gets a justice of the peace to attest his declaration, the justice having taken his word as to the date of his original claim, then that declaration will be sent to the electoral registrar in Longreach. And should the date happen to be wrong, the justice of the peace at Westlands will be liable to be hauled up before the court, and sent to gaol without the option of a fine. Would we attest claims under such circumstances? If we did, the only ones that we would attest would be the claims of men who brought a certificate from the electoral registrar showing the date on which they put in their first claims. But how many people would do that? Who would bother the electoral registrar to give them such certificates? Very few persons would do that. The result will be that justices of the peace will not dare to attest claims, and the man who is moving about in the way I have mentioned will say: "I forgot to send in a notice to the registrar when I was at Arrilalah, and I may get hauled up before the court." There will be so much intimidation and terror that half the people will give the matter up in disgust. It is a very curious thing that when the other colonies are liberalising their electoral laws, and giving further facilities to electors to get on the roll we are actually trying to strike terror into the heart of any person who dares to try to get on the roll. The Federal Parliament are talking about bringing in a Bill making six months' residence the qualification for an elector. We shall then have in Queensland two sets of rolls, two sets of laws, two sets of scrutineers, and everything else in connection with elections, and this will give rise to the greatest confusion. A man will think he is on the State roll, and ride 20 or 30 miles to record his vote, and then possibly find that he is on the federal roll. This complication will also give rise to a great deal more expense, and the registrars who have to do the work will be overburdened to such an extent that the Home Secretary will have to enlarge the lunatic asylums. As a native of this country I cannot imagine legislation like this being thrust before an intelligent Parliament in the twentieth century. It is like going back to the old days. Our present Act is good enough. I would like to see it made better; but still, as I cannot have what I want I am quite satisfied to stand to that with one or two amendments. If the Government wanted to introduce one woman one vote, it would be very easy to do that. How easily we dealt with the plural vote at the Federal election, and there were no

complaints and no appeals! How easy it was for myself, being an elector of the Mitchell electorate, to go to a polling-booth here in Brisbane, if I was down here at the time, and record my vote!

We have just had an experience of how simple it is to abolish plural voting; and what is the good of coming along with a big [7:30 p.m.] rigmarole like this. If the Home Secretary really wants to liberalise

our election laws he might have brought down a Bill of two clauses to amend the present Act. He need not have altered the classification of residence or humbugged us with this two babies one vote business. I most strongly object to the Bill. There are many details I would like to refer to, but probably they can be dealt with in committee. I really hope there is no intention on the part of the Government of pressing on with the Bill. It is rather hard on members like myself, who live hundreds of miles away, to be kept here when there is other business we would like to see put through. It might not be so hard on members residing close by, but it is very hard on us. I really hope that after to-night this Bill will not be gone on with.

* Mr. FOX (*Normanby*): I think we must all have been impressed with the speech of the hon. member for Toowong, which was very interesting and lucid, and one that went straight to the point.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOX: It is very clear it has disturbed the minds of some hon. members on the other side, and they evidently prefer to abide by what they have. I must say that after the speech of the hon. member for Mitchell the Bill certainly wants some amendments in committee. With regard to my own views of the matter, I believe in minority representation and effective voting. I am sure that every member of this House must have been impressed with the anomalies that exist under the present electoral system and the mischief that it does by giving infinitesimal power to minorities. In dealing with this question of the effective voting system it may not represent districts or towns as this Bill proposes to do if carried to its logical conclusion, which you must do if you have one man one vote, by having also one man one value.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOX: Now, effective voting represents all classes in proportion to their numbers. It gives every interest in the colony representation in the Legislative Assembly according to its numbers. It destroys no man's vote. Every vote that is given is effective, because, if a man cannot get his first choice, his vote is transferred to the second and then to the third man, as the case may be; and if there are numbers of candidates for an electorate—say that you group certain electorates together, and there are 14,000 votes, and ten or twelve candidates—on the first count the lowest candidates on the list stand out. So far as the votes for these candidates are concerned, they are lost, but the electors' votes are transferred to the candidates who still remain on the list. This system is not a new one. It has got past the stage of theory. It is already in use in Belgium and in Tasmania. There have been two elections conducted in Tasmania on the Hare-Spence system, and in the opinion of those who are interested in the question it is to be highly commended. At any rate, it has this in its favour—that it is just, fair, and honest. No man, by staying at home, can disfranchise hundreds or thousands of electors. Under our present system, and since the introduction of payment of members, there are large numbers of candidates offering themselves for each con-

stituency. It is clear that in many cases, if there are three or four candidates for a one-member electorate, the minority only will be represented and the majority will be disfranchised. In many cases an elector may have important duties to perform at home, or he may have a headache, and by staying away he disfranchises half the electorate. Now, with regard to proportionate representation or effective voting, nothing of that sort can occur, because every vote counts. If an elector cannot get the man of his first choice, he gets the next man, and so on, so that his vote is effective, and hence the term "effective voting." There are some parts of the Bill that I do admire, such, for instance, as the provision to establish voting by post. I think Lord Salisbury is one of the first who suggested this, and, to use his own words, he said that by introducing it you would bring the ballot to the voter, and not the voter to the ballot. Anything that will do that will be a benefit and advantage to the colony, because it will enable many who under existing circumstances cannot record their votes to do so. To emphasise my point with regard to the disfranchisement of a large body of electors throughout the various colonies, I shall quote some extracts from a pamphlet I have in my hand, which is termed: "What is Effective Voting?—An Explanation by Mrs. A. H. Young, hon. secretary, Effective Voting League of South Australia." On page 1 it gives this example—

It will suffice to refer to what happened in Victoria in 1893. On 9th October of that year Mr. Max Hirsch and Colonel Templeton contested the Benalla district. Each polled 753 votes. Now, it is very obvious that had a single voter stayed at home, his doing so would have disfranchised all the voters on his own side. He did his duty by going to the poll, and the disfranchising required by the existing law had to be done by someone else. That someone else was the returning officer, who, being a Conservative, selected for disfranchisement the supporters of Mr. Max Hirsch. A single-taxer who had the same duty to perform would doubtless have given his casting-vote for Mr. Hirsch, and disfranchised Colonel Templeton's supporters.

On page 2 it gives another example—

Now, we do not think that 753 voters ought to have their franchise taken from them by the vote of any person or any combination of persons. We protest against a system that enables any person, or any combination of persons, to render the votes of tens, or of hundreds, or of thousands, worthless. Our claim, in a word, is that the franchise should be the inalienable possession of every voter, whether he be a millionaire or a pauper.

It may not often happen that a single vote has the consequence shown in the illustration we have given. But it does often happen that a mere handful of votes may make all the difference between the enfranchisement and disfranchisement of thousands.

All the evils of which we complain arise from a radical, but easily remedied, defect in our present system of voting. That system is based on the principle that the defeat of a candidate carries with it the disfranchisement of his supporters. We propose to establish quite a new principle. When a candidate is defeated his supporters ought to have another choice, and if the object of the second choice fails to get returned, then let them have still another choice, and so on, till their votes become effective. This can only be done by rendering every vote transferable. No elector with a headache, or with an engagement which keeps him from the poll, can under effective voting interfere with the franchise rights of the people who go there. Under effective voting it is quite impossible for any voter under any circumstance to be defrauded of the suffrage.

Under the heading "The Evils of Single Electorates" it states—

Single electorates are almost the universal rule in the United Kingdom, and faith in their efficacy must be robust indeed which can survive a glance at the results of the general election of 1900. On a poll of 5,000,000 the Tories had a majority in the country of 123,000, which, with a fair system of voting, would have given them a parliamentary majority of 16. But with the inequitable system now in use a majority of 16 becomes a majority of 134!

For the fifty-second Congress of the United States, 1890, the Republicans, with 4,217,264 votes, only elected 88, while the Democrats, with 4,974,450 votes, elected 235, and the Populists, with 354,217 votes, elected 9. Is "defective" a strong enough word for a method of voting which turns a majority of two into a majority of 188?

In the New South Wales Parliament in the 1898 election Mr. Reid and his friends, with a minority of 15,000 votes in the country, secured a majority in the House of five. The splitting of votes explains the anomalous state of things in this instance, as in the others.

The general election of 1897 in Victoria yielded results just as astounding. For every seat the Liberals secured they had to pay 2,279 votes, as against the 1,705 votes which sufficed to put a Conservative in. The Liberals did the splitting, as they generally do. The Conservatives, going solid, as they generally do, threw away no votes. As Lubbock has well said, it is always the Liberals who are in danger of wasting their votes through dividing them between too many candidates.

The last general election in South Australia revealed some very startling discrepancies between the strength of parties and their representation. While 101,357 votes elected 52 members for the Assembly, 61,204 elected none at all. In three districts 7,237 votes returned all six representatives, and 7,981 returned none at all. Of 10,577 who plumped in the metropolitan districts, 5,995 might as well not have been registered. Through voting for defeated candidates they were as much disfranchised as though they had never voted at all.

Then with regard to the dangers of the block vote it says—

It may be worth while to consider in a little more detail the dangers arising from the block vote. The *scrutinio de liste*, as it is called, has now been abandoned by every other country in the world. It was tried by Gambetta, in France, with appalling results, so far as the disfranchisement of the masses went, and it was abandoned in Belgium after political riots, in which many lives were lost. The block vote, at best, restricts representation to a majority, and this majority may be a quite infinitesimal one. Out of a total, say, of 80,000 votes, 40,001 might conceivably get all the representation, and 39,999 none at all. One man might, therefore, by changing sides, disfranchise half the colony. This is an extreme case, but extreme cases are the test of principles, and if the principle of majority representation only is established, the enormous power it will put into the hands of minorities is not unfairly shown by this illustration.

I think we might very well consider with a Redistribution Bill another system of voting altogether—the principle of effective voting embodied in the Hare-Spence system now in practice in Tasmania. The members selected under that system would come to the House with the best possible feeling without any of the bitterness we have with regard to the party on each side. With regard to the elections under the present system, each candidate goes for party; under the effective voting system every man goes to represent a certain interest or a certain class, and it will enable every class to be represented. We know that the labour class is a large one, and I am one of those who believe that the vote of the working man should be represented in this House, but I think it should not be represented to the exclusion of any other class; and I think that any other class should not exclude the worker's vote. Therefore the system proposed by the Hare-Spence plan is one of the most equitable that can be proposed, and it is one of those systems which will no doubt in the near future be adopted by all the States, because the present block system is no doubt most unjust and unfair, and the most likely to lead to class feeling on both sides of the House than any other system you could adopt. We are all inclined to be democratic, and I believe that the Australian colonies are democratic, and, if that term means anything, it means government by the people for the people, and not any particular class of the people, because, in that case, it must be to the injury of every other class, and in the end must tell against the particular class itself; and I think

every member who comes to this House should come with the idea of representing all classes. Unless he does that, he must raise an antagonism against himself. Under the Hare-Spence system, I am quite sure that this antagonism would cease, and every class would be fully represented according to their votes. I do not intend to take up the time of the House on this question, but I wish to impress upon the members who are present that if they wish to work amicably together in this House, they will endeavour to bring in some system that will enable this House to represent all interests in the colony, and without the bitterness that now exists in every election, and also without disfranchising anybody. Under this system, if a man does not secure the man of his choice, at least he secures some one of his choice. The voting under this system is quite as simple as under the present one. All candidates' names are put on the paper and a line is drawn between them, and all the voter has to do is to put a figure from one to six, according to the number of candidates to be returned, against the names of the different candidates in the order of his choice. If his choice is accepted and he has more votes than suffice to return that candidate, the extra votes are not lost. They are transferred to No. 2, No. 3, or No. 4, as the case may be. If his candidate is thrown out on the first count, the votes which were in his favour are added to those of the next candidate of his choice. There can be no fairer system in existence than this. I quite understand that no new system or any Bill can be entirely perfect, but I think this system is the nearest approach to perfection we can possibly have, and, therefore, having given some consideration to this question, I thank members for the patient hearing they have given to me this evening, and I feel sure that they will see from what I have said that I have given some consideration to this question, and am very earnest about it. I would like to see a fair, just, and honest system adopted for the representation of all the interests in the State of Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): I do not think that I can say a great deal about this system which the hon. member advocates, because, while it may have been advocated for many years, I think so far there has been no experience regarding its work except in Tasmania, and I think it very nearly killed half the people who started to deal with it down there. There were a great many objections to it when it was started first, and then I think it was only started in two or three towns. I know there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction down there in connection with it. The hon. gentleman evidently has a bit of a fad upon this question of proportional voting, and thinks this is the best place for him to bring it out. I may say at the start that it affords me great pleasure to vote against the second reading of this Bill. I know the people outside seemed to think this Bill was going to capture the Labour party straight away, and there is one gentleman who, I believe, is a member of another place, who runs a newspaper, has been calling in his leading articles on the Government members to get up and demolish the Home Secretary and all his works, because behind him he was going to have the Labour party, who were going to assist him to get this Bill through. He also asked the Government members to remember what effect this would have on their own electorates, and asked them to wreck the Bill if they could possibly do so. I do not regard this as legislation. I regard it as a deliberate crime against the liberties of a large section of the people of this community. There are all sorts of crimes. A person need not take an axe and murder

