

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1907

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—

1 Construction of the tramway was commenced before 1st July, 1906, as provided by the Act, but the plans, sections, specifications, etc., have not yet been deposited with the Commissioner.

2. Yes; 8th February, 1906.

3. Yes.

4. It does not seem likely.

5. Yes.

6. Such as the Government could not accept.

7. Will consider when the occasion arises.

Mr. PAULL asked the Secretary for Mines—

1. How many mineral licenses or leases are held in the Albert River and Lilydale districts by the Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited, and how long have they been held?

2. Are there any other mineral licenses or leases now held in those districts, or in any district that would have been served by the lately proposed Albert River, Burketown, and Lilydale tramway; if so, what are the names of the holders; and how long have they been held?

3. What rents or fees have been received from the Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited, and from other holders during the present year, distinguishing between them?

4. Are all these holdings being worked?

5. If not, what exemptions have been granted, and on what grounds?

6. Have any mineral holdings in the foregoing districts been surrendered or forfeited during the last two years; if so, what are the particulars?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. W. Blair, *Ipswich*) replied—

1. Forty-eight mineral leases applied for under the Albert River, Burketown, and Lilydale Tramway Act, viz. :—

3	applied for	1 January, 1901.
1	applied for	1 January, 1902.
7	applied for	1 July, 1903.
27	applied for	15 April, 1904.
1	applied for	10 November, 1904.
8	applied for	6 February, 1905.
1	applied for	15 March, 1905.
—				
48				

2. Leases held by others than Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited, are—

No.	Holder.	Date of Application.
93	R. M. Watson	25 October, 1904
100	A. E. Mellor	1 November, 1905
101	Do.	1 November, 1905
102	R. M. Watson	2 January, 1906
110	Do.	23 February, 1906
111	Do.	23 February, 1906
112	Do.	23 February, 1906
113	Do.	23 February, 1906
116	Do.	7 March, 1906
117	Do.	19 June, 1906 -
119	A. E. Mellor	15 April, 1907

3. Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited, £1,118; other holders, £232 4s. 8d.

4. No.

5. There are no labour conditions attached to the leases held by the Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited. Other leases under exemption are—Nos. 102, 110, 111, 113, 117. Each six months' total; the grounds being, "Awaiting railway communication."

6. Mineral leases surrendered or forfeited during the last two years :—Nos. 31, 74, 79, 82, 97, 93, 99, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 115, and 118. All forfeited for non-payment of rent.

INCOME TAX ACT.

Mr. CREGH (*Croydon*) asked the Treasurer—

1. In face of the Treasurer's statement that where a dividend is only of the same amount as the call made on shares it is not a dividend within the meaning of the Income Tax Act, will the Treasurer explain why the Commissioner claimed dividend tax in the case of

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER, 1907.

The SPEAKER (Hon. John Leahy, *Bulloo*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPERS.

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

- (1) The report of the Official Trustee in Insolvency, Rockhampton, for 1906.
- (2) Annual report of the Department of Public Works for 1906-7.

QUESTIONS.

ALBERT RIVER, BURKETOWN, AND LILYDALE TRAMWAY ACT.

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

1. Are the provisions and conditions of the Albert River, Burketown, and Lilydale Tramway Act Amendment Act of 1905 being carried out by the Queensland Silver Lead Mines, Limited?

2. Has the extra deposit of £2,500 been lodged with the Government as provided by that Act?

3. Was the tramway commenced before 1st July, 1906?

4. Is it likely to be completed before 1st January next, as provided by that Act?

5. Has any application been made to the Government for any further extension of time?

6. If so, what are the terms and conditions suggested?

7. If not completed by 1st January, is it the intention of the Government to carry out the Act, and forfeit the £5,000 or the amount deposited (whatever it may be), and also to forfeit each and every lease held by the said company?

the Brisbane Gas Company, recently before the court, and others, including mining companies; and is it the intention of the Treasurer to embody in the Income Tax Amendment Bill a clause declaring that in all cases in which a dividend declared by any company covers only a small call made such dividend shall be exempt from income tax?

2. In face of the Premier's distinct promise, when the Income Tax Act Amendment Act of 1902 was before the House, that there should be no appeal beyond the Supreme Court, why did the Government take the recent case to the High Court, and will the Government embody in an amending measure a clause declaring that the court of review shall be the final court of appeal in regard to both the Commissioner and the public?

3. As large claims by the Commissioner against other companies hinged on the decision given in the case referred to, and as that case was really a declaratory decision as to the meaning of the Income Tax Act, does the Treasurer intend to treat same as a test case?

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—

The hon. member will have an opportunity of discussing this subject when the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill comes on.

DEATHS IN INFANTS' HOME, TURBOT STREET.

Mr. BARNES (*Bulimba*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. How many children died in the Infants' Home, Turbot street, during the year 1905?

2. How many died during the year 1906?

3. How many died from the 1st day of January to the 31st July of the year 1905?

4. How many died from the 1st day of January to the 31st July of the year 1906?

5. How many died from the 1st day of January to the 31st July, 1907?

6. What was the average number of deaths per cent. of children in the home during the year 1905?

7. What was the average number of deaths per cent. during the year 1906?

8. What is the average number per cent. that have died for the present year up to 30th September?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

1. Seven.
2. Eighteen.
3. Three.
4. Nine.
5. Twenty-two.
6. 9.46.
7. 21.95.
8. 30.12.

I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the control of these infants is in the Orphanages Branch, which is a sub-department of the Department of Public Instruction, so that this matter does not really come under the Home Secretary's Department.

CONTROL OF MOTOR CAR AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. Is there any traffic regulation providing for the licensing or numbering of motor-cars, or providing for drivers being compelled to pass an examination of competency or fitness?

2. Will he state whether the present regulations are sufficient to efficiently control motor-car and bicycle traffic?

3. If not, and if legislation is necessary, will he consider the desirability of introducing an amending Bill this session?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

1. It is doubtful whether the Brisbane Traffic Act of 1905 contains sufficient authority for the making of such regulations.

2. See No. 1.

3. Yes. The matter is now under consideration.

WHEATGROWING IN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*) asked the Chief Secretary—

Having regard to the fact that Queensland is importing about £250,000 worth of flour per annum, will the Hon. the Premier authorise a competent official to inquire into the vital question of wheatgrowing in Queensland upon such a scale as will make her absolutely independent of the Southern markets, the fluctuations of which, so it is claimed by the flour-millers and master bakers, are directly responsible for the present high price of bread, a circumstance keenly felt at the present time by thousands of wage-earners in Queensland?

The PREMIER replied—

This important matter will receive careful consideration.

PETITIONS.

HON. E. B. FORREST (*Brisbane North*) presented a petition, signed by eighty-nine barmaids and barmen of Charters Towers, asking for an alteration in the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill in the direction of fixing a maximum number of hours for service in hotel bars.

Petition received.

Mr. MAUGHAN presented a petition of similar purport and prayer, which was also received.

ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

The PREMIER moved—

That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 3 o'clock p.m. on Friday in each week, in addition to the days already provided by Sessional Order, and that Government business do take precedence of all other business on that day.

Hon. R. PHILP: Is the motion seconded?

The SPEAKER: Yes; it was seconded by the hon. member for Woothakata.

Hon. R. PHILP: There ought to be some reason given for a motion of this kind.

The SPEAKER: The motion was called "Formal."

Question put and passed.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. W. Blair, *Ipswich*), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

LAND SURVEYORS BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said: I apprehend that this is a measure which, as to its general principles, at all events, is not likely to call forth much opposition. It is possible that in the Committee stage there may be suggestions for amendments in some of the clauses, but I confess that, so far as my knowledge upon the general reception which the body of surveyors have accorded to this measure is concerned, I do not anticipate that even in Committee there will be many proposals for drastic alterations. This Bill is the outcome—I admit a belated outcome—of a conference held in Melbourne in 1891—a conference of delegates of examining bodies of surveyors in each State. That conference laid

down the general principles of this Bill. They laid down the fundamental principles and many of the details which should create in each State a governing body for the full control of surveyors and surveying work for the purpose of preserving the standard of efficiency among surveyors, and which would be able, when occasion arose, to inflict punishment upon those surveyors who had proved their inefficiency by performing irregular work. That conference laid down the basis of a Bill which in each State should achieve that object. A number of the States have placed a similar Bill to this on their statute-books—New Zealand, Western Australia, South Australia, and Victoria; and New South Wales had a Bill ready, and we in Queensland for some years have had this Bill ready. The measure has received the approval of the Institute of Surveyors, a body representative of the general mass of surveyors in Queensland. They have gone through the Bill and approved of it, and it is almost identical or distinctly similar to the measures which have passed in four other States. At the present moment the controlling force for surveyors in Queensland is in a confused state. We have the Lands Department surveyors, under the control of the Lands Department; we have the surveyors who are doing work for the Real Property Office, and surveyors who are doing work for the Mines Department.

Hon. R. PHILP: The Railway Department, too.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, of course. One might amplify them and refer to the surveyors under the Marine Department as well.

Mr. JENKINSON: They are not land surveyors.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Of course, I was dealing with surveyors in the ordinary sense, and not technical or special surveyors. In regard to the Mines and Real Property Office, there is really very little control over the work which these officers do. The Lands Department is the only department which has a staff of permanent men who go into the field and check the work which contract surveyors perform. There is no corresponding check over the surveyors of the Mines Department.

Hon. R. PHILP: Is all the work under the Lands Department checked?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A very great deal of it is checked.

Hon. R. PHILP: Not $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I confess I do not know as much about the matter as the Surveyor-General. If I did, I should be able to check the hon. gentleman's figures. The hon. gentlemen will, however, understand that it is not contended that the permanent field staff are expected to check every item of work that the contract surveyors do. All that they can do is to check a general proportion of the work, and ascertain its general efficiency.

Hon. R. PHILP: It can be checked in the office.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes. A good deal of it is checked in the office. In connection with the Mines Department and Real Property Office, there is no supervision to any extent over the work which the surveyors employed by those departments perform. If surveyors who are doing work under the Real Property Acts or in connection with the Mines Department do their work unsatisfactorily, there is practically no control over them, and no machinery for bringing them to book. One result of this measure will be that a board will be created, which will bring these surveyors under

a sort of discipline. There will be more supervision over them, and the surveyors who are found guilty of a dereliction of duty—and I am glad to say there are very few of them in that condition—will be subject to punishment at the hands of the board. As hon. members will see, the board will be constituted as provided by clause 4. The Surveyor-General will always be, *ex officio*, a member of the board; two members will be appointed by the Governor in Council, being salaried officers of the Crown, which practically means staff surveyors, and two members will be appointed by the Governor in Council on the nomination of the Institute of Surveyors.

Mr. JENKINSON: Why is that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Because that will give representation to the general body of surveyors.

Mr. JENKINSON: Would it not be possible for a large number not to belong to that body? Why drag them in?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The object is, as far as possible, to give representation to the general body of surveyors, and I have no doubt, if the hon. gentleman has any grounds for what he says, he will be able to show in Committee that there are a large number of these surveyors who are not members of the institute.

Mr. JENKINSON: I can conceive of a large number not belonging to the institute.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that that is so now?

Mr. JENKINSON: No, no!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If it were so, I should be very much surprised to hear it. I believe the institute is representative of the general body of surveyors, and I do not think the history of surveying in any of the other States indicates that the Institute of Surveyors is not representative of the general body of surveyors. If the hon. gentleman is nervous on that point, and desires to allay his apprehensions, I shall be very glad to meet him when the Bill is in Committee.

Mr. JENKINSON: Nervousness is foreign to my nature.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not mean to suggest that a stigma attaches to a man who is nervous. Even the best of men are occasionally nervous. As a matter of fact, I am very much disposed to think that the man who is never nervous is not quite as decent as he ought to be. Those cocksure, calm men are not always quite as admirable as they might be. Nervousness is a sign of decency.

Hon. R. PHILP: Honesty.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes; honesty, if you like. I hope now there will be a change in the demeanour of the hon. member for Fassfern as the result of my honesty. If hon. members will turn to clause 24 they will find that it deals in detail with the powers which the board may exercise, and it will be observed that their powers are fairly wide. Amongst other things they may make by-laws for the direction and guidance of surveyors in carrying out the provisions of the Acts relating to Crown lands, mining, and real property. That is one of the most important clauses in the Bill, for at the present moment the control over mining and real property surveyors is quite inadequate. I am not aware that there is very much more that I need say upon the Bill. The general body of surveyors will undoubtedly welcome this legislation, and I am confident it is a Bill which is

Hon. J. T. Bell.]

really in the public interest, for it will go some way to put an end to evils that exist to the detriment of the public in regard to surveying work.

HON. R. PHILP: What do you refer to?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I refer to slovenly work done under the Real Property Act, and to unsatisfactory work that is sometimes done for the Mines Department. In referring to unsatisfactory work which is occasionally performed, let it be understood that I am not in the slightest degree casting any reproach on the general body of surveyors in Queensland. I am not using any idle stereotyped words of flattery when I say that they are a fine body of men. No one who goes into the country and comes across a surveyor's camp can be other than pleased with his experience. You meet there educated men possessed of bushcraft, and I always feel the greatest pleasure in meeting them in pursuit of their duties in the bush. It is a hard life living under canvas all the year round, and they earn every penny of the money they get.

MR. JENKINSON: They get very little.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have been getting a great deal more under the administration of this Government than under the previous Government. There has never been a period in the history of Queensland when surveyors have been so continuously employed.

MR. JENKINSON: They get less fees than in the other States.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You cannot gauge a statement of that kind by the number of surveyors employed.

HON. R. PHILP: The money spent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have to look at their books to see how continuously they are employed, and I am quite correct in saying that in the history of surveying in Queensland the general body of surveyors have never been so continuously employed as they have been during the last few years.

MR. JENKINSON: The seasons have had a lot to do with it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We will not go into that.

MR. BARBER: They are very hard worked in the Dalby district. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, they are hard worked in the Dalby district, and I am very glad of it, [4 p.m.] and I am sure the hon. member for Bundaberg is patriotic enough to be glad too. I know surveyors who have been doing very hard work in the district in which Bundaberg is. (Hear, hear!) I hope within the next year or two we shall have a larger number of surveyors busily employed there.

MR. BARBER: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: As to the suggestion about Dalby, there is really nothing in it. Dalby happens to be a part of the Darling Downs, and anything that has Darling Downs attached to it has, in the minds of most of the men who come up from the South, a particular attraction. That is one of the chief reasons why there are so many surveyors in that part of the country. (Laughter.)

MR. MACARTNEY: It is only one part of the Downs.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes; but all the land is taken up on the other part of the Downs. When I remember that amongst the roll of Queensland surveyors has

[Hon. J. T. Bell.

been the name of Sir Augustus Gregory, and men like the late W. A. Tully, I feel that there are distinguished names associated with them, and from that reason, with others, I have the greatest pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): This Bill is really a Committee Bill; it is not a Bill over which we can raise any great heat or fervour or opposition, but I think the Minister might have left out a few words about some bad surveyors and good surveyors. I was ten years in the Mines Office, and I have no hesitation in stating that there was rarely a complaint about the surveys in that department during that time. The Lands Department wanted to have the control of all the surveys, and complained that there was trouble in some ways, but as far as I know there has never been any trouble with the mining surveyors. All the mining surveyors are certificated men, and the work is effectively checked in the Mines Office.

MR. KENNA: Do they want control of it?

HON. R. PHILP: They want to get control of the Mines and Real Property Office surveys.

MR. KENNA: But do mining surveyors want to come under this?

HON. R. PHILP: I have not heard. Survey work in Queensland has been exceedingly well done by all the departments, and there is no occasion for one department to be praised at the expense of the other.

MR. MAXWELL: The Mines Department is more effectively checked than any of the other.

