

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 3 DECEMBER 1909**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 3 DECEMBER, 1909.

---

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

SADDLERY AND HARNESS MAKERS' BOARD.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

1. On what date did the Saddlery and Harness Makers' Board sit?
2. What was the duration of each sitting?
3. At how many sittings were the chairman and respective members present?
4. What was the remuneration received by the chairman and each member respectively?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

1. Seventy-eight meetings held between 8th January, 1909, and 29th November, 1909, meetings usually being held bi-weekly.

2. The board usually sat from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. at each meeting.

3. J. G. Macdonald (chairman), 73; C. Anderson, 76; H. Hill, 69; J. Mathews, 66; A. Uhl, 78; R. C. Chambers, 51; D. McKay, 78; J. G. Trew, 76; T. Quinn, 75.

	£	s.	d.
4. J. G. Macdonald (chairman) ...	74	0	0
C. Anderson ...	36	0	0
H. Hill ...	33	15	0
J. Mathews ...	31	5	0
A. Uhl ...	36	0	0
R. C. Chambers ...	22	10	0
D. McKay ...	36	15	0
J. G. Trew ...	36	10	0
T. Quinn ...	36	10	0
	£343	5	0

#### COMMERCE AND QUARANTINE ACTS.

HON. E. B. FORREST (*Brisbane North*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

1. What payment, if any, does the State Government receive from the Federal Government for the administration in this State of the Commerce and Quarantine Acts?

2. Is the Minister aware of the friction that exists between the department and merchants in connection with the administration of the Quarantine Act—due, it is alleged, to the insufficiency of staff?

3. Will the Minister furnish to the House a return of fees received in this State to date under the Acts referred to?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

1. Nothing at present, but the approximate amount to be received per annum for the inspection of plants and stock, together with the upkeep of buildings, etc., at all ports is £2950.

2. No. Remonstrances have been made by one firm, and the Chamber of Commerce have complained at their monthly meeting as to delay in obtaining delivery permits; but as the Quarantine Act has but lately come into operation and requires inspection of goods that were not before inspected in Queensland, it is to be expected that for a time some inconvenience is to be experienced. The chief quarantine officer is in communication with Melbourne on the matter.

3. £71 19s. 9d.

#### FLOGGING WITH STINGAREE TAIL IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

1. Is it true, as stated last night by the senior member for Brisbane South, that it is a common thing for public teachers in the North to flog pupils with a stingaree tail?

2. If so, will he take steps to put a stop to such brutal conduct?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

1. No; I think the senior member for Brisbane South must have been misinformed.

2. The regulation of the department relating to corporal punishment reads—

Corporal punishment shall not be inflicted for trivial breaches of school discipline, but may be employed for offences against morality, for gross impertinence, and for wilful and persistent disobedience, and for these only as a last resource. All degrading, injurious, and unnecessarily cruel and severe modes of punishment are strictly prohibited. Female pupils who have reached the age of twelve years shall not be subjected to corporal punishment.

Violations of this regulation are severely dealt with by the department.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Treasurer, without notice—

Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea when the papers relative to the Government Printing Office will be ready?

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

I have no idea, but I will make inquiries and let the hon. gentleman know on Monday, if possible.

#### JUBILEE DAY.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*) asked the Premier, without notice—

Is it the intention of the Government that the House shall sit on Friday next, Jubilee Day?

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

It will not be practicable for the House to sit on that day. A ceremony takes place at half-past 3 in the afternoon, and all members are invited. (Hear, hear!)

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): I desire to make a personal explanation—a correction in *Hansard*. On Wednesday, 1st December, speaking on electoral registration, Chief Secretary's Estimates, I am reported as having said—

He had suggested to the department that they should send instructions to electoral registrars, telling them that any elector who was objected to and who was out of the electorate on the court day should not be disqualified at the annual revision court, but there was no notice taken of it.

The word "not" was omitted, which puts an entirely different sense on what I said.

The PREMIER: They seem to have a habit of leaving out the word "not."

Mr. COYNE: Yes; the same thing occurred to the hon. gentleman the other day. This is how it should read—

who was not out of the electorate on the polling-day.

#### PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed—A return of railway concessions to land-seekers.

#### PORT ALMA RAILWAY.

##### INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*): I beg to move—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to validate an agreement entered into between the Secretary for Railways, for and on behalf of the Government of Queensland, and the Rockhampton Harbour Board for the construction of a branch line of railway from Port Alma to a point on the main line of railway from Rockhampton to Gladstone, and to authorise the construction of the said railway, and to make provision for certain matters incidental thereto.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*): I should say that it is rather a surprise for the House to be asked to allow this Bill to be introduced. I think that a large number of the members of the House must have regarded that Bill as being dead and buried.

Mr. GRANT: Why?

Mr. LENNON: Because it was before the House on two previous occasions, and it was withdrawn on each occasion.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not dead, but sleepeth.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is very much alive just now.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. LENNON: Apparently it was only in a heavy slumber. In the opinion, at all events, of members on this side of the House, and also in the opinion of a good number on the other side, this railway is not at all required, because the port of Rockhampton is amply provided for in the shape of a fine river, on which large sums of money have been expended—

The HOME SECRETARY: Twelve feet at low water.

Mr. LENNON: In addition to that they have the railway to Broadmount, which runs alongside one side of the river, and now they propose to commit the country to the absurdity of running another railway along the other side of the river. Then we will have a fine river, a harbour, and a railway running on each side of the river—all for the benefit of Rockhampton.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is for the Central district.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would be glad if hon. members would recognise the proper method of expressing their approval or disapproval of the remarks of another hon. member.

Mr. LENNON: There are many districts in this State that are languishing for need of railway construction, and Rockhampton is already supplied with a railway that is ample for its development and for the proper carrying of the whole of the inland railway traffic, yet we are asked to commit the country to the expenditure of £70,000—that is the estimated cost, but it will probably be nearer £100,000 before it is all done—to provide the Rockhampton people with an additional harbour, which is quite unnecessary.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is guaranteed by the Rockhampton Harbour Board.

Mr. LENNON: Is it guaranteed by the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce? I can assure the House that the residents of Rockhampton are totally opposed to the construction of this line. I am satisfied that I am not exaggerating in the slightest degree when I say that a very large majority of the people of this State are totally opposed to the construction of this line, because it is unnecessary, as Rockhampton has already been provided with a deep-water port.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): It seems a strange thing that the Premier is anxious to finish the session before Christmas, and yet he is putting more business on the business-sheet. Anyone looking at the business-sheet will see that there is a long list of Bills to be dealt with in Committee, there are the Estimates of several departments to be gone through, and there is only a short time between now and Christmas to do it. The hon. gentleman must know that he is bringing forward a very contentious measure at the present time, just at the tail end of the session. It is a measure that I suppose very few members thought was going to be brought forward this session. (Hear, hear!) If he intends to proceed with this Bill, I do not know how the hon. gentleman expects to finish before Christmas, unless he intends to put through a lot of measures and the Estimates with the aid of the "gag" and "guillotine." This Bill is only going to be discussed at the expense of other Bills and other items in the Estimates. It is a very contentious measure, and there are members on the other side who are as much against it as members on this side.

Mr. RYLAND: They have had a caucus.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is such a contentious measure, and even his own party are so divided on it, that the Minister might well let this measure stand over until next year. So far as the Central district is concerned, there are other parts of the Centre that are waiting to be served

by railways, even more than Rockhampton. It is not a question of whether the Rockhampton Harbour Board is going to guarantee it or not. It is not what is going to suit the Rockhampton Harbour Board, who, after all, are only a few people in Rockhampton. I was talking to some Rockhampton business people here to-day about it.

Mr. GRANT: Who are they?

Mr. HAMILTON: I was talking to one man who is a pretty big business man in Rockhampton, and he says that a great many of the business people in Rockhampton are against the Port Alma Railway. It actually means that we are going to duplicate the deep-water port of Rockhampton. They have got one deep-water port there already, which has cost the country £250,000.

Mr. GRANT: It has not cost that much. They are paying back something.

Mr. HAMILTON: The railway to Broadmount and the wharves and everything else that were erected there cost £250,000, and all this will be scrap-iron if the Port Alma Railway is built. If it were merely a question of giving Rockhampton a deep-water port, and it was a question of whether it should be Port Alma or Broadmount, then I would say that if they wanted Port Alma, let them have it. They were offered a railway to Port Alma some years ago and they refused to accept it. They would not have Port Alma, but said that they wanted Broadmount. Well, the railway was built to Broadmount, and wharves were erected there at great expense, amounting to £250,000 altogether, and then the Rockhampton people said, "We don't want Broadmount. We want a railway to Port Alma."

Mr. RYLAND: No, they don't say that. Only the Premier says that.

Mr. HAMILTON: The Mount Morgan Company and Walter Reid and Co. are at the back of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Are they going to guarantee it?

Mr. HAMILTON: Are they going to guarantee the interest on the cost of constructing the Broadmount line, which will have to be paid just the same whether this line is built or not? And yet it is going to be turned into scrap-iron. I am not going to vote for this measure. I am totally opposed to it. It is not a question of giving Rockhampton a port, because they have got one now. They were offered Port Alma and they would not take it. They asked for Broadmount and they got it, and now they want Port Alma.

Mr. GRANT: They never asked for Broadmount.

Mr. HAMILTON: If the Government have got such a lot of money to construct railways, let them build some of the lines that are wanted in the Central West. Let them build a line from Longreach to Winton or from Barcardine, or let them connect the Northern and Central railway systems somewhere, as such a railway as that would be of benefit to the whole of Queensland, and would be far better than spending £100,000 on a railway to Port Alma. If the Government want to get the business through before Christmas, and do not want to rush the business through, they should withdraw this measure, and let it stand over till next session. It is a contentious measure, and it cannot be expected that the business will get through before Christmas if we are to have a reasonable discussion on all the Estimates that come before the House.

\* Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*): I am surprised that the Government should find it necessary to

*Mr. Breslin.]*

reintroduce a Bill which within the last two years has received a very adverse verdict from this House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. BRESLIN: It was withdrawn twice, and no Bill would be withdrawn if a Minister saw that he had a chance of carrying it. The Bill was withdrawn twice, and now it is suddenly sprung on us with the hope that members, in their anxiety to finish the session before Christmas, will allow this political fraud—I may say—to go through without proper discussion. The present Minister for Lands has in the past shown himself to be an opponent of this measure. The senior member for Townsville has also shown himself to be an opponent of this measure.

Mr. MURPHY: And the member for North Rockhampton.

Mr. BRESLIN: There are so many opponents to this measure on the Government side that it is hard to see how the Government can put it through, because those hon. gentlemen have had no cause to alter their opinions.

Mr. MURPHY: They have had a caucus.

Mr. BRESLIN: This is the same old railway line, starting from the same point, running to the same Archer land, and the same mud flats after that. Where can these members show their reason for reversing their former opinion against this measure? There may be reasons for it, but they have not been produced yet. This is a matter which the Premier laid great stress on—that it was a port for Central Queensland—a deep-water port for Central Queensland. Providence made a port for Central Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRESLIN: But the Premier thinks he knows more about it than Providence. (Opposition laughter.) He wants to dig one out of a mud pan. Some days ago I submitted a simple, straightforward, honest request to the Premier, which, if he was genuine in his professed views as regards a deep-water port for Central Queensland, he would not have refused as he did. I asked that before any further expenditure was incurred in connection with a port for Central Queensland, the Government should have a report made on Port Curtis Harbour similar to that which had recently been obtained with regard to the Broadmount and Port Alma harbours, and have the same laid before the House for its consideration. The Premier replied that it was undesirable to mix up two matters which had no necessary connection. The inference from that reply was that Port Curtis had no necessary connection with Central Queensland. If Port Curtis is not in Central Queensland, it is very hard to say where it is. Perhaps the Premier's geography has been neglected, or perhaps he does not go outside the city of Rockhampton; but everybody must know where Port Curtis is. Port Curtis has always been recognised as a part of Central Queensland. It has always been in the same place, and will be there when Port Alma is sunk in the mud.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRESLIN: Many years ago, when the separation agitation was at its height, there was never any question as to Port Curtis being in Central Queensland. Port Curtis was always considered an integral part of Central Queensland, and when the movement for separation was at its height, Mr. Jason Boles was returned for Port Curtis simply on the ground that he was a separationist, and he was supported by the Separation League, which had its headquarters at Rockhampton. That ought to be proof enough as to where Port Curtis is. At Port Curtis we have an excellent harbour, which

[*Mr. Breslin.*

is land-locked; we have deep water there; there is no ship that comes to Australia which cannot go up there at any state of the tide and go alongside the jetty, and no vessel has to wait outside until the wind dies down before entering the harbour.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No fogs.