another person with it. He may do that just as effectively, and yet he may escape one of the penalties that the law provides for murder. Jabez Balfour was tried for fraud, and he got fourteen years' imprisonment. Jabez Balfour was guilty of murder, not in one but in scores of cases. He was practically responsible for driving a large number of people into their graves. He drove a large number of people into lunatic asylums, and he wrecked the homes of hundreds of people who had placed faith in him and in his schemes. I contend therefore that this man was as guilty of murder as if he had taken a tomahawk or any other weapon and simply wiped those people out of existence. In the same way we have read a great deal about the tactics of the Thugs, who, when they came to a man asleep, they used to tickle him until they got him in a right position, and then they strangled him with a little cord which they used to carry for the purpose. In my opinion the hon. gentlemen opposite, so far as the liberties of the people of this colony are concerned, are practically a band of political Thugs.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I suppose you call this an indictment of the Government?

MR. TURLEY: I do not know whether it is an indictment of the Government or not. I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite who are responsible for the introduction of this Bill are practically a band of political Thugs, who are endeavouring to strangle the liberties of a very large number of people in this community, and they are doing it by the old system. They are saying, "See, we are giving you adult suffrage and a great many other things," and at the same time they know perfectly well that the operation of the Bill will not give any of the things which they promise, and that practically they are precluding from the right of exercising the franchise a large number of people. It will, I suppose, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Kennedy, be a party question, and hon. gentlemen opposite will be supposed to vote for it anyway; but it seems to me that most people outside this House regard this Bill as a sort of something introduced for the benefit of the Minister for Agriculture for discussion on Thursday afternoons, so that there may be something on which he could lay himself out and show what were the dangers of this sort of thing. I thought that was the reason why it was introduced. I understood the Government had thrown this out as a sort of thing which they did not care very much about, saying, "You can simply worry this a little bit, and it will do no particular harm." I thought they were in no hurry with this legislation; but we find the Home Secretary states that the Government are actually in earnest with it. I suppose a great many people are surprised. I have met numbers of people outside; but I have not met one single business man or woman who regarded this Bill as having any business in it. I was speaking to the president of the Woman's Equal Franchise League the other day, and asked, "What do you think about the Elections Bill?" and she said, "You cannot go and listen to a fool of a thing like that; there is no business meant in it." That is the impression that exists outside. We find, in the *Brisbane Telegraph*, that when this Bill was introduced it was spoken of as something of a Chinese opera. I think if the hon. member looks at the *Telegraph* of the 29th August he will find that he is regarded as a sort of Chinese opera by that journal. (Laughter.)

MR. KERR: I suppose that is because it is so long.

MR. TURLEY: I do not know much about Chinese opera. I think the Minister for Agri-

culture knows more about it than I do. It

seems to me that there is something [8 p.m.] very funny about this Bill when you examine it, and when you examine the attitude which hon. members on the other side have taken up in connection with this question before. There is one paper which is supporting this measure, and that is the *Brisbane Courier*.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the *Street*.

MR. TURLEY: I am not quite sure about the *Street*, but the *Brisbane Courier* is just about on the same level. The *Courier* is supporting this measure, and the Minister for Agriculture and the Home Secretary have told us that the *Street* is worthy of comparing with the highest journals possible. That is all right. I am not growling about what the hon. gentlemen say with regard to their taste for newspaper work, but they seem to put these two papers pretty well on the same level. I will give the hon. gentlemen two or three instances to show them how the *Courier* has jumped about and turned itself round. During the South African war it was announced—

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What did they say about your candidature for South Brisbane? That's what you are thinking about?

MR. TURLEY: During the South African war, when it was announced that General Buller was going to South Africa, the *Brisbane Courier* came out with a fulsome article saying that he of all men in the British Army was the man who should be sent out there; that he knew what should be done. But after he met with reverses in Natal the same journal, in another leader, said: "Whoever thought he was going to do anything there; that he had no record; that he had never done anything to recommend him for the position, and why was he sent out there? That is the sort of journal the *Courier* is.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Evidently you read its leaders.

MR. TURLEY: Yes. That shows how impartial I am; but I read other journals which give other sides of the question. The hon. gentleman probably gets his *Courier* in the morning and reads it because it suits him to do so, but he does not read other papers which are against him. I like to be more catholic in my tastes than that. Then during the federation campaign we had the Hon. Edmund Barton here, and the *Courier* said he was Australia's noblest son; that there was no man in the whole of Australia who could stand alongside of him; that he had every record as to ability and everything else to entitle him to hold the position he did. Then, before he had been three months in the position he now occupies, the same paper wrote a leading article referring to him as a Janus-faced creature. People could not have much respect for a paper which turns its ideas round like that—when it comes out with fulsome flattery of a person and then afterwards describes the same person as the greatest thief and the greatest robber that anyone ever dreamt of. Just the same sort of criticism happened to a gentleman we had in this Chamber—the present Postmaster-General. While he sat on this side of the House he was a man of no account; the *Courier* said that people would take no notice of him. But by and by, when he flopped across the Chamber to the other side he immediately in the *Courier's* eyes became a genius. He was the very man the Government required. By and by, when he came to stand for federal honours in the Senate—

THE HOME SECRETARY: When did the *Courier* advocate Mr. Drake?

MR. TURLEY: When he ratted from this side and went over to the other side.

MR. MCMMASTER: They did all they could to keep him out of the Federal Parliament.

Mr. TURLEY: That is just what I am pointing out. When he was here on this side he was of no account; but when he got on the other side he became a genius; but when he came out for federal honours they could not say anything too bad about him. I think he owes a debt of gratitude to this paper, because I know a lot of people who said they intended to vote for So-and-so, but they would give Mr. Drake their votes after that, and that was the reason why he polled so heavily round Brisbane. I am just showing what the support of a paper like that, which changes its coat to so many different colours, is worth. It does not represent public opinion. It is the most hypocritical, bigoted, and venal organ that has existence in the whole of Australasia. Only three days ago it had this sentence in a leading article—

A vile campaign than that of Dr. Leyds, in the fabrication and dissemination of falsehoods by means of a hired Press, has never been carried on.

I wish to goodness they would look at home. I believe this journal is carried on by a gentleman who professes to be a Christian, but evidently he is able to see the mote in someone else's eye, and yet not see the beam in his own.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The PREMIER: Who is the Christian gentleman?

Mr. TURLEY: The gentleman who carries on the *Courier*. I have always heard that he is a Christian gentleman, but I don't know him myself. I would like to point out what has been said by the Home Secretary and others—that some of the provisions of this Bill have been taken from the system of voting in existence in Belgium. Now, I think it is just as well for hon. members to know exactly how far the conditions in that respect in Belgium have been inaugurated. Under Article 47 of the Constitution of Belgium a franchise law was passed, which provided that only male persons in that country who paid taxes to the extent of 42 francs per annum should be entitled to the franchise. Prior to 1890 there was a great agitation, with the object of getting an extension of the franchise. A great many people then believed in universal franchise. All the countries around them—France and Germany—had universal suffrage.

The HOME SECRETARY: Universal suffrage?

Mr. TURLEY: Manhood suffrage.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is different altogether.

Mr. TURLEY: They were agitating for universal suffrage, and after this agitation had gone on for three years a number of schemes were submitted to a committee of the House in Belgium, but there was not a sufficient majority in the Chamber of Representatives there—for a majority of two-thirds was required—to carry the reform, and owing to there being some delay another agitation was started. A referendum was taken on various questions, one being to see if the people were in favour of universal suffrage, and in the Commune of Brussels, one of the largest communes, the principle of universal suffrage was carried by a large majority. Out of 60,279 persons who voted, 48,660 voted for universal suffrage—that is, that all persons over twenty-one years of age should have the franchise.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not universal suffrage, or anything like it.

Mr. TURLEY: That was the proposal that was put before the people. There were 7,684 in favour of limiting the age to twenty-five years, and there were 3,935 in favour of other proposals; so that, practically, there were about three-fourths of the people who took part in the referendum in favour of granting the franchise to

persons over twenty-one years of age, independent of any other qualification. As this agitation had been going on for some time, and nothing had been done by Parliament, nearly every town in the country was in a state of riot. The military were called out; they shot down people in two or three different communes, because they were agitating for the extension of the franchise, and at last Parliament was called together in a hurry. The King opened it in person, and stated that there must be some alteration in the franchise, and then one of the Ministers came forward and proposed the franchise that is at present in existence. I think we might as well know what effect it had on the country. At that time there were 6,147,041 persons in the country, and, under the franchise in existence prior to this, there were only 130,000 persons entitled to vote. When the franchise was altered, and the people got a vote for different qualifications, and I may say here that it was not for two babies they got a vote. If anyone had legitimate issue he was entitled to a vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: I read it out.

Mr. TURLEY: But the hon. gentleman never attempted to give this information. If he had it, I suppose he smothered it up.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Every schoolboy knows that.

Mr. TURLEY: Every schoolboy may know it; but it strikes me that the hon. gentleman knows absolutely nothing about it. A good many schoolboys know more than the hon. gentleman.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: My youngsters are learning it at home in their lessons.

Mr. TURLEY: It is quite likely they are. While there were only 130,000 electors under the old franchise, the next year after the new franchise was granted there were no less than 1,370,000 people whose names were registered on the rolls. I can quite understand the people of Belgium being in favour of this extension of the franchise, seeing that it enfranchised 1,200,000 people. The Home Secretary seems to have sought for the worst possible franchise he could get in any part of the world. Most of the Continental nations have a far freer franchise than Belgium. It was a step forward there, but here it is no step forward, when, instead of giving facilities for men to get on the roll, it will have the opposite effect, and will prevent thousands of men who are now able to get on the roll from exercising the franchise. It seems to me that on every occasion when there is a possibility of the Government of Queensland losing ground this is the first thing they adopt. In 1892 they did exactly the same thing. They thought then, "Here is the Elections Act, which will enable a number of people to exercise their votes, and the result will be that the Government will be beaten." They therefore passed a Bill which, in their opinion, was destined to have the effect of keeping out a considerable number of men who did not believe in the principles which they enunciated. It did not have that particular effect because, as a matter of fact, while it kept out one or two members from this side I think it kept out one or two members from the other side, and since that there has been a considerable number of members on the other side who have been advocating the repeal of what is known as the contingent voting sections of the Elections Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are suppressing the information or forgetting the fact that this cannot take effect at the next general election.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He knows that perfectly well.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are representing that this is done to enable the Government to control the elections.