HON. R. PHILP: I never heard any complaints of wrong surveys in the Mines Department while I was there. I know that the survey work was kept up exceedingly well; you could get a survey much quicker through the Mines Office than the Lands Office, and the Real Property Office surveyors have done their work exceedingly well. I hope this is not going to be a flash in the pan; that we are not going to the Mines Office for surveys and then to be told "We cannot do it now, the Lands Office do all the surveys; we can only ask to have the surveys done." I think it will be a mistake if the surveys are not left under the heads of the various departments, as formerly. Let the Mining Department deal with mining surveys, the Department of Justice with real property surveys, and the Lands Department surveys under the Minister for Lands; otherwise—if it is under one head—there will be more confusion. It is quite certain that survey work has not been sufficiently recognised, and this Bill will give it necessary recognition, and I hope it will be the means of getting work done quicker than it is at the present time. That is the complaint all over Queensland. The Minister said surveyors are doing better than they have ever done, or better than they did under the last Administration. I can only say that the returns furnished by the Treasury show that more money was spent in four years by the late Administration than has been spent during the four years of the present Administration.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Continuous employment.

HON. R. PHILP: We went on surveying land, knowing it would be required some day, and did not cease work because times were bad. We kept men regularly on surveying work for the wants of the people, and the present Minister has admitted the good work done by us, because of the quantity of land he found surveyed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You surveyed large areas.

HON. R. PHILIP: Small and large areas, as the present Minister is doing. I think the present Minister is very much behind with surveys. People want land, and it is not surveyed, and they cannot get it.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They did not want the land then.

HON. R. PHILIP: Not to the same extent. There is a great demand for land now all over Australia. It is the same in New South Wales, Victoria, and the other States—their land surveyors are taxed to the utmost. It would be better to let each department be responsible for its own surveys, and then there would be a Minister responsible for all the work that is done.

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

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

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

Clause 12—“Remuneration of factory workers”—put and passed.

Clause 13—“Certificate of employment”—put and passed.

On clause 14—“Working hours and overtime for male young persons and females in factories”—

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. T. O’Sullivan, *Warwick*) moved the omission of the following paragraph:—

(21.) The provisions of this section, requiring payment to be made for overtime, shall not apply to females who are employed in the capacity of forewomen, and who receive as wages not less than thirty shillings per week.

A deputation had asked him if there was any valid reason why forewomen getting not less than £110s. a week should be in a different position to other employees in reference to payment for overtime, and he had some difficulty in giving an explanation. The provision was embodied in the clause because it was dealt with in the principal Act. There was really no justification for it, however, and he therefore moved its omission.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOUCHARD moved the insertion, at the end of the clause, of the following paragraph:—

(24.) All the provisions of this section relating to females shall apply to adult male persons engaged in or in connection with a laundry at work which is usually performed by females in a laundry.

In laundries females were usually employed, but in Brisbane there were some laundries owned by Asiatics, who employed their own countrymen, and the consequence was they worked till all hours. In the Southern States it had been found necessary to deal with laundries owned by Chinese and Japanese in the same way. His amendment would have the effect of putting those people on the same footing as the females employed in other laundries.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 15—“Hours of business in shops—Exempted shops”—

Mr. BOWMAN said he would like the Minister to introduce in this clause an amendment removing hairdressers’ shops from the category of exempted shops. In the principal Act hairdressers’ shops were included among the exempted shops. He had in his hand a petition

signed by sixty employees in hairdressers’ shops who were anxious to come under the provisions of this Bill. The employees in all shops, with the exception of one, had signed that petition; most of the employers were in favour of the shops being brought under the provisions of this Bill, and the proprietor of the one shop to which he had referred had written to him stating that he was in favour of such a course being adopted. What the employees desired was that their hours should be regulated as follows:—Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, close at 6 p.m.; Thursday, close at 1 p.m.; Friday, close at 9 p.m.; and Saturday, close at 10 p.m. The hours now worked by employees in the city are as follow:—Monday, from 8 a.m. till 8 p.m., 12 hours, less 1½ hours for meals, actual working hours, 10½ hours; Tuesday, same; Wednesday, same; Thursday, from 8 a.m. till 1 p.m., 5 hours; Friday from 8 a.m. till 9 p.m., 13 hours, with 1½ hours for meals, 11½ hours actual work; Saturday, from 8 a.m. till 10 p.m., 14 hours, less 1½ hours for meals, 12½ hours actual work; total hours for the week, 59½ hours. In the suburbs the hours were:—Monday, from 8 a.m. till 9 p.m., 13 hours, less 1½ hours for meals, actual working hours, 11½; Tuesday, the same; Wednesday, the same; Thursday, from 8 a.m. till 1 p.m., 5 hours; Friday, from 8 a.m. till 9 p.m., 13 hours, less 1½ hours for meals, actual working hours, 11½; Saturday, from 8 a.m. till 10 p.m., 14 hours, less 1½ hours for meals; a total for the week of 62½ hours. He hoped the Minister would see his way to meet the wishes of the hairdressers in this matter.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:

The object of the hon. member was a very good one, but the amendment he suggested was not necessary, and it was not feasible. The effect of an amendment striking out hairdressers’ shops from the list of exempted shops in section 50 of the principal Act would be that they would have to close at 6 o’clock on every day in the week except one, and that would not suit the convenience of the public. As a matter of fact, the Government were meeting the barbers to a large extent by this Bill, which would reduce their hours of labour from sixty to fifty-three hours a week. What he suggested to a deputation was that they should make an arrangement among themselves as to the hours which they would work, and under the new Wages Boards Bill that arrangement could be gazetted by the Minister, and it would then have the force of law; and he thought that would meet the case. Having regard to the fact that the proposed amendment would mean that all hairdressers’ shops would have to close at 6 o’clock every day in the week except one, he hoped the hon. member would not press his amendment.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Minister did not know his own Act. Section 50 dealt with exempted shops. Then, in section 51, there was the following proviso:—

Subject to the provisions of this Act, all shops shall be closed on the business days of every week at the hours following, namely:—On the evening of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at the hour of six o’clock; on the evening of Friday at the hour of ten o’clock, and on the afternoon of Saturday at the hour of one o’clock:

Provided that if the day appointed for the half-holiday as hereinafter provided is a day other than Saturday, all shops shall be closed at the hour of one o’clock in the afternoon of the day so appointed, and the occupier may keep his shop open on the evening of Saturday up to the hour of nine o’clock, but, unless the day so appointed is Friday, shall close his shop on the evening of Friday at six o’clock.

The hairdressers had their half-holiday on a Thursday, and they remained open on Saturday evening instead.

Mr. Jenkinson.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you say that section 51 applies to hairdressers?

Mr. JENKINSON: It applied to all shops which were not exempted, and if they took hairdressers' shops out of the list of [4.30 p.m.] exempted shops, it would apply to them as well as to others. Hairdressers' shops were exempt, and the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had asked that they should be omitted from the exemptions, and be placed on the same footing as non-exempted shops, to which section 51 applied.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Was that not what I said?

Mr. JENKINSON: No. The Minister said that they would have to close every day in the week at 6 o'clock.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes, if the amendment of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley were carried.

Mr. JENKINSON: If they were excluded from the exempted shops, then clause 51 would apply.

Mr. BOWMAN: I asked for 6 o'clock for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday; 1 o'clock on Thursday, 9 o'clock on Friday, and 10 o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Act provided for that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No, they can only have one long night in the week.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Act read—

If the half-holiday is a day other than a Saturday the occupier may keep his shop open on the evening of Saturday till nine o'clock.

Mr. BOWMAN: Read on.

Mr. JENKINSON: It provided that the shop should close at 6 o'clock on Friday, but it only meant getting in another provision stipulating the hours which the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had on his petition. The fact of the matter was that the Minister had been opposing this all along. Deputation after deputation had waited on him, and although they arranged it, the Minister was never satisfied, and always tried to block them. As both employer and employee desired to be brought under the provisions of the clause, he did not see what objection there could be to it.

Mr. BOWMAN: He could see the force of the Minister's argument that if they brought the hairdressers under the Bill as non-exempted shops they would deprive them of certain concessions they were asking for to enable them to keep open two late nights. If they brought them under the law as it stood, they could only have one late night—Friday or Saturday, as the case might be. He knew the hon. member for Fassfern had taken an interest in the hairdressers in Brisbane, and had tried to get them some relief in the hours they had to work, and, as they had been assured by the Minister that the wishes of the majority in the regulation of hours would be given effect to if they sent a petition to him, that was all that was necessary.

HON. E. B. FORREST: He had accompanied deputations which had waited on the Minister, and the arrangements which had been made between the employees and employers had been satisfactory. The Minister gave them certain advice, and they followed it.

Question put and passed.

Clause 16 put and passed.

[Mr. Jenkinson.]

On clause 17—"Amendment of section 52"—

HON. E. B. FORREST explained that he had an amendment to move in clause 16, but he was waiting for a prior amendment to be moved when the clause went through.

Clause put and passed.

HON. R. PHILP moved the following new clause to follow clause 17:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Early Closing Acts, there shall be no limit to the time during which a shopkeeper, whether within a metropolitan or a country shopping district, or the husband or wife of such shopkeeper, may keep his shop open, and, with the assistance of one member of his family, sell goods therein on any week day whatsoever.

This was another appeal for the one-man shopkeepers. This amendment was an exact copy of the South Australian Act. South Australia, like Queensland, passed an Act in 1900, but they found that it would not work, and in 1902 they passed an amending Act with this amendment in it to please the small shopkeepers. A similar amendment was passed in New Zealand in 1905. The clause there provided—

The wife of a shopkeeper or any of his family shall not be deemed to be a shop assistant within the meaning of this section.

In giving evidence in Sydney, Mr. Hordern said that his business had enormously increased at the expense of the small shopkeepers. He thought the little shopkeeper deserved as much consideration as the big shopkeeper, but the Bill favoured the big man against the small man. Every person in business in a large way started in a small way, and if they had not been permitted to do so they would never have started. If the present onerous conditions continued, the small shopkeepers would be wiped out altogether, and large trusts would be formed, for which the Labour party of Queensland would be responsible. Any deserving and thrifty man who started a little shop of his own now could do no good with it on account of the existing law. He believed if a poll were taken of the big shopkeepers, the consensus of opinion would be in favour of allowing the small men to keep open. He strongly condemned the creation of trusts and monopolies, of which they had heard so much in America, for when trusts existed it showed that the trade of the country was in the hands of big men, and that the little men got no chance. What were the Labour party there for?

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: To draw their screws.

HON. R. PHILP: They were supposed to fight for the small man, and if the Government were as democratic as they professed to be they would join with him and vote for the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The leader of the Opposition had put the case very strongly; but he was convinced that the amendment was against the principle of the present Act. At the same time, he did not want to treat the amendment as a party one in the slightest degree. (Hear, hear!) It was a matter upon which people could honestly differ. A great deal could be said for the hon. gentleman's view, and if he were not convinced that the amendment was against the principle of the Act he would vote for it. The hon. gentleman had founded his argument in favour of the clause on the South Australian amended Act. He noticed in the last report of the factory inspector a reference to that subject on page 16, where he said—

The great majority of shopkeepers are most emphatic in their denunciation of the provision which permits a shopkeeper who pays no wages to keep his shop open as long as he pleases, while those who pay wages, and incidentally help to support other families besides

their own, are penalised for so doing. It is particularly exasperating to shopkeepers who employ one or two assistants and close their shops at the appointed times to have to compete against men in the same line of trade who carry on their business with the aid of a grown-up family, and keep the shop open until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, and on Saturdays until nearly 12 o'clock.

Complaints of this nature are many and well founded, and I have been urged to bring under your notice the disadvantages under which the employers of assistants are labouring while competing with shops run by large families who are exempt.

Then Mr. Quinn, the Queensland inspector, said—

The one-man shop and the mixed shop are still a source of continual trouble; although I devote a considerable amount of time and attention to this class of shop, there is still a constant demand for vigilance, as, in addition to the passive resistance always displayed by this class of shopkeeper, there is the rapid change in ownership to contend with. A comparatively large number of these shops change hands several times during the year.

Judging from the reports it seemed that the working of the system was unsatisfactory, and the amendment seemed to conflict with the principle of the Factories and Shops Act. The shopkeepers who had employees were bound to close their shops at a certain hour for the benefit of the general community, and it was not fair that they should have competition from men in the same line of business simply because they had no employees. For those reasons he regretted that he could not accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITE (*Musgrave*): When on the hustings he was repeatedly questioned on this subject and always said he would allow the one-man shops to remain open. They did not come into competition with the larger shops, and were a great convenience to the public. Many an honest and industrious woman who kept a small fruitshop afforded great convenience to the poorer class of the community if she also stocked a few groceries, besides which it enabled her to make an honest living. The Minister told them that the amendment was against the principle of the Act, but how many exemptions were there in the Factories and Shops Act? There were too many altogether. If the Government dealt with all shops and public-houses, and compelled them all to close at 6 o'clock, there would be something in the Minister's argument. But there were many shops that were not closed at 6 o'clock, and they still had employees to go into them. He was in the same position himself, being one of the exempted shops. If one shop was closed at 6 o'clock, let all shops be closed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: All shops in the same line.

Mr. WHITE: He did not believe in exemptions at all. If everybody wanted a night off let the Bill provide for the closing of all shops, and also public-houses and barbers' shops, but any Government trying to do that would find it was not in accordance with the wishes of the people. Most of the Bills being brought forward now were in the interests not only of the large shopkeepers but of the manufacturers. It was now impossible for a man to improve his position under the present Act. The Bills being brought forward by the present Ministry, he contended, were not "Gang forward" Bills but "Gang backward" Bills—trying to dictate what every shopkeeper should do. He believed in the principle of early closing, but he believed these exemptions should take place within a certain radius of the centre of a town or city. That would be in the interests of the public, and would allow a man or woman to improve their position in life. He would vote for the amendment.

HON. E. B. FORREST: Notwithstanding the fact that the South Australian factory inspector had reported adversely to one-man shops, the fact remained that there had been no attempt, and there was not likely to be any attempt, to alter legislation in that direction. There was nothing to show any intention in South Australia to alter the Bill, and it stood there as it was proposed by the amendment it should stand here. He had already drawn attention to the fact that they should have had the inspector's report presented before the Bill was gone on with. They had had what purported to be an extract from the report, but why was the report not on the table? The probability was that before the inspector published his report he would change his mind again. He did not pay the slightest attention to the reports read this afternoon. In common decency to hon. members, they should have had the report tabled. It was kept back for a purpose; it had been done before, and it was being done again.

Mr. KENNA: You are attributing motives.

HON. E. B. FORREST: He did not care; it was a patent fact.

Mr. BOWMAN: The same thing happened last session.

HON. E. B. FORREST: It often happened, and was happening now, and why did the hon. gentleman not put his foot down and stop it? (Laughter.) If he had as strong a foot as the hon. gentleman, he should put it down, and they would have the thing altered in one act. One section of the community thought it was a convenience to them that one-man shopkeepers should have the right to keep open till 8 or 9 o'clock at night, as sought by the amendment, and it was a concession to which the small shopkeepers were justly entitled. These shops were frequently kept by women who were struggling to make a living. They were struggling under the grossest hardships. Whatever view they took of the matter, there would be no harm in accepting the amendment and making the experiment. They had heard a great deal of the effect it would have on the bigger shopkeepers, and one of the officials in a trading institution here had told him that if the amendment was carried there would be 200 applications for shops in Queen street within a month; but nothing could be more absurd. Where were the 200 people coming from, and where were they going to get the shops? Where were they going to get the rent? Long before this kind of legislation was ever dreamt of, the best of the large shops were observing shorter hours, and shutting up at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and they were contented that the smaller shopkeepers should have an opportunity of making a living. Western Australia was regarded as somewhat of a Labour State, and the shops there closed at 1 o'clock on one day a week, at 10 o'clock on another day, and the other four days they closed at 8 o'clock. Why should that not be a proper thing here? In New Zealand one-man shops were exempted altogether, and that was a very strong Labour place. In South Australia it was the same as it would be under this amendment, and in Victoria the matter was being considered by the Legislature. What they proposed there was in the direction of allowing small shopkeepers with no assistants to keep open till 8 o'clock. In every case the inspector's approval was necessary. When they found such legislation had been passed in the other States of the Commonwealth, he trusted the Committee would have the good taste to pass the amendment.