Mr. BRESLIN: And there are no fogs. All the Grange and Shire steamers come straight in, load their cargo at the jetty, and go out again with their freight. Horse-boats come right up to the jetty, load their cargo of horses or whatever else they may carry, and go away again without any trouble. Why, then, should this port be overlooked and treated as it has been?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Why don't the people of Central Queensland send their produce there?

Mr. BRESLIN: Why does not the Secretary for Railways give us long haulage rates? Some time back, after years of agitation, we were able to get the jetty enlarged. Then it was pointed out by the engineer that when the jetty was completed it would still accommodate only one vessel of the size of the "Bingera." It was estimated that the expenditure of an extra £2,000 would make it possible for two large vessels to berth at the jetty at the same time by letting their bows overlap. What did the Premier say when he was asked to sanction that extra expenditure? He said, "Get your trade first, and then we will make the improvements." Why does he not get the trade at Port Alma first, and then make the railway there?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRESLIN: The senior member for Rockhampton says the Rockhampton Harbour Board can always pay interest and redemption on their loans. I am not going to argue that point, but I say that the Gladstone harbour does more than that. We have not got a harbour board, and all the dues are paid into the Treasury. The income from the harbour has been considerably more than the amount required to pay interest and redemption, and yet we could not get a paltry £2,000 spent in extending the jetty so that it would accommodate two vessels at the same time. But on this Port Alma Railway the Government are prepared to spend £70,000, or probably £100,000, without turning a hair.

Mr. COYNE: To bridge a swamp.

Mr. BRESLIN: Yes, to bridge a swamp. At this stage I do not intend to delay the House any further. I simply point out that in Port Curtis we have a harbour in Central Queensland which, next to Sydney Harbour, is the finest port in Australia. It is absolutely safe for any vessel trading to these shores; it has deep water; it is not visited with violent winds; there is nothing to be afraid of there; and if the Premier and the Minister for Railways are really genuine in their desire to give Central Queensland a proper port, a port of which they can be proud, let them devote their energies to providing facilities at Port Curtis, and let Port Alma sink into the mud.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): I am surprised at the Government bringing forward this line. It was understood in this House that the proposal had been abandoned. Not only did members on this side oppose it when it was introduced previously as a thing which was likely to prove a job, but many members on the Government side have, up to a very recent date, been strong opponents of the railway. How have the Government supporters been consolidated in regard to this matter? It would be very interesting to know that. Has the consolidation been brought about

on the "Lucinda" at the crack of the caucus whip? The Premier must have some reason for believing that he will get support in his proposal or he would not have brought forward this Bill. It is a most contentious measure to bring in at this late period of the session, when we are sitting long hours, practically sitting day and night for five days a week, in order to accommodate the Government and close the session by Christmas. I am entirely against the proposal, as I think it would be a waste of public funds to build this railway. It would be sacrificing the best interest of the people of Queensland to build this line over a mud flat to Port Alma. Practically it will only reduce the distance over which the Central Queensland trade will have to go by 10 miles, and yet it is proposed to construct this railway at a heavy cost, when in Port Curtis we have one of the best ports in Australia. A wharf that is practically up-to-date has been built there recently, and therefore there is no necessity to build this branch line to Port Alma, where there is practically no land

[4 p.m.] protection whatever to vessels, and,

I suppose, the next thing, we will be asked to spend money on a breakwater to give the necessary protection. I hope the majority of this House will vote against the proposal. Further railways are required in the pastoral and agricultural districts, and we also require to link up our present system. All this has to be done, and members on this side of the House have no objection to it being done, but I hope members on this side, and many members on the other side, will vote against this proposal. There has been a mistake made in connection with our railway system in the past, through political pulls on the part of those interested in land. Now, in connection with the proposed line, if hon. members look at the map they will see it is all marked "Archer, Archer, Archer," one piece after another. This is an Archer railway, and the only practical benefit by the building of this railway will be reaped by Mr. Archer and those who own the land. The railway will go where there is not a possibility of getting one drop of water, except sea water, and all that is required will have to be taken down in punts to that wharf. From the beginning to the end there is no necessity for the railway. We have a good port in Gladstone, which should be the port of the whole of Central Queensland. Rockhampton itself has a railway down to a deep-water port on the other side of the river, and why it should be necessary to build another line of railway through these mud flats to Port Alma is something I cannot understand, and it is something that the people of Queensland cannot understand. It will practically make scrap-iron of the existing line. I, for one, will vote against it at every stage, and I hope the Minister will not waste the time of the House this session by having a discussion over it.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I notice that the Premier, in his policy speech, is reported in the *Courier* of 8th September, 1909, as follows:—

At the close of his speech the Premier was accorded an ovation. Replying to questions, he said it was the intention of the Government to proceed with the Port Alma Railway. It would be a great advantage, he thought, to Rockhampton, and it would be wise for Rockhampton men to get over their local squabbles and have the question settled. But neither the Port Alma nor any other railway scheme would be a plank of the Government programme.

I do not regard this as a plank in the Government programme.

Mr. COYNE: It has been revised since then.

Mr. LESINA: I do not think this is a plank in the Government programme, and I have always regarded the merits of a railway as

entirely superior to a mere party question. I say if you make the railway policy of the country a question of party policy, then the railway policy is going to suffer. Railways should always be considered above such sordid considerations if we are large minded and take a patriotic view of the matter. I have been instructed to vote two ways on this railway, and I am in rather a peculiar position. (Laughter.) During the election I was asked what attitude I would adopt in connection with the railway policy, and I told the electors I would support the Government programme of railways in every case, with the exception of the Port Alma line, and on that matter I had an open mind, but I went so far as to say that if the Government introduced that railway during the coming session, I would write to the town council in Clermont and the Belyando Shire Council and ask their advice. I put this question to them: "Do you think that this railway will injure the interests of the Clermont electorate as a part of Central Queensland, looking at it from that narrow point of view?" The town council sent me the following wire:—

Meeting council last night decided to instruct you vote against Port Alma Railway.

The chairman of the local Divisional Board told me that they had not had time to get a meeting together, but Mr. Andrew Small, one of the oldest representatives of local government in Queensland, and a man of considerable standing in the district, and chairman of this board, wired me as follows:—

An certain Port Alma Railway will not be inimical to interests this districts personally in favour have interviewed all available members and am of opinion my council is in favour.

The Black Ridge Workers' Political Organisation wrote to me on the 29th November, 1909, as follows:—

Your letter dated 23rd November duly to hand, and it was carefully considered this day by a meeting of our members and residents.

It was resolved that you should be asked to record your vote in favour of the Port Alma Railway line to junction with the main line between Gladstone and Rockhampton.

Mr. GRANT: That is a two to one majority.

Mr. LESINA: In determining the merits of the railway, I must confess I bow to public opinion in my own district. The representatives of two local bodies both favour the construction of the line, because they consider it is not inimical to the interests of that particular district. I want no other reasons, but I go to the Commissioner's report, and see what the Commissioner, who has a long experience on this subject, has to say. The reports laid on the table of the House yesterday are not yet printed; we shall get them later on when this railway is submitted to the Committee. The Commissioner, in his report, to be found in "Votes and Proceedings," Volume iii., page 399, says—

I recommend the construction of this railway because the State will not lose thereby, it will bring into use a good wharf built at great expense over twenty years ago, and practically lying idle ever since, and at the same time be a great convenience to oversea passengers to and from Rockhampton and the Central district generally.

Something was said about the amount of private property being enhanced in value by the construction of this line. Private property is always enhanced in value by the construction of public works. There are  $4\frac{1}{2}$  miles of private land, the Commissioner says, along the route the railway will go, and about 51 acres will be resumed altogether. It is a pity we cannot build the railway without making any resumption, because you have to pay practically what they ask. I have no prejudices one way or the other in connection with this matter, but on the advice of the local

Mr. Lesina.]

authorities and the Workers' Political Organisation, I am prepared to vote for the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*): If there is a division on this proposal I intend to vote against it. I can only assume, as the reason for bringing in this proposal at this late stage of the session, the fact that this side must have shown rather too much affability in meeting the Premier, and had we discussed measures as much as we should have done I do not think he would have reintroduced this matter.

Mr. MURPHY: That is pretty rough on your own party.

Mr. FERRICKS: However, I am not opposed to this measure because it is introduced by the Premier and applies, or is likely to apply, as they think, advantageously to Rockhampton, and not because it might detrimentally affect a constituency of a member on this side; but I am opposed to it because I do not think it is in the best interests of the State that the Port Alma Railway should be built. I speak rather feelingly on this matter. We have a parallel case up North; we have a splendid harbour there—Port Denison—quite equal to the Port Curtis Harbour—yet that harbour has never been able to get its due or just treatment, through the simple fact that we have a little place further up in Queensland where hundreds and thousands of pounds have been spent in the vain attempt to make a harbour, just as it is proposed to put money in Port Alma in the vain attempt to make a harbour there.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, no! The deep water is there.

Mr. FERRICKS: This line is flying in the face of Nature, for though water may be there, sometimes other things are wanting. A great proportion of the country between Rockhampton and Port Alma is such a mud flat that it would bog a mosquito, and you can understand that the construction of such a line would be a great mistake. The hon. member for Clermont is quite justified as far as he has gone, that it is to the interests of his constituency to see this railway constructed; but I, as a member of this National party, do not care what the clerk of the Workers' Political Organisation or the people of Clermont think. I look at whether the proposition is in the best interests of the State as a whole. We profess to be a National party, and that is the way we regard it if we are conscientious to our party teachings—we regard these propositions in the light of what is best in the interests of the whole State. I happened to be living in Rockhampton when the Broadmount line was built. Loud huzzas and banging of drums took place on that occasion. It was said then that Rockhampton would virtually jump ahead by leaps and bounds, and would, in fact, leave Brisbane far behind; but that has not been done. When the Secretary for Railways interjected, and asked the member for Port Curtis why the trade did not go to Port Curtis, it is reasonable to reply to that interjection by the assertion that vested interests in a place like Rockhampton are so great that they cannot be overcome in a day. We cannot go against Nature. Nature has made a port at Port Curtis, and if you put the money into Broadmount or Port Alma, you would not be able to come out with the natural facilities which are afforded by Port Curtis.

Mr. GRANT: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. FERRICKS: It has been said that this line will be guaranteed by the members of the Rockhampton Harbour Board. We might reasonably ask, Who are the Rockhampton Harbour Board? They may be there to-day and away

to-morrow. We might say the same with regard to the Mount Morgan Goldmining Company. It has paid millions of pounds in dividends, but it may not last another month. We do not know what is under the earth, and a guarantee like that in a financial proposal of this nature is not a lasting guarantee. I protest against the Chief Secretary introducing this measure at this stage of the session, and if he insists on it going through, the only way it will go through will be by the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Rockhampton North*): At this stage I have no intention of going fully into the matter, but I just wish to say that my constituents are by a large majority against the Port Alma line.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRENNAN: On every platform from which I addressed my constituents during the last election I told them that I was decidedly opposed to the Port Alma line, and if a division takes place I shall vote against it. I shall reserve what I have to say for a future occasion.

\* Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): On the last occasion when the motion to introduce this railway was brought down, I gave it the strongest opposition that I could, for the reason that I am well acquainted with this portion of the country, and consider that any proposal to build a line to Port Alma would be simply a waste of public money.

Mr. D. HUNTER: What about the mosquitoes?

Mr. MANN: The hon. member has asked me about mosquitoes. They never light upon the hon. gentleman but they get burnt. (Laughter.) The motion reads—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to validate an agreement entered into between the Secretary for Railways, for and behalf of the Government of Queensland, and the Rockhampton Harbour Board.

Now, if the Rockhampton Harbour Board was a solvent body, and had some considerable weight behind them, if we understood that that body was there by the wish of the people of Rockhampton—

Mr. GRANT: Do you mean that the board is not solvent?