Mr. TURLEY: No, I am not doing anything of the sort; I am pointing out that this is the ultimate object the hon. gentleman has in view. I suppose if he wants to go a mile he does not expect to do it in one step, and just the same in connection with this. The Government recognise that because of the various things—I do not know what name to attach to them—of which hon. gentlemen opposite are guilty—the Chillagoe business and various other things that could be mentioned—the people of the colony are just beginning to wake up to the fact that the Government in power are simply there with the object of protecting class interests, and realising that they are thinking that it will be necessary to have some other method so as to secure and maintain the class interests which they represent. They are simply laying down this with the idea that if by any means they can fool a sufficient number of electors at the coming general election, this Bill will then be carried practically into effect, and the result will be that they will have the colony at their mercy for a considerable length of time. To me it is something like the attitude adopted by a burglar. If he gets in, and he is able to annex other people's property, he does not trouble his head at all, but simply departs in peace; but if the person sleeping in the house shows signs of waking up, he usually carries a waddy or something of that sort to hit him on the head and prevent him from waking up. That is just the object of this Bill. It is a sort of legislative waddy which the hon. gentlemen have in reserve, and if the people of the colony show any signs of waking up—that is, by discovering exactly what has been going on during the last few years—they will have this to stiffen them out with, so that they will be able to have a considerably longer lease of power. I would like to show what has been our experience in connection with legislation since we have been here. We have endeavoured on various occasions to get legislation through this House. In 1893 there was a motion moved—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to amend the electoral laws at present in force, and especially to repeal the provisions under which a man can be registered as an elector in every electorate in the colony in which he owns a freehold property of a value of £100 clear of encumbrances.

There were members who voted against such a proposal, and are in the House now. They are Messrs. Annear, Armstrong, Callan, Dalrymple, Foxton, Grimes, Lord, McMaster, Petrie, Philp, Smith, W. Stephens, Tooth, and Cribb. Those were the gentlemen who opposed the wiping out at that time of the system of plural voting as far as Queensland was concerned. In favour of the motion were the present Minister for Railways and Mr. Bell, besides the members of the Labour party and the gentlemen sitting on this side under the leadership of Mr. Powers. In the following year this matter came up again. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Powers, introduced an Elections Bill of two clauses, one providing for adult suffrage and the other for the abolition of the plural vote. It is just as well to know how hon. gentlemen have treated this question for a number of years, so that when the electors are asked to express their opinions about the men who come before them they shall know what action has been taken by those men in Parliament. When Mr. Powers brought in that Bill there was a vote taken on the 2nd October, 1894, and there voted against that Bill Messrs. Annear, Armstrong, Callan, Cameron, Cribb, Dalrymple, Foxton, Grimes, J. Hamilton, Petrie, Philp, Plunkett, Smith,

G. Thorn, Tooth, Lord, and McMaster—all members on the Government side at present, and all supporting the Government presumably in this Bill.

Mr. McMASTER: All good men.

Mr. TURLEY: I am only pointing out the action of these gentlemen when the question was before them in years gone by—how they have been able to say they did not believe in the system now brought in by the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not all of them.

Mr. TURLEY: I will do the hon. gentleman justice. He voted for that Bill on that occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We have changed sides; that's all.

Mr. TURLEY: We have not changed sides at all. The hon. gentleman is the greatest contortionist on this question. There is no difficulty about his changing sides. He is able to take any side on this question; but hitherto he has been constantly opposed to this sort of legislation, and I will give the House the reasons he has stated.

The PREMIER: Give your own reasons.

Mr. TURLEY: My reasons are well known, and have been recorded in connection with every Bill introduced since I have been in this House.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now you are going to make a somersault.

Mr. TURLEY: No, I am not. I have always stood as an opponent of the plural vote, and I stand here to-day just as firm as ever against that principle. In 1894 one of our present senators introduced a Bill providing for adult suffrage, for closing hotels on election day, for having all elections on one day, and providing better facilities for registration. It was on this Bill that the Minister for Agriculture, as pointed out by the leader of this party, took twenty or thirty columns of *Hansard* to express his disgust at this measure being introduced. On that occasion there voted against that measure Messrs. Annear, Armstrong, Callan, Foxton, Lord, McMaster, O'Connell, Petrie, Philp, Plunkett, Tooth, and Smith; and there paired against it Messrs. J. C. Cribb, Cameron, Chataway, and Grimes. The Minister for Railways at that time voted for the Bill, which I think was on a very liberal basis. In 1895 the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Powers, introduced another Elections Bill providing for the abolition of plural voting and for transfer, and there voted on that occasion against the Bill Messrs. Philp, Dalrymple, McMaster, Smith, Cribb, Foxton, Cameron, Armstrong, Stephens, Callan, Tooth, Lord, Grimes, Petrie, and Annear, and the Minister for Railways and the member for Dalby voted on that occasion for the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are going to vote for this.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman is doing a somersault.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are doing a somersault.

Mr. TURLEY: No, the hon. gentleman was opposed to plural voting then and stated so; now he is in favour of plural voting, therefore he is turning a somersault. I am voting against this Bill because I am opposed to plural voting in any shape.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are electioneering.

Mr. TURLEY: I am going to let the hon. gentleman have his choice and call it what he likes. Later in that year there was introduced by Mr. Glassey the same Bill practically that was introduced in 1894, and there voted against it Messrs. Dalrymple, Philp, G. Thorn,

McMaster, Armstrong, Smith, Plunkett, O'Connell, Cribb, Grimes, Lord, Callan, Stephens, Foxton, Petrie, and Annear. The Minister for Railways voted for that Bill.

Mr. McMASTER: That is all in *Hansard* already.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes; I want to get it in again. You cannot get a good thing into *Hansard* too often.

Mr. McMASTER: The general election will be here by and by.

Mr. TURLEY: I believe it will. In 1896, on the Address in Reply, we had another gentleman, Mr. J. C. Stewart, who moved an addition—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh! Spare us!

Mr. TURLEY: Oh! He was the man that was going to be flattened out in one act, but he flattened out all the black labour men that came against him. That is what troubles the soul of the Minister for Agriculture.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not fond of the enemies of my country.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman is not fond of anybody. The hon. member [8.30 p.m.] is only fond of persons who have a different colour to himself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURLEY: There was this addendum moved to this Address in Reply—

At the same time we cannot refrain from informing your Excellency of our deep regret that in the list of measures proposed to be introduced this session, no mention is made of an amendment of the present electoral laws, to which so many members of the present Legislative Assembly pledged themselves during the late general election.

When these hon. gentlemen came to vote on 18th June, 1896, they voted against that addition, but not because it was a party question. I would like to point out that it was not treated as a want of confidence motion. Only three spoke on the question, and it was allowed to go to the vote, and the men who voted against anything being done in the way of electoral reform were—Sir H. M. Nelson, Messrs. Byrnes, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Tozer, Battersby, Dickson, Thomas, Stephenson, G. Thorn, McMaster, Corfield, Macdonald-Paterson, Bell, Newell, Armstrong, Petrie, Bridges, Fraser, McGahan, Story, Smith, O'Connell, Collins, Stumm, Cribb, Leahy, Lord, Grimes, Crombie, Stephens, and Annear. That is the reason why I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that he was not always consistent upon the question.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That was not a Bill brought into the House.

Mr. TURLEY: I did not say it was a Bill. The hon. gentleman has to vote on something else but Bills. I suppose he has voted for a motion which contained the expression of opinion that the electoral laws of the colony required amendment. Then we had introduced two Bills by the present Agent-General, one in 1897 and one in 1898, and there is not a solitary member who was present at the time but who knows perfectly well that, however small the amount of concession those Bills contained, if it had not been for the support that was given to the Government by the Labour party, these Bills could not possibly have become law. The Government had the opposition of a very large number of members at that time who were sitting behind them. In fact, so strong was the opposition, that the Acting Premier at that time got up in his place and complained of his own people not backing him up when he brought in a Bill which was not particularly liberal, and he had to appeal to members on this side of the House to give him assistance.

Mr. STEPHENSON: It was natural enough when we saw him intriguing with your party.

Mr. TURLEY: It was passed in spite of the opposition of you and your party.

Mr. STEPHENSON: Naturally, when we saw him intriguing with your party.

Mr. TURLEY: They were afraid of their leader ratting upon that question. They thought that the Acting Premier was going to leave them in the lurch; and at that time they were prepared to sacrifice him, just as they would sacrifice anyone of their friends on the front Treasury bench now, if they thought it was a matter of saving themselves. I do not blame the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, if that is the principle he has introduced into politics. There is another matter which I wish to bring up, because it was practically touched upon by the member for Toowong. In 1897, before the Bill was introduced by the Minister at that time, there was introduced a Bill by the present Senator Glassey, which provided for the abolition of plural voting, and for claims to be attested by electors for six months' residence in the colony, a proposal for transfer, and I think there were only about four or five principles embodied in the Bill. Now, what was the action hon. gentlemen took on that occasion?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What was the action you took with the senator at Bundaberg?

Mr. TURLEY: That has nothing to do with it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about ratting?

Mr. TURLEY: I am talking about the Elections Bill which they have introduced into Parliament. I am speaking on this particular point, because it was raised by the hon. member for Toowong this afternoon, and the reason given by the hon. gentleman why they voted against this particular Bill—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did you "down" Glassey?

Mr. TURLEY: I know the hon. gentleman does not like this sort of thing; he does not care about remarks of this sort being brought up. The hon. member reminds me of a man who is suffering from *delirium tremens*. He fancies that around him there are all sorts of images which are simply the figments of his own imagination, and they all scare him. I remember one time when I was on board ship. I had shipped at Cardiff on a ship which had a "norecastle"—the hon. gentleman will know what I mean—just near the foremast there was a galley, and the galley funnel was of peculiar construction. First there was a piece went one way, and then there was a piece went that way, and then another piece went up, and then there was a piece at the back of that. I would like to say that we were on the mud at Cardiff, and there was a man who joined the ship there, who was in something of the same state physically that the hon. gentleman is in politically now; he was seeing things. When he saw this smoking stack, its little pipe standing out, he thought it was another devil that was after him, and he came down head foremost as if it were after him. The hon. gentleman is seeing things now. But they are not the figments of his own imagination. They are simply the ghost of his dead self which now arise pointing the finger of scorn at the hon. gentleman because of the way in which he has gone on. (Opposition laughter.) I would just like to point out that the leader of the House at that time moved this amendment on Mr. Glassey's proposal—

It would not be just or expedient to carry out the principle of one man one vote with the machinery embodied in this Bill unless the principle of equality in voting could also be secured, and in the present circumstances of this colony an equal electoral voice would lead to a preponderating representation of the towns at the expense of the country.

I am pointing out the way hon. gentlemen opposite at that time believed that an injustice would be inflicted by the towns upon the country. At the present time they say it is all right—because the Government have introduced the Bill nothing of that sort will take place. It is all right now, because they happen to sit behind the Government and the Government have introduced the Bill. They know perfectly well that the intention was that this Bill should take effect at the next general election. It was only owing to the despatches from home, received a few months ago, that they have been able to alter their decision. I am satisfied that if this Bill had been introduced with the object of getting it into working order for the next election, and there had been no redistribution, they would have got the support of nearly everyone of their supporters that sit behind them, and even of those who might have opposed it a few months ago, simply because they would say, "It is a Government measure, and we must either support the Government right through or the Government will send us out of the positions that we occupy." I can understand the position that the hon. gentleman take up, and I shall read the division that took place on that occasion. There voted for that amendment and against the Bill the following gentlemen who are in the House now:—Messrs. G. Thorn, Stephenson, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Armstrong, Cribb, Stephens, McMaster, Petrie, Grimes, Lord, O'Connell, Stodart, Story, Smith, Bartholomew, J. Hamilton, and Annear. The Minister for Railways on that occasion stuck to his principles, and voted against the amendment moved by the then Acting Premier. That was on 7th July, 1897.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not relevant.

Mr. TURLEY: I think it is very relevant, because we want to know what has been done by hon. gentlemen in this House before in regard to this question. In 1898 we had a Premier who had progressive tendencies; who believed that by trusting the people it would be possible to get better results—the late Hon. T. J. Byrnes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Whom you called "Coercion Byrnes."

Mr. TURLEY: I am pointing out that we had that gentleman at the head of the Government at that time, and that he was in favour of progressive legislation. That is in 1898, not in 1894; and there was a Bill introduced in the following year by the present Home Secretary, who, by the way, uttered an awful wail when he introduced the Bill. He said he did not know why he should have to introduce a thing like that. He had not been in favour of it, and that he was put in an awkward position in having to introduce a Bill which contained principles which he did not believe in.