Mr. BOUCHARD was very glad the Secretary for Works had stated that he did not regard

Mr. Bouchard.]

the amendment as a party question. He intended

to support it, as it was a humanitarian provision. These shops were mostly kept by widows or else by elderly men and women to enable them to eke out an existence. The one-man shops did not come into conflict with the larger shops. Most of them were situated in the suburbs, and were a source of great convenience to the residents there. Hon. members on that side had referred to the legislation in the other States. In South Australia such a provision was found to be necessary; and there were similar provisions in force in Western Australia and New Zealand. In those three States the Labour party might be said to be fairly dominant, and if the Labour parties in the other States he had mentioned had seen the reason and justice of the provision, it was surely reasonable and just for them to agree to a similar provision here. If it was not carried, he believed it would be the means of throwing upon the charity of the State a good many people who were at present eking out an existence by keeping small shops.

Mr. BARBER: Nonsense!

Mr. BOUCHARD: The hon. member must know that in the district in which he resided the people who kept those shops were mostly old people. He was surprised that an hon. member who held forth in that Chamber and in his own electorate as a champion of the rights of the poor people should not lift up his voice on behalf of the people affected by the amendment. He hoped the Committee would see the justice and reasonableness of the amendment.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): As far as he remembered, when the Factories and Shops Bill was first introduced in Queensland this miserable whine about the poor one-man shopkeeper and the poor widow shopkeeper was set up, and it had not been dropped since. When the Bill was introduced last session the Secretary for Works read an extract from the report of the Chief Inspector to the same effect as that which he had just read. The leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Brisbane North, the hon. member for Musgrave, and the hon. member for Brisbane South, had all quoted South Australia. He would point out that the Minister for Labour in South Australia promised to deal with the matter last year on a recommendation made by the inspector of factories and shops at Adelaide. Despite the assertion of members of the Opposition, something had been done in South Australia. If hon. members took any interest in South Australian matters, they would know that the real reason why an amending Bill had not been introduced into their Legislature this year was because the Legislative Assembly had been busy fighting the Upper House on the franchise question, and practically everything else had had to stand in abeyance until that matter was settled. He held in his hand a report taken from the *South Australian Register*, one of the leading papers in Adelaide, of Tuesday, 11th July last. A very large deputation, practically representing the whole of the shop assistants of South Australia, waited on the Minister for Labour and urged upon him the necessity for compelling the smaller shops to close at 6 o'clock, the same as the big shops. Mr. Wiltshire, the secretary of the Early Closing Association, said—

They had found that the clause which exempted those who did not employ assistants other than members of their own families had worked greatly to the detriment of the shopkeepers. It had also had a bad effect upon some assistants, for where only one or two men had been engaged they had been dismissed, and the work given to members of the family, so that the owner could have unrestricted liberty in keeping his shop open. He thereby gained an advantage over, perhaps, his next door neighbour, who had no family to help him.

[*Mr. Bouchard.*

Further on he referred to another matter, and said—

Then they brought forward the question of mixed trades—that was, the shops in which exempt and non-exempt goods were offered. A number of greengrocers, ham-shops, and similar establishments had enlarged their operations in the grocery line, and had become a menace to those who dealt purely in non-exempt goods in that particular neighbourhood.

That deputation placed several important matters before the Minister, but he would not read the whole of them. The Minister, in reply, said—

He knew the Early Closing Act was defective. . . . An amending Early Closing Bill was now being prepared, and he would see, with his colleagues, if they could adopt the suggestions that had been made.

From what he had seen of the reports of other deputations which had waited on Ministers in South Australia, he believed that an amending Bill of the character suggested would be introduced in that State this session, and that small shopkeepers would be compelled to close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. KEOGH: Do you think that is fair?

Mr. BARBER: Of course he did, or he would not advocate it. They would have this pitiful whine about one-man shopkeepers every year. He had always taken up the stand that no concession should be granted to those people.

Mr. KEOGH: Even to a widow?

Mr. BARBER: Even to a widow—place them all on the same basis. That was the view he expressed in reply to questions at the last general election, and he saw no reason for altering his opinion. There were several one-man shops in the suburbs of Brisbane in which he lived, but they were run by families. When the sons and daughters came home from their employment in the evening, one took a shift one night, and another another night. That was not fair to larger shopkeepers. He had not heard of a solitary one-man shopkeeper who had been compelled to apply for State relief through having to close his shop at 6 o'clock in the evening, and his experience was that immediately a small shop became vacant there was a rush for it; so that, apparently, those people were doing a good business. At any rate, he had never heard any of them complain against having to close at 6 o'clock. He would vote against the amendment.

Mr. BARNES: He lived in the same direction as the hon. member for Bundaberg, and he was sorry to say that his experience was not that one-man shopkeepers did not complain against having to close at 6 p.m., and he would rather be on the side of the weak in this matter.

Mr. BARBER: A very nice sentiment.

Mr. BARNES: It should be something more than a sentiment; it should be the desire of every representative of the people to do his utmost for the weak, provided that in doing so he did not do injustice to other persons.

Mr. MANN: What has your firm done?

Mr. BARNES: The hon. member for Cairns was in the habit of asking unintelligible questions, but he might tell the hon. member that his firm in Warwick took the initiative in closing in the afternoon before there was any legislation on the subject, and the hon. member for Cunningham could bear him out in that statement.

Mr. GRAYSON: Quite so.

Mr. BARNES: What he could not understand was that hon. members who were supposed to be in practical sympathy with the working classes seemed to block them at every turn. Some members of the Labour party had been the strongest opponents to a proposal to grant justice to the

small shopkeeper. The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that no injustice was done to such people, and that when there was a vacant shop it was immediately rushed. The hon. member then made the sweeping assertion—not in precise terms, but by inference—that he would rather see a woman receive relief from the State than strive by means of a small shop to keep herself and her children.

Mr. BARBER: He said no such thing.

Mr. BARNES: He accepted the hon. member's denial, but that was certainly the inference which he drew from the hon. member's remarks. He understood the hon. member to say that it would be against the general good for even a widow to be allowed the privilege of keeping her shop open at night to do business.

Mr. BARBER: No.

Mr. BARNES: Really he would ask what did the hon. member say? What would be the effect if this drastic legislation, shutting the door against one-man shopkeepers, was carried out? They would not make a satisfactory people if they coddled one class, and said another should not have a chance of rising. When he started in business he had to work very long hours, and he was very glad that he had to do so. He did not see why they should debar anyone from trying to get on, but that was what they were doing.

Mr. BARBER: In what way?

Mr. BARNES: When a small man was trying to rise in his business they said to him, "No, you cannot do it. You must become the servant of the big man." It was said by the hon. member for Clermont—whom he regretted to hear was ill—that the sooner these small men were wiped out the better. The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that the present Act had been evaded, and two or three children were sitting at the door to keep a lookout.

Mr. BARBER: I never said anything about children sitting at the door.

Mr. BARNES: The hon. gentleman said that they were practically scouts out while business was being done at night. Whatever the Labour party had to say about it, the legislation that prevented these people doing business was against that particular class of the community. The majority of traders did not object to give their fellows a chance of rising, and that could be done by passing the amendment.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): The amendment had not been printed; but from what he could gather it meant that a father, mother, and one member of a family could keep a shop open for an indefinite number of hours, while the man next door, if he employed one person, and was only in a small way of business, had to close his shop at 6 o'clock. The leader of the Opposition made a strong appeal for the small shopkeeper, and was backed up by the hon. member for Bulimba; but where was their concern for the small man when they were passing the poll tax? These very gentlemen said that the very best feature of the poll tax was that it collared everyone in the State, including the poor widow and the one-man shop man. There was a good deal of concern about the poor widow, and he agreed that she should get every show imaginable. But the amendment would penalise the widow in this respect: If the widow was unable to attend to her business herself all the time, and employed someone even for a few hours while she attended to domestic duties, she must close her shop at 6 o'clock; but the shop next door, which was in the same way of business, might be carried on by the father, mother, and one member of the family. Again, a widow might have to employ someone to keep her books, and that would mean that she would

have to close at 6 o'clock. He sympathised with the small shopkeepers who were struggling along; but the interests of the man who employed men and paid them fair wages had also to be considered. He objected to the amendment unless a better definition of a one-man shopkeeper was brought down. It should be limited to one person, either to a widow, a widower, or to a single person incapacitated for hard work. If it was limited to a person who wished to earn a few shillings rather than go to Dunwich, then they might allow that person to keep a shop open at night. There would be too much evasion under the amendment. A lot of people did a back-door trade now, and if they opened the door they did not know where it would end, and the whole Act would be a farce.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*): If the amendment were carried, it would undermine the whole Bill. A feature that had been overlooked was as to how it would apply to the Northern towns. A number of the shops there were kept by Japanese and other aliens, and they would all come under the one-man principle. The junior member for South Brisbane said it would be humanitarian to pass this amendment; but, in his (Mr. Nevitt's) opinion, it would be the reverse. He did not say that all parents were hard taskmasters; but, in reading the history of legislation prior to the introduction of the factory system, they would see that some children who worked for their parents were under worse conditions and worked longer hours than they would work under the factory system. The amendment would give parents who had not got that love and affection for their children which they should have an opportunity of making them work a greater number of hours than they should. The hon. member for Bulimba said that the hon. member for Bundaberg inferred that the Act was evaded in East Brisbane, but the inference he (Mr. Nevitt) drew from the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg was that exempted shops were to blame for working their sons and daughters long hours. They knew that in many cases where the sons and daughters came home from their ordinary employment in town, they had to take a shift at home at night. It had been said that it was a convenience to keep one-man shops open. No doubt it would be if all shops were kept open, but the present legislation had existed for five years, and he had not yet heard of a large proportion of one-man shopkeepers being obliged to go to Dunwich or having to seek relief. He should certainly vote against the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER (*Fortitude Valley*): It had been a wonder to him why the representatives of Labour always opposed this amendment. It was a surprise in one way, but not in another. They posed as friends of the poor, and yet they were driving the whole trade into [5.30 p.m.] the hands of the rich. He did not know what their object was unless they thought they could more easily carry out their socialistic ideas when trade was concentrated in the hands of a few. The hon. member for Bundaberg said he had no sympathy for the widow, but the hon. member seemed to have a good deal of sympathy for the bookseller, the tobacconist, and the Chinaman who kept a fruit-shop. His (Mr. McMaster's) colleague was able to keep his shop open to all hours of the night, and yet his neighbour next door, who happened to sell 1 lb. of tea or sugar, was obliged to close his shop at 6 o'clock. He had always wondered why such people should be exempt. He observed that members of the Labour party were ready enough to quote New Zealand when it suited their purpose, but they did not quote the experience of New Zealand on the

Mr. McMaster.]

one-man shop question. The Minister, in speaking about barbers not being brought under the provisions of the Act, said it was a public convenience that those shops should be kept open. He could tell the hon. gentleman that it was a greater inconvenience to the public to close the one-man shops than it would be to close the barbers' shops. There was a certain class of people who could not possibly do their shopping during the day. Many of them were servant girls and shop hands. In regard to what had fallen from the leader of the Opposition, he could thoroughly endorse what he said—that the present state of the law prevented many young men from making a start for themselves in business. There were some trades, such as the draper's trade, in which a young man could not start without a few hundred pounds capital, and even then he had to start in a very small way indeed and gradually build up his business, which he could only do if he was allowed slightly longer trading hours than the bigger shops. He had seen the beginning of nearly every large wholesale and retail house in Brisbane, and he could assure the Committee that they nearly all started in a very small way indeed. There was no question whatever that the Act was at present being evaded. There were some persons who kept a few vegetables and some fruit in their windows, and at the same time had a screen drawn across another part of the shop, behind which there was often drapery and groceries. Those people endeavoured to keep the law as far as they could, but it was not in human nature that they should refuse a customer who came in and wanted something from behind the screen. When the Act was first introduced he advocated that it should be applied to all trades, without exception, and there would be some consistency in such a course being pursued; but he could never understand why there should be so many exemptions. The one-man shop was a great convenience to the public, besides enabling many a poor woman to earn a living for herself and children. He would remind hon. members that in Brisbane the large retail shops closed at 6 o'clock long before there was any legislation on the subject. In Fortitude Valley the larger shops all closed at 6 o'clock two years before there was any early-closing legislation, and they were not jealous of the small shops. Women went out in the daytime to the larger shops, where there was a greater variety of goods; but the trade done in one-man shops was done by those who were unable to get out during the day.

Mr. MITCHELL (*Maryborough*): But for the reputation which the hon. member for Bulimba bore for truthfulness, he would have been inclined to doubt his word when he said that when he was comparatively young and had to work all hours, he was glad he had to do it. (Laughter.) He had never himself, even amongst the socialists, met men who were delighted because they had to work long hours, and he was sorry to hear the hon. member for Bulimba give expression to such sentiments. Now he had an opportunity he also desired to give them to other members of the community.

Mr. BARNES: No!

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member said "No," and at the same time advocated the desirableness of permitting certain individuals to keep their shops open as long as they liked.

Mr. BARNES: No, no!

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Brisbane North also called "Hear, hear!" when the hon. member for Bulimba was speaking. That was a bad position for men to take up

who talked about sympathy. There was no sympathy in permitting men to work more hours than their neighbours.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not close them all?

Mr. MITCHELL: He was quite willing to close them all; he was opposed to exemptions altogether. He ran a shop which was entitled to exemption, but he had never taken advantage of it, and on principle had always closed his shop the same as the others. The socialists simply wanted, as interjected by the hon. member for Toombul, to do away with the exemptions altogether, to have all shops closed at 6 o'clock. He was opposed to the amendment, and would assist the Minister in carrying the clause as it stood. If some were allowed to keep their shops open, it had a tendency to induce the next door neighbour to do the same, whether exempted or not, and it encouraged men to act in an irregular and dishonest fashion. Some shopkeepers who sold goods which were exempted and goods which were not exempted carried on business after 6 o'clock when the opportunity occurred, and that had a tendency to induce others to keep open on the quiet when they could do so. He hoped hon. members would see the desirableness of voting against the amendment.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): He did not think for one moment that the amendment was going to interfere with the large shops. If he thought it was going to do any harm to the employees in large shops he would not support it. From information he had gathered, he failed to see why one-man shops should be included in the Bill. It was perhaps hard to define a one-man shop, but he took it that the clause would be a hardship on a widow, for whom a subscription had been got up to enable her to start in business to get a living for herself and family, and the provisions of the Bill would act very hardly on her if she had invested her capital in a small shop. He could not understand the attitude of some of the Labour members, who, he took it, were here to pass legislation for the poor, the weak, and the oppressed, but they were playing into the hands of the large shopkeeper. None of the large shopkeepers had complained to him. It seemed to him that we were getting over-legislated for in many ways, and that presently it would not be possible for any small shopkeeper to live in the city. He knew many small men who, if they were not exempted, would be ruined, and the result would be that they would have to appeal for the old age pension or go to Dunwich. He did not see why fruitshops or oyster saloons should be allowed to keep open when the other shops were closed. To be consistent, they should close all shops. He did not suppose they would be able to carry the amendment, though he would like to see the one-man shopkeepers exempted from the provisions of the Bill. If he thought their exemption would tend to injure the employees in shops, the amendment would not have his support, but he believed that, on the contrary, it would be a great relief to many struggling people throughout Queensland.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): This was a matter to which he had given very serious consideration ever since it was first brought before the Chamber. Seeing no member of the Committee was more thoroughly conversant with the needs of the one-man shopkeepers than the Minister in charge of the Bill, he trusted he would accept the amendment in the interests of a number of people who were trying to eke out an honourable existence. The hon. member for Bundaberg had never been in business and knew nothing whatever about the condition of the unfortunate

[*Mr. McMaster.*]

people whom the amendment was trying to benefit. The hon. member had intimated that he knew several cases in which sons and daughters who worked in factories and shops during the day took a hand in their parents' shops at night. It was well known that the small wages paid in factories and shops were not sufficient to keep body and soul together, and all honour to those young people for giving a helping hand to their parents. Was it not right that they should do so? He was a shopkeeper, and closed at the regular hour of 6 o'clock, but there were many who were not in a position to close at 6 o'clock. They did not hurt the big shopkeepers. Up to the present he had never heard a complaint from the larger shopkeepers. A large firm like Cribb and Foote, in Ipswich, would not care 2½d. if small shops kept open from 6 in the morning till 6 the next morning. It would not hurt them; and there were many other firms of the same way of thinking throughout Queensland, and who would be pleased to see a helping hand extended to the small shopkeepers. Some of those people had said that they did not want the 10s. a week that was to be paid under the new régime; and why should they not be allowed to make a living for themselves by remaining open a little longer? If the Minister in charge of the Bill wished to gain kudos throughout the State, he would take no notice of the leader of the Labour party in this matter.