Mr. MANN: I do. I say the board is elected on so restricted a franchise that it does not represent the will of the whole of the people of Rockhampton—not even of a majority of them. I am quite confident that if to-morrow the Premier introduced a Bill to provide that the members of the Rockhampton Harbour Board be appointed by the ratepayers of Rockhampton, a majority of the ratepayers would appoint a board which would be hostile to this Port Alma Railway. The senior member for Rockhampton asked me if I thought the board was insolvent, and I say that I do, inasmuch as if the board paid off the enormous sum of money spent in trying to make the Fitzroy a navigable river it would just about make the people of Rockhampton insolvent.

The TREASURER: They meet their responsibilities.

Mr. MANN: They meet their responsibilities, and it is hitting them very hard, and if we build this railway, the £350,000 sunk in the Fitzroy River has been entirely wasted. I have got off the coasting steamers, and gone on the tender for the purpose of going to Rockhampton. The little tender of 150 tons burden has to lie there in Keppel Bay for hours and hours, if there is a fog, before she can attempt to make the passage in the Fitzroy River.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is not Port Alma.

[*Mr. Lesina.*]

Mr. MANN: That is an argument showing that, although the Rockhampton Harbour Board has spent £350,000 in the Fitzroy River, it is not navigable if there is the least bit of fog or wind, as the hon. member for Port Curtis says. I have been over this country. The Commissioner for Railways says that the banks to carry the rails through this swamp are not standing well. I believe the crabs have made holes in the banks, and the borers have got into them; and if it is built a tremendous expense will be incurred in keeping the banks safe for the running over of the trains. If the back country is genuine in the support of this railway, and believe that only through this railway can they handle produce expeditiously and cheaply, then why did the Secretary for Railways not come down with a motion to include in the benefited area all the portion of the country favourable to it? The hon. member for Clermont says that two-thirds of the people in his district are inclined to favour the railway. Well, I think there are five out of nine members of the Rockhampton Harbour Board—a bare majority—in favour of it, but that board is not an expression of the will of the people of Rockhampton. So many absentees have votes for the appointment of the members of the harbour board that it is practically the board of Walter Reid and Co., McIlwraith, McEacharn, and Co., and companies interested in booming properties in the neighbourhood of Port Alma.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Why cannot you discuss this on the Bill?

Mr. MANN: Before the Bill is introduced I am pointing out that, if the Secretary for Railways wishes to get the Bill through, he ought to have a big benefited area included, showing that the people of the back country are so satisfied that the railway will be a commercial success that they are willing to guarantee interest and redemption. If the people of Clermont and other parts of Central Queensland are prepared to relieve the other parts of the State from all responsibility for finding money to make up the loss that must accrue on the railway, this House cannot have any strong reason for opposing it. But I object to the people of Cairns having to pay to open up a port that, on the evidence of the hon. member for Port Curtis, is not required. I am inclined to back the hon. member up, inasmuch as twenty years ago I went over that country trying to get down to Port Alma. After walking for 2 or 3 miles 3 or 4 inches deep in water, I found the water getting so deep that I could not get any further unless I took off my boots and rolled up my pants, so I turned back. There are other methods of developing our country that would be more successful than attempting to give Rockhampton what we may term a third port. They have spent £320,000 in deepening the river, and I have the authority of the hon. member for Gregory that they have spent another £250,000 in building the railway to Broadmount and the wharf at that place; and now they want to spend another £70,000 trying to open up a port where Nature never intended one to be, while a few miles away we have one of the finest ports in the whole of Australia.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Fifty miles away.

Mr. MANN: Fifty miles is nothing when you have the stuff loaded on the railway wagons. It is merely a question of trains running another 50 miles. If the Secretary for Railways knew his business, he would offer every inducement to the people of the Central district to send their stuff to Port Curtis, where it can be handled cheaply and expeditiously, and where, at any stage of the tide and in any kind of weather, the

biggest ships afloat can come right up to the jetty. Why should we throw away money in trying to fight against Nature, when Nature shows so clearly that the port for Central Queensland is Port Curtis. I noticed in the papers the other day that the Premier said he would not allow the Cairns Shire Council—a progressive body—to build a railway to Geraldton; but he wishes this House to pass £70,000—possibly £100,000—to build a railway that will not open up any new territory. Nobody will tell me that it will pass through any agricultural land, or that it will open up any land that is not now well served by the railway from Gladstone to Rockhampton. The Secretary for Lands condemned the railway when it was before the House on a previous occasion, and said he could not allow it to pass unless an expression of opinion was obtained from the Rockhampton Harbour Board. He might have gone further, and said the people of Rockhampton, because, after all, the harbour board can never get sufficient revenue to pay for any loss upon the railway without taxing the products that come in to supply the wants of the people of Rockhampton and the back country, and also the exports of the district. Every effort on our part should be made to spare taxing the people in the hinterland of Rockhampton; but if the harbour board cannot meet interest and redemption on the line, they will have no alternative but to impose heavier dues on both imports and exports.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not necessarily.

Mr. MANN: They must necessarily do so, or else they will not pay their way. They have no royal way of raising money save by taxing consumers and exporters. An enormous amount of stuff will have to pass over this railway to make it pay. It will practically mean that no traffic at all will come over the Broadmount line.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Very little goes over it now.

Mr. MANN: We shall have to take up the rails if this line is built. The Commissioner for Railways is a business man. He has already urged the taking up of one line in Queensland, and I am satisfied that, if this line is built, and does not pay its way, and the harbour board complain that they are unable to collect sufficient dues to meet interest and redemption, they will urge on the Commissioner that he ought to take up the Broadmount line, wipe out the debt in connection with it, and try, as far as possible, to induce people to send their goods *via* Port Alma by penalising them if they attempt to send them *via* Port Curtis. The senior member for Townsville made a very strong speech against this railway on a previous occasion. He quite clearly understands the terrible amount of expense and trouble there is in trying to establish a port where Nature never intended one to be. He knows the trouble and difficulty they have had in Townsville in trying to get sufficiently deep water to allow ships to get in at all states of the tide.

Hon. R. PHILP: It is the best port in Queensland now.

Mr. MANN: It may be until such time as we get another "Sigma" that will level the jetty. Then it will be, as it was before, an open roadstead.

Hon. R. PHILP: There will not be much left of Cairns if a "Sigma" levels Townsville.

Mr. MANN: Cairns is outside the cyclonic belt. But I do not intend to discuss the relative merits of Cairns and Townsville. I am simply pointing out what an enormous expense it has been trying to get deep water at Townsville. The harbour board have spent thousands and

*Mr. Mann.]*

thousands of pounds in trying to get deep water close to the town, and the hon. member quite well understands what an enormous expense it will be to enable the traffic to get from this wharf to the back country. To save the enormous loss there is bound to be, the Secretary for Railways might very easily give concessions to allow the trade to go to Broadmount, or if, as they claim, Broadmount is unsuitable, no hon. member will deny that Port Curtis is eminently suitable for handling any traffic that may go to it. The hon. member for Rockhampton North says he is opposed to this railway. North Rockhampton is a very important part of Rockhampton, and the wishes of that portion of the community should be considered. Hon. members should not allow any mere party views to compel them to vote for a railway that I am satisfied the bulk of them do not believe in. Even though the Government bring it in, that should not bind any hon. member to vote for a railway that he honestly believes should not be constructed. I honestly believe it should not be constructed, and I claim that if we build this non-paying railway, we must inevitably be prevented in the near future from building a line to a district where the same expenditure would build a revenue-earning railway. I think this is one of the worst lines ever brought before the House, with possibly the exception of the Dalby-Tara Railway.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): I think that at this stage discussion should be deprecated, and I shall support this motion; but when it comes to the second reading of the Bill, I hope to give the House good reasons why [4.30 p.m.] it should be thrown out, because I do not believe in building the Port Alma Railway. There is a good port at Broadmount, and in a river with a rise and fall in the tide of 17 feet there is ample accommodation at that port to serve the Central district for twenty years to come. I had the privilege of being in the House when the Broadmount line was passed, after weighing all the pros and cons with regard to the two lines. I know that a former Premier wanted to build the line to Port Alma, but the two members for Rockhampton—Messrs. Pattison and Archer—were told that they must vote against the railway. If all local jealousies were buried, and the people there made honest efforts to use the Broadmount Railway, it would serve the requirements of the Central district for a long time to come. I know the objection there is to a tidal port; but London is a tidal port, so is Brisbane, and you cannot get a vessel drawing more than 27 feet to Sydney at low water, though Port Jackson is the finest harbour in Australia. When the Bill comes on for its second reading, I think I shall be able to give sufficient reasons why the Port Alma Railway should not be built, and why we should let the Rockhampton people concentrate their efforts on the Broadmount harbour.

Mr. GRANT (*Rockhampton*): The deputy leader of the Opposition waxed more eloquent on this question than on any question that has come before the House; and he made some statements that he would not have made if he had a fuller knowledge of the facts. The hon. member for Gregory stated that the Rockhampton people asked for Broadmount; and that is on a par with some of the other statements he made. The Rockhampton people always opposed Broadmount; they never asked for Broadmount. They had a committee of representative men—members of the Chamber of Commerce, shipping men and others—who took voluminous evidence from experts, men in the Government service, pilots and others; and they unanimously reported in favour of the Port Alma line as

[*Mr. Mann.*

against Broadmount; but the Government of the day, instead of listening to the advice of the committee, brought in the Broadmount Railway. How can the hon. member say the Rockhampton people asked for the Broadmount Railway? The hon. member brought the names of private firms into the matter—Walter Reid and Co. If there is one firm in Rockhampton or in Queensland that will lose by the building of the Port Alma Railway it is Walter Reid and Co. At the present time they have a fleet of lighters bringing cargo up and down the river, which is a very profitable thing for them; and as soon as the Port Alma Railway is built their fleet of lighters is done away with. It is most unfair for the hon. member to make statements of that kind. He said that if the Port Alma Railway were built the Broadmount Railway would become scrap-iron. What is the Broadmount Railway at the present time? What profit is it to the country?

Mr. HARDACRE interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member can say what he wishes to say in a speech.

Mr. GRANT: The hon. member for Leichhardt, instructed as he is by a man in Rockhampton—

Mr. HARDACRE: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. GRANT: I will not say anything personal about the hon. member, because the last time anything personal was said about him he took to his bed for a fortnight. (Laughter.) I can understand the member for Port Curtis opposing the Port Alma Railway; and it was amusing to watch, while the hon. member for North Rockhampton was speaking, how he was encouraged by the hon. member for Port Curtis. If the building of this railway is an evil thing for Gladstone, surely it cannot also be an evil thing for North Rockhampton. It is inconceivable that the two places should suffer by the building of the railway. The question that members should consider is whether the security offered for the loan of the money required is good enough. It is not the Government that is going to lose if the railway is not a success; it is the Rockhampton Harbour Board; and the only question to consider is whether the security offered by the board is good enough.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: We do not think it is.

Mr. GRANT: I think that on the second reading of the Bill the Chief Secretary and myself will be able to show that the security is exceedingly good. What has Gladstone to do with this matter any more than Brisbane? What right has Gladstone to take part in what is purely a local matter? We did not object when it was proposed to build a jetty at Gladstone; we helped them. The Chief Secretary, in his capacity as Treasurer, lent them the money. Gladstone will not suffer in any way from the building of this line, because she has everything she wants in the way of getting import and export trade—a railway, wharf and jetty, deep water. Yet the people will not use the port. How many bales of wool have been sent from Gladstone? How many tons of stuff has gone into Gladstone from the West? Never will Gladstone be able to take away that trade which Rockhampton now holds.

Mr. HARDACRE: They get special rates.

Mr. GRANT: It is just like a lot of other statements that the hon. member often makes without any substance of truth in them whatever. It is like the speech he made at Allentown, Rockhampton, when he said he saw a member of this House counting out the £5 notes which he had received for his vote. (Laughter.) That was what the hon. member

for Leichhardt said at Rockhampton, although I do not know if any members of this House knew of it before. He also said at Rockhampton, during the election campaign, that he knew a member who got £500 for his vote, and he saw the man counting out the £5 notes. (Laughter.) And the hon. member for Leichhardt's objection to the purchase of the motor-cars was that the Premier got a commission out of it. (Government laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting,

Mr. HARDACRE: That is so.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. GRANT: It is quite on a par with all the other statements of the hon. member for Leichhardt.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to hon. members that it is the imperative duty of every member in this Chamber to cease interjecting at once when the Chair calls "Order."