The HOME SECRETARY: Will you quote from *Hansard* where I said that?

Mr. TURLEY: Oh, yes; I will by and by. At present my notes do not provide for that reference.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quote now. I question your statement.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, certainly, the hon. gentleman may question it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We question anything you say.

Mr. TURLEY: At any rate, in 1899 one of the principles contained in the Bill was one man one vote, and also only one qualification. Clause 5 of that Bill provided for the qualification of residence only, and clause 6 stated that no person should be entitled to have his name entered or retained upon more than one electoral roll at one and the same time. Now we have the hon. gentleman who previously voted against any

alteration of the franchise—especially the extending of the franchise to people who could not get it—doing away with plural voting. What can have come over the hon. gentleman to produce this alteration since 1899? I wonder what force was behind the hon. gentleman at that time. The hon. gentleman expressed great respect for his leader then, and we know his leader was in favour of a Bill of this description. We were told that the leader of the then Government left a large number of Bills behind him which he had intended to introduce, and this was one of them. The late hon. gentleman was progressive enough to see that what the Bill of that year proposed was the wisest thing to do—to extend the franchise and do away with plural voting. At any rate we have the Home Secretary's vote against the extension of the franchise and against the abolition of plural voting recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. McMASTER: Who was the Premier when that Bill was introduced?

Mr. TURLEY: The late Sir James Dickson.

Mr. McMASTER: You said the late Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. TURLEY: No; I referred to the amount of respect which hon. gentlemen opposite had for the late Mr. Byrnes, and that Mr. Dickson had told us a dozen times that he had left a lot of legislation behind him. The late Mr. Byrnes died in September, 1898, and this Bill was introduced in 1899.

Mr. McMASTER: That is the reason why I said you were wrong.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman who interjects will doubt anything just now. In 1900 we have the hon. gentleman introducing another Bill. He had evidently forgotten what he had done previously. Evidently his previous action did not matter a jot. But at any rate the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill in 1900 which provided that every person should have a vote—male or female, over the age of twenty-one years—but there was a difference in this Bill again. There was brought back the old qualification. The hon. gentleman previously brought in a Bill which provided for only one qualification, but in 1900 he provided for a whole heap of qualifications. If a person possessed property or held a lease he could record his vote for any electorate in Queensland he liked. In clause 9 of the Bill I refer to, it was provided that one person could only have one vote; but I would like to point out that there has been a departure from the principle which the hon. gentleman had professed previously when he said that there should be only one qualification in Queensland, that no person should be able to register except for the electorate in which he resided, and that a man should not be on more than one roll. He departed from those principles in his Bill of 1900, when he told us that any person could get his name on a roll and all the qualifications which existed previously would be in existence as far as the Bill was concerned. The hon. gentleman asked me for some quotation just now.

The HOME SECRETARY: I asked for a particular quotation which you have not given.

Mr. TURLEY: I do not know that I have that particular quotation, but there will be no trouble in getting it. It was on the second reading of the Elections Bill in 1899, nearly at the commencement of the hon. gentleman's speech.

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Byrnes was not Premier then.

Mr. TURLEY: No; Mr. Dickson was Premier then.

Mr. McMASTER: You put Mr. Byrnes's name before the House.

Mr. TURLEY: I pointed out that it was legislation which Mr. Byrnes has left behind him, which I said was of a progressive character.

We heard a lot about "the box" trotted out by members on the other side; that "the box" was full of Bills which would be brought forward as soon as an opportunity offered.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You said that was all fiction, and now you profess to believe it.

Mr. TURLEY: I did not say anything about fiction. I referred to the affection which hon. gentlemen opposite had for their late leader, and that was the reason this legislation was brought in. Yet the Government are prepared to put a man like the late Mr. Byrnes—whose ability we all recognised—lower than the level of a naturalised Chinaman who happens to have two children born in wedlock—that is according to the Bill. And yet they talk about affection and their respect for their late leader. I say that if that late hon. gentleman had been on those front Treasury benches a Bill of this sort would never have been placed before this Assembly—a Bill whereby his colleagues, with all their respect, now put him on a lower plane than they put the naturalised Chow who happens to have two youngsters born in the colony.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a slander.

Mr. TURLEY: It is not a slander. That is the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite. That is the respect which they profess to have for their departed leader, and the position in which they would put him if he happened to be living in Queensland now. The hon. gentlemen reminds me of the man who has *delirium tremens*. They begin to see things and they do not like them.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are beneath contempt.

Mr. TURLEY: Well, I am perfectly satisfied with any interjection that comes from the Home Secretary. This is the mark of respect and affection which the hon. member has shown to his late leader; and then he talks about contempt! It is too thin. Here is the quotation which the hon. gentleman wants. It appears on page 846 of *Hansard* for 1899. The hon. gentleman said—

Now the leading principle of this Bill is, of course, one man one vote. I little thought that it would ever fall to my lot to be the one to introduce a Bill of this sort into the Assembly. (Opposition laughter.)

The junior member for North Brisbane, Mr. Cameron, in 1895, in opposing the Elections Bill, said—

I have never believed in the principle of one man one vote, and nothing will ever convince me that all men should have equal voting rights.

That is on page 700 of *Hansard* for 1895. The hon. member for Lockyer, in 1897, when the amendment was moved by the leader of the Government, pointed out on page 224 of *Hansard*—

Large numbers of persons who by thrift have acquired property, if through circumstances they have to shift into another electorate, and acquire manhood suffrage there, they should also be able to vote for the electorate where their property is. The country should recognise thrift by allowing a property vote. I thoroughly agree with the contention of the leader of the Government, that one man one vote will lead to a preponderating influence of the towns over the country.

He further said that if the Bill had contained woman suffrage it would be only an additional reason for his opposing it. The present Secretary for Lands evidently was pledged to do anything in this way when introduced by the Government, but as long as it was introduced by anyone else he was pledged to his constituents not to support it. It was not on principle that the hon. gentleman apparently supported it, it was because he was sitting with the Government and now forms a component part of the Govern-

ment which is responsible for bringing in this ridiculous joke of a thing which is called an Elections Bill. The hon. gentleman, in 1897, page 234 of *Hansard*, said—

Some years ago I gave a conditional pledge that if this matter were brought up, and was not opposed by the Government I was returned to support, I would vote for it. (Laughter.)

He believed that the demand for a fair franchise was simply a cry that was giving the Labour party a big hold in the country, and that to a very great extent was the reason why he was in favour of it. The present Treasurer said in 1897—page 229 of *Hansard*—

I do not believe in putting the idle, dissolute, and disaffected man on an equality with the thrifty, industrious, and temperate man in the matter of the franchise.

He also said that a young man of twenty-one has not the experience of his father in the needs of the colony, and he would also raise the age to twenty-five years. Now, I contend that the Bill which the Government have introduced does put the idle, the dissolute, and the disaffected exactly on the same plane as everyone else, in spite of what the hon. gentleman said at that time. I believe the reason why the hon. gentleman opposed the Bill at that time was because, as he stated, seeing the plural vote was in existence for property, there was a possibility of the thrifty person getting an extra vote, and of thrift obtaining a larger amount of influence in the country. Now, the principle has been departed from by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. gentleman was prepared to fight for all along. Then another member of the present Government, the Hon. John Murray, in 1897—page 233 of *Hansard*—said—

If the country is to be wisely and judiciously governed, it must be governed by the best intellects that we have, and not by the unthinking mob. The moment the Government of the country gets into the hands of the unthinking and unthrifty multitude, at that moment the period of destruction sets in, and to place intellectual people who establish industries and give employment upon an equality with the man who walked over the border six months ago is simply monstrous. I have never been able to see the justice of it, and shall die fighting against it.

(Opposition laughter.)

This cry appears to have taken possession of the public mind to such an extent that I suppose there are many people who a little time ago entertained the views I do are becoming inclined to go with the popular current. I am not one of those. I do not care how strong the popular current grows, I shall breast it and stick to the opinions I have entertained upon the subject from the first to the last.

Well, there is another member of the Government who is prepared to turn somersaults over and over again and depart from the principles he advocated then. He is prepared not only to support this Bill, but, if it should get through this Chamber, he is prepared to induce hon. gentlemen in another place to agree to it. Then we have the Secretary for Agriculture. His opinions, there is no doubt, entertained hon. members at the time, but it is just as well we should get them into *Hansard* again alongside the opinions which the hon. gentleman will put there himself presently. In 1894, page 470 of *Hansard*, the hon. gentleman said—

The great majority of women look forward to being compelled to register and record their votes with the most intense disgust and horror.

Does the hon. gentleman think that that disgust and horror has worn off the people who exhibited those symptoms at that time? Someone said they would not be compelled to vote, and the hon. gentleman went on—

The great majority of women look forward to being compelled to register and record their votes with the most intense disgust and horror. . . . The moment

the franchise is extended to women they will all be compelled, whether they like it or not, to vote, because if they do not, those who will vote will give assistance to men who vote, and the result is that the exigencies of the occasion will compel women who would much rather not vote, to do so.

I would like to point out that in connection with this Bill the hon. gentleman is prepared to do another somersault—he is prepared [9 p.m.] to advocate that this will do a considerable amount of good in spite of what he said a few years ago. On page 471 of *Hansard* of 1894 the present Secretary for Agriculture proceeds thus—

Let us take a case where laws are passed partly by women and partly by men. If the women are not prepared to fight, I am afraid their position will be an exceedingly awkward one. Suppose there are two parties in a legislature—a two-thirds majority of women and a one-third minority of men—and a measure is passed where nearly all the men voted on the other side, what would be the consequence? It might be a law with regard to liquor, or the early closing of public-houses, such as was passed lately in South Carolina. If that law was known to rest upon a minority of the men and a majority of the women, the people would feel disposed not to submit to the law because the women could not enforce it. In other words, the force would not be on the side of the law, and therefore the stability of the country would be endangered. At present the legitimate influence of women is exerted in such a way that it gets that consideration which alone can give it force or make it valid in law. That is to say, men will support women in legislation on all those matters which have in times past—and some there have been—unduly interfered with them or their privileges or rights. These either have been removed or will be removed; and if they are not removed it will be because they have not force on their side; and if they cannot, in advance, force the men who have to carry out the laws, they will be no better off afterwards, because they cannot coerce the men. If they pass legislation which does not rest on force, their legislation would be of no avail.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I suppose you regret very much—

Mr. TURLEY: I want to give the hon. gentleman his own opinions. Why he should be in favour of this particular joke introduced by the Home Secretary—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We are not allowed to change our opinions.

Mr. TURLEY: I have pointed out that the hon. gentleman is the greatest contortionist in this House.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And a romancer as well.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes—the hon. gentleman is a romancer, too. I believe he gave us quite a number of quotations which, I think, he must have taken from romance at that time. On page 1140 of *Hansard*, 1894, the hon. gentleman says—

Take woman out of her place, unsex her, and things will get mixed up and be followed by horrible confusion. I do not know whether the hon. member who introduced this Bill thought that would be any objection, but it certainly would be a very serious objection so far as I am concerned. I do not want things to get mixed and get into a state of horrible confusion.

On the next page he says—

Another thing is that there is no doubt if women in this matter take up the rôle of men, seeing that they are, on the whole, more emotional than men, their presence in political life will tend to increase the bitterness of political life, and wherever there is any difference in religious beliefs, it will tend to increase those differences. It will also do away with the chivalrous relation which exists, and which has existed, and which I hope may continue to exist, between women and men.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Evidently the matter I gave you is of great value.

Mr. TURLEY: I always like to point out to the hon. gentleman the ghosts of his dead self.

Just like a man with *delirium tremens*, the hon. gentleman has seen things, and he does not care about them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: People have been converted by ghosts.