Mr. CREAGH (*Croydon*) intended to vote against the leader of the Opposition on this question. He did not wish to allege that the

hon. gentleman was not genuine in [7 p.m.] moving the amendment, for he did not think the hon. gentleman usually submitted a proposal in that Chamber in which he was not sincere; but his (Mr. Creagh's) experience of one-man shopkeepers in his district was that nearly all of them were Chinese, Afghans, Syrians, or something of like description. Many years ago, when the Hon. F. McDonnell, then member for Fortitude Valley, was steering a Bill similar to this through the House, and was supported in his efforts by the late Mr. W. H. Browne, members of the Early Closing Association in Croydon took steps to forward that movement. A deputation waited upon the white storekeepers in Croydon and made suggestions regarding what they considered fair hours for shop assistants, and the shopkeepers met them in a reasonable manner. After the agreement which was arrived at had been going for some time, Assyrian and Chinese one-man shopkeepers made a breach in the agreement, and so penalised the white traders. The shop assistants endeavoured to assist the white storekeepers and to stop the trading after hours. They formed an association for the purpose, and appointed some members to act as pickets, of whom he was one. The consequence was that about fourteen of them were summoned for creating a disturbance and using intimidation, and he was one of the victims. He was arraigned before the police magistrate on a charge of creating a disturbance, and was fined. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the one-man shops in mining towns were kept by Chinamen, Assyrians, or Afghans, and he held that those people should not be given privileges to trade against legitimate tradesmen. No doubt the leader of the Opposition was animated by the best of motives in moving the amendment, but he (Mr. Creagh) considered that it would defeat the principle of the measure, and on that account he would vote against it. With regard to the argument of the hon. member for Rosewood and the hon. member for Bulimba, that if young men and young women were industrious enough to help their fathers or mothers after they came home from business, while there was something to be said

in favour of that contention, there was a good deal to be said against it. The law was made for the benefit of employees, and he saw no reason why an advantage should be given to the alleged small man to rise gradually which was not given to the other man who employs a great number of hands and pays them fair wages.

Mr. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*) intended to take up the same attitude on this matter as he took up when it was before the House twelve months ago, and that was to vote in favour of exempting the small shopkeeper. He had been in business himself for about twenty-five years, and he started in a small way, but if the amendment were rejected, many deserving young men would be debarred from entering into business. Many young men who had been employees for a considerable time, and who were desirous of improving their position in life, wished to enter into business on a very small capital, probably £200 or £300. They were not in a position to employ assistants, and if one-man shops were included within the scope of the Bill, and the hours of business were curtailed, they would have no chance of establishing a business on their own account. Another point was that a great many of the men and women who ran these small shops had their dwelling-places attached to their business premises. It was almost a cruelty to expect them to close their places of business in a hot climate like this at 6 o'clock, and keep their front door closed. He knew of several widows, whose husbands had died as the result of accidents, and subscription lists were sent round the district for their benefit, with the result that considerable sums were raised, and they were started in a small way of business sufficient to keep them and their families. If the clause were left in the Bill as it stood it would deprive these widows of a means of livelihood. He knew that there was no objection on the part of those in a large way of business to those in a small way of business keeping their business premises open till 8 or 9 o'clock at night. The hon. member for Bulimba had referred to firms who granted their employees a half-holiday before any Act came into existence. He remembered that about twelve or fifteen years ago a meeting of shop assistants was held in Warwick with the view of obtaining a half-holiday, and it was decided to interview the member for the town and also the mayor. Sir Arthur Morgan was the member, and he (Mr. Grayson) was mayor of the town. They were invited to interview the merchants and other employers of Warwick to get them to grant the half-holiday to their assistants, and the managing director of Barnes and Co., on being asked, immediately agreed to their wishes. Mr. G. P. Barnes, the managing director of that firm, was one of the most honoured business men they had in Warwick. (Hear, hear!) All the other storekeepers also agreed to close. His sympathies were with the amendment. He was surprised at the attitude of the Labour party, because he thought they would have been in favour of giving this concession to a deserving class, such as those who were running one-man shops.

Mr. COWAP (*Fitzroy*) intended to vote against the amendment. If they exempted a one-man shopkeeper, and allowed him to employ one member of his family, that would be two. That would open the argument to exempt two in a family, and by and by they would be asked to grant further exemptions, until at last they would get the big shops, practically speaking, exempted also. This was the right place where they should put a stop to that. The hon. member for Cunningham mentioned certain cases where the employers granted their employees a half-holiday before the Act came into existence. In

Mr. Cowap.]

nearly every town of any size in Queensland the same privileges were given by the shopkeepers, but it generally happened that one firm would break away and keep open, and everything had to be fixed up again from time to time. Now that the Act fixed this half-holiday definitely, they should leave it at that. There were a few one-man shopkeepers at Mount Morgan, and they were in a fair way of business, and he never heard of any outcry against them having to close their premises at 6 o'clock. He referred to the white people, as he did not deal off aliens himself and knew nothing about the shops kept by them. If white people only treated the alien shopkeepers as he treated them, then they would soon close them up altogether, as they would do no business. Everything that could be bought from a Chinaman could be purchased just as easily from white people, and it would be better and cleaner. There were too many people exempt under the Act, and it was making early closing a farce, because what one was debarred from getting from one shop he could get from another. The grocery shop would have to close at 6 o'clock, but they could often buy what they wanted at the fancy-goods shop after 6 o'clock, and it was time they stopped it.

Question—That the proposed new clause (*Mr. Philp's*) stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 19.	
Mr. Barnes	Mr. McMaster
„ Blocksidge	„ Paget
„ Bonchard	„ Paull
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Forrest	„ Philp
„ Grayson	„ Somerset
„ Hanran	„ Stephens
„ Herbertson	„ Swayne
„ Keogh	„ White
„ P. J. Leahy	

Tellers: Mr. Paull and Mr. P. J. Leahy.

NOES, 32.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kidston
„ Barber	„ Land
„ Bell	„ Lennon
„ Blair	„ McIntyre
„ Bowman	„ Mann
„ Brennan	„ Maughan
„ Cowap	„ Maxwell
„ Creagh	„ May
„ Douglas	„ Mitchell
„ Grant	„ Mulcahy
„ Hamilton	„ Nevitt
„ Hawthorn	„ O'Sullivan
„ Hunter	„ Payne
„ Jones	„ Roberts
„ Kenna	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Woods

Tellers: Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Creagh.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Jenkinson. No—Mr. Sumner.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. E. B. FORREST: Before clause 18 was proceeded with, he wished to move another new clause in connection with one-man shops. It was in print, and, he presumed, had been sent round to hon. members. It was in the exact terms of the clause he moved twelve months ago, and read—

After section fifty-two of the principal Act, the following section is inserted:—

[52A.] Subject to the provisions of this Act, all small shops shall be closed on the business days of every week at the hours following, namely:—On the evening of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, at the hour of eight o'clock; on the evening of Friday, at the hour of ten o'clock; and on the afternoon of Saturday, at the hour of one o'clock. In districts, however, where the weekly half-holiday appointed for shops as hereinafter provided is on some day other than Satur-

day, the closing time for small shops on that day shall be one o'clock, and on Saturday shall be at the hour of eight o'clock in the evening.

The expression "small shop" means a shop the occupier whereof employs no assistants other than the wife or husband of the occupier and such one member of the occupier's family as the inspector approves. This section shall not apply to any person of the Chinese or other Asiatic race unless he holds a license from the Minister to be the occupier of a small shop.

He was not going over the arguments used in connection with the leader of the Opposition's clause, but he directed attention to the fact that there was a provision in the clause which did not appear in the clause last under discussion, and that was the reference to Chinese and other Asiatic races. The reasons that had already been urged were quite good enough to lead to the clause being carried in the modified form in which it was now proposed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS must treat the clause in precisely the same manner as its predecessor. It was to the same effect, except that it was not quite so objectionable in another way. The clause moved by the leader of the Opposition made no restriction as to hours at all, whereas there was a restriction as to hours of trading in the clause moved by the hon. member for Brisbane North. However, it was substantially the same clause, and he must treat it in a similar manner.

HON. R. PHILP thought the clause worthy of discussion. It was certainly a modification of the clause he proposed, because it gave the small shopkeeper an extra two hours on four nights in the week. Instead of closing at 6 o'clock he would close at 8 o'clock on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. That was not a very large concession, and nothing like as great as was given in South Australia or New Zealand. Although he did not think the concession a very great one, it would be prized, and the compromise seemed to him reasonable. To his knowledge, most of the small shops did no business while the large shops were open, and the business they were now doing was illegal business. They opened the back door and sold stuff to people after closing hours. It would be far better to allow the small shopkeepers two hours extra, and then they would have no excuse for breaking the law. He hoped the Committee would meet the hon. member for Brisbane North, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. BARNES: He thought there was a feeling that some concession should be made to one-man shopkeepers, and, as the Committee was apparently not willing to go as far as some of them wished, this would be a fair compromise.

Mr. KEOGH: One of the greatest objections made to the last amendment was that it left it open for Chinese and other Asiatics to come under the Bill, but that objection [7.30 p.m.] had been met by the present amendment, and it was only fair that hon. members should concede this small modicum to the struggling shopkeepers, who in many instances were in very poor circumstances, and the only opportunity they had of making a living was when the big shops were closed. The members of the Labour party, who had a mortal dread of what they termed the boodler, should show by their vote on this occasion that they believed in giving a helping hand to the poor man.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*) thought the amendment hardly so objectionable as the preceding one, particularly as it provided a bar against Asiatics, but nevertheless his opinion was that the desire of members of the Opposition who supported the amendment was not so much to protect the poor widow and the working man as

[*Mr. Cowap.*]

they would have the Committee believe. It appeared to him that such sympathy was not usually found among Conservative members of Parliament. He had been chairman of the Townsville Early Closing Association since its inauguration, and, as far as his knowledge went, the Act, which had been in operation for ten years, had not inflicted a hardship on one-man shopkeepers.

Mr. MCMASTER: I know many it has ruined.

Mr. LENNON: The most striking feature to a visitor from the North was the number of small shopkeepers in Brisbane and suburbs, and he could not understand how they could carry on if such a harsh state of things existed. In Townsville twelve or fifteen years ago the shops used to keep open till 8 or 9 o'clock every night, and 11 and 12 o'clock every Saturday night, but when the Labour party came into power they brought in legislation to alter that. He admitted that there were always a certain number of employers who exercised a kindly feeling towards their employees, but unless the Act was made compulsory there would be no business in it at all, and it appeared to him that if they allowed the small shopkeepers to keep open till 8 o'clock every night it would render the early closing Act abortive. It was probable that that might be the desire of some hon. members on this side of the House—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Speak for yourself.

Mr. LENNON: He would speak for other people, if he chose. He had just as much right to speak of the Opposition party as Opposition members had to speak of the Labour party. If he had no right, then they had no right.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Mind your own business.

Mr. LENNON: When he was told in no courteous tones to mind his own business, he resented it, no matter from whom it came. This amendment, while being a slight improvement on the last, would render the Act abortive, and for that reason he would vote against it.

Mr. MACARTNEY thought the hon. member rather misunderstood his interjection. The hon. member had a perfect right to criticise the Opposition party, but he seemed to think that the Opposition party—or as he termed it the more conservative party—were manifesting a desire to assist the poor people in the State rather late in the day, or something of that sort; but he could assure the hon. member that a desire to do justice to all parties prevailed on this particular side of the House. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) It did not matter what question was before the Chamber, or whether it was the poor man or the rich man.

Mr. BOWMAN: The agricultural labourers, for instance.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He supported the amendment last year and he was going to support it to-night, as he thought it was very reasonable. At the same time, if they tied down shopkeepers to certain rules, it was a dangerous thing to pass a provision enabling some other class of persons to come and hurt them because they had to conform to the law.

Mr. LENNON: You have already exempted wholesalers.

Mr. MACARTNEY could tell the hon. member that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley was the man who exempted them. He should have voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, because he believed it would have seriously affected the people tied down by the Act; but this was an amendment of a different sort, of a very liberal character, and in favour of a poorer class of person altogether, and he would

vote for the amendment. He thought it would have been better if at the time the original Act was passed, the persons who were carrying on one-man shops had been adequately protected from the start—that is, the one-man shops should have been entirely exempted from the Act. If an amendment was proposed which would exempt people carrying on business in that way, he would gladly support it; but under the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition an entirely new class of shopkeepers would spring up to take advantage of the stringent conditions imposed upon other people. The amendment at present under consideration proposed a merciful leniency, whilst it would not injure the people who were controlled by the principal Act.

HON. R. PHILIP: He had been in North Queensland before the hon. member for Herbert went there, and in those days the decent shops closed at 6 o'clock every day except Saturday. The Labour party were not in power, as the hon. member said, when the Factories and Shops Act was passed, though they might be in power now.

The PREMIER: They were in power then for that purpose.

HON. R. PHILIP: They were not in power then for that or for any other purpose.

Mr. LENNON: The late member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Frank McDonnell, was practically the father of the Bill.

HON. R. PHILIP: The Minister who passed it was Mr. Foxton.

Mr. BOWMAN: He gave Mr. McDonnell credit for being the father of the Bill.

HON. R. PHILIP: No. He gave Mr. McDonnell credit for assisting him. Mr. McDonnell, off his own bat, could not have passed one clause of the Bill. He believed the Act had proved a very good one, but it had been found to press hardly upon the small shopkeepers. Already in South Australia and New Zealand they had seen the hardship, and had remedied it, and we in Queensland ought to be prepared to amend the Act in the same direction. He did not think the big shopkeepers would complain at all, because they knew that the small shopkeepers could only do business after the big shops were closed. Most of the small shopkeepers were keeping those shops because they were incapacitated from doing other work. Nobody had ever heard of a one-man shopkeeper making a fortune, but they might make a living if they were allowed a little latitude in regard to keeping open after the larger shops were closed. There was no doubt the working classes themselves went to the big shops as a rule, and only went to the one-man shops to get a few things after the big shops were closed.

Mr. MANN: Not many days ago the hon. member for Toowoong lectured hon. members for not attending to their parliamentary business. Now the hon. member said that the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition was a most dangerous one, and yet he had not been present to vote against it. It was scandalous that a member living in this city, with all the conveniences at his hand in the shape of cabs and motor cars, could not be present to help to defeat an amendment which he considered dangerous! He sympathised with the one-man shopkeepers probably more than hon. members of the Opposition, but there was a danger in the amendment, which provided: "This section shall not apply to any person of the Chinese or other Asiatic race, unless he holds a license from the Minister to be the occupier of a small shop." The Opposition had all along favoured cheap coloured labour; and, if they had a Minister in power who was a

Mr. Mann.]

howling jingo, who thought that a Japanese was better than a Britisher, he might grant licenses to Asiatics to open their shops.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: You know perfectly well why it is put in that form.