Mr. HARDACRE: He attacked me first.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman knows quite as well as I do that there are clear and legitimate means of repelling an attack. It is absolutely out of order for the hon. member to sit in his seat and interject.

Mr. HARDACRE: He was out of order in what he said about me.

The SPEAKER: In that case the hon. member should have risen and formally called my attention to it. I realised that the hon. member for Rockhampton did make some remark which was not in order, and I waited for the hon. member for Leichhardt to call my attention to it, but as he did not do so I took no further notice of it.

Mr. GRANT: There is nothing arbitrary by way of freights to prevent the Western people from using Gladstone. They can use Gladstone if they like by paying the extra carriage from Rockhampton to Gladstone. I am sure that the hon. member would not desire that we should carry wool 90 miles for nothing on the railway from Rockhampton to Gladstone in order to put Gladstone on the same footing as Rockhampton.

Mr. BRESLIN: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no idea of distances. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRANT: Why should the Railway Department carry produce from Gladstone to Rockhampton, and from Rockhampton to Gladstone, for nothing? If the Railway Department do not do that, then Gladstone will never get any of the traffic that at the present time goes to Rockhampton.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Railway Department would not do it.

Mr. GRANT: It is hardly likely that any sane person would dream of doing it. Gladstone has really no business in this matter at all. Why should Gladstone interfere in a purely Rockhampton matter? If this railway is run at a loss, we are going to pay for it and not the Gladstone people. At the request of Gladstone, and at the request of the late member for Port Curtis, Mr. Herbertson, we got the "Bingera" kept at Gladstone. It was at the instigation of my colleague and myself that we got the "Bingera" retained at Gladstone instead of at Port Alma. The hon. member for Bowen also spoke without knowledge of the subject when he said that there was no natural harbour at Port Alma. Why it is one of the best harbours on the east coast of Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No!

Mr. GRANT: Ships can go into Port Alma at any tide, either day or night, without the slightest trouble, because there is 26 feet at low water.

Mr. BARBER: They cannot find it at night time. What about the fogs there?

Mr. GRANT: There are no more fogs at Port Alma than any other place. I may say that it is not merely a Rockhampton matter.

Mr. BRESLIN: You just said that it was a purely Rockhampton matter. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRANT: I will make a slight correction of that. I say that Gladstone is not more concerned in this than anyone else. But behind this desire for a railway to Port Alma we have the West. The Pastoralists' Association, at their annual meeting in March last, passed a resolution in favour of the Port Alma Railway. The Barcaldine Shire Council passed a resolution in favour of it. As the hon. member for Clermont pointed out, the Workers' Political Organisation at Black Ridge and the Belyando Shire Council both asked him to vote for it. Mount Morgan, as the hon. member for Fitzroy will bear me out, is unanimously in favour of it. The Livingstone Shire Council, the Fitzroy Shire Council, and the Rockhampton Town Council have all passed resolutions in favour of this railway. When the matter comes up for the second reading of the Bill we will be able to give some information that it is not desirable to give at this stage of it. It is an unusual thing for a railway to be opposed in its preliminary stages like this. It merely amounts to this, that the party over there intend to make a party question of it.

Mr. NEVITT: That is not so.

Mr. GRANT: Why should the leader of the Opposition make such a fiery attack upon it?

Mr. LENNON: Do you call that fiery?

Mr. COYNE: You should hear him when he gets going.

Mr. GRANT: It was fiery in comparison with some of the speeches that the hon. gentleman delivered. As I started so will I finish. This railway will pay. If it is passed the country will not lose a penny over it. The harbour board is a thoroughly solvent body, and it has agreed to guarantee it. The harbour board do not owe a penny for interest and redemption. They met all their payments of interest and redemption and other expenses out of revenue last year and still have a credit balance.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): I do not want to give a silent vote if this question goes to a division. I look on this question with a purely open mind. The senior member for Rockhampton pointed out that if the railway did not pay it was not going to hurt anybody else except the harbour board at Rockhampton.

Mr. HAMILTON: And the people of Rockhampton.

Mr. PAYNE: Who are the Rockhampton Harbour Board? They are a body of men who collect harbour dues. They collect those harbour dues from the producers of Central Queensland.

Mr. HAMILTON: And the consumers.

Mr. PAYNE: If this line is built and does not pay, then the people of Central Queensland will be hit hard, because they have got to find the money to give to the harbour board. The senior member for Rockhampton pointed out that a resolution in favour of this line was passed by the Pastoralists' Association in March last, saying that it was necessary to build this railway to open up a deep-water port for Central Queens-

*Mr. Payne.]*

land. I would point out that at that meeting of the Pastoralists' Association there were only nineteen men present.

Mr. GRANT: It was the annual meeting.

Mr. PAYNE: And the voting in favour of Port Alma was fourteen to five.

The PREMIER: They represented a large proportion of the trade of Central Queensland.

Mr. PAYNE: Nineteen men at the Pastoralists' Association annual meeting at Rockhampton was a very poor meeting. I will go further. I venture to say that every wool-grower in Central Queensland, big and little, if they had a voice in this question, would decide by a big majority against the construction of the Port Alma line. It is all very well for members to get up here and say that a resolution was passed by the Barcardine Shire Council. The hon. member for Clermont told us that there were resolutions passed by a body of men in his electorate. We know how insignificant these bodies are at times.

Mr. GRANT: The Workers' Political Organisation at Black Ridge insignificant!

Mr. PAYNE: They are insignificant in comparison to the actual voice of the people in that locality. Members of shire councils get together and say a certain thing, and then hon. members come into this Chamber and say that is the voice of the people. That is not correct. I voted against this proposal on a previous occasion, and I cannot see my way now to support its construction. There are lots of places in Queensland where the money which this line would cost can be put to a much better use than it would be put in building a railway to Port Alma. There are some railway stations in Central Queensland which are a disgrace to the Government, and when they are asked to improve them Ministers say they have no money to provide better accommodation. It would be much better to provide reasonably good accommodation on existing railways than to spend a large sum of money on this line. I am not prepared to say whether the people in Rockhampton are in favour of this particular line or not, but I do say that the fact that the Rockhampton Harbour Board by a majority of one have decided in favour of the line is no evidence that the proposal is approved by the people. Since the matter was last before the House, I have gone into it very carefully, and I am unable to see that the construction of this railway will give more facilities to the producers in Central Queensland, but I am quite certain that if it does not pay it will hit them very hard.

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Fitzroy*): I do not intend to speak at any length at this stage of the matter. I am perfectly free in regard to any action I may take with regard to Port Alma. The construction of this railway was not a question raised during my election campaign, only one insignificant question having been asked me on the subject, and in answer to that question I expressed no opinion. But I know perfectly well that for a long time the people of Mount Morgan have expressed themselves by petition and by public meeting in favour of the construction of this line to Port Alma. I am therefore anxious to have a better opportunity of considering the proposal in detail. I shall not go into the matter now, because I intend to vote for the introduction of the Bill in order that I may have an opportunity of going thoroughly into the whole question. When the proper time comes I shall ask the patience of the House for a considerable time in order to express my

[*Mr. Payne.*

opinion on this very important matter. I am anxious that the Bill should be introduced, so that those members who, like myself, are new to this House, and have not had an opportunity of considering the proposal on a previous occasion, will have an opportunity now of considering it in all its details.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): I do not intend to make a long speech, but I desire to enter my strong protest against this proposal. I oppose the introduction of the Bill because we know a great deal about the proposal from information which was laid before this House on a previous occasion, and from information which we have got from outside. The information I have got shows that this proposal is the nearest approach to a political job of any proposal which has been made by the Government since I have been a member of this House. It is a proposal to build a railway on similar lines to those railways in America which are built for the benefit of big companies or a few financial institutions. No evidence has been placed before the House which would warrant the expenditure of public money in building a railway to Port Alma. The Commissioner for Railways actually condemns the thing by faint praise. First of all, he says the railway will go for the most part over mud flats and flooded country, and that nobody knows how high the floods are in that country. Here are his words—

Much of the route is over flooded country, owing to the overflow from six-mile and eight-mile creeks, which extend from about 2 miles to 6 miles, and practically nothing is known as to the height and direction of the water, nor how long the floods last.

That passage in itself is sufficient to condemn the proposal; but at the close of his report the Commissioner further says—

I recommend the construction of this line because the State will not lose thereby.

Not only will the line go through flooded country and mangrove swamps, but there is no possibility of building a township at Port Alma, and there is actually no water to be obtained at the place for the shipping and the people who will be employed at the wharves. This is a most contentious matter, not only in this House, but also in Rockhampton, and in order to get better evidence in regard to it a committee of experts was appointed to make inquiries and report on the proposal. That committee sat and took evidence, and actually reported against the proposal. They recommended the construction of a line from Broadmount which should cross the Fitzroy by a bridge.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: An oversea railway.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; they actually preferred a railway which would cross the mouth of the Fitzroy to this railway over flooded country. If that is not enough to show members the foolishness of this proposal, I do not know what is. It is said that the Rockhampton Harbour Board are to guarantee the line. The Rockhampton Harbour Board members are elected on absolutely the most restricted and conservative franchise which any local body is elected in Queensland or in Australia. It reminds one of the old corrupt franchise which existed in Great Britain before the Reform Act of 1832. The majority of the members are elected by so-called payers of dues, and the minority of four are elected by the ratepayers of Rockhampton. Whenever the ratepayers of Rockhampton get a chance to express their views they invariably express themselves as opposed to the Port Alma

Railway. But a few financial companies in Rockhampton, whose headquarters are in Melbourne, have a huge scheme behind this for their own self-aggrandisement; they have managed to obtain a majority on the Rockhampton Harbour Board. I have evidence to show that ten financial institutions in Rockhampton and Melbourne have managed to secure something like 100 proxy votes out of a total of 173. By that way they manage to elect representatives who override the wishes of the people of Rockhampton every time. I say the Rockhampton Harbour Board, elected on a franchise of that kind against the wishes of the people of Rockhampton—a guarantee should not be accepted from a board of that kind. It is not the people of Rockhampton who are guaranteeing this railway: it is the financial oligarchy over-riding the wishes of the Rockhampton people, and they are going to guarantee a railway that is going to divert trade from the Rockhampton Harbour.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Rockhampton will control Port Alma.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Rockhampton Harbour Board have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on improvements in the Fitzroy River, and now they are really going to guarantee a railway which will divert the trade from the Fitzroy River itself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The river boats will go up to Rockhampton.

Mr. HARDACRE: A large amount of the trade will go *via* Port Alma. They are actually throwing money away if they build this railway. The Rockhampton Harbour Board have deepened the river at considerable expense, and they are going to make it entirely unnecessary to take advantage of the deepening of the river, which has been brought about by the expenditure of this money.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The coastal steamers will still go to Rockhampton.

Mr. HARDACRE: A few small boats will go to Rockhampton, but the large boats will stay at Port Alma—the deep-water port—where the steamers can come in at any time, and in that case it is going to take these ships from the Fitzroy River.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Those steamers do not go up the river now.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; and they all go to Broadmount now if the tide is not against it. I enter my protest against the railway, and when it comes on for discussion on the second reading I shall have a great deal more to say about it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oakey*): It seems to me rather unusual, at this stage, that so much time should be taken up in opposing a motion for the introduction of this Bill. I quite understand the thing being contested purely on its merits, but at this stage we are not able to get the whole facts before us as recently ascertained. It is the old story—this Port Alma Railway. We have had it more than once before the House; it has caused trouble on more than one occasion, and I think it is as well that the matter should be completely and finally dealt with. (Hear, hear!) I believe, during the afternoon, some reference was made to the position I took up in relation to this line on one occasion. That position was a perfectly honourable one, and I am in the same position to-day. I said that it was a matter for

the people themselves in that neighbourhood and district, and if they were desirous of securing the line and would foot the bill—there was a local election pending at the time, and if the result of that election was in favour of the Port Alma line it had nothing at all to do with me. That election went in favour of the Port Alma line.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was a very restricted franchise.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The franchise is not perhaps of the most modern, but such as the franchise is, it went in favour of the Port Alma scheme, and I think, at least, the House should have admitted of the Bill being brought down so that the whole facts could be laid before hon. members, and the railway dealt with, as I am sure it should be, on its merits.