Mr. TURLEY: I have never known the hon. gentleman to be converted yet. It is simply a question whether it pays or not; it is not a question of principle with the hon. gentleman in connection with this matter. I am satisfied of that, because he could not go back on the utterances we have here in *Hansard*. *Hansard* is a very good record. Further on we have this from the hon. gentleman—

If women say, "We insist on making the laws, but you can carry them out," we say, "We decline to carry them out. You take your share of it. You go into the army; you be a peeler." And why should they not?

The hon. gentleman states that, if we extend the franchise to women, the woman must be a peeler and must go into the army, and he says, "Why not?" Here is another result foretold by the hon. member on page 1141—

If I am going to support the Premier, and my better-half is going to support the leader of the Labour party, such is the weakness of human nature that I feel that in my domestic circle and on my family altar there will be strife. I feel that that is the only result that could accrue. If, in addition to the many causes of trouble in domestic life, we introduce the element of politics, then I am afraid that the number of marriages which take place will rapidly diminish, and that the divorce court will be more thronged with suitors.

That is the position being brought about by the Government, and the hon. gentleman cannot blame members on this side for trying to bring about anything of the sort. On page 1142 the hon. gentleman says—

It is as sure as anything can be, reasoning from what has happened in the past, that the effect of giving women the franchise will be to increase clerical influence. I am sure that will not suit the hon. member who distrusts sectarianism, as he calls it. He does not like this influence. I am not prepared to say that that would not be one beneficial effect of the Bill. Religious feeling is more strongly developed in woman than in man. At any rate it finds voice in religious observances more with them, and that can be proved from the fact that in France and in fashionable churches in England a very large proportion of the worshippers are women. In some way they seem to attach more importance to those observances than men. Now, if you give woman the franchise you will add to the power of the clergy, and by that means will strike a terrible blow at the new unionism, and the democratic socialism, and all the other "isms," of which the hon. member for Burke is such a strenuous upholder.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is quite true.

Mr. TURLEY: I am glad he is prepared to back up his arguments now that the Bill introduced by his colleague is to be responsible for breaking up family life; that it is going to put strife on his family altar, and that it is going to crowd the divorce courts with suitors. I am only pointing out what, according to the hon. gentleman's own arguments, is going to be the effect of this Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am startled at the truth of those remarks, made many years ago. They must be exceedingly valuable.

Mr. TURLEY: I hope the hon. gentleman is going to give us the same thing when he gets up to speak on this Bill. Further on the hon. gentleman said—

It may not be expedient to admit single women alone to the franchise, but it is certain that it is putting a premium on the single condition, because it is the single women, or, at any rate, the women without families, who would exercise the greatest influence in the political arena, as they have more time and more strength than wives and mothers. I submit that of all women in the world it is far more desirable that wives and mothers should exercise a preponderating influence than that it should be exercised by single women. This is an attempt to minimise the influence of the family.

This is what the hon. gentleman characterises as an attempt to minimise the influence of the family.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You approve of that?

Mr. TURLEY: No. I am pointing out that they claim for an adult vote Bill—and something besides—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A family vote.

Mr. TURLEY: I will come to the family vote presently. In 1895 the hon. gentleman had the same objection as the hon. member for Toowong has expressed to-day. He says he is not going to allow his constituents to be overruled by people who are in the centres of population.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Our place is a centre of population.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman has evidently changed his politics, seeing that his place is the centre of population, and all the other parts of the colony, so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, can go hang. That appears to be the position which the hon. gentleman takes up.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I certainly consider that my constituents have some claim upon me.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman said—

Whatever influence the country districts have now, they will have vastly less when this takes place. The large populations in the towns will have a dominating influence, and those who bury themselves in the bush, and are deprived of many of those comforts which those in town enjoy, will be at a far greater disadvantage than at present.

I believe the deliberate object of this particular Bill, or joke of a Bill, that has been introduced by the hon. gentleman's colleague is to disfranchise a large number of people in the back country. That is the object hon. gentlemen have in view.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If they are not entitled to it, why should they not?

Mr. TURLEY: If they are entitled, as I maintain they are, the obstacles that are put in the way are such that it will be almost impossible for them to get their votes. The Minister for Railways says that he has always been in favour of this sort of legislation. The hon. gentleman has been in nearly every case a consistent opponent of plural voting, and now he tells us that he is in favour of plural voting because this Bill takes it away from the property and gives it to the father. That is plural voting.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Certainly not!

Mr. TURLEY: The father has a double vote so long as the children live, and even if they die or go out of the colony he retains it, simply because he is their father.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You people were disputing the other night that he might not be the father.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURLEY: I never said anything of the sort. I deny that I ever uttered a sentiment of that sort.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I said your people.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member said "you."

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This is the first time you have spoken. I could not say "you." I said your people.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman said in 1895, on page 1335 of *Hansard*—

I shall not refuse to vote for a measure, as it is said some members do, because this year it contains too much, and then refuse to vote for it next year because it does not contain enough. Though there are some things in this Bill of which I do not approve, I shall vote for its second reading. I voted before for the

extension of the franchise to women, because I believed it was a proper thing, and I shall vote for it again, as they are entitled to the franchise on every ground that a man is entitled to it.

The hon. gentleman does not say so now.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The same thing.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman says now that a man is entitled to two votes and the woman to only one. That is the position that he takes up behind his colleague. He said on the previous occasion—

But there is no getting away from this—that we shall have to abolish the plural vote.

And the hon. gentleman is re-instituting it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman does not like people to believe that for a number of years he has been a consistent opponent of the plural vote, and all at once because he is a member of the Government he is obliged—like the Minister for Agriculture—to take two or three somersaults and say, "I am in favour now of what I was opposed to yesterday." The hon. gentleman also said—

It has been abolished in almost all the other colonies, and life and property are as safe there as they are in Queensland. There is a motion now before the Victorian Parliament for the abolition of plural voting. It does not exist in New South Wales or South Australia or New Zealand, and it has recently been abolished in Tasmania.

But the hon. gentleman now reintroduces it. It is no use for the hon. gentleman to state that he is trying to put men and women on an equality when he turns round and supports a Bill, because it happens to be brought in by the Government of which he is a member, which gives the man double the voting power of the woman. I am opposed to that principle, and the hon. gentleman at that time was opposed to it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was never before the House before. It was what was then called the corner peg vote. Now it is the flesh and blood vote.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, and the man votes twice. It is no use for the hon. member to say that the sexes are placed on an equality, because it is giving the man twice the voting power of the woman.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Personally, I do not care whether you give the voting power to the man or the woman.

Mr. TURLEY: I am glad to get even that confession from the hon. gentleman. It indicates that he is not particularly strong behind the colleague who has introduced this Bill; and his colleague has pointed out that it was absolutely necessary for a man to have two votes, and not the woman.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Well, the father is the trustee under all our laws.

Mr. TURLEY: It was pointed out by the hon. member for Kennedy that that might work out in this way: When a boy got to the age of eighteen or nineteen years, and did not happen to believe exactly as his father, there would be a row, because, in that case, if the father exercises the vote, which the hon. gentleman tells us belongs to these children, he is using it against their interest. Is that acting as trustee for the children? The hon. gentleman says further on page 1336—

The plural vote is centred in and around the metropolis, with the result that the metropolis rules the whole of the colony, and rules it very badly at times.

The hon. gentleman is now seeking as hard as he can to disfranchise the Western workers, because they have returned men to this House opposed to the Government. That is the aim and object that the hon. gentleman has in view.

He wants to disfranchise the Western workers, because they have been able to secure a majority of support from the Gulf down to the borders of the hon. gentleman's own electorate.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They have not got the Balonne yet.

Mr. TURLEY: No, but they have all the rest. They have returned men to the Federal Parliament, who were of the same way of thinking. The hon. gentleman further said on the same subject—

I am advocating what I believe to be right. It would be no injustice to the country; the people of the colony would not suffer by it, but would, I believe, be great gainers by coming into line with what is the practice throughout the civilised world.

Can the hon. gentleman stand up and say that this is the practice of the civilised world—that this joke of a thing that we have had put before us as an Elections Bill, with the object of delimiting upon it—can the hon. gentleman say that this is the practice of the civilised world or anything of the sort? The hon. gentlemen searched round until they came to a little place called Belgium, where they have a backward electoral law, and he says every schoolboy knows all about it. If every schoolboy knows about this business, then has he no right when he grows up to eighteen or nineteen years of age to interfere with his father as to the way in which he uses the two votes, one of which the hon. gentleman has said is a flesh and blood vote? If because a man owns flesh and blood he is to have a certain number of votes, that brings it back to the argument of the hon. member for Ipswich, who said that if people consumed dutiable goods, they should have a vote. Why, a horse consumed dutiable goods, and would you give the man who owns a horse a vote, because that horse consumes dutiable goods? We do not want arguments of that kind in a place of this sort.

Mr. BARBER: A vote for kanakas?

Mr. TURLEY: If we are going to give this vote to the owners of flesh and blood, why not give it all round? How many votes would men who own numbers of kanakas then have? How many votes would the Secretary for Agriculture have in that case?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the votes for the Trades Hall?

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman won't get any votes from the Trades Hall; the people there know his colour too well.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If I put in a few advertisements there, I would get them.

Mr. TURLEY: Even then I don't believe the hon. gentleman would get one vote, or half a vote. During the federal elections a number of Government candidates came along to the Trades Hall and put in a number of long advertisements; but they got the opposition of the *Worker*, and as a result they did not get one solitary Labour vote. They went down with a resounding thud. That is the sort of vote the hon. gentleman can expect from that source. When the Elections Bill was introduced in 1897 I find, on page 222, vol. lxxvii. of *Hansard*, that the Secretary for Railways then said—

I have always been opposed to plural voting, and I am not going back upon the stand I have taken in former times. I submit that the principle is unjustifiable.

And now the hon. gentleman is a strong supporter of plural voting!

Mr. McMASTER: Why did you turn your back on Glassey?

Mr. TURLEY: I do not know why the hon. member should be solicitous about Mr. Glassey just now. I remember when hon. members on the other side blackguarded Mr. Glassey,

called him a thief and a robber, and said he had done everything he could to burst up happy homes in Queensland—to burst up the good feeling which existed in the colony. Such charges have been hurled against Mr. Glassey by members on the Government side. I do not wish to be drawn off the track.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You have never been on it. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: I thought I was speaking about the principle of elections.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are talking about the ghosts of the past.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes. I want them brought up in order to compare them with the remarks and the votes given by hon. gentlemen opposite. Then on the same page the Secretary for Railways further said—

Women are just as much entitled to the franchise as men, and would cast their votes just as intelligently. Women's franchise in the southern colonies has proved no danger whatever. On the contrary, it has proved quite conservative, and it has put out two or three Labour members at by-elections in South Australia.

Then the hon. gentleman assumed the position of a prophet. He said—

If we have federation we shall certainly have a modification of the franchise, and it will be based on the abolition of the plural vote. Let hon. members make up their minds to that. If you are going to have it in the near future, you may as well have it now. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment.

That was the amendment moved by the leader of the then Government on the Bill which was introduced by Mr. Glassey.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Did not that show good sound sense?

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, and I am surprised at the hon. gentleman going back on that good sound sense and supporting a principle which he said was unjustifiable.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He is getting more radical, and that is what you don't like.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman is not getting more radical. He is getting more hide-bound to conservatism, as the other members of the Government are. There is an old saying that you must judge a man by the company he keeps, and judging by the company the hon. gentleman has got into, he has had to go back on the principles of a lifetime, and swallow what has been put before him by his colleagues in the Ministry.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Something like the Trades Hall.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member does not seem to like the Trades Hall, but the Trades Hall has nothing to do with this Bill. I can say that the Trades Hall would be ashamed to introduce a Bill like this, with all its faults. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not ashamed to introduce such legislation as a political joke, and tell us that this is the sort of legislation that the people of this State have demanded. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill evidently before has not believed in the principle. He says in 1894—*Hansard*, pages 726-7—that he does not believe in one man one vote as it means one vote one value, and would throw all the power into the towns. He expresses the hope that the electors will think well before they send members in pledged to one man one vote, and goes on to say that he was not altogether in favour of the property vote. Then he says—

I do say that there should be a distinct line drawn between those who have a stake in the country and those who have not. I believe there can be found a solution for that, not by mere tinkering of the electoral laws, but by a comprehensive measure which, by judicious compromise, would arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, and not by giving the idle and undesirable

members of society the same political power as men who have served their country for thirty or forty years with honour and distinction. That would be a grosser anomaly than the one which exists at the present time."