Mr. MANN knew that, if the Opposition were in power, and a request came from the Japanese Government, they would be only too willing to allow the Japanese shops in Queensland to remain open till any hour of the night.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: They were in power when the only treaty made by any State in the Commonwealth had been entered into with Japan. They were responsible for allowing the Japanese to come here and start business. The main street in Townsville, for instance, was pretty well full of Chinese and Japanese shops now.

Mr. CREAGH: What about Cairns?

Mr. MANN: They did not buy wedding cakes from Chinese at Cairns. Townsville was worse than Cairns. It was quite possible that the Japanese Government might insist on their subjects resident in Queensland having votes, and they might have all the Japanese shopkeepers in Townsville applying pressure to the leader of the Opposition, who might then be leader of the Government, to give them permits. That might happen not only with the Japanese, but with the Chinese, the Javanese, and all the other "ese" from Asia. He would like to vote for the amendment but for the danger that he saw in that connection. Seeing that a Japanese or a Chinaman might be allowed to keep open, he was going to vote against it.

Mr. KENNA (*Bowen*) was somewhat sceptical about this poor widow whom the Opposition seemed to keep always on stock. That unfortunate creature appeared to be always on tap. They had her dragged in in connection with the postal ballot, and on almost every Bill they heard of her. The leader of the Opposition was rather unfortunate in referring to the case of South Australia, because the report of the inspector there went to prove that the large shopkeepers who were compelled to close were resenting the one-man shopkeepers being allowed to remain open. He did not think the passing of the amendment was going to cause much trouble, because most of those one-man shopkeepers sold surreptitiously after closing time. They would require an army of inspectors to keep watch over all the one-man shopkeepers in the metropolis. He had seen trading done openly in one-man shops. There was not much good in weeping and wailing over the one-man shopkeeper. The general tendency was towards the concentration of industry and the wiping out of the small shops, and the small man had to go. The universal provider was going to wipe him out, and the extension of the parcels post was wiping him out. The small man still survived, but the big trading classes would tell them that he only survived by picking the eyes out of the industry. The existence of most of the one-man shops, which lived by picking the very eyes out of industry, was a precarious existence. In many cases the wife of a working man who had a business tendency opened a little shop, and she was content if she made sufficient to pay the rent. In other cases one-man shops were established by some agent, and then sold as a going concern to a person desirous of entering into business. This Bill proposed to restrict competition, to make people purchase within a given time. People were inclined to be lazy in these matters, and to put off making their purchases till the last moment. Some persons if they had twelve or fourteen hours' leisure, and had a little shopping

to do, would put off that shopping till the last ten minutes within which it could be done, but under this measure they would have to do their business within certain hours. And if they allowed a big class of people—and the one-man shopkeepers were considerable in number taken in the aggregate—to have the privilege of trading out of those hours, they would do an injustice to those traders who were restricted. The fairest way to deal with the matter was to put them all on a level, and then if the one-man shops could not survive they could not help it. When the proposal to close one-man shops at the regulation hour was first submitted to the House, the same cry was raised, but more vigorously, that it would drive the one-man shopkeeper to the wall. The report of the inspector of factories and shops showed that it had not wiped out the one-man shopkeepers, but that, as a matter of fact, they had increased in number. He did not think they would inflict any hardship upon one-man shopkeepers by continuing conditions under which they had grown up and survived, and he intended to vote against the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: When he read this amendment, he thought it was so reasonable that it would be generally accepted, and he was surprised to hear the arguments which had been urged against it. The hon. member for Herbert stated that the Opposition were not in earnest in pleading the cause of the widow in this matter, and that they were only professing to advocate the cause of those people. Let the hon. member speak for himself. As far as he (Mr. McMaster) was concerned, he was in earnest in the matter. He knew people who had been ruined through being compelled by an arbitrary Act to close at the same time as the larger shopkeepers. The hon. member for Bowen said the small man must go down. He knew one man who started in a small way, and who was now one of the most prominent shopkeepers we had got. The people who spoke about the competition of Chinamen and Gingalese, and who were trying to prevent the European one-man shopkeeper from keeping open, were the very people who kept the Chinaman going. He had seen a Chinaman's shop full of women customers, while the Englishman who kept a shop alongside was doing nothing but leaning over the counter smoking his pipe. The hon. member for Herbert talked about his sympathy with the employees in shops. Why did not his sympathy go out to the leader of the Labour party, whose shop was exempt, and to the deputy leader of that party, whose shop was also exempt?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is not true.

Mr. McMASTER: Well, why did not the sympathy of those hon. members go out to those people who were compelled to close their small shops? If the Committee refused to accept this amendment, they would do a very great injury to a large number of people. He was not pleading the cause of the widow in this matter more than that of any other person. Only yesterday a man in a crippled condition came to him.

[8 p.m.] This man was in the prime of life, and had been employed at one of the Government sugar-mills. Owing to the injury that man received, he was incapable of doing any hard work. He could keep a small shop; but it was no use a man in that state of health keeping a small shop, as he would not do any business while the large business establishments were open, and he would be only able to get a living if he could deal with those who came out after 6 o'clock. There were hundreds in Brisbane who would be only too glad to earn their living in this way, and in some cases it would prevent people having to go to the

[*Mr. Mann.*

Government and beg for the 5s. a week. But this clause prevented an honest man from earning a living in that way, and closed the door against him.

Mr. MITCHELL (*Maryborough*): The hon. member for Fortitude Valley said, in connection with the keeping open of shops, that he noticed that working men's wives took up a considerable part of their time in leaning over the counter and discussing matters with the Chinamen and other Asiatics.

Mr. McMASTER: That is so.

Mr. MITCHELL: In the interests of the democratic movement, he hoped the working men of the Valley would notice the reflections that had been cast on them and their wives by the hon. member for the Valley.

Mr. McMASTER: I made the same statement four or five years ago in this House.

Mr. MITCHELL: Another matter he would like to refer to was that when he made the statement that his shop was closed at 6 o'clock it was sufficient evidence that that was so. Evidently the practice of the junior member for the Valley in connection with his business and his general bearing and character was to evade what was generally considered to be the truth, and to make people believe he was doing things which he was not doing when he got up and accused other members in that way. He (Mr. Mitchell) made the statement quite clearly that his shop was never open after the time fixed for closing. The amendment was too thin for anyone not to see through it. The hon. member for Toowong said if he had been in the House he would have voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, but as this amendment was modified he would vote for it. The hon. member's reasoning was that if a man stole £1 he did a great wrong, but if he stole 5s. they could look over it. The hon. member came to the conclusion that the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was wrong because he demanded too much, but when modified by another amendment it might be accepted by the Committee. This amendment was to continue the appearance of things that the Opposition members were more sympathetic and more generous to the poor people than any other member of the Committee, but the experience of the members of the Opposition would lead people outside the House to judge accordingly, and those people would say, "This is a class from which we can expect very little sympathy." He would have much pleasure in voting against the amendment.

Mr. MACARTNEY would not have risen again had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough. From his experience in the House, and from his experience of the Labour party of the last seven or eight years, he had come to the conclusion that when it came to a question of mercy to any unfortunate person in the State, whether he was a worker or a person carrying on a one-man shop, that mercy was not to be found in the Labour corner.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Labour laughter.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Mercy was subordinate to some of the principles which the hon. gentleman—honestly enough, perhaps—pretended to possess. When a man got to the age of sixty-five years, then, according to the Labour party, that man had to be pole-axed.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who said so? Your own Government were instrumental for putting men out at that age.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Then they gave a man a paltry 5s. a week to live on.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who initiated that 5s. a week?

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was quite true that the Opposition when in power were merciful enough to grant these men 5s. a week, but they did not deprive men of the right of making a living as well. When they found legislation of that kind introduced into this House, then they found that anything that stood in the way of the principles advocated by the hon. gentleman—whether it was alive or otherwise—then it had to be wiped away ruthlessly, and irrespective of any feelings of mercy or justice. When he said he would support the amendment, that was a merciful view to take, and it was not playing like the hon. gentleman indulged in. They saw a great deal of play-acting in this House.

Mr. BOWMAN: And there is no greater artist at it than you.

Mr. MACARTNEY: And they saw as much of it in the Labour corner as they did on the Treasury benches.

Mr. MAXWELL: This is the last shot before he leaves for home.

Mr. CREAGH rose to refute some of the statements made by the hon. member for Cairns, who catechised the leader of the Opposition as a member of a town that had its main street full of Chinamen. This was what a certain paper said about Cairns and its member—

Cairns is remarkable for two things—viz., it is a town where every poor white trash takes off his hat to a chow, and the only "rat" Labour paper in the State is published. It is worthy of note that a youth named Wah Yen has been taken on at the local telegraph office as messenger. Cairns will have nothing white if it can get it yellow or spotted or brindle. Similarly, it is satisfied with its member. It is dreadfully easily satisfied.

The interjection he made had no application to the hon. member for Cairns particularly, but he tried to show, by reading from a paper and letters which he received every week from a certain person in Croydon, that he (Mr. Creagh) had a wedding cake made by a Chinaman. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address himself to the clause before the Committee. I listened to the extract read by the hon. member to see if he intended it to have any bearing on the clause, but I could not discover that it had. If the hon. gentleman desires to make a personal explanation, he can ask the leave of the Committee to do so, but otherwise he must address himself to the clause.

Mr. CREAGH thought the Chairman had ruled once before that a member against whom a personal reflection was made was justified in replying.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member complain that the hon. member for Cairns has made a personal reflection upon him during the discussion on the clause?

Mr. CREAGH: That is so.

The CHAIRMAN: During this debate?

Mr. CREAGH: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not remember hearing it. Will the hon. member state when it occurred?

Mr. CREAGH: While the hon. member for Cairns was speaking.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member inform me what were the words used? (Government laughter!)

Mr. CREAGH: Yes; the hon. member for Cairns was making certain reflections on the leader of the Opposition in reference to Chinamen and Japanese.

Mr. Creagh.]

Mr. MANN: What has this to do with it?

Mr. CREAGH: He was addressing the Chair—a gentleman—and not the member for Cairns.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CREAGH: The hon. member was making certain reflections on the leader of the Opposition, and he interjected that the same thing was done at Cairns, and the hon. member for Cairns, speaking to him directly, said, "I did not have a wedding cake made by a Chinaman," thereby intending to convey that he (Mr. Creagh) had a wedding cake made by a Chinaman. (Laughter.) That statement was made through the Croydon local paper. He need not name the paper. It was sent to the hon. member for Cairns, who promised to take the first opportunity of bringing it before the Chamber and exposing it. Seeing that that was the first opportunity the hon. member had had of exposing something which never took place, it was only fair that he (Mr. Creagh) should have an opportunity of denying what the hon. member for Cairns wished to convey.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the interjection made by the hon. member for Cairns, but if it were made I think the hon. member for Croydon might be permitted briefly to deny the statement. He certainly cannot go into it at length.

Mr. CREAGH: He would accept the Chairman's ruling. The particular cake in question to which the hon. member for Cairns referred (laughter) was a very good cake. It was not bought by him from a Chinaman, but presented to him by a better Chinaman than the hon. member for Cairns.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Question—That the new clause, as read (*Mr. Forrest's*), stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 24.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
" Barnes	" McMaster
" Blocksidge	" Moore
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Cribb	" Paull
" Forrest	" Petrie
" Fox	" Philip
" Grayson	" Somerset
" Gunn	" Stephens
" Hanran	" Stodart
" Keogh	" Swayne
" Leahy	" Walker

Tellers: Mr. Paget and Mr. Cribb.

NOES, 32.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kerr
" Barber	" Kidston
" Bell	" Laird
" Blair	" Lennon
" Bowman	" McLutye
" Brennan	" Mann
" Cowap	" Maxwell
" Creagh	" May
" Douglas	" Mitchell
" Grant	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Nevitt
" Hardacre	" O'Sullivan
" Hawthorn	" Payne
" Hunter	" Roberts
" Jones	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Woods

Tellers: Mr. Cowap and Mr. Grant.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Jenkinson. No—Mr. Sumner.

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 18 put and passed.

On clause 19—"Duration of employment and overtime work"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved the omission in subclause (6), line 27, of "night." It would then read—

No person who is employed in any capacity as a salesman, or shop assistant, or in clerical duties in any shop

[*Mr. Creagh.*

shall also be employed as a watchman in any shop occupied by the same occupier.

If the prohibition of a shop assistant as a watchman was a right thing, it should also apply to the duties of night watchman.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: He had an amendment in a previous part of the clause. If the clause was carried as it stood, it would compel shopkeepers to close at half-past 9 o'clock, because it only allowed them fifty-two and a-half hours for work. On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday there were nine hours each day, or thirty-six altogether, and five on Saturdays, which made forty-one. The clause only allowed for eleven and a-half on Friday, which made a total of fifty-two and a-half hours per week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member not having given notice of the amendment, he had not considered the question, but he did not think there was anything in the point raised. As the law would stand now, there would be a limitation of fifty-three hours' work in a week, and the shops must be closed at 9 or 10 o'clock, as the case might be, on the long evenings. There was no time fixed for starting. The hon. member was perhaps assuming that the employer was bound to start at a fixed time, but he was not. This clause was taken from section 54 of the old Act, under which the hours of work for women and children were fifty-two. There was the following proviso to the clause:—

But when by this Act the shop may be kept open up to nine o'clock or ten o'clock, as the case may be, in the evening, he may employ them on that day for a period of eleven and a half hours, exclusive of the time allowed for meals.

The time here was fifty-three hours, which was an advance upon fifty-two under the previous Act.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: It was not possible for a shopkeeper to keep open and work his employees until 10 o'clock, unless he started them half an hour late one morning in the week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He could do that.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: But why compel him to do that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He might let them go at half-past 5 o'clock one evening instead of 6 o'clock.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: He thought it was hardly right to say that if the employees went half an hour late one morning in the week they should leave half an hour earlier on Fridays.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he had reckoned the hours on the different days on which employees worked. An hon. member springing an amendment like this always ran the risk of it not being accepted, unless it was clear it would do no harm to the Bill. On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday there were nine hours a day, making thirty-six hours, and twelve hours on Friday, and five on Saturday. That would make fifty-three hours altogether, which was the maximum time that an employer could work an employee.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: That is all I am asking for.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Now there was a limitation. The Bill restricted that to eleven and a half on the long day, so that an employer would have to take half an hour out of his employees on some other day of the week.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member wish to press his amendment?

Mr. BLOCKSIDE did not wish to press the amendment further if the Minister would not accept it. He thought it would be a reasonable alteration.

Amendment (*Mr. O'Sullivan's*) agreed to.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved the omission of the following paragraph:—

(17.) The provisions of this section requiring payment to be made for overtime shall not apply to any manager or foreman who receives as wages not less than fifty shillings per week.