The PREMIER: I would just like to say a few words on this matter. I do not intend at this stage to discuss the merits or demerits of the proposal at all. I do not think this is the proper time to do it. Indeed, I say frankly that I regret exceedingly the line of action taken by the deputy leader of the Opposition on this occasion. I am quite willing that the House should consider this proposal purely on its business merits, and deal with it according as their judgment goes, but there is no member in the House this afternoon who imagines that this matter has been discussed on its business merits. Hon. members opposite imagine—and probably the deputy leader of the Opposition is not the worst of them in this matter—hon. members opposite think that by defeating this railway they can discredit the Premier. Not one man who talked on the railway cared one snap of the fingers about it. I think it is rather hard. During the time I have been in office as Treasurer, and then as Premier, I have been doing my very best to improve all the ports of the State from Brisbane to Thursday Island, and, as a matter of fact, I have done it. I am trying now to complete the port accommodation of the Central district—to give the people of the Central district the advantage of the British-India service which other ports are getting. I am trying to make the same arrangement for the people in the Northern districts by dredging. I am trying to get the deputy leader of the Opposition the advantages of a port and railway facilities for his district. Show me a port on the coast of Queensland where I have not attempted to improve the shipping facilities, and because this happens to be my own district is it to be neglected? If the House will discuss this on its business merits, and accept it or reject it, I do not care a straw for the result, but it is impossible to get any person to believe that trying to prevent the thing being brought before the House is caused by anything else but party or personal feeling. Let the House go as fully as they please into its business merits, and I am quite prepared to take the judgment of the House in regard to this railway, as I am in regard to any other railway. It is only a fair thing that the House should do that. To refuse the proposal at all, or refuse to discuss it on its merits, is not the duty of members of the House. I am quite prepared to discuss the matter on its merits when the second reading of the Bill comes on. That is the proper time, and we will then have ample time to do it.

Mr. LENNON: Have I the right to reply, Mr. Speaker?

*Mr. Lennon.]*

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes, he will be in order in making a personal explanation.

Mr. LENNON: The only personal explanation I desire to make is that there was nothing of a personal character whatever in the opposition on this side of the House—nothing of that sort was entertained for a moment.

The SPEAKER: The more regular way to make that explanation would be to get some hon. member who had not spoken to refer to it.

\* Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*): As it appears that this question is going to a division, I feel bound to say something in reference to it. I have always been opposed to the Port Alma Railway. I have on several occasions spoken publicly in Rockhampton against the construction of this line, and in favour of the opening of Broadmount. Those facts were known to the electors of the Barcoo when I put up as a candidate at the recent election, and I think the electors are quite content to leave the matter as to how I shall vote in my own hands. I am quite certain that a lot of them are not concerned about the matter, and they desire their member to use his own judgment, to apply it to the facts, and to vote accordingly, consistent with the interests of that electorate and with the interests of the whole of Queensland. I am—and I am quite sure hon. members on this side of the House are—desirous of hearing any measure discussed.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: They are anxious to get any information they can, and judge accordingly. I have a mind open to argument on this question, and I shall be glad to hear the arguments that can be adduced in favour of this railway. I have already heard them, and there is no suggestion that any new arguments are going to be adduced in favour of it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There may be when it comes along.

Mr. RYAN: There has been no suggestion that there have been any new arguments, and I think the Minister, if there are any new grounds why the railway should be supported, should have given that information to the House when he proposed the introduction.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is not the proper time.

Mr. RYAN: I think that, under the circumstances of this particular case, this would be the proper time to do so. But as this measure must be admitted by members on both sides of the House to be a very contentious one, and one which will occupy a lot of time, as the session is short, and as we are apparently going to have all-night sittings, the Government should not have endeavoured to introduce this measure this session. That is the only ground on which I am prepared to oppose its introduction now. It is not because I desire to prevent the discussion of it, but because I think that in such a short session as this, with such important business before us, we should not have a measure of this kind introduced. I shall have an opportunity—unless at the introduction the measure is defeated—of dealing fully with it and justifying the position I am taking up. The senior member for Rockhampton has said that the West is in favour of it, but that is a matter which I am not aware of.

[*Mr. Lennon.*

Certainly the Barcoo Shire Council passed a resolution, which they communicated to me, that they desired me to support the measure. I have too much respect for the Barcoo Shire Council to think that they would imagine that, when I have definitely fixed ideas on a measure of this kind, and have expressed them publicly before the election, I should abandon those views in order to comply with the request. I think also that the full information which should be before these local bodies has not been before them, and it is highly probable that, if it were before them, these resolutions would not be arrived at. I feel very strongly that in regard to the putting through of this particular railway a great number of sinister influences have been at work—(hear, hear!)—and I think we are bound to expose those influences, and for that reason I think ample time will be required for the discussion—very much more time than we shall be able to devote this session if we are to close as soon as the Government desire. I think it is very undesirable that we should have all-night sittings—sitting here till 6 o'clock in the morning. Hon. members are not in a fit condition to give proper attention to measures if they sit all night in that fashion. To mention one or two instances of the kind of influence I refer to, the other day we saw in the *Brisbane Courier* a telegram from Rockhampton with reference to the port of Broadmount. It was stated that the steamer "Santhia" was unable to get into Broadmount. The pilot could not bring her in for certain reasons—there was not sufficient water, and she had to go to Gladstone and ship horses there. Immediately afterwards the captain of the vessel was interviewed at Gladstone. The report states—

Captain Parkinshaw of the "Santhia," and Torres Straits Pilot Peebles, who was also on board the vessel, state that there was absolutely no reason why the "Santhia" should not have berthed at Broadmount.

Mr. GRANT: Why didn't she? (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: The reason is plain. We have that telegram coming through for the information of hon. members immediately before they introduce the Port Alma Railway Bill to this House. That is the reason she did not go into Broadmount. Another matter that puts us on our inquiry is this: A certain member of the Rockhampton Harbour Board was compelled to retire from the board on account of certain influences which were brought to bear on him, for the simple reason that he was in favour of the port of Broadmount, and another member was elected in his place who happens to be in favour of Port Alma. He was elected by a very narrow majority, some of the votes by which he was elected coming from the Standard Oil Company in America, and from Melbourne. I say that the franchise on which the Rockhampton Harbour Board is elected should be altered before we consider whether they should be allowed to guarantee the construction of this railway or not. The Premier, when he was contesting the election in Rockhampton, was asked if he was in favour of altering the franchise under which the Rockhampton Harbour Board was elected, and he said he was in favour of having it put on the same lines as the Cairns Harbour Board.

Mr. LENNON: A very good one.

Mr. RYAN: But when he was asked if he was in favour of doing that before going on with the Port Alma Railway, he was careful to say that the two matters had nothing to

do with one another, and he would not make any promise at that time. Before we consider the question of accepting the guarantee of the Rockhampton Harbour Board, we should have it elected on a proper franchise. Representing an important constituency in the West of Queensland, I should be lacking in my duty if I allowed a guarantee of that kind to be undertaken by the Rockhampton Harbour Board, the onus of which may eventually fall on the people of the electorate I represent.

Mr. WHITE: How can it?

Mr. RYAN: The consumer must eventually pay the harbour dues which may be placed upon the introduction of goods to Rockhampton.

Mr. WHITE: They are not the consumers.

Mr. RYAN: I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Musgrave say that they are not the consumers. The Western people are the consumers, as well as the Rockhampton people.

Mr. GRANT: What about Mount Morgan?

Mr. RYAN: I am not here to speak about what the people of Mount Morgan or the people in any other constituency think. I am here to use my intelligence and apply it to the facts of this particular case, and I feel I should be lacking in my duty to the electors I represent if I were to support this particular railway.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about the resolution now?

Mr. RYAN: The interjection of the Minister for Lands is certainly an intelligent one. My reason for not supporting the introduction of the measure now is because the session is so short and there are so many other important measures to be dealt with. The measure is such a contentious one, and will take so much time, that it is not proper that the Government should introduce it this session. That is the only reason on which I oppose the introduction of the measure now. If it was introduced earlier, when there was a better opportunity for discussion, I should vote in favour of allowing it to be introduced.

Mr. GRANT: Oh!

Mr. RYAN: I trust the senior member for Rockhampton will accept my word for it.

Mr. WHITE (*Musgrave*): I just wish to refer to two remarks made by the hon. member for Barcoo with reference to the payers of dues. Three-fourth of the dues collected by the Rockhampton Harbour Board are paid by the Mount Morgan Company, and another large proportion is paid by the exporters of wool. The people of Rockhampton or of Barcoo are not the payers of dues in any sense of the word.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Nonsense!

Mr. WHITE: It is perfectly right. The buyers of the wool in England, America, Germany, and other parts of the world, and the purchasers of the copper matte and gold exported from Central Queensland are the payers of dues. The hon. member for Barcoo gave among his reasons for not voting for the introduction of the Bill that there were a lot of doubtful interests behind this measure, but he stated at the finish of his speech that his only reason for opposing its introduction was because the session was so short, and there

were so many important measures still to be disposed of. He made a sort of "Yes-No" speech. He is trying to please his own constituents in one direction and to please other people in another.

Mr. RYAN: I stated no such thing.

Mr. WHITE: The hon. member distinctly stated at the conclusion of his speech that he would not vote for the introduction of the Bill under certain conditions—presumably because it was not brought in earlier in the session. Previously, he said that he was opposing the motion for a totally different reason. I am not wedded to this proposal. I approach it with a perfectly open mind—exactly as the hon. member for Barcoo does. But the arguments from the other side have convinced me that there are ulterior motives on that side, if there are some on this side, as is alleged. I took the trouble to go to Rockhampton to investigate this matter, thinking it would probably come on, and certainly opinion is strong on both sides in Rockhampton. The hon. member for Barcoo stated that in his election campaign he was perfectly open on the matter, and that he stated that he was against the Port Alma scheme.

Mr. RYAN: I did not say I stated that.

Mr. WHITE: If I have misconstrued what the hon. member said, I am very sorry, but I was certainly of opinion that he did say so. On the other hand, the senior and junior members for Rockhampton both expressed themselves unmistakably in favour of Port Alma.

Mr. COYNE: Not to the electors.

Mr. WHITE: They were both elected, and one of the grounds on which they were elected was that they were in favour of the railway. I have just been reading some of the speeches made by the Premier, and both in Rockhampton and elsewhere the hon. gentleman has never hesitated to give his opinion about Port Alma. If the people of Rockhampton are satisfied that the railway is the correct thing, and they are prepared to take the whole responsibility, I do not see why there should be any hesitation about allowing the Bill to be introduced. After it has been introduced we shall know exactly what is to happen. I am personally sorry it has been brought on at the end of the session.

Mr. RYAN: That is my objection.

Mr. WHITE: There is certainly no reason why it should not be brought forward. It may not be passed this session. I do not know whether it is to be pushed through or not—I am not in the confidence of the Government on the matter—but it is only fair that it should be allowed to be introduced. This Government have done a great deal to open up the ports of the State. So far as Bundaberg is concerned, I do not think they have done anything; but they have certainly done a great deal to increase shipping facilities at Townsville, Rockhampton, and Brisbane.

Mr. ALLEN: And not Bundaberg.

Mr. WHITE: No; Bundaberg has a harbour board of its own, and they are working in their own quiet little way. But Bundaberg has nothing to do with this matter. It is not a parochial matter at all, and I intend to vote for the introduction of the Bill to give it the same chance as any other measure.

*Mr. White.]*

Question put ; and the House divided :—

AYES, 32.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
„ Armstrong	„ Keogh
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Kidston
„ Boker	„ Lesina
„ Bridges	„ Macartney
„ Corser	„ Morgan
„ Cottell	„ Paget
„ Crawford	„ Petrie
„ Cribb	„ Philp
„ Denham	„ Rankin
„ Forrest	„ Somerset
„ Forsyth	„ Swayne
„ Grant	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Walker
„ Hawthorn	„ White
„ Hodge	„ Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Bridges and Mr. Morgan.

NOES, 25.	
Mr. Allen	Mr. May
„ Barber	„ Mulcahy
„ Brennan	„ Mullan
„ Breslin	„ Murphy
„ Coyne	„ McLachlan
„ Ferricks	„ Nevitt
„ Hamilton	„ O'Sullivan
„ Hardacre	„ Payne
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Ryan
„ Land	„ Ryland
„ Lennon	„ Theodore
„ Mann	„ Winstanley
„ Maughan	

Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. J. M. Hunter.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Fox, Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Appel, and Mr. Bouchard.