He stated at that time that he was not opposed to women suffrage, but he voted against the Elections Bill which was before the House, and then afterwards he introduced a one man one vote Bill which he had previously declared would practically be the curse of the country. Now he has departed even from that principle, and has introduced a thing like this. I do not know what you can call it. I understood there was no business meant by it, that it was brought in as something for the Secretary for Agriculture to talk about on Thursday afternoon. But it seems now that the hon. gentlemen opposite mean business. The antics of hon. gentlemen in connection with this remind me of that quotation from Shakespeare—

Man, proud man, dressed in a little brief authority,
most ignorant of what he's most assured—his glassy
essence—like an angry ape plays such fantastic tricks
before high Heaven as make the angels weep.

And there is no doubt that that is what we are getting from hon. gentlemen opposite. The Hon. the Secretary for Agriculture, the Secretary for Railways, the Home Secretary, are all practically in that position, when we take into consideration the attitude they adopted previously in connection with this question of elections. I think I may as well state the reasons why I am against the system which has been promulgated and put before the House in this Bill. I am against it practically for eight reasons. The first is qualification; the second, residence; the third—what the leader of this party calls "the tandem vote," and which hon. gentlemen call "the family vote"—at any rate, the plural vote; the system of registration; the attestation of declarations—the declaration system altogether; the abolition of plumping; the objections to clause 39; and the temporary provisions that are included in the Bill at the end. I

will deal first with this so-called [9:30 p.m.] family vote—this plural vote. The Secretary for Agriculture is always pointing out what has been done before. I know that the hon. gentleman used to point out that a Ho-Hang-Ho, or somebody who lived some time ago—I forget exactly the name the hon. gentleman used to give it, but hon. members can find it in *Hansard*.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A Labour leader.

Mr. TURLEY: This individual promulgated doctrines some years ago which have been taken up by the Labour party, according to the hon. gentleman, and they were bringing them in now as fresh doctrines, which they asked the people of this country to take up. Now, what is this system that they propose to introduce in this Bill? There have been quite a number of forms of worship; but there has been nothing so degrading to the human race as Phallic worship, which is practically proposed in this Bill. In old times they used to worship the symbol of fecundity, and in this Bill it is practically laid down that it is not intelligence, it is not manhood, which will entitle a man to have two votes. It is proposed to give him an extra vote for fecundity. He must be the parent of two children or he cannot have two votes. The Bill proposed that the people of Queensland should bow down and worship this symbol of fecundity, and the reward offered to them is that they shall have two votes. If they are not prepared to exercise their abilities in this direction they are only to have one vote. Therefore, I think hon. members will agree with me that it is reintroducing the system of Phallic worship.

Mr. BELL: Why stop at two votes?

Mr. TURLEY: That is the question I was going to ask. Why not give a dozen if a man is entitled to them?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Move an amendment.

Mr. TURLEY: I am not going to move an amendment. I am against the whole concern—lock, stock, and barrel. I always understood that hon. gentlemen opposite were worshippers at the shrine of Venus; but I now find they are worshippers at the shrine of Bacchus. I know they have read of the orgies that used to go on at the Feast of Bacchus in Greece and Rome. They know perfectly well that this worship was first brought from Egypt, and this symbol of fecundity was the object of their worship. That worship is embodied in this Bill, which says that a man, according to his powers of fecundity—at any rate, so far as two children are concerned—shall be given a reward in the shape of one vote. If this principle is carried to its logical conclusion, we shall have the hon. member for Nundah exercising something like seven or eight votes, while the hon. member for Dalby will only have one vote. I ask hon. members, who know the difference in ability between the two hon. members, which should have the larger number of votes? The Bill proposes to reintroduce this old system of worship which had to be put down everywhere by law. As I have introduced the question, I shall read what is known of it. I remember the Secretary for Agriculture on one occasion saying that, if we extended the franchise to women, we were endeavouring to alter a natural law that had been laid down even in the protozoa in the beginning of the world. We are not now going back as far as that. "Lempriere's Classical Dictionary," page 579, tells us what this system was. It was instituted in the old mythological times, apparently, of Osiris and Isis in the Egyptian mythology. Lempriere says that in following this worship they had a regular system. In their worship of this symbol of fecundity they carried it to a greater extent than hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to do, and were evidently prepared to offer a greater reward—whether in this world or in the world to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to offer a reward in this world. Lempriere says—

Its representative, called *phallus*, was made with wood, and carried during the sacred festivals which were instituted in honour of Osiris. The people held it in the greatest veneration: it was looked upon as an emblem of fecundity, and the mention of it among the ancients never conveyed any impure thought or lascivious reflection. The festivals of the *phallus* were initiated by the Greeks, and introduced into Europe by the Athenians, who made the procession of the *phallus* part of the celebration of the Dionysia of the god of wine. Those that carried the *phallus*, at the end of a long pole, were called *phallobori*. They generally appeared among the Greeks, besmeared with the dregs of wine, covered with skins of lambs and wearing on their heads a crown of ivy.

We know that this system was taken from Greece and carried on in the Bacchanalian festivities in Rome, being introduced there by a Dionysius, who professed to have brought the system from India, where he had been on an exploring trip, or something of the sort. When I read this, I pictured to myself a modern Dionysius in the person of the Home Secretary dancing round, and I take it that the Secretary for Railways would be able to carry the phallus most successfully, and dance joyously along behind the Home Secretary. Then, behind him, the Secretary for Agriculture could be dressed up in a number of skins of kookaburra, laughing at everything that was going on, and enjoying himself immensely, with a wreath of ivy round his head to show that

he was a firm believer in the system of worship that was being promulgated by the Home Secretary.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You seem to be the apostle of the Phallic system of worship.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman would be quite prepared to do it. Fancy the hon. gentleman and his colleagues dancing round in the grass in Victoria Park carrying on the system of worship that was carried on in ancient Greece and Rome. I would like to point out, getting away from that point—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Tell us about the landing of Captain Cook.

Mr. TURLEY: I always understood that the schoolboy knew about the landing of Captain Cook. Now the hon. gentleman is professing his ignorance—he knows nothing of the landing of Captain Cook. There is a good library here, and if the hon. gentleman reads the books relating to the matter he will be better acquainted with the conditions existing at that time. I think it is admitted as a biological fact that as the brain of man increases—as it is put to greater use—so does the power of fecundity tend to diminish all the time. I think that is laid down, not by persons who know nothing of the subject, but by persons held to be amongst the greatest thinkers in the English-speaking world.

Mr. BELL: What about Gladstone?

Mr. TURLEY: I am not giving single instances. I might give a score of eminent men in every walk of life who have been sterile. I was not giving individual instances; I was going on the opinion of the greatest of English thinkers. I don't know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to refute them or not. He may be. I have here Marshall's "Principles of Economics." I suppose the hon. gentleman will admit that Professor Marshall is one of the highest exponents of political economy existing.

Mr. BELL: He is a very good University professor. He is nothing exceptional—he is a good man.

Mr. TURLEY: He is supposed to be one of the best authorities on political economy in England to-day. He says, on page 233—

Reference has already been made to the influence of the age of marriage on fecundity. People whose lives involve much mental strain often marry late; and this by itself would tend to diminish their families. But, further, there can be no doubt that fecundity is diminished by any great nervous strain. Mr. Galton has indeed proved that those who do high mental work are not as a class prolific.

I think the dictum of Mr. Galton may be taken as that of as good an authority as can be got on this question.

Mr. BELL: You cannot settle a subject like that in a sentence.

Mr. TURLEY: I am not doing that. If we were arguing on the right or wrong of this question—

Mr. BELL: The data on this subject are very incomplete indeed.

Mr. TURLEY: I am satisfied of that; but does the hon. gentleman say that because that is so the Government should introduce a Bill like this which provides that two votes should be given to the person least intellectual according to what is laid down as the result of biological research—which the hon. gentleman is not prepared to come forward and refute. Here is a gentleman who, it was said the other night, if he was in Queensland, would be considered fit to have one vote; while a man who had got married and whose wife had two children—and perhaps kept him by working at the washtub—would have two votes. Herbert Spencer is

reckoned as one of the greatest thinkers in the English-speaking world, though he is over eighty years of age.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so.

Mr. TURLEY: I am glad the hon. gentleman admits something. But when he comes to the facts which Spencer lays down the hon. gentleman is prepared to get behind the jost of a thing like this, called an Elections Bill, and say that, though most intellectual men are often sterile, the fact remains that the Government are prepared to prevent those persons from having the full rights of citizenship. Spencer lays it down, on page 502—

Already the brain of the civilised man is larger by nearly 30 per cent. than the brain of the savage. Already, too, it presents an increased heterogeneity—especially in the distribution of its convolutions. And further changes like these which have taken place under the discipline of civilised life, we infer, will continue to take place. But everywhere and always evolution is antagonistic to procreative dissolution. Whether it be in greater growth of the organs which subserve self-maintenance, whether it be in their added complexity of structure, or whether it be in their higher activity, the abstraction of the required materials implies a diminished reserve of materials for race-maintenance.

I ask is the Secretary for Agriculture—is the hon. member for Dalby—prepared to come forward and prove that Herbert Spencer and Galton and some of the greatest thinkers of the age are wrong in the position they maintain?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is a great deal that Spencer says which won't support the attitude of your party.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes; but if the hon. gentleman will take the works of Spencer—let him read "The Man *versus* the State" and see whether there is not a great deal said in that which is opposed to the principles of the hon. gentleman and his friends. Even in his "Study of Sociology" the hon. gentleman can get a great deal that is opposed to the principles he advocates, and decidedly opposed to the principle—which is laid down as being a good principle—underlying this Bill, that is the principle of two votes based on the power of fecundity of the male.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Rubbish!

Mr. TURLEY: I agree that it is rubbish, and I am surprised at it being brought forward for consideration. Though the hon. gentleman says "rubbish" he stands behind his colleague and is prepared to go back on the expressed principles of a lifetime with the object of saving the position as far as the Government are concerned. The hon. member for Dalby interjected that you could get a very large number of persons who were fathers of families who had taken an active part and made their way in certain walks of life. I told him then that I could give him the names of some of the greatest thinkers in all the walks of life who had died childless, or who had been sterile. The Hon. the Minister for Agriculture would tell us that John Stuart Mill has laid the basis of all things, who has laid down the principles of political economy, and yet John Stuart Mill if he were in Queensland would only be allowed one vote.

Mr. BELL: Would you blame John Stuart Mill under those circumstances?

Mr. TURLEY: I will not say who is to blame.

Mr. BELL: Would you blame John Stuart Mill?

Mr. TURLEY: Who would the hon. gentleman blame? Would he blame nature? Is the hon. gentleman prepared, in spite of his legal training, to say that though a man is not guilty he is deserving of punishment? John Stuart

Mill, though married, had no family, and if he were in Queensland he would be denied a second vote.

Mr. BELL: John Stuart Mill, in the House of Commons, was of less importance than you are in this House. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: That may be true, but at the same time we often have the opinion of John Stuart Mill thrown across to members on this side of the House when they are debating a question of public interest. He has been quoted here again and again to show that he did not believe in the principles that we are advocating. I am not going to say what position he got in the House of Commons. I know very well that it is not every great man who has made a position in the House of Commons, but I suppose the hon. gentleman will admit that Pitt made his name felt and his weight felt in the House of Commons. I suppose the hon. gentleman will admit that, and yet Pitt did not leave any descendants behind him. That man, notwithstanding his astounding ability, if he were in Queensland, the huge, gigantic intellect of hon. gentlemen opposite would refuse him the full rights of citizenship.