It was a similar amendment to that made in clause 14 with reference to forewomen.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 20—"Hours of employment in exempted shops"—

HON. E. B. FORREST moved the insertion, in line 54, page 13, of the words "in hotel bars and." In the principal Act hotels were exempt, and the maximum number of hours [8.30 p.m.] their employees were to be asked to work was fixed at seventy-two per week. The Bill proposed to reduce the number of hours from seventy-two to fifty-three. That was a tremendous drop of nineteen hours a week, which would disorganise any business. It might be said that seventy-two hours was too long to work anybody. He said so himself; but, as a matter of fact, employees in hotel bars had never worked seventy-two hours per week from the time the Act was passed, and nine-tenths of them did not know that seventy-two hours was the maximum under the Act. Never having been compelled to work for that number of hours, they had never found it necessary for them to be aware of the fact. His proposed amendment would reduce the number of working hours from seventy-two to sixty hours per week. That was a proposal that came from the hotel employees themselves. He would now give some of their reasons for asking for this alteration. In the first place, the Licensing Act rendered it necessary to keep hotels open from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. It might not be compulsory to keep open for those hours, but competition made it necessary for all to remain open, as the hotel which did not observe those hours would lose business. Another reason why the number of hours should be fixed at sixty per week was that that was the number in New South Wales, where they had one of the most stringent Licensing Acts in force in Australia; and, if the system worked well in that State, it should work equally well in Queensland. It was also alleged by the barmaids and barmen that theirs was an easier occupation than work in shops or factories, and they also said that they had greater privileges. They had a weekly half-holiday, in common with other classes of employees; they claimed that they had more concessions than employees in shops and factories. Many of them were treated as members of the family; they received better wages than employees in shops and factories; and, in addition, they said they were content with their conditions and did not want to be disturbed beyond having the maximum number of hours reduced from seventy-two to sixty per week. Only strong reasons should induce hon. members to vote against the amendment. Hon. members were aware that two petitions had been presented that afternoon in favour of the proposal. He had presented one signed by eighty-nine barmaids and barmen in Charters Towers. They represented thirty-two hotels, which was a very strong representation from Charters Towers. The other petition was presented by the junior member for Ipswich. It was signed by fifteen barmaids and barmen in Ipswich. He had also received letters from both barmaids and barmen.

The first one was from Brisbane, and was signed by forty-seven barmaids, who, referring to the change proposed to be made by the Bill with regard to the maximum number of hours to be worked, said—

We contend that the latter maximum (fifty-three hours) is unreasonable, inasmuch as we are oftentimes during the dull business parts of the day practically doing nothing, although on duty, and if the fifty-three maximum is carried it will mean the loss of many privileges and concessions which we now enjoy. We would point out that our employment is altogether different in the way of close application to business during working hours as compared with employees in other branches of labour, where it is imperative to work continuously and without intermission during the stated hours laid down. We, therefore, respectfully request that you will, in our interests, exercise your influence in the House with a view of making the maximum sixty hours, a maximum which we feel assured would be satisfactory alike to employer and employee.

That letter was written by a lady who was very well known in Brisbane, and who bore an excellent reputation. The hotels represented were:—The Australian Hotel, British Empire Hotel, His Majesty's Hotel, Oxford Hotel, Grand Hotel, Prince of Wales Hotel, Exchange Hotel, Queen's Hotel, Hotel Daniel, Lennon's Hotel, Stock Exchange Hotel, York Hotel, National Hotel, Hotel Cecil, Carlton Club Hotel, Union Hotel, and the Longreach Hotel. The next letter was from seventy-five barmen in the same hotels, and was substantially the same. Both barmaids and barmen suggested that sixty hours a week should be the maximum, and they expressed the opinion that that would be satisfactory to both employers and employees. The next letter he had received was dated the 14th of September, from Maryborough. In this letter it was stated that—

Our work in a general way is not of an arduous nature, we oftentimes having hours during the day when there is practically nothing doing, and altogether different to girls who, in other walks of life, have to apply themselves without intermission to their employment during their working hours. We would suggest a fair compromise—that the proposed hours, fifty-three, should be amended to sixty, a maximum which we consider would be fair alike to employer and employees.

The other letter came from Gympie, and was signed by a dozen employees who represented the Union Hotel, Royal Exchange Hotel, Tattersall's Hotel, Imperial Hotel, Sydney Hotel, Otago Hotel, Royal Hotel, Mining Exchange Hotel, Northumberland Hotel, and the Commercial Hotel. Then he had got another letter from Bundaberg, signed by employees in the Queen's Hotel, the Grand Hotel, and the Palace Hotel. He had now given the Committee the information which had been placed at his disposal, from which they would see that the proposition to fix the maximum hours per week at sixty came from the bar attendants. It was a reasonable proposition, and one which he trusted the Government would accept and the Committee adopt.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS proposed to treat this amendment as a non-party question, as it was entirely a matter for the Committee to decide. Under the present law the number of hours which bar employees had to work was seventy-two, and the Bill proposed to reduce them to fifty-three. There was a great deal in the contention of the hon. member, for such a reduction had a tendency to disorganise any business. The amendment would make the maximum number of hours sixty instead of fifty-three, and that would be twelve hours less than bar attendants were required to work under the present law, which was a pretty good concession. As the Bill stood, the provision fixing fifty-three hours as a week's work applied to all employees, except those engaged by chemists and butchers,

Hon. T. O'Sullivan.]

and there were obvious reasons why the hours were longer in those cases. The question was whether the mover of the amendment had made out a good case, apart from the argument that the proposal in the Bill would tend to disorganise business. It seemed to him that as hotels had to be open from 6 a.m. till 11 p.m., the employees in hotels were in a rather different position from employees in other businesses, and, taking the whole of the circumstances into consideration, he recommended the Committee to accept the amendment. To prevent any misunderstanding, he might say that he did not look upon the letters from the employees as very satisfactory evidence in support of the amendment, especially as, though coming from different places, they all suggested the same maximum of sixty hours, but he based his conclusion on the case which the hon. member had made out on behalf of the employers.

Mr. BOWMAN was opposed to the amendment, and he regretted that the Minister was even prepared to support it. He did not think there were any women who deserved greater protection than the barmaids. He was looking forward to the day when there would be no barmaids in the hotels, and when the amending Licensing Bill came along he would support a provision that no barmaid be allowed to hand over grog. From his experience of living in hotels, he had heard greater insults hurled at women serving in the bars than he had heard used to women in any other calling. The hon. member for Brisbane North read a letter stating that the barmaids were not always actively employed. It was true that they might be waiting for a few hours during the day, but they were on duty all the same, as they were there to serve out liquor when it was required. The argument that they were not on duty when they were not serving out long beers or lading out whiskies would not stand at all. He could understand the petitions that had been sent in, because the Licensed Victuallers' Association was a live organisation, and the secretary of that organisation was one of the most active secretaries that the association had ever had in their experience. He was a competent secretary, and a competent organiser, and this was the result of his travelling round and his agitation. The hon. member for Brisbane North had always been to the fore in advocating the claims of licensed victuallers. He remembered the hon. gentleman, in 1900, even voting against the seventy-two hours, which was the time fixed for the barmaids and barmen, because the hon. gentleman was interested in the trade. He (Mr. Bowman) was personally acquainted with one or two barmen, and they told him that they wanted to come under the same provisions as employees in other callings. He would test the Committee by a division, and see who was sympathetic in connection with the number of hours these barmaids and barmen had to work. He would support the clause as it stood.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY was particularly pleased that the Minister said this was not a party question. In reducing the hours from seventy-two to sixty a considerable concession had been made to the male and female employees of hotels. After all, the only difference between the leader of the Labour party and himself was seven hours a week. The Committee were called upon to fix the reasonable hours of labour for bar employees, and the amendment would commend itself to all reasonable members of the Committee. Sixty hours a week was not too much to ask them to work when there were periods in the day when they were not asked to work at all.

[Hon. T. O'Sullivan.

Mr. MITCHELL: He would be even willing to apologise for what the Labour party had said in regard to the want of sympathy on the part of the Opposition if they would give expression to their sympathy by voting against the amendment. The members of the Opposition told them of their sympathy for the poor widow and others, then let them extend that sympathy to these girls, who were very much in need of it. An interjection was made when an hon. gentleman was speaking: "How would you like your own daughter to stand those hours?" Without wishing to be personal, there was scarcely a member of the Committee who would desire to see his daughter a barmaid. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. BOWMAN: It is good enough for the other girl.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Discuss that when we are dealing with the abolition of barmaids.

Mr. HAMILTON: There are just as good girls barmaids as in any other calling.

Mr. MITCHELL: There were as good and respectable girls employed as barmaids as they could possibly have. But if

[9 p.m.] hon. members would only think of the hours they had to work, and the degradation they had to suffer by the insults they received in some of the bars, they would not like to see their daughters in that position. If they could not abolish barmaids, in the meantime the next best thing was to see if they could not shorten the hours which these girls had to work. Seventy-two hours was a ridiculous time for any man or woman to work in a week, for even if not continuously employed, they had to be in attendance, and that was work. He was surprised at the Minister's attitude, which was really disappointing. There had been no hint of an amendment until a petition came before the Minister, and he now suggested that the matter should be left entirely to the Committee. The hon. gentleman should stand by his own Bill whatever the result might be. He hoped the Committee would vote against the amendment.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*) did not agree with the amendment, and would not support it, for he had always been an advocate for eight hours where practicable. If it was desirable to pass legislation to protect men and women in other callings, it was only fair that they should be protected in hotels. If an hotel-keeper had to depend upon the wages he could save out of his employees, the sooner he closed down the better. A great deal had been said about the treatment that bar girls received, but he had no doubt that, with the exception of the insults with which they had to put up occasionally, they were better treated and better off than domestic servants.

Mr. MACARTNEY failed to understand why they were discussing the question, seeing that in the earlier part of the session they passed a Wages Boards Bill providing for the regulation of the hours of labour and the fixing of wages by special boards. Those boards would be just as eligible to deal with the hours of labour and wages of barmaids as the hours and pay of other employees. However, the fact remained that the hours were to be reduced from seventy-two to sixty under the proposal before them, and if it had not been for the petition read by the hon. member for Brisbane North he would have been found voting for the shorter hours. In the face of that petition, he failed to see how they could disregard the facts. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Bowman, scoffed at the petitions

which had been presented. He did the same in connection with the petitions from the employees of wholesale houses. It was essential that they should have regard to petitions setting forth absolute facts, and he thought in that case the fact that so many bar men and women had attached their names to the petitions was sufficient justification for supporting the amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member for Toowong had insinuated two or three times during the session that he had made certain statements that were not true concerning certain petitions of last year in connection with employees of wholesale houses.

Mr. MACARTNEY: This year I am referring to

Mr. BOWMAN: He never said one word about the validity of the signatures this year. On the Wages Boards Bill he referred to what transpired last year. When the deputation from the wholesale houses employees waited upon him and upon the Minister, they said there would be 970 odd signatures presented to the House the following day, and that took place. They also recognised that in that petition they were petitioning against the House increasing their hours by twelve and a-half in the week. That was very different from the attitude taken up by the hon. gentleman to-night. They were now fighting to reduce the hours. Had they fought against the wishes of the wholesale employees, they would have increased their hours by twelve and a-half. When that was pointed out to him, he had no hesitation in saying that he would let the thing go on the petition which was presented. (Hear, hear!) That was the explanation of his action in connection with the wholesale employees. As to the remarks of the hon. gentleman earlier in the evening, and his attacks upon the Labour party—which he was ready to make both in the House and outside, in the sneering manner that well befitted him—he was always prepared to tell what the Labour party had not done in the way of sympathy—he (Mr. Bowman) claimed that the humane legislation, not only in Queensland, but throughout Australia, had been due to the advocacy of the Labour party, which had forced the conservative parties in the various Parliaments to give the legislation we had to-day. Where was the hon. member's vote when arbitration and conciliation was introduced as a Labour measure? Against it every time. Was he not against the Trades Dispute Bill, which had been desired by thousands in Queensland? They found the hon. member in his legal capacity always ready to vote against the unionists, so that they might be belittled in the eyes of the community. Any criticisms which came from the hon. member would rather help the Labour party than discredit them, because his attitude had always been antagonistic to Labour legislation. He hoped that when the hon. member came back from his trip, which he (Mr. Bowman) was sorry he had to take for the benefit of his health, his mind would be more open than it was at the present time.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY thought it was to be regretted that an occasion of this kind should be made subject of personalities such as they had just listened to.

Mr. BOWMAN: You were never capable of doing it, were you?

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: He never indulged in them; he always endeavoured to bring calm, cold reason to bear on a subject. The hon.

member for Maryborough had told them that one reason why the hours should be brought down from sixty to fifty-three was that barmaids had to listen to a lot of bad language, and argued that the smaller number of hours the less bad language they would have to listen to. (Laughter.) To be logical, the hon. member ought to bring down the hours to one, or do away with barmaids altogether.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do away with bad language.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: It was impossible to do away with bad language where there were members of Parliament about. (Laughter.) If it was a question of abolishing barmaids, his vote would be in favour of it, as he thought they would find other occupations just as good, but it was not proposed to abolish them. The hon. member for Maryborough made an attack on the Minister because he chose to make a detail of this kind a non-party question. They could only infer from the hon. member's remarks that, irrespective of the merits of the question, the Government were supposed to use their majority to dragoon members into a particular thing. That was what was advocated by the vice-president of the Labour party, a gentleman who stood up as an exponent of enlightened democracy. This was the man who would prevent another from expressing his opinions freely. The hon. member for Balonne had said that he knew something about hotels, and that he (Mr. Leahy) also knew something about them, but he had never had any experience in running hotels.

Mr. MANN: Do you sell them?

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: He was not like the hon. member for Cairns, he never sold people; he sometimes sold hotels.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: He believed there were many respectable men who kept hotels, notwithstanding the hon. member for Balonne. The vital question was whether the proposed sixty hours of labour per week was fair and reasonable under the circumstances. If they regarded the wishes of the male and female employees, who, he presumed, acted without coercion, they would undoubtedly record their votes in favour of the sixty hours.

Mr. PAULL: The hon. member who moved the amendment had presented a petition from his (Mr. Paull's) electors with a large number of signatures, which he thought would include nearly the whole of the bartenders in the electorate, and, in accordance with their request, he could see nothing else but to vote for the amendment. He thought the bulk of the licensed victuallers' vote went against him at the last election, and he wished it to be understood that he was voting for the amendment because those interested in his electorate asked that it should be included.

Mr. CREAGH thought the Minister was doing a reasonable thing in fixing the hours of bartenders at a maximum of sixty hours per week, as previously they had to work seventy-two hours. It had been pointed out by the hon. member for Warrego that, if the use of bad language in bars was the objection, it would be right to reduce the number of hours to one per day. It might be advisable even to abolish licenses altogether. But, as we have not yet arrived at that stage, looking at it from a practical point of view, he thought the Minister was right in agreeing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MANN expected to hear the leader of the Opposition speak on the amendment.

Mr. Mann.]

When the Bill was going through last session, the hon. gentleman said he would support any proposal in favour of closing hotels at 6 o'clock, so that he hoped he would vote to reduce the number of hours per week to fifty-three on the present occasion. He (Mr. Mann) had received a wire from four or five of the hotel-keepers in Cairns asking him to support the amendment to be moved by the hon. member for Brisbane North. He did not know how they got to know that the hon. member was going to move the amendment. He had received no request from any of the hotel employees in Cairns to vote for the amendment. He believed that girls had better times in hotels than in many private houses, and that was why many preferred working in hotels to going into private service. He was not one of those who advocated that barmaids should be abolished. Any girl who respected herself know how to treat any man who used bad language in her presence; and most of the hotel-keepers he knew would put a man who indulged in bad language in their bar out quick and lively. He could hardly support the amendment, because in a hotel where a big trade was done fifty-three hours a week was quite enough. Reputable hotel-keepers desired to treat their girls fairly, and he hoped that the new Licensing Bill would make provision for the closing of all hotels which were not reputable. He intended to vote for the clause as it stood.

Mr. COWAP intended to vote against the amendment. It ill became anybody who voted for a maximum of forty-eight hours in other trades to support a proposal to fix the maximum for barmaids and barmen at sixty hours. In his district, men worked forty-seven hours per week, and he did not see why people should work longer hours in a bar. If an amendment was proposed to reduce the number to forty-eight hours, he would support it.