Noes—Mr. Bowman, Mr. Foley, Mr. Collins, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Blair.

Resolved in the affirmative.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND BILL.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mr. Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair.

Mr MANN: I wish to enter my protest against entering on the consideration of the Council's amendments. You read the message from the Council at about half [5.30 p.m.] past 6 this morning. Shortly after that members went home to bed and did not get up till dinner-time, I suppose. I have had no chance of seeing the amendments, and I ask the hon. gentleman to put off the discussion until Monday, so that members may have a chance of seeing what the amendments really are.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

On clause 5—“Affiliated institutions”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the amendment by the Council on page 2, line 33, be agreed to. Hon. members would see that it rather widened the scope of the Bill.

Mr. MANN The Minister had not the courtesy to reply to his request before the Speaker left the chair, and he would like to get some information. The Council had inserted certain words, and he wished to know whether members could insert other words, or whether they must simply accept or reject the amendment incorporated by the Council. If he had had time, he would have gone into the matter with the Clerk.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member could not make other amendments.

Mr. MANN asked for the Chairman's ruling on the point, because he might be inclined to move the insertion of the Kamerunga Nursery and the Cairns Technical College in addition to the institution put in by the Council.

The CHAIRMAN: The question was that the amendment be agreed to. With regard to the hon. member's question, you can only amend the words that are actually before the Committee—that is, the words “Central Technical College.” You can agree to them or amend those words only, but you cannot make any further amendment.

Mr. MANN: He would have liked to have been able to put in other words, such as “The Brisbane Hospital.” Further on in the clause he saw the words “and any other educational establishment in Queensland,” so that really there was no necessity for the Council to have inserted the words “Central Technical College.” He moved the deletion of the word “Central” with the view of inserting the word “any.”

Amendment (Mr. Mann's) put and negatived.

\* Mr. MANN: Apparently the Government who talked about trusting the people did not accept any amendment from the elected representatives of the people, but apparently they were quite agreeable to accept any amendment moved by the nominee Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman's observations are quite irrelevant.

Mr. MANN: He protested against the attitude taken up by the Government. He wanted to get the Cairns Technical College included in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member asked me for my ruling, and I gave it. I ask him now to obey that ruling, or else move that my ruling be disagreed to.

Mr. MANN: He was not questioning the Chairman's ruling, and the Chairman must not get excited. He wanted to get in an amendment so as to include the Cairns Technical College, but the Government would not accept amendments from members of the Legislative Assembly, although they accepted them from the Upper House.

Question put and passed.

On clause 9—“Disqualifications”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 9, lines 10, 11, 12, and so far as the numbers were concerned in the other lines, be agreed to. The amendment provided for the disqualification of a principal of any secondary school or person engaged in preparing students for the University from becoming a member of the senate. He accepted the amendment on the understanding that no reflection was cast against persons filling those positions. It was to be regretted that the amendment was not inserted in some other part of the Bill instead of being included with the other disqualifications. Apparently it was convenient to have that safeguard, and in order to expedite the passage of the Bill, he accepted the amendment and moved that it be agreed to.

Mr. MANN had the same objection against this amendment, as he had not time to read

the debates that took place in the other chamber, and did not know at whose instigation it was inserted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The amendment was inserted by the Council by a majority of 18 to 5. Some of the arguments used in another place were that the teaching staff might be suspected to be behind something that would be distinctly of advantage to them if the persons mentioned in the amendment were on the Senate.

Mr. LENNON: Remember that that amendment was carried against the Government in the Upper House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He admitted that it was, but in order to expedite the business he would accept the amendment.

Mr. MANN: The Bill was drafted by the Education Department, yet the Minister was prepared to go back on his staff and accept the amendment of the Council, none of the members of which, perhaps, might have any knowledge of instruction for which a teacher was fitted. In accepting the amendment the Minister was allowing the express wish of his department to be flouted. He would not call for a division, because there was no chance of defeating the Government on it, but he pointed out that the Minister in charge of the Bill in the Upper House voted against the amendment. He was not in a position to say whether the amendment was a good or a bad one, but he thought that in a matter of this kind members should be largely guided by the advice of experts of the department, and their advice was clearly against inserting the amendment. He trusted that the Minister would not agree to accept the amendment.

Question—That the Council's amendment in clause 9 be agreed to—put and passed.

On clause 11—"Constitution of council"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the Council proposed several amendments in this clause. The first was in subsection (f), in which the Council had omitted the words, "whether by instalments or otherwise," and substituted the word "five" for the word "one," which made the paragraph read as follows:—

All individual persons who have made any gift or donation to the University amounting in money or value in the aggregate to not less than £500.

The next amendment was in subsection (g), in which the word "professional" was inserted after "scientific," and then the following new paragraph was inserted—

And provided that (a) no person who has been convicted of an indictable offence, unless he has received a free pardon or has undergone the sentence passed upon him; or (b) is undergoing a sentence of imprisonment; or (c) is an insane person within the meaning of the laws in force for the time being relating to insanity, shall be capable of being or continuing a member of the council.

The last amendment was in subsection (6), in which the word "fifty" was substituted for "twenty-five." This was really a correction of a mistake in the Bill as it left the Assembly. He moved that the Council's amendments in this clause be agreed to.

Mr. LENNON: When the Bill was before that Committee previously he moved the omission of subsection (f), as he regarded the provision as a blot on the Bill. The proposal that

a man who donated a certain sum to the University should be able to acquire the distinction of a seat on the council was exceedingly objectionable, and the fact that the Legislative Council had raised the amount of contribution qualifying for that distinction from £100 to £500 in no way met his objection to the provision. However, he would not move any amendment. It was not worth while, as the Government had a majority behind them who would defeat any amendment he might submit.

Mr. BLAIR thought the new provision inserted by the Council was a very peculiar one. According to that proviso, whoever was responsible for the constitution of the council of the University was supposed to have in their minds the possibility of appointing a person who was insane; or a person who had been convicted of an indictable offence, unless he had received a free pardon or had undergone the sentence passed upon him; or—which was still more extraordinary—a person who was undergoing a sentence of imprisonment. Did the Minister think that a measure of this kind was improved by the insertion of such a provision? Would it not be better to delete it altogether, and resubmit the Bill to the Council? The amendment was a very bad copy of

[7 p.m.] clause 9 dealing with the senate.

To illustrate his argument, if hon. members would look at clauses 8 and 9 they would find that the first members of the senate would be appointed by the Governor in Council and the disqualifications were—

No person who—

- (i.) Is not of the full age of twenty-one years; or
- (ii.) Is a principal of any secondary school or a person engaged in preparing students for the University; or
- (iii.) Has his affairs under liquidation by arrangement with his creditors; or
- (iv.) Is an uncertificated or undischarged insolvent; or
- (v.) Has been convicted of an indictable offence, unless he has received a free pardon or has undergone the sentence passed upon him; or
- (vi.) Is undergoing a sentence of imprisonment; or
- (vii.) Is an insane person within the meaning of the laws in force for the time being relating to insanity;

shall be capable of being or continuing a member of the senate.

Clause 9 in the Bill and the amendment sought to be inserted in clause 11 were very bad blots on an otherwise good measure. Fancy the Governor in Council appointing a person who was undergoing sentence of imprisonment or an insane person! Some Governor in Council might appoint a person who had had his affairs under liquidation by arrangement with his creditors, because it was said by some people that some persons, after an arrangement with their creditors, were in a better position to contribute £500. He called attention to the wording of the amendment. The letter (a) should have been inserted after the word "person." As it was at present, it made nonsense of the amendment. He hoped the Secretary for Public Instruction would see his way to delete the proviso that had been inserted, and to recommit the Bill with the view of cutting out clause 9, with the exception of the proviso with regard to persons under twenty-one years of age. To make the thing complete, the Committee should insert that a member of the council could not be appointed who was not of the age of twenty-one years. Surely they could trust those persons who had the management of the University to see that no insane person, and no person who had been convicted of an indictable offence, would be appointed to the council. The Bill would be essentially improved by those provisions being wiped out altogether.

*Mr. Blair.]*

Mr. MANN expected the Secretary for Public Instruction would have replied to the hon. member for Ipswich. He thought the senior member for Rockhampton would have objected to the amendment of the Council, because he said the University was very much in need of funds; and now, according to the amendment inserted by the Legislative Council, a person would have to donate £500 to get a seat, and he could not pay by instalments.

Mr. GRANT: £500 is better than £100.

Mr. MANN: It seemed to him that the hon. member simply used his arguments to get the measure through the House, no matter how objectionable it was, and when an amendment was made in another place, he entirely forgot to fight against it. The hon. member was only seized with the desire to agree with everything the Council proposed, bearing out the idea that the Government was simply the instrument of hon. members in another place.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—That the Committee agree with the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 11. The "Ayes" have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose to a point of order. He was on his feet before the question was decided.

The CHAIRMAN: During the past two weeks, while I have been occupying this position, I have repeatedly asked hon. members to rise before I rose to put the question; and also, when they rise, to address me either as "Mr. Chairman" or "Mr. Armstrong." I say in the present instance that procedure was not followed.

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. member for Cook was on his feet and said, "Mr. Armstrong," before the motion was declared carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I stand corrected. Mr. Douglas.

Mr. DOUGLAS pointed out that the word (*a*) in the proviso was misplaced. It should appear after the word "who."

Mr. LENNON asked if the Minister had given any reason why he declined to accept this suggestion. It was ridiculous in its present form; the suggestion would be an improvement.

Mr. MACARTNEY said that this was one of those formal things that could be corrected by the clerk of the House. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. FERRICKS did not think there was a technical error in the wording of the amendment, though there might be a technical difference. To his mind, the words "no person who" were understood before subsections (*b*) and (*c*) of the amendment.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the Legislative Council's amendment on line 47, clause 12, deleting the word "fifty" be disagreed to. It was a consequential amendment, and if it were left as it now appeared it would make the Bill ridiculous.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the Council's amendment on page 6, lines 36 to 41, inclusive, be agreed to. It read—

4. Provision shall be made by the statutes for the granting after examination of degrees and the diploma of education to persons engaged in the profession of teaching or other persons in cases where such teachers or other persons are unable to attend lectures at or in connection with the University.

This practically provided for external students.

[*Mr. Mann.*

Mr. LENNON: It provides what you would not provide for us.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Surely the hon. member was not going to object?

Mr. LENNON only wanted to draw attention to the fact that the Minister was taking the dictation of another place.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION was very pleased to see hon. members opposite recognising that the Upper House were of some service.

Mr. MULLAN: The Government, in accepting this amendment, was providing an argument in favour of the retention of the Upper House. Hon. members on this side had tried very hard in Committee to have a provision of this kind inserted, but the Premier had laughed at the absurdity of such a thing. However, he was pleased that the hon. gentleman, in his wisdom, had seen fit to accept the suggestion of this side, even though indirectly. The meaning was that instead of the University being a Brisbane University, it would now be a Queensland University.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had disagreed to one amendment, and agreed to all the other amendments.

The report was adopted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I move that the Bill be returned to the Council, with the following message:—

Mr. PRESIDENT,—

The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's amendments in the University of Queensland Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

Disagree to the amendment in clause 12, because it is out of harmony with other portions of the Bill;

And agree to all other amendments in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

## SUPPLY.

### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. W. D. Armstrong, Lockyer, in the chair.*)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—CHIEF OFFICE.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved that £15,826 be granted for the "Chief Office," Department of Public Works. There was an increase in the salary of the Under Secretary, Mr. Brady, of £50, bringing the salary up to £800—the amount at which it stood before retrenchment took place. Mr. Brady was not only an Under Secretary, but he was also a professional man, who rendered excellent service. There were increases of £20 to the deputy Government architect and the chief draftsman. In connection with the inspectors of works there were six increases of £10 and one of £15. In connection with draftsmen there was an increase of £315—six increases of £20 each and three of £10 each. In connection with the junior draftsmen there was an increase of £39. The accountant and chief clerk received increases of £20 each. For clerks there was an increase of £110, which was due very largely to an increase in the number of clerks. The various clerks received the following increases—four £10 each and one £20. There was an increase of £10 to one of the typists. The plankeeper, messenger, and assistant messenger each received an increase of £10. The vote for temporary assistance was £200 less than for last year. One watchman received an increase of £10, and the lift engineer received a similar increase. Two of the lift attendants received increases of £10 each,

and a fresh appointment made up the difference. The telephone switchboard attendant also received an increase of £10.