Mr. BELL: Why Pitt did not attempt to qualify. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: That does not make any difference. I am pointing out that whether he attempted to qualify or not he was supposed to follow in and join in the usual Bacchanalian feast, upheld in this system of Phallic worship that the hon. gentleman would force upon this country. He was a man of great ability and of great attainments, and if he were in Queensland he would not be entitled to the full rights of citizenship, which the Government would give to any one who happened to be the father of two children in Queensland. The late T. J. Byrnes the hon. member for Dalby has described as a gentleman who led them; but if that gentleman were here to-day he would be put down beneath a naturalised Chinaman or kanaka, if either of the latter happened to have two children. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to take up that position?

Mr. BELL: He would not object to it either.

Mr. TURLEY: I think he would. Does the hon. gentleman say that he himself is prepared to be put down, so far as his civil rights are concerned, below the level of a naturalised Chinaman or kanaka? If the disability would apply to the late Hon. T. J. Byrnes, supposing he were here, it would apply equally to the hon. member, because he had not attempted to qualify in Queensland for a full vote. That being so, this Bill would put the hon. member beneath the naturalised Chinaman or kanaka. I do not believe the hon. gentleman would allow that to occur. I believe the hon. gentleman would be a long way above that, and I am surprised to hear him admit that practically that is the position that he ought to occupy here as a citizen. A very large number of eminent public men would be in that position. The Earl of Beaconsfield was another man. He was a married man, but whether he attempted to qualify or not, he would not under this Bill be entitled to the full franchise. Under this Bill if the hon. member got married, there would be nothing to prevent him attempting to become qualified, but how would anyone be supposed to know whether a man attempted to qualify or not?

Mr. BELL: I would object to you saddling me with the blame, if I failed. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: I am pointing out that we would have no notice of the hon. gentleman attempting to qualify. I am opposed to the Bill because it would inflict a punishment upon a man for something that he was not responsible

for. The hon. gentleman is surely not prepared to lay down a system of justice in Queensland based on anything like that. I would like to point out, for the benefit of the Minister for Railways, the case of the late Charles Stewart Parnell. He was one of the greatest men from the hon. gentleman's country—a man who did more in England for his country than almost any man of this century. He was a man who was believed, so far as intellectual ability and parliamentary practice were concerned, to be almost the equal of the late Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone.

Mr. FORSYTH: Oh, oh!

Mr. TURLEY: Yes. It has been admitted that there were very few men of his ability as an organiser standing on the floor of the House of Commons, and yet that man would not get two votes in Queensland.

Mr. BELL: I thought his fall was because he was too anxious to qualify.

Mr. TURLEY: He could not qualify under this Bill. It must be two children born in wedlock; and if the hon. gentleman happens to have half-a-dozen knocking around in Queensland at the present time, I would like to point out that it would not qualify him under this Bill. (Laughter.) I do not know how far the hon. gentleman may be qualified, but I would like to point out that so far as this Bill is concerned he cannot get a qualification of that description. I am surprised that here we have gentlemen composing a Government who recognising, as they must, that large numbers of men who practically take the foremost rank in all the walks of life do not see that they are men who would never or who never were qualified to obtain two votes if they existed in Queensland. There is another man, a man often referred to as a captain of industry, an empire builder—Cecil Rhodes, of South Africa, a gentleman whom the hon. gentlemen opposite would bow down and worship if he were only in the country here. They have pointed out that practically he has been the man who has built up South Africa, who by his indomitable courage, his energy, his ability, and his intellectual grasp, has built up almost an empire in the southern hemisphere. That man has been termed by hon. members on the other side as an empire builder.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: An empire wrecker.

Mr. TURLEY: I will express no opinion on that. I will take the hon. member's [10 p.m.] word for it. But I would like to point out that if this gentleman came to Queensland, hon. gentlemen opposite would put him on the same level as a naturalised kanaka who happens to have a wife and two children. What a splendid position they would place him in! Is it any wonder that Queensland, in a matter like this, stands forth throughout Australia as a State that is hardly worth taking any notice of—when they see hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared in cold blood to bring in such legislation? This Bill has made Queensland the laughing-stock of the whole of the States in the Commonwealth, and of a State outside the Commonwealth. What I am now going to state I have stated on a public platform more than once—that is, that there is no State in the whole group where, if such things were done by the men in power as have been done by hon. gentlemen opposite, the responsible men there could hold their positions for twenty-four hours. I believe that if the Government of any other State, or of New Zealand, attempted to force legislation like this on the people they would not be able to hold office for twenty-four hours. They would be ashamed to propose such legislation. And even although they were not ashamed to do it, as soon as the electors got an opportunity of

expressing their opinions, they would pretty soon be thrown out of their positions. They would have no difficulty in doing that. I was not going to give the whole of the names I wished to refer to, but I think I might as well, if only for the purpose of filling up *Hansard*. There is John Bright, the Right Hon. Henry Fawcett, Professor Jewett, Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Newman, General Gordon, Macaulay, Palmerston, Beaconsfield, Pitt, John Stuart Mill, Tyndall, Carlyle, Ruskin, Parnell, Cecil Rhodes, and T. J. Byrnes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the hon. member for Dalby.

Mr. TURLEY: But the hon. member for Dalby is not qualified.

Mr. BELL: Neither is Cecil Rhodes. I may if this Bill passes. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member evidently thinks the reward of an extra vote will be a sufficient inducement for him to get qualified. If we are going to go in for Phallic worship, why not carry the matter to its logical conclusion, and give every man who possesses the power of fecundity in the form of creating children a proportionate reward.

Mr. BELL: Phallic worship was carried to excess in Rome and Greece.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes. It eventually had to be put down by law there.

Mr. BELL: That is no indication of national decay.

Mr. TURLEY: I did not say it was. But I say that it is a system we do not want in Queensland. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to take up the position of high priest instead of the Home Secretary, dancing round in Victoria Park or some particular place on the Downs? (Laughter.) I think the hon. member for Dalby would decline to be bound with ivy wreaths, and to follow some old scullion carrying a phallus at the end of a long pole, as evidence of this Phallic worship.

Mr. BELL: With our small population we might do worse. (Laughter.)

Mr. TURLEY: Perhaps that is the reason why this Bill has been introduced by the Government. They may have been stirred up by the hon. member for Dalby, who probably has seen the advantages of this system of worship, with a view to increasing the population. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Dalby thinks the reward offered is sufficient for him to try and make himself qualified. But why not give all persons the full reward? The Government have always pointed out that rewards should be commensurate with success. If that is so, why not give the full reward to the hon. member for Cambooya? I understand he has a very large family. He should have one vote for himself and another vote for every two of his children; and in that case he will be able to go round and exercise fourteen or fifteen votes. And yet the hon. member for Dalby could exercise only one vote. (Laughter.) See the openings this will give! It will give people on polling day an opportunity of wearing different coloured ribbons to show people their social position. If we go out to the National Association Show, we see a bull or an ox at the top of the tree decorated with a blue ribbon. Another animal wears the red ribbon, which conveys that he is only second class. If this were carried out at election times, why, the hon. member for Cambooya would be decorated with a purple ribbon—(laughter)—as evidence that he is entitled to record fourteen or fifteen votes. Then another member who would be entitled to record ten or twelve votes, might wear a red ribbon, and so on. Talk about a show day, why, it would not hold a candle to an election day under these conditions! And say

the Minister for Agriculture came along—well, he would probably be decorated with a yellow sash, as an evidence of his standing as a citizen, and as evidence of how many votes he is able to record. (Laughter.) And if the hon. member for Dalby came along, of course he would be clothed in the traditional purple white. (Renewed laughter.) It would be an evidence at any rate that he was entitled to cast one vote, and have one say in the government of the country. I do not know why the power of fecundity should be the only test for a person to have a say in the government of his country. Why should we not say that if a man has red hair he shall have two votes, or if he is bald-headed—possibly I would get another vote on that account? I do not know that there is any special reason why the power of fecundity should be selected. Why not take a man who is good at cricket or football, or a man who can run 100 yards in so many seconds, or say that if a man is over 5 feet 6 inches in height he shall have two votes, whilst if he is less than 5 feet 6 inches in height he shall only have one vote? All those reasons are just as logical, just as sensible, as the one that has been proposed by the Government in this Bill.

Mr. AIREY: A stud vote.

Mr. TURLEY: This is not a reward for maintenance. This is not a reward for a man being trustee for so-and-so. We have it on the word of the Secretary for Agriculture that if this Bill passes the divorce courts are going to be thronged with suitors—that people are going to be divorced because of their family altars being wrecked, and all this sort of thing. If that is so, then we may have a case like this: A man gets married, and has two or three children, or whatever it may be. By and by, through the franchise which the hon. gentleman said would be responsible for bringing about this state of affairs, we shall have the divorce court thronged, and this woman goes there. In many cases the woman will be given the charge of the children. Now, if she marries again, if the man she marries again is prepared to undertake the responsibility of bringing up those children, he is certainly the one who should be entitled to the second vote. But, instead of that, the man who has got free—the man who is divorced—will have two votes for the rest of his natural life, while the man who accepts the responsibility will be tied down to one vote. The thing is monstrous. I have pointed out that this is no inducement to population, because a man only gets two votes even if he has a dozen youngsters. But it may have this effect: we know very well that if we take up a newspaper we see all sorts of advertisements—"People who do not want families, call on Dr. So-and-so"; or "Cut out this, place it in an envelope, and forward it to Dr. So-and-so, and you will get information that will enable you to do anything you like." If this Bill is brought in with the object of increasing population, it may prove to have the very opposite effect. We are told by hon. gentlemen on the other side that a man does not struggle when there is no prospect of any further reward. They say that while there is a prospect of reward men will fight and struggle against Nature. But when a man has two children he will have proved that he is entitled to the full rights of citizenship, and there is nothing more for him to struggle for. There is no reason why he should have any more children. Then why should he have a bigger family? Instead of the Bill being an inducement to people to go in for procreation and to have large families, I submit that it will have the opposite effect. The hon. gentleman, by interjection, just now asked me what about France? I am not sure, but I think it was during the Napoleonic wars that they instituted a system in France as an inducement to people to have large

families. Not only was the State prepared to take the families off their hands—to educate them and look after them—but they relieved the fathers of large families from paying any taxation. That was a bigger inducement than giving them an extra vote. Since that time they have established a system there in which all children are taken without any question asked, and they are brought up by the State, which acts as a foster-mother; and people who have slipped, or fallen, or who do not want their children, are relieved of all responsibility by the State. But, in addition to that, a few months since the same question came up again in France. An agitation was got up, and it was asked why, with the population going back in comparison with the surrounding nations, the same old system should not be introduced? Why the man, with his wife, who was responsible for having a large family, should not be relieved from the whole taxation of the country? I do not know whether the hon. member for Dalby is prepared to introduce an amendment, if the Bill happens to get into committee, providing that every man who has two or three children shall be relieved of taxation, as an incentive to him to do everything he possibly can to increase the population.

Mr. McMASTER: Will you support that if it is moved?

Mr. TURLEY: Me? I think it is rather an absurd question to ask me, but I am not afraid to give the hon. member an answer. I am totally opposed to any system of plural voting, and that would be a system of plural voting. There is another thing: There is a clause in the Bill which provides that any person can enter an objection against my name being on the roll. Supposing an objection is entered against my having two votes, I must appear either personally or by an agent; and, if an agent appears for me, he must be competent to depose to the fact from his own knowledge that I am entitled to have two votes. Can anything be more ridiculous than that? Could you possibly get a man who would be prepared to go to a registration court and depose that, of his own knowledge, another man was the father of two children? The more one looks into it the more absurd it appears. I do not believe you could get a solitary individual in the whole of Queensland to depose to a thing of that sort of his own knowledge. I am opposed to this Bill for another reason—and it is a thing that, as a rule, I like to keep out of politics. I do not believe in introducing anything of a sectarian nature unless I cannot possibly help it. I am opposed to any system that will penalise one portion of the community because of their religious belief. I decline to be a party to voting for the second reading of a Bill which says to the ministers of one denomination, "Because of the view you take in connection with your religion you are not fit to exercise the right of citizenship." I decline to be a party at any time to penalise any man because of his religious belief. If hon. gentlemen on the other side are prepared to do that let them get up and say so. I know there are a number of men who are ministers of religion who are just as much entitled from their manhood, from their ability, to express an opinion, and from the fact that they are connected with large numbers of other people; and I contend that they are as much entitled to the full rights of citizenship as the ministers belonging to any other denomination. What sort of a system is it under which the pastors and leaders of a large number of people are to be put into a position in which they will not be able to exercise the full rights of citizenship? What have we heard of in connection with the country the Minister for Railways comes from? Men have made their reputations there fighting for equal political rights independent of

religious feeling altogether. We know men whose names have come down in history, whose names are household words to-day, not only with the hon. gentleman's fellow-countrymen but with all English-speaking people—a great part of whose lives were taken up in fighting for something which meant that a man should not be penalised because of his religious belief; and I decline to be a party to penalise a man, as this Bill does, because of that particular reason.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That's all right.