HON. R. PHILP: When the first Factories and Shops Bill was brought in by Mr. Foxton, seven years ago, barmaids and barmen worked fourteen hours per day. The Act reduced the number to twelve hours a day. The Licensing Act permitted hotels to keep open for seventeen hours a day, and so long as that was the law they had to treat their employees in the same way. He was now prepared to vote to reduce the hours of work to ten per day. They could not have eight hours a day in every occupation, as it would not be convenient. When members of Parliament went to a hotel at night they expected to be looked after. If they found everybody in bed because of an eight-hour day they would get very abusive. Personally, he thought from 6 a.m. till 11 p.m. too long for hotels to remain open; but so long as those were the hours fixed by law, licensees had to keep their employees to wait upon the public. Ten hours a day was a great improvement on fourteen. At the same time, they knew that barmaids did not need to work strenuously, like dressmakers. They were not in the bar all the day.

Mr. MANN: Sometimes they are shut up in the bar all Sunday with the doors closed.

HON. R. PHILP: The Commissioner for Police said that Sunday trading had been stopped. He was prepared to abolish it altogether, and during the election campaign he had advocated closing the bars from Saturday night till Monday morning. But this was a different thing altogether. Seeing they could not insist on the employees in hotels only working eight hours a day, he intended to vote for the amendment.

[Mr. Mann.]

Mr. LENNON was rather surprised at the Minister accepting the amendment, because it had not been sprung upon them. It was well known that the Licensed Victuallers' Association had been hard at work for some weeks in working up this agitation. The remarkable unanimity of expression in the petitions which had been presented looked suspicious. He had received a letter from one of the leading Northern branches of the Licensed Victuallers' Association requesting his support for the amendment, but he at once replied that he could not support it. Although it was a big drop from seventy-two hours to fifty-three, he thought the bartenders were entitled to it. It might not be very arduous work, but it was very monotonous. As the tendency was to reduce the hours of labour, and as fifty-three hours was the maximum under the Bill, it was a wise limit for bartenders, and for that reason he intended to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BARBER: It struck him as very peculiar that there should be such a general unanimity in the petitions which had been presented. During the past two or three months he had met several young men who followed the profession of bartender, and without one solitary exception they had asked him, as secretary of the Labour party, to urge members of the party to support the provision to reduce their hours of labour to fifty-[9.30 p.m.] three hours per week. There were eighteen hotels in Bundaberg, and the hon. member for North Brisbane had produced a letter signed by only three bartenders in that town, but even if every bartender there had signed the letter he would vote against the amendment. He was pleased to hear some hon. members say that they would vote for an amendment abolishing barmaids altogether from hotels, and he would do the same if opportunity offered. He would not like to see a daughter of his in a bar, and he did not think any member would like to see his own daughter in the bar of any hotel. The fact that the letters quoted by the hon. member for North Brisbane had been forwarded to him at such an opportune time suggested the conclusion that some one had been actively at work among the licensed victuallers getting the matter fixed up. He intended to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BOUCHARD: He was under no obligation to the licensed victuallers, as their vote was cast against him at the last election; but despite that fact, he considered that in a matter of this sort those who were concerned in the business should have some regard paid to their wishes. The Committee had paid regard to the wishes of employees in wholesale warehouses, and he declined to believe that bartenders were so abject as to sign their names to a petition asking for a modification of the hours of labour as affecting their business, if they did not honestly think it was to their interest to do so. If the hours were reduced to the number specified in the Bill, it might mean that the wages of these employees would be reduced, and he had no doubt that a fear that such a thing might happen was one of the reasons which induced those persons to make known their wishes to the Committee. He had been approached by bartenders of both sexes, and they had asked him to support the sixty hours' maximum, as they felt that if the maximum were reduced to fifty-three hours it would be necessary for the licensed victuallers to employ extra hands, and in that case they feared that their wages might be reduced. He would support the amendment, believing that it was in the interest of the bartenders themselves.

Mr. BARNES was going to support the clause as printed. While saying that, he also wished to state that he did not think it was at all likely that any man or woman would sign a petition at any person's dictation simply because they were asked to do so by an employer; and he regretted very much that it had been so often suggested that employees had come to that pass. When speaking on the second reading of the Bill, he said it was to be regretted that the Government had not proposed to fix the hour for the closing of hotels at 10 instead of 11 o'clock, and because he believed that if the clause in the Bill were carried as it stood it would have a tendency to reduce the hours for the sale of liquor, he intended to vote against the amendment.

Question—That the words "in hotel bars and" proposed to be inserted (*Mr Forrest's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. McIntyre
" Blair	" McMaster
" Blocksidge	" Moore
" Bouchard	" O'Sullivan
" Creagh	" Paget
" Cribb	" Paull
" Douglas	" Petrie
" Porrest	" Philp
" Fox	" Redwood
" Grayson	" Somerset
" Gunn	" Stephens
" Hanran	" Stodart
" Hawthorn	" Swayne
" Keogh	" Walker
" Kidston	" White
" P. J. Leahy	" Woods
" Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. White.

NOES, 23.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kenna
" Barber	" Kerr
" Barnes	" Land
" Bell	" Lennon
" Bowman	" Mann
" Brennan	" Maxwell
" Cowap	" Mitchell
" Grant	" Nevitt
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Hardacre	" Roberts
" Hunter	" Ryland
" Jones	

Tellers: Mr. Kenna and Mr. Roberts.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Jenkinson. No—Mr. Sumner.

Resolved in the affirmative.

HON. E. B. FORREST said he had another amendment. Subclause (5) of the clause stated—

The time of stopping the day's work for each such employee shall not be more than fourteen hours later than the time at which such employee started work, and the working time shall not be more than eleven hours in any day.

What was wanted was an amendment to work out the sixty hours to suit their own arrangements. No one would be called on to work more than ten hours in any one day. That was an established fact. When the employees could be worked for seventy-two hours in a week they were never worked for eleven hours in a day. Those who came on duty at 6 o'clock in the morning would never be asked to come on from 9 till 11 o'clock at night, as they generally took day about at those hours. He moved that the clause be amended by inserting after line 21 the words—

So much of this subsection as provides a maximum limit between the time of starting and stopping the day's work shall not apply to employees in hotel bars.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS regretted he could not accept the amendment, which was on a different footing to the last

amendment. The limit for bar employees was now fixed at sixty hours a week. The hon. member for Brisbane North took that to mean not more than ten hours a day, but that did not follow at all. They had a weekly limit, and they must also have a daily limit; otherwise there was nothing to prevent a girl being worked twenty hours in a day. As it was necessary to put in a daily limit, he thought fourteen hours was long enough. The bars were kept open till 11 o'clock at night, and between 9 and 11 o'clock was a busy time. The result was that if a girl worked till 11 o'clock at night she could not be legally asked to work again until 9 o'clock next morning. Was that not perfectly fair and reasonable?

Amendment (*Mr. Forrest's*) put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 13.	
Mr. Blocksidge	Mr. McMaster
" Bouchard	" Moore
" Forrest	" Petrie
" Hanran	" Philp
" Keogh	" Redwood
" Leahy	" Stephens
" Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Petrie and Mr. Stephens.

NOES, 40.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kerr
" Barber	" Kidston
" Barnes	" Land
" Bell	" Lennon
" Blair	" McIntyre
" Bowman	" Mann
" Brennan	" Maxwell
" Cowap	" May
" Creagh	" Mitchell
" Cribb	" Nevitt
" Douglas	" O'Sullivan
" Grant	" Paget
" Grayson	" Paull
" Gunn	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Roberts
" Hardacre	" Ryland
" Hawthorn	" Swayne
" Hunter	" Walker
" Jones	" White
" Kenna	" Woods

Tellers: Mr. Ryland and Mr. Roberts.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Jenkinson. No—Mr. Sumner.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. PAULL asked the meaning of subclause (9) which read—

No employee in any such exempted shop other than employees in hotel bars and in the bars of registered clubs and in chemists and druggists' shops and undertakers' establishments shall be employed on Sunday.

The Licensing Act provided that no liquor should be sold on Sunday. Was it intended by the subclause that employees might go into the bar and serve travellers? The subclause made one think that it was intended in the amending Licensing Act to provide for Sunday trading.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: On looking at the subclause he must say that he felt some difficulty in following what the difficulty of the hon. member was. The effect of the subclause was that no employee should be employed on a Sunday in any exempted shop, with the exception of hotel bars, registered clubs, chemists and druggists' shops, and undertakers' establishments. The hon. member wanted to know if that implied an insidious attempt to amend the Licensing Act, which provided that no liquor should be sold on Sunday. The Licensing Act did not say that. It simply said that liquor should not be sold under ordinary conditions on Sunday, but it might be sold to travellers and guests. The ordinary work of the employees must go on in hotels on Sunday.

Hon. T. O'Sullivan.]

They had to work sixty hours a week, and the only restriction was that the employee must not work for longer than fourteen hours between the time of starting and leaving off. The sale of liquor was not the principal business of an hotel, and the other duties must be performed.

Mr. MANN: If everybody stopped selling liquor on Sunday, he did not see why these employees should be working in the bar.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But you do not stop selling liquor on Sunday; you can sell it to *bona fide* travellers.

Mr. MANN: As he had pointed out on a previous occasion, he had gone into one Brisbane hotel last year on a Monday,

[10 p.m.] when one of the girls told him she had served sixty people on the previous Sunday who were not travellers. It might be a good thing to compel the licensee to dispense the liquor himself.

Mr. BOWMAN: A good deal of discussion took place last year in regard to undertakers' employees. Was he to understand that they had only to work fifty-three hours a week, and to be paid time and a-half for anything over that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes.

Clause 21 put and passed.

On clause 22—"Hours of employment for carters"—

Mr. McMASTER said the wholesale houses were allowed to deliver parcels up to 6 o'clock, but the retailer was not allowed to deliver any parcels to his carter for delivery after half-past 5 o'clock. This would be a great hardship on the public as well as the shopkeeper. A carter, for instance, might take out some orders at 4 o'clock, but in the meantime customers might order goods and want them delivered that evening, and the shopkeeper might promise to send them, but the carter might not get back till a quarter to 6 o'clock, and the goods would not be delivered before the next day.

Mr. HAMILTON: They ought to order them in time.

Mr. McMASTER: He had had experience, and knew how difficult it was to arrange those matters, and if customers were disappointed they would go to another place. He had no desire to keep the carters longer than possible, and they should not be expected to work longer than other employees. In the morning the carters had very little to do but look after their horses, because orders were not in, and the time of delivery was where the hardship came in. He thought the Minister should make it 6 o'clock, the same as the wholesale houses.

HON. R. PHILP: As they had fixed the hours at fifty-three per week they should leave it at that, and say that the carter should not work more than fifty-three hours in one week.

Mr. HAMILTON: Any one who was in the House last year, when the amending Bill was going through, knew that on behalf of the carters driving delivery vans at night there was an attempt made to get an earlier delivery for them. Many of them did not get the goods from the shops until about 6 o'clock, and it was half-past 10 or 11 o'clock at night before they had all the parcels delivered. The late member for South Brisbane, Mr. Reinhold, and himself had formed a deputation to wait on the Drapers' Association on behalf of the men, who wanted the goods delivered not later than 4 o'clock. The association were willing to try and shorten the hours of the carter, but

[Hon. T. O'Sullivan.

said they had no control over those shops which had their own carters. An arrangement was come to to make the delivery half an hour earlier than the usual time of 6 o'clock. It was fixed at half-past 5 o'clock, and the members of the association were quite satisfied with that. If people knew that goods purchased after a certain hour would not be delivered that night, they would take care that they shopped in time. The drivers of the parcel delivery vans had to work very long hours, and they were probably the worst paid men in the city, and he hoped the Minister would not alter the arrangement come to last year.

Mr. BARNES: There was a great deal in what the hon. member for Gregory said. Whilst sympathising with the parcel delivery men, he was afraid the clause would prove a stumbling-block in other directions. On the second reading he alluded to certain classes of perishable goods. Strawberries, for instance, might arrive at Melbourne-street Station at 9 o'clock at night. They had to catch the mail train the next morning, and yet anybody carting them over the same night would be guilty of a breach of that clause. It was never intended to interfere with any business in that way. Then fish were sent to Melbourne-street Station by the first train available after they were caught. They might arrive at half-past 7 o'clock, or they might arrive by another train about 10 o'clock, or even later. It was imperative that they should be removed to the cold stores the day they arrived. To meet the case of such perishable goods as strawberries and fish, he suggested the insertion in line 53, after the word "being," of the words "forwarded by rail or sent to cold stores." He was sure it was never intended to harass any class of business by imposing unnecessary restrictions. He was quite in accord with the proposal that no carter should work more than fifty-three hours per week.

Mr. BOWMAN drew the attention of the Minister to a disability that had been pointed out to him by some of the employers and by some of the carters. There was no desire that the men should work more than fifty-three hours per week, but they suggested that the men might be allowed to deliver part of Friday's orders after half-past 5 o'clock, so long as the carters were back before closing time, allowing the balance to be delivered on Saturday, thereby preventing the carters from being deprived of their half-holiday on Saturday. This referred particularly to grocers. It had been the practice for men to be sent out with big loads at 1 o'clock on Saturday, and that was unfair. Two or three members of the Traders' Association had waited on him at the House and told him that the association had no desire to work their employees more than fifty-three hours per week, and suggested that, for their own convenience and for the convenience of the public, they should be allowed to deliver part of their goods on the late night. The employers said that their carters were not fit to do counter work in the shops, and they were employed exclusively in driving the carts.

HON. R. PHILP: It would meet the case if they simply provided that the carters should not work more than fifty-three hours a week, and that they should have a half-holiday on Saturday, omitting the rest of the clause. In other trades they did not say when the fifty-three hours should be worked. They simply provided that they should not work more than fifty-three hours in the week, and left it to the employers and employees to arrange the details themselves. It was absurd to provide

that in connection with retail shops parcels should not be delivered to a carter after half-past 5 o'clock, in the case of a merchant after 6 o'clock, whilst in other classes of business they might work all night.

Mr. McMASTER admitted that parcel delivery carters were sometimes employed very late. He had quite recently seen carts passing his house at 9 o'clock at night, but he believed that employers as a rule did not want to work their men over the number of hours specified. They, however, wanted to work them at a particular time. A grocer's carter might have very little to do during the forenoon, as orders could not be sent out until they were received, but in the afternoon he might have a rush of work.

Mr. BOWMAN: His hours start from the time he goes to work. You do not deduct any hours, do you?

Mr. McMASTER: He did not want to deduct any hours. The men should work only fifty-three hours a week, and they should have their half-holiday; but if, by legislation, they prevented the delivery of a parcel after half-past 5 o'clock, they would not be doing the carter a great kindness, and they might be doing the public a great injury.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It seemed to him that there was a great deal in the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition. The last time this matter was before them they had a great deal of discussion upon it. The hon. member for Gregory pointed out very forcibly that unless the carters got their parcels not later than half-past 5 o'clock they would be at work till 11 or 12 o'clock at night; and, when it was proposed to provide that parcels should be handed to the carters by that time, members representing country districts said the restriction would not apply to their districts. Then the provision was made to apply to Brisbane only. If the hon. member for Gregory thought the limit of fifty-three hours a week met his objection, then the best thing they could do was to adopt the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition—retain the first part of the clause, and then insert a proviso to the following effect:—

Provided that no load or parcel shall be delivered for carriage to any carter from any shop or factory later than one o'clock in the afternoon of the day appointed for the half-holiday.

Mr. BOWMAN: Would you knock out the Brisbane district?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes; knock out the Brisbane district altogether.

Mr. HAMILTON: Did that mean that a parcel should not be delivered to the carter, or that it should not be delivered to the customer after 1 o'clock in the afternoon?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The suggestion I made was that it should be delivered to the carter by 1 o'clock.