Mr. LENNON regarded it as a matter of duty to call attention to the fact that the gentleman in charge of this department, like the gentleman in charge of nearly all the departments, received a substantial increase in salary. He admitted the justice of the remarks made by the Minister, that this officer was a professional man. This department differed very much from other branches of the public service, inasmuch as the increases were general throughout the department. They had all got decent rises, and he had no doubt they were entitled to them. The deputy Government architect was a thoroughly efficient, capable man, and he was glad to see that his ability had been recognised. The large number of increases was perhaps due to Mr. Brady's powers of persuasion. With regard to the vote for temporary assistance, while there were reasons in the case of this department and the Railway Department why such a vote was necessary, as a general rule, it should not appear at all in the Estimates. People in the service should be paid for doing their work, and if the staff was not large enough to cope with the work then it should be permanently increased.

The PREMIER: You cannot do without temporary assistance sometimes.

Mr. LENNON: That was what he had just stated, but as a rule it ought to be avoided. He was quite familiar with the conditions under which State schools were erected and repairs and additions to school buildings were carried out by the Government; but, as the conditions were not generally known, he would ask the Minister to state what they were for public information.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: In the case of new schools, when a school was approved of, one-fifth had to be provided locally and the Government found the balance. After a school was erected, the whole responsibility in regard to additions and repairs was taken in hand by the Government.

Mr. MANN: There was no doubt, as the Minister had stated, that the increase to the Under Secretary was warranted. At any rate, it was more warranted than the increase to the Under Secretary to the Chief Secretary's Department, because in this case there was a good deal of work to do. He noted, in common with the deputy leader of the Opposition, that the increases were general until they got down to the lift attendants. He noticed that one received £100, and three others £60, £50, and £40, respectively. He presumed the three latter were boys.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes; some of them are very young.

Mr. MANN: He did not know that it was advisable to have lifts worked by young lads. He thought, however, that the senior lift attendant should receive more than £100. A man working a lift was certainly not overpaid at less than £2 a week. He brought the matter under the notice of the Minister to see if the amount could not be increased a little. If a man was married and had a family to keep, the amount was not sufficient, and he hoped the Minister would see that lift attendants who were married got a living wage.

Mr. ALLEN desired to know how it was that they never saw an inspector of works in the Bulloo electorate except at election time; also,

why an inspector was not allowed to report upon anything that had not been placed before the department in writing. He under-  
[7.30 p.m.] stood that the committee of the Thargomindah State School desired to make improvements to the veranda—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in discussing buildings under this item. They are included in the next vote.

Mr. ALLEN: He was pointing out that owing to red tape an inspector of works was not allowed to report on anything that he had not received instructions from the department to report upon.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is perfectly in order in discussing that.

Mr. ALLEN: In the first place, the school committee asked for an additional veranda on one side of the teacher's residence, and they afterwards came to the conclusion that it would be better to have a veranda on each side. When the inspector came up to report, he could not make a report on the advisableness of putting a veranda on each side of the building, because he had only been instructed to report on the question of putting a veranda on one side of the building. That was a ridiculous condition of affairs.

Mr. MACARTNEY thought the Minister was to be congratulated on the fact that his Estimates met with the approval of even the hon. member for Cairns. With respect to inspection under the Factories and Shops Act, he had heard complaints of the inspectors acting in an arbitrary manner in the case of those businesses in connection with which the owners practically lived on the premises. Under the provisions of the Act, the door between the residential quarters and the business premises must be closed, but there were many cases where, without any intention of going against the Act, the door was left open for the convenience of inmates, so that they might enjoy the coolness of the evening or something of that sort. He understood that inspectors exercised much too arbitrary control in cases of that kind. The administration of the Act also weighed heavily on a class of small business people, who united with their business the keeping of a boarder or two and a dining-room. These people were compelled to register as boarding-house keepers, and also under the Factories and Shops Act—a double registration. He considered that these Acts should be administered with a certain amount of common sense.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Like the deputy leader of the Opposition, he was pleased to see that increases had been granted to the junior members of the staff. He expressed the hope that the day might come when all the labour departments and sub-departments of the Works Department, and several other subdepartments, might come under the category of the Labour Department and be put under one official head, with a Minister for Labour in charge. Not long ago, the Premier, when in company with a number of Labour members and trades unionists, in connection with the Trades Disputes Bill, introduced the present Attorney-General as the Minister for Labour, but from that day he had never seen where that gentleman had been gazetted as Minister for Labour.

Mr. FORSYTH: Do you want to create another billet with £1,000 a year?

Mr. MAUGHAN: There was a Minister for Labour in both New South Wales and South Australia. There were so many subdepartments under different Ministers that they hardly knew

*Mr. Maughan.]*

where they were, and it would be better to have a Minister for Labour in charge of all these matters.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** The matters that had been referred to by members would receive the fullest consideration. If any hon. member could point out to him at any time where any undue delay was taking place in matters connected with the department it would be attended to. (Hear, hear!) In reply to the hon. member, Mr. Macartney, he could say that the first duty of the person in charge of the department was to see that the law was carried out; then, after having satisfied himself about that, common-sense methods should prevail in a climate such as ours, provided that officers of the department were satisfied that certain things could be done by leaving the doors open to prevent any means of doing business. There should be a certain amount of give and take; in fact, that would be the policy of the department. (Hear, hear!)

Question put and passed.

#### BUILDINGS.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS** moved that £166,336 be granted for "Buildings." There was an increase in the vote of £56,786. That seemingly large increase was brought about principally as a result of some £50,000 being put down towards the provision for a Queensland University and Central Technical College building. In other cases there were slight increases which were largely due to the growing needs of the department.

Mr. MANN noticed the item "Hospital Buildings (three-fifths cost) £5,500." The people at Cairns wished to build a new wing to the hospital and were collecting money for it now. Was the Government ready to advance the three-fifths of the cost, and would it come out of this amount?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** £500 of this sum was a re-vote, as hon. members would see from the footnote.

Mr. MANN: That leaves £5,000.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** It was considered that there would be ample money to meet cases such as that the hon. gentleman referred to.

Mr. HAMILTON asked if cottage hospitals would be assisted in the same way as general hospitals in regard to the three-fifths to be given by the Government.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** All hospitals were treated on the same footing—namely, three-fifths contributed by the Government.

Mr. WINSTANLEY asked if the money was provided for the new police quarters at Charters Towers, and would the Minister say if a contract had been accepted?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** That matter was provided for on the Loan Estimates, as the hon. gentleman would see.

Mr. ALLEN: The buildings in Thargomindah had not been painted for ten years in some instances, and the chimney of the courthouse, which had been down five years, had not yet been re-erected. Would the Minister have these matters attended to?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** He would have inquiries made into the matter.

Question put and passed.

#### INSPECTION OF MACHINERY.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS** moved that £8,360 be granted for "Inspection of Machinery." There were four additional in-

[Mr. Maughan.

spectors appointed as a result of the increase of the work in the department. The increases in the amounts paid to inspectors of machinery amounted to £940. There were four new appointments at £240 each. Provision was made for three other new appointments, totalling £720. One officer died who was getting £240, one resigned who was getting £240, and another who was getting £260 was promoted. In connection with the clerks, there was an increase of £180. The same principle was followed in the increases—namely, three at £10 each, another two at £10 each, and certain adjustments as a result of the resignations and new appointments.

Mr. LENNON was pleased to see that the department had appointed an additional number of inspectors of machinery. Dissatisfaction had been expressed by the people in some Northern districts at the absence of inspection of machinery. This might have arisen from the fact that there were not a sufficient number of inspectors to do the work, and he hoped that now that the number of inspectors was increased by four the cause for this dissatisfaction would disappear. There was also a feeling in some districts in the North that the inspection was rather perfunctory, owing to the fact that the inspectors had to hurry away to other places, and he trusted that in this matter, too, the cause of complaint would be removed.

Mr. MAY expressed the hope that special instructions would be issued to the inspector who was stationed at Hughenden to inspect the machinery attached to shearing-sheds prior to the commencement of shearing, as in the past strikes had taken place owing to such machinery being in a defective condition. There were a great number of old boilers and machinery used in the working of mines in the Cloncurry district which were not safe, and he suggested that they should receive the attention of the inspectors. He desired also to point out that a number of thoroughly competent men who had been driving engines for years had not had an opportunity of getting certificates of competency. They might not be able to pass a theoretical examination, but they were practical and competent men, and he thought the inspector should be empowered to put them through their facings when he was making his rounds, and, if they proved themselves efficient, to grant them certificates, so as to save them the trouble and expense of a long journey to Townsville, Charters Towers, or Hughenden.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: A short time ago his attention had been directed to the fact that the second-class certificates which had been issued to the drivers of stationary engines had been recalled, and new certificates, which were not of the same value, issued in their place. Under the old certificates the men could handle engines of a much bigger capacity than they could under the new certificates, which was a great injustice to the men, as they were thoroughly qualified. It would be hard to call upon those men, many of whom were fifty years and some over fifty years of age, to go through a technical examination, and he hoped that the department would take steps to remedy this grievance.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The matter referred to by the hon. member for Kennedy had been brought up in the House on one or two occasions, and a promise had been given that an amending Bill would be introduced to meet the case, but up to the present they had not seen that Bill. When new certificates were issued to engine-drivers under the Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding Act, they were dated on the date of issue, so that the men were made to appear as new engine-drivers, there being nothing on the certificate to

show their previous length of service in that capacity. He hoped that the Minister would arrange that all certificates issued in future should show the length of time that holders thereof had been employed as engine-drivers, and that in the case of certificates already issued the length of service of the holders would, upon application, be endorsed on the certificates, or certified by the department on separate slips which could be attached to the certificates.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said there was no objection on the part of the department when issuing future [8 p.m.] certificates to state on same the length of service, and he did not think there was any obstacle in the way of any person who had already received a certificate of having the length of service marked on it, if he made application and could verify his statement.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Will the Minister make that public?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He was making it public. In reply to the hon. member for Flinders with regard to the disabilities under which some people laboured through being removed a considerable distance from where they could sit for examination, which entailed a good deal of expense, he would like to say that it was possible now for people to sit for examination at Hughenden. This was a more difficult question than appeared on the face of it. It was absolutely important that men in charge of machinery should be capable men, and the department would be very blameable if they, by slipshod methods, did anything that would possibly, as a result of their slipshod methods, cause loss of life. That was the first thing the department should consider. He could assure hon. members that, as far as it was possible, he would meet the wishes of the people placed in the position mentioned. It was very evident the department could not send an officer to every man who wanted to sit for examination—there must be some centre. The hon. member for Kennedy made reference to the fact that there were very competent men who probably, if they had to sit for examination, would not be able to very successfully pass that test, although they were thoroughly practical. The department in all those cases would exercise common sense and would meet those cases so long as they could safeguard public interests. The most sympathetic consideration would be given to all such matters. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN pointed out that a man who held a second-class certificate was required to send in his certificate to the department, and they issued another certificate under the Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding Act that was not of the same value as the old certificate. He wished that rectified, so that when the new certificates were issued the men could handle the same class of machinery as under the old certificate.

Mr. MAY wished to impress upon the Minister that when the inspectors were going round the country examining machinery, and a man only wanted a third-class certificate, the inspector should be allowed to examine him there and then.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Every effort would be made to meet the wishes of the hon. member. As far as the position in connection with shearing-sheds was concerned, he would, as far as possible, see that all shearing machinery was in proper order before shearing commenced.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said one of his constituents held a first-class certificate under the

Western Australian Act, and he had been trying to get a certificate issued to him under the Queensland Act, but found great difficulty in getting the department to recognise him as the man referred to on the certificate. Of course, that man could only say that he was the man referred to on the certificate; but that did not seem to satisfy the department.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There might be some difficulty as regards identification. It might possibly happen that an inexperienced man might steal a certificate. Common-sense methods would be adopted in dealing with all those matters.

HON. R. PHILP: As a matter of fact, when the Act was going through it was the party opposite who had insisted on all those provisions. There were a number of men on mineral fields who had not got certificates, but who were thoroughly practical men, and more capable of managing a boiler than men who could pass the best technical examination. They had learned their business, and knew the engine and boiler just as a schoolmaster knew his boys. The party opposite had insisted on all those things, and the result was that a number of good men could not get employment.