Mr. TURLEY: I am not troubling about the hon. gentleman's opinion. I take my stand as a man who believes that a man should not be penalised for his religious belief. If the hon. gentleman believes that there should be instituted in Queensland a system like that which was once in existence in the country he came from—which was burst up by the efforts of Daniel O'Connell when he won the Clare election in 1829, when he pointed out to the English House of Commons that something had to be done to remove existing disabilities—if the hon. gentleman is in favour of establishing a system like that in Queensland, I leave it to him to do so, but I will never be a party to doing anything of the sort, no matter what the denomination may be.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You cannot fool the people with those professions.

Mr. TURLEY: I am stating my own opinions.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Everybody knows what you are trying to do.

Mr. TURLEY: I am standing here because I take exception to the Bill. I will take exception to it on every platform I have a chance of getting on between now and the time of the election. I am not bidding for the Catholic vote, if that is what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. BELL: You are doing your best.

Mr. TURLEY: I am taking my stand against the Bill as a man who believes that in no case should a man be penalised on account of his religious belief. If hon. gentlemen on the other side believe there should be a system of that sort instituted in Queensland they are welcome to their belief; but they will never be able to say that they got any assistance from me, and I believe they will never be able to say they got any assistance from any member of this party in bringing about such a system.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: I now come to the qualifications. I do not believe in the qualifications. I believe in one qualification, and one only.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: I am speaking on the ground occupied by the Home Secretary in 1899, when he wanted to know why it was that he had to introduce a Bill like this. I contend that residence should be the only qualification to enable a person to obtain the franchise in Queensland. I have given the hon. gentleman's reasons at that time, but I would like to point out that in this Bill there are four qualifications. Then there is voting by post, which will practically enable the person who possesses the qualification to vote, as the hon. gentleman says, in whatever part of the Commonwealth he may be at the time of the election. I don't believe in giving the property vote that hold which it will have under this Bill—which will be a greater hold even than it has now. The Home Secretary, in introducing the Bill in 1899, said this, as will be found in *Hansard*, page 846—

However, we are not here to discuss the different principles upon which members should be elected to the representative Assemblies of Australasia. That has practically been settled by the adoption in five colonies of the Commonwealth Bill. It is

in deference to the expressed will of the people in the adoption of that Bill that this measure is now introduced, in order that Queensland may be brought into line with the other colonies in regard to this very important question. I believe it is a fact that a considerable majority of the members of this Assembly were pledged to support the principle of one man one vote, and, since it is the corollary of the adoption of the Commonwealth Bill, I take it there is very little doubt as to its passage through this Assembly.

Speaking further on the hon. gentleman pointed out this—

No one has the right to assume that either manhood suffrage, with one man one vote, or adult suffrage, with one person one vote, has been adopted. The only principle we can be certain about as having been adopted in the passing of the Commonwealth Bill is the principle of one man one vote.

Then the hon. gentleman told us why he adopted the system. On page 847 he said—

It will be argued probably that a man should have a vote for the electorate in which his interests lie rather than for the electorate in which he happens to be residing. I may point out that in New Zealand three years after they adopted the principle of one man one vote, retaining the property qualification, they altered that qualification to the one contained in this Bill, and that fact largely influenced me in representing to my colleagues that it was desirable straight away to adopt the principle of residence as the only qualification.

That is the reason why that principle was adopted in that particular case. There is another reason why I am opposed to the Bill, and that is the provision with regard to residence. We know a few months ago Mr. Justice Chubb declared that if a man was living in an electorate, even if he camped under a gum-tree, that should count as residence. That was the judgment given in court. This Bill is brought in with the object of wiping out any such system as that. Under the residence clauses of this Bill a man must have a home. Many a man in Queensland has no home to-day—many a score of men—in fact we are told by the representative of the pastoralists in this House that the nomad vote—the vote of the man who goes round to look for employment in the Western districts—is a national curse—that he is the man responsible for sending members to Parliament to represent opinions held by members sitting on this side of the House. Because he does not believe in the Government that is in power, because he does not recognise the principles they advocate are favourable to his interests, he is termed a national curse. Why? Simply because he exercises the right of citizenship, and this Bill is introduced to say that he shall not exercise the right of citizenship; to say that he is not to go to the ballot-box—the same as he has done in the past—

[10:30 p.m.] and say, "I am going to vote for a man who believes in the principles which I believe, if carried out, will redound to my benefit and my credit." For that reason he is to be penalised by the hon. gentlemen who believe that they will be able to capture these Western electorates if they are only able to get this Bill through. There is also the system of registration. It is not one that will suit any body of men, unless they are absolutely stationary. Suppose I reside for a certain time in a place, and by and by fill in a claim. That is all right. It is put on the register. Then I have to carry with me, for six months, the day and date when I filled in that claim; and if I shift from the place where I filled in that claim, I have to fill in a declaration to the effect that I certainly did fill in a claim, that it was certainly for residence, and that I have been residing in the electorate. I have to get that witnessed by a magistrate or someone else. The document has to be witnessed with an absolute knowledge that everything is absolutely correct, and if the magistrate does not

do that he will probably be put in gaol or struck off the roll for a couple of years. What a lovely system of justice that will be! The hon. gentleman knew that they have fully nine-tenths of the magistrates under their control. They know that nine-tenths of the magistracy are totally opposed to the principles that are held by this party, and they know that every obstacle is put in the way—if they have reasonable ground to believe that the claimant believes in the principles of the Opposition party in this House—with the object of keeping him off the roll. I have had to go to magistrates in this city—to whom men have taken claims and they have only done half their work. The claims came into my hands, and I went to those magistrates and asked them to finish their work. They then turned round upon me, and wanted to know who I was. I told them I would speak to the Home Secretary, and see whether they were to be allowed to abuse their office in this way, and they again asked, "Who are you?" I said, "I am the representative of South Brisbane," and they immediately said that it was all right, and proceeded to finish their work. That is the reason why I say that this is only another obstacle that is being put in the way of the people of this colony to prevent them from getting their names upon the electoral rolls. There is another reason why I am against the Bill, and that is because plumping is forbidden. I believe in a system of single electorates in the first instance, but when there is more than one person to be elected for a constituency I deny the right of the Government to say that any man shall not exercise his franchise in any way that he thinks proper. This is the result of the Federal elections. It is because hon. gentlemen see that on that occasion three men were put forward as being favourable to the policy of the Federal Premier, and we asked the electors to support them. They responded to that call; they were loyal to their professions; they were not prepared, like the hon. gentleman, to make a Jim Crow of their political principles, and they went to the ballot-box and elected those three, and I say that they had as much right to vote for them as the other side had to vote for their six candidates.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They did not vote for you, anyway.

Mr. TURLEY: No, they did not; I am still here, if the hon. gentleman wishes to know. There were three men standing who believed that black labour was opposed to the best interests of Queensland, and they were opposed by a number of men who were willing to clasp to their bosom the smelly kanaka or anybody else—in fact they recognised him as a long lost brother, but the three men who were for a white Australia were elected. Is there any injustice or any recognition of a man's liberties in requiring that men should vote not for the member they wish particularly to have elected, but for the whole six who were required?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You could have run six men.

Mr. TURLEY: They did not want to run six. They selected three men, and the very fact of running three men successfully proves that their judgment was not in error. The hon. gentleman ran more than that, and I remember the lovely cartoon which appeared in the *Worker* afterwards—"Home they brought their warriors dead." (Opposition laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Warriors dead are better than warriors that skedaddle.

Mr. TURLEY: Quite so, but the hon. gentleman does not believe in that. He believes that "he who fights and runs away may live to

fight another day." The hon. gentleman has run away from his political opinions for a number of years, and he does not like it to be known.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS : Oh, no.

Mr. TURLEY : It is because the hon. gentleman is prepared to make a Jim Crow of his political principles, and among them his opposition to plural voting, that this Bill is being introduced at the present time. There is another reason why I am totally opposed to it, and that is because the temporary provisions are bad. They will prevent numbers of persons who are now on the rolls from getting their names on the new roll. Within a certain time after this Bill has come into operation, the electoral registrar will send out notice to these men, saying, "Your name is on the roll, and we want you to fill in this claim, and hand it back after it has been witnessed by a magistrate or any other person mentioned in the Bill." Now, I know the difficulties. I know there are a number of justices of the peace who shirk their duties in this respect, and I have mentioned a case showing what has transpired within my own knowledge in this city. I have heard many hon. members refer to the difficulty of getting magistrates in fairly thickly populated portions of the colony to witness claims. If that is so there, what is the position of men in the West in this respect—of men who have been held up by hon. members opposite to be the pioneers of the country—men who have gone out into the Western country, who have settled down there, and who have assisted in producing wealth from the soil—men who are prospecting on our mineral fields and who have added something to the wealth of the community—men who have a hard life—men like the leader of the Opposition, who have gone out with a tent and a blanket and a pick and pan, and who have been the means of adding to the wealth of this State? If this Bill becomes law, what possibility will these men have of being able to comply with the "temporary provisions" of this measure? I say that these provisions would be a disgrace to those pets of hon. members opposite, down in the South Sea Islands, if they had any system of elections there. I do not believe that these people would propose such things as have been proposed now by hon. gentlemen opposite under this farce of a Bill. The idea of hon. gentlemen opposite may be that there is going to be a change made in the constitution of this Parliament, for the electors realise how this State has been governed for a number of years; they realise the trickery that has been indulged in; they recognise the style of legislation which has been introduced, which I term class legislation. I ask is it not a fact that the people of this State are waking up and that they are prepared to say that some change should be made as far as their interests are concerned? That is the only reason why hon. gentlemen opposite have come down with a Bill of this sort, which, in the first instant of its being put into operation, most undoubtedly will be in the direction that is required by the hon. member for Balonne; in the direction that is required by the Minister for Railways, and in the direction that is required by most hon. members opposite, who wish to remove what they term the curse of the nomad vote. They wish to take away the franchise from numbers of these men in the Western electorates. Are not these the reasons why the Government have come down with this Bill, and why they have asked hon. members to be so green—or, if not green, to be so forgetful of their pledges and principles—as to support this measure, which I term an abortion? It will give me great pleasure to

record my vote against the second reading of this Bill, but if this vote is taken on Friday night, I shall not be able to record my vote. I have made an engagement to go to Stanthorpe on Friday and address a meeting there; so if this vote is taken on that night, my name will not appear in the division list. But if it is taken at any other time, I shall be very pleased and proud to cast my vote against the second reading of this Bill. And even if I will not be able to record my vote, I shall be pleased to tell some of the constituents of the Home Secretary the reasons why I think this farce of a thing has been introduced into this Chamber.

MEMBERS of the Opposition : Hear, hear !

Mr. McMASTER : I hope you will tell the truth.

Mr. TURLEY : Yes, I will.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS : It will be the first time, then.

Mr. BARNES (*Bulimba*) : I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, intimating that the Hon. B. D. Morehead had been appointed a member of the Library Committee in the room of the Hon. William Allan, deceased.

PRICKLY PEAR BILL.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council returning this Bill with amendments, in which they invited the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

On the motion of Mr. BELL (*Dalby*), it was ordered that the Council's amendments be taken into consideration to-morrow.

The House adjourned at fifty minutes past 10 o'clock.