Mr. HAMILTON: Then, it would take him till 6 o'clock to deliver his parcels, and he would not get a half-holiday. At present carters had to be up early in the morning to feed and groom their horses, then, after breakfast, they had to go round for what was called "inward delivery," after which, at 11 o'clock, they had to be at the office to take parcels for outward delivery. A compromise was arrived at last year fixing the time for delivery of parcels to carters at half-past 5 o'clock, and that would have allowed them to get off half an hour or an hour earlier than they had done previously. He thought such provision should be made as would secure to them their half-holiday.

HON. R. PHILP urged that it should be made clear that carters would get away from their work at 1 o'clock on the day appointed for the half-holiday. It was not fair to expect carters to work after the men employed in the shops were done, and if parcels had not to be delivered to the carters till 1 o'clock they might be at work all the afternoon. Let the provision with regard to the fifty-three hours per week stand, and make it clear that the carters should get a half-holiday from 1 o'clock.

Mr. BOWMAN thought the Minister misunderstood the desire of the Committee, which was that carters should not have to work after 1 o'clock on the day appointed for the half-holiday.

Mr. MITCHELL: The carters in Maryborough sometimes delivered parcels up to half-past 11 o'clock on a Saturday, which was the late night in that town. He had waited upon the people concerned to see if the matter could not be mutually arranged, but there was a feeling of mistrust among them, and he could not get them to come to any agreement. He thought the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition would meet the case, provided it was made clear that carters should not be required to work more than fifty-three hours per week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: In deference to the wishes of the Committee he would submit his amendment in this form: Omit the three last paragraphs of the clause, and insert the following:—

Provided that every load, article, or parcel delivered for carriage to any carter from any shop or factory on the day appointed for a half-holiday shall be handed to such carter in sufficient time to enable such load, article, or parcel to be delivered at one o'clock in the afternoon of such half-holiday.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was due to the carters who were out till 8, 9, 10, and even 11 o'clock at night that some provision of the kind he had suggested should be inserted—relating to the time at which parcels should be handed to them on late nights.

HON. R. PHILP: They cannot work more than fifty-three hours a week.

Mr. MITCHELL: It would be much more satisfactory if they put in the Bill the time at which the parcels must be received.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: The Minister proposed to delete the last three paragraphs. The last two lines referred to parcel delivery men. Would it not be necessary for them to be retained in the Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No. That paragraph was necessary on account of the second paragraph. With regard to what the hon. member for Maryborough had said, the fifty-three hours a week, which was the limit those men could work, would cover all that. There was no other way to limit it. The same difficulty was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition last year, and it was to meet the difficulty raised by that hon. gentleman that the proviso was put in on this occasion. With regard to the half-holiday, the parcels must be delivered to the carter in sufficient time to enable him to deliver his parcels by 1 o'clock. That was as far as they could go.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: The amendment related to shops and factories. Was a parcel delivery establishment a shop or factory under the principal Act?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There might be some difficulty about it, and it would be better to leave the last paragraph in.

Hon. T. O'Sullivan.]

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: Unless the last paragraph was retained the parcel delivery carters would not come under the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He would leave the last paragraph in, and first move the deletion of the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs of the clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 23 and 24 put and passed.

On clause 25—"Hawking, etc., after shop closing hours prohibited"—

Mr. BARNES asked the Minister the reason for allowing hawkers to continue their calling half an hour longer than shops without granting the shops equal facilities.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The shops have got half an hour's grace.

Mr. BARNES: He referred to the 3rd paragraph of the clause, which read—

It shall not be lawful for any employe or a commercial traveller as aforesaid employed by an occupier of a shop to take or solicit orders at any house or place situated in any district and distant less than ten miles from such shop at any time later than half an hour after the time when shops conducting the same class of business within such district are required to be closed under this Act.

There was considerable discussion last year on that provision. A traveller might go from Brisbane to 10 miles outside of Toowoomba and enter into competition with local traders. He thought the scope of the clause should be very much wider. Had the hon. gentleman given the matter any consideration?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The evil which the paragraph was directed against was this: It was not considered a fair thing that a man who did business in Fortitude Valley, for instance, should send a person soliciting orders to Bulimba after closing hours, or within 10 miles of where his principal business was carried on. The hon. member suggested that the 10 miles should be extended, but commercial travellers arrived whenever their steamers or trains arrived, and the same reason for restricting the operations after closing hours of a man within 10 miles of his principal place of business did not apply to them. A man representing a Brisbane house would get into Rockhampton at night, do his business whenever he could, and perhaps leave next morning. That was the reason the distinction was made.

Mr. BARNES: It was possible for a traveller from Brisbane to go to Toowoomba, and, because he was outside the area limit of 10 miles from Brisbane, he could engage in a retail trade which the local Toowoomba men were not allowed to touch.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That argument was used last year.

Mr. BARNES: Yes; and there had been time to think it over since last year. They should take steps to deal more effectively with what was a serious objection.

Mr. WHITE did not think the clause would have any effect at all in deterring people from doing business. Travellers arrived, say, in the Bundaberg district, and the only time they could see the business people was at night, and they left the following morning. If they made the law too strict, there would only be an inducement to break it. Every traveller arriving from Sydney or Brisbane in Bundaberg did business at night.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Twenty-five miles was in the Bill as I introduced it last year.

[Mr. Blocksidge.

HON. R. PHILP suggested that the paragraph should be omitted altogether. There was an objection to travellers selling retail in opposition to local retailers after hours, but they should do nothing to discourage travellers going all over Queensland. Did the hon. gentleman mean to confine the 2nd paragraph to commercial travellers selling retail?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The 3rd paragraph only applies to taking orders.

HON. R. PHILP: That is nonsense, because travellers have to work after hours.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But they must not take orders within 10 miles of their principal place of business.

HON. R. PHILP: He doubted whether the paragraph was wanted at all. Travellers from Toowoomba and Warwick would be debarred from working their own district after hours, while the travellers from Brisbane would not be. That would give an unfair advantage to Brisbane travellers. Had such a clause been asked for, and by whom?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: By a deputation of business men introduced by the hon. member for Toombul last year.

HON. R. PHILP thought it would operate unfairly towards local people who had travellers working their districts.

Mr. WHITE pointed out that travellers from Finney, Isles, and Co., Allan and Stark, and other large firms visited the Bundaberg district. The local shops were all closed, and those representatives from Brisbane houses did practically retail business.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is what the clause is stopping.

Mr. WHITE: It would not stop it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Read the 2nd paragraph.

Mr. WHITE quite agreed with the leader of the Opposition, and thought the paragraph should be omitted altogether.

Mr. LENNON said the shopkeepers in Townsville a few years ago complained of alien hawkers going out to the meatworks and other places, and he thought the clause would prevent that kind of thing.

HON. R. PHILP: No. The 1st paragraph was against the hawkers, the 2nd against travellers going into a town selling retail, and the 3rd prevented travellers selling either wholesale or retail. The clause was really not wanted. It was giving a preference to Brisbane over Ipswich and Toowoomba, to Rockhampton over Barcaldine and Longreach, and also to Townsville over Charters Towers and Hughenden. A local man could not take orders, he could not sell, but the man from outside could. They should put all travellers on the same footing, or strike out the clause.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There seemed to be some little confusion in the minds of hon. members as to the different things dealt with by the clause. The 2nd paragraph dealt with the evils which the hon. member for Bundaberg pointed out. Was it a fair thing to men engaged at Bundaberg in a retail business that travellers should go up from here, with practically a retail stock, and enter into competition with them when their shops were closed? Then the leader of the Opposition wanted to know what necessity there was for the 3rd paragraph. On page 827 of *Hansard* of last year he was reported as having said—

He was not going on his own information or the advice of the inspector. He was accepting the advice

of a deputation of business men who were introduced by the hon. member for Toombul. That deputation was perfectly satisfied with the proposal, and they were a fairly representative body of men. He understood that hon. members opposite would prefer the 20-mile limit, and he had altered his amendment accordingly. He was sorry to say that he could not see his way to reduce the 20 miles to 5 miles.

The hon. member for Toombul followed on, and said that he had introduced a deputation. His recollection of what was complained of by the deputation was that some man carrying on business in the suburbs closed his shop at the closing hour, and went round the other suburbs of the town, coming into competition with the people there. It was thought desirable to stop that, as it was not fair trading. The leader of the Opposition said a commercial traveller could come here from Townsville and have free access after hours, whereas the commercial traveller in Townsville could not do such a thing, but the traveller of a Townsville house was on the spot, and could do everything he wanted in business hours. This clause did not affect him in business hours; it was only outside business hours.

Hon. R. PHILP: You are giving preference to the stranger again.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No; there was nothing about preference to a stranger. This only enabled the representative of a Brisbane house or some other place, who arrived late, to take orders after closing hours. The evil it was directed at was the unfair competition of persons carrying on business within 10 miles of each other. If there was any particular desire to strike out the 3rd paragraph, he would not press it.

Mr. BARNES hoped the hon. gentleman would strike out the paragraph, because the argument he had used of an individual going from one suburb to the other applied with much greater force to country tradespeople.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I will delete it. Move an amendment.

Hon. R. PHILP moved the omission of paragraph 3.

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

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*) moved the addition of the following new clause:—

It shall not be lawful for any occupier of any shop or factory to require any employee to carry in the course of his employment any bag containing sugar, wheat, or other grain or produce, or any goods or package containing goods of a weight greater than one hundred and sixty pounds.

His own experience had shown him that every year in Queensland a great many hard-working men had their health seriously impaired by the weight of the sacks they had to handle. They were moving in this direction in Victoria, a Bill having been introduced a short time ago fixing

the maximum weight of bags at [11 p.m.] 200 lb. The reason why he had specified 160 lb. was that in that case an equal number of full sacks would make a ton—namely, fourteen—which would be convenient in several ways. In some cases, such as a large sugar store at Mackay, the bags were moved by machinery, but there were many places where that was not done. Many years ago he had occasion to be constantly on the wharves at Mackay. After taking to another calling, when he went to the wharves at intervals of a few months, he missed familiar faces, and on inquiry he found that men had been compelled to seek easier work owing to their health having been impaired from handling excessively heavy bags. Legislation in this direction was almost as important as any legislation that could engage their attention.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It was usual for an hon. member desiring to move such an amendment to let the Minister in charge of the Bill know something about it beforehand. If the hon. member had done that, he would have been able to consider the matter, and time might have been saved. The amendment dealt with sugar, wheat, grain, or produce. The bags containing those things were not made up in a factory or shop, and the amendment therefore hardly came within the scope of a Factories and Shops Bill.

Mr. SWAYNE: Sugar-refineries and flourmills come within the scope of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Wheat and produce were bagged in the fields. The whole thing had not been thought out properly. It seemed to him that it was rather a matter for shipping regulations than for a Factories and Shops Bill. He thought it would be unworkable, and he hoped the hon. member would not press the amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: On the second reading he mentioned the weight of bags, at the instigation of the Wharf Labourers' Union, many of whose members suffered in health from strains and ruptures sustained from the excessive weight of the bags they had to handle. He spoke to the Minister on the subject this afternoon, and the hon. gentleman informed him that it did not come within the scope of the Bill. If anything could be done to relieve the men who had to carry those heavy burdens, it should be done. Perhaps the matter might be dealt with under some other statute.

Mr. HUNTER (*Maranoa*) did not see how the amendment would be effective, inasmuch as corn was bagged on the farm, and the great bulk of the handling was done before it came near a mill or factory. Furthermore, before such a change was made sufficient notice should be given, so that indentors would not indent bags which they would not be allowed to use. It was necessary that something should be done to alter the weight of bags, but he thought the amendment would not have the desired effect.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS rose to a point of order, and asked the Chairman's ruling as to whether the amendment was within the scope of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Mackay can show me that it is relevant to any particular clause I shall be glad of the information; but at present I cannot see that it is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. Therefore, I must rule that it is not in order.

Mr. SWAYNE: Under the circumstances he asked leave to withdraw the amendment. In reply to the hon. member for Maranoa, he might say that the object he had in view could be attained by limiting the size of the sacks.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 27—"Amendment of section 65"—put and passed.

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

The Bill, as amended, was taken into consideration, and the third reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow, after the third reading of the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill, will be the second reading of the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill, and after that the further consideration in Committee of the Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill.

Hon. W. Kidston.]

HON. R. PHILP: I think the Premier might tell us what amount of business he expects to get through this session. We passed a motion this afternoon to sit four days a week—a motion which is usually brought in when the press of business is so great that there is no chance of getting it through in decent time unless we sit four days a week. So far as we know, all the business before us consists of one or two important Bills. We have not yet started to discuss the Estimates, and the hon. gentleman might tell the House when he intends to proceed with that business. He has promised a long list of railways—the longest list that has ever been submitted to any Australian Parliament—and it is about time that we had some of those railways before the House. We have now been sitting two months, and up to the present we have simply marked time. Sitting four days and four nights a week is very hard work for people who attend to their business in the House, and, as far as I can see, there is not sufficient business before us to occupy us four days a week.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Any amount of business.

HON. R. PHILP: Well, it is not in front of us now. We started one Bill in Committee, and went half way through it, then we started another and went half way through it, and then we started another Bill. It is due to the House that the Premier should take us into his confidence, and tell us what business he intends doing, what further measures he proposes to introduce, and when he intends to pass the Estimates.

The PREMIER: Although this is a somewhat irregular time to ask for such information, it may be a convenience to the House if I just tell hon. members what business we have to do yet. We have before us the Land Surveyors Bill, which went through its second reading this afternoon. That is a somewhat technical measure, and I do not suppose there will be much difficulty about it in Committee. Then we have the Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill, two-thirds of which has still to be considered in Committee. It is a very troublesome Bill indeed, as there are so many experts in local government in this House, and they want to testify on each clause, so that it will take a great deal of time to get through that measure. Then there is the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill, which is a little pet of my own, but I do not anticipate there will be very much trouble in getting that through. Then there is the Religious Instruction in State Schools Referendum Bill. Then there is the Old Age Pensions Bill, which I hope will be passed on the voices. Then there is the Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding Bill, which will probably take some time. All those Bills are already before the House. Then there is the Land Act Amendment Bill, which will probably take some time. Then there is the Bill to enable the Government to carry out their scheme for the establishment of power works at Barron Falls. I hope to get the preliminary stages for that business completed within a few days, and to have a Bill introduced for that purpose. Then there is the Superannuation (Public Servants) Bill, and a State Insurance Bill. I hope to get the first one ready, but I am not sure whether we shall be able to get the last one ready for consideration this session. Then there is a Licensing Act Amendment Bill—if we have time to deal with it—and a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. There are one or two more little things—things that are very desirable—if we can manage to deal with them. Now, in addition to that, there is the whole of the Estimates to get through, which will take us a considerable part of the session still left.

[Hon. R. Philp.]

Hon. R. PHILP: When are you going to start on the Estimates?

The PREMIER: Then there is a large number of railway proposals which will probably take a considerable time to get through. In regard to the question as to when we are going to start on the Estimates, I have thought it desirable to get through the bulk of our Bills before starting on the Estimates. The other place is rather slow in getting a move on this session.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are tired.

Hon. R. PHILP: Your own party bolted this afternoon.

The PREMIER: It will give them some little time if we get our legislation through first, and tackle the Estimates and railway proposals afterwards. The leader of the Opposition will see, and hon. members will see, that if we are to finish our work by Christmas we will not only have to sit four days a week, but I regret to say that we will have to sit somewhat later in the evening than we have hitherto. I do not want to sit late myself, but hon. members can understand, judging for themselves—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Start early in the morning.

The PREMIER: I am not sure that it would not be a good thing to start early in the morning. (Hear, hear!) I have said sufficient to show that we have still got a good deal of work to get through. Now, there is plenty of time to do all that work, and do it fairly well, if we do not get abusing one another—

Hon. R. PHILP: If you behave yourself.

The PREMIER: And waste time in general talk. I think we can do all that, and I hope we shall be able to do it all before Christmas. I think I have given the House fairly full information as to the intentions of the Government.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-two minutes past 11 o'clock.