Question put and passed.

#### LABOUR AND FACTORIES.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved that £8,399 be granted for "Labour and Factories." There had been increases in connection with the clerks as follows:—Two at £20 each, two young ladies at £10 each, three others at £10 each; new appointments at £110, £70, £50, £50, and £26 respectively, or a total of £396. There had been one or two who had been transferred, or who had risen, and the deductions on that account were £250; making a total increase, after allowing for those who had been transferred, of £146.

Mr. COYNE: But you have four extra clerks.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That was so. Some of the clerks in question were juniors.

Mr. COYNE: You have a cadet clerk at £39.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: In connection with that cadet clerk there had been an increase of £13. They had tried not to forget those who were lowest down in the department, and had assisted in that direction.

Mr. MANN said there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in his district in connection with the administration of the Factories and Shops Act. He had tried to get an inspector appointed there, but failed. The clerk of petty sessions was acting inspector, and he was a very good officer, but he had not sufficient time to attend to the business. He had been calling in the assistance of the police, but he (Mr. Mann) was told that the police were not too keen in taking up this duty, because they had plenty of other work to perform. He had received complaints from the shop assistants, and also employers, that there was a good deal of evasion of the Act. He knew the Chief Inspector did the best he could with the means at his disposal, but it was absolutely necessary that an inspector should be appointed in Cairns to look after this work. There was a big alien population there, especially Chinese, and they traded at all hours. They should not be allowed to compete in that way against the white storekeepers. The white storekeeper closed his shop at 6 o'clock, and the Chinese stores ought to be closed too. The Chinese storekeeper kept the goods out of sight, but anyone could get practically what he

*Mr. Mann.]*

wanted, because the houses were like rabbit warrens—if it was not in one store they could slip around the back and get it from another. He had brought the matter of the trading by the Chinese on Sundays before the department, and the report which came back to the inspector was that no such trading was being done, but he (Mr. Mann) saw eight Chinese stores open in Cairns on a Sunday, and doing business, so that the report the inspector got was not correct. Would the Minister see if he could find money to appoint an inspector who would go round and prevent this? He knew of one or two cases in which overworked assistants had to consult medical men, and he had received information of the long hours worked in some of the business houses in Cairns, where the assistants were brought back at night. He hoped the Minister would be able to appoint an inspector to look into these matters.

Mr. LENNON said there was great dissatisfaction in his electorate with regard to the trading of the Chinese after hours. He had had some correspondence on this matter, and the feeling up there was that the police could not act without getting authority from the Police Department at Townsville, and breaches of the Act were passed over. He was aware that in Ingham the Chinese stores were open at night. The hon. member for Brisbane North, on a previous vote, had called attention to the hardships experienced by small shopkeepers in Brisbane. The Act had to be carried out, but the inspector should use his discretion, and not inflict unnecessary hardship. With regard to the Chinese in the Northern districts, the white traders who kept general stores for the most part lived away from their business premises, but the Chinese lived in the back part of the building. The front door was closed and there was no light, but there was a light at the back, to which there was access by a right of way, and it was alleged that people went in and purchased the goods from Chinese after hours. The director had told him that he had communicated with the police up there, who said that no complaints had been made. Evidently the people thought all they had to do was to write to their member, but if they communicated with the proper officer the matter would be rectified in half the time. Similar complaints had been made in Halifax, but as that place was not under the Act the matter could not be discussed. The residents in his electorate persisted in saying that the Act was being evaded, and he would ask the Minister to be good enough to see that the Chief Inspector sent out instructions to the police to be on the alert, and to endeavour as far as practicable to prevent evasions of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is a very reasonable request.

Mr. MAY said that the evasions referred to by the hon. member for Herbert and the hon. member for Cairns were also taking place in his district. He had brought this matter up in December last, when the then Minister promised to have the matter rectified. There were complaints that the officers in charge of these matters showed favour to one man when they were antagonistic to another, and that the strictest impartiality was not always observed. He would suggest that the department should send round a man who was unknown to the people to have a look round for himself, when he would discover things going on in these towns far worse than the department imagined.

Mr. WINSTANLEY said that Charters Towers was no exception in regard to complaints concerning the administration of the Act. The Act should be administered in a common-sense way, but common sense was

[Mr. Mann.

the one thing that was lacking in the administration. Complaints had been made about working after hours in Charters Towers, but the inspector declared that he had not sufficient power, that he had to send the evidence to Brisbane, and delay took place, and it sometimes happened that by the time he was instructed to take proceedings it was too late to initiate a prosecution. The inspector of shops and factories at Charters Towers also had work to do for the Labour Bureau. Some radical alteration in the system was necessary, as there was not enough officers in many cases. He could not say where the blame lay in connection with Charters Towers, but he would ask the Minister to try and find out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS agreed with the hon. member for Cairns that it was a difficult matter dealing with Chinese.

In answer to the inquiries of hon. members, although it might not be altogether wise to give the information, he might say that there was no lady inspector in the North, but an additional one had been appointed. She had already visited some of the Southern towns, and was going North. She would not be known, and there would be an advantage in that. (Hear, hear!) Something of the same kind would be done in connection with male inspectors. Hon. members would recognise that there was a great deal of difficulty in administering the law in that respect, but his desire was that those who carried out the law should not be penalised by those who did not carry it out. He had no sympathy with people who sweated their employees, especially in a climate like that of Cairns. It would be a pleasure to him to investigate cases which hon. members might submit to him in confidence, after they had satisfied themselves as to the facts.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—That the Chairman do now leave the chair, report that the Committee had come to certain resolutions, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. COYNE: Before the Chairman left the chair, he objected to the adjournment of the House at that hour. They had sat there all the previous night, and they had only sat an hour and twenty-five minutes since resuming after the tea adjournment. Why should hon. members be penalised?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COYNE: He objected to the Chairman leaving the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is a question that cannot be raised at the present moment. The Committee has no cognisance of what may take place in the House. For all this Committee knows, we may be sitting again in a quarter of an hour. The question before the Committee is that I do now leave the chair, report certain resolutions, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to certain resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—That the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

Mr. COYNE: I do not know whether I am exactly in order, but I am going to try to put myself in order at this juncture. The Committee are asking leave to sit again on Monday. Now, I think that the Committee should

have continued sitting to-night. There was plenty of work for the Committee to do, and I object to adjourning at this hour.

The PREMIER: Who is proposing to adjourn?

Mr. COYNE: You are going to ask the Committee to sit again on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved that the resolutions from Committee of Supply be received on Monday next.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. The first business on Monday will be Supply—the [8.30 p.m.] Justice Estimates, which I think we may put through on that day.

I regret the very late sitting this morning, and I did not like it any more than the hon. member for Warrego; but these things, I am afraid, are inevitable, and we have to take them on the average. Considering how late we have sat this week, I think it is only a fair thing to adjourn now.

Mr. COYNE: I agree that we sat a long time yesterday and this morning; but as far as to-day's sitting is concerned, we have only sat from half-past 3 till half-past 8 o'clock—only four hours altogether, leaving out the tea hour.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. COYNE: We sat all night last night, and this morning till half-past 6 o'clock.

The HOME SECRETARY: And did good work.

Mr. COYNE: I fancy the Home Secretary was quite satisfied.

The HOME SECRETARY: I was, absolutely.

Mr. COYNE: And a great many members were satisfied at 1 or 2 o'clock. Far better work would have been done if we had adjourned at 1 or 2 o'clock this morning and sat till 12 o'clock to-night. We could have put through a couple of votes of the Justice Estimates to-night, and that would have lessened the strain on the remaining days. Next week it is proposed to lose a day's sitting for the purpose of dedicating the building down the road to the University. I do not know if there is any great desire on the part of the Government to get through the business in a rational fashion; if so, I do not see why we should miss next Friday's sitting. Only recently the observance of the King's birthday was postponed for a week, and the observance of Jubilee Day and the dedication might be postponed till Saturday, and we could then have another sitting day. I do not see why we should not sit longer to-night and dispose of a couple of votes in the Estimates of the Justice Department.

The PREMIER: You need not adjourn. Let the Speaker go out of the chair, and you can have it all to yourself. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: You can make yourself merry.

Mr. COYNE: The Premier and the Home Secretary are very funny. I did not notice any indication of merriment on them at half-past 6 this morning. I think we ought to sit longer to-night. It will help to relieve the strain that must come before the end of the session in the matter of sitting late.

The PREMIER: It is a mere matter of convenience. If you think we can put through

the Justice Estimates, I do not mind withdrawing the motion.

Mr. COYNE: Will the hon. member withdraw the motion? I object to sitting all night and up till half-past 6 in the morning, and then only sitting a few hours next day. It is not fair to members, and it is not fair to our constituents.

Mr. MANN: I intend to support the motion for the adjournment. After the experience we had this week, I think it would be wise if the Premier would tell us at the beginning of a sitting how far he proposes to go with the Estimates before adjourning.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was done.

Mr. MANN: I was not consulted. (Laughter.) Whatever arrangement may have been made between the Premier and the deputy leader of the Opposition, I was not consulted.

Mr. LENNON: I think it is a very proper thing after a very long sitting to have a short sitting to allow us to recuperate. The hon. member for Warrego may be such a glutton for work that he wants to sit longer to-night, but, speaking for myself, I say that the sitting of fifteen hours yesterday and this morning, and the sitting of four hours this afternoon, constitute two days of more than nine hours each, and that is quite enough. Moreover, it was only the other day that a lot of us objected to sitting on Monday, and I do not think it is consistent to object to not sitting next Friday. Another thing, a few minutes ago I asked the leader of the Government what he proposed to do—if he intended to go beyond the Estimates of the Works Department. The Premier said "No." He said that because we had had a long sitting yesterday it was a fair thing to adjourn at an early hour to-night. That certainly appealed to me then, because I felt that I was quite tired. Unless someone on this side can enter into an arrangement of this sort I do not know how it can be done. If I have to appeal to every individual member on this side of the House to see if he is willing to adjourn or not, it would only lead to disorder. I think it is within my province to say that, having come to an understanding with the Premier, it is a fair thing that other hon. members on this side of the house should observe that arrangement.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And it is for the convenience of hon. members themselves.

Mr. LENNON: Last night we tried to finish the discussion on the Home Secretary's Estimates. We agreed to finish the discussion in two days, but owing to the enormous amount of time occupied—I will not say wasted—in the discussion of the hospital vote, we did not get through last night. There is no more blame attached to members on this side any more than members sitting on the other side in that respect. (Hear, hear!) Of all those who spoke on that vote, I am quite satisfied that quite as large a number spoke on the Government side as spoke on this side. We are all practically to blame for that. I hope that the discussion of the hospital vote may lead to some good. I must certainly say that I think that the discussion on the police vote, although it took place early in the morning, was a very good one. It was a very temperate discussion, and when we consider that we did not have an opportunity of discussing these matters for three years, it was only proper that we should discuss them. We did a good night's work

*Mr. Lennon.]*

last night and this morning, and we got through the Works Estimates to-night, which was largely facilitated by the suave ranner of the Secretary for Public Works. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) It is only reasonable that we should adjourn now, so that we can go home to our beds. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. ALLEN: I, like the hon. member for Warrego, object to adjourning now instead of carrying on the business of the House. I know that the Labour party advocate an eight hours day:

Mr. MURPHY: I rise to a point of order. Have you not ruled, Mr. Speaker, that on a motion for adjournment it is only the leaders of parties who can speak.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman can show me that ruling in black and white.

Mr. MANN: I will show you.

Mr. MURPHY: You ruled that all right.

The SPEAKER: In the meantime, I rule that the conversation which is going on at this moment is quite out of order. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: What I object to is this: We sit for fifteen or sixteen hours on one day and only two hours on the next day. It would be far better to fix the number of hours which we should sit here.

Mr. HARDACRE: Eight hours a day.

Mr. ALLEN: And when the hour arrives which we have fixed, we should adjourn. There was an earnest desire on the part of members to adjourn at 12 o'clock last night and again at 1 o'clock, but the Premier had no more feeling for us—

The PREMIER: Than what he had for himself.

Mr. ALLEN: We can trust the hon. gentleman in those matters to look after himself. He had no feeling for us last night, but he found that we could stand an all-night sitting just as well as he could. But he is not prepared to go on to-night. I came along to-night fully prepared for another all-night sitting. I may say that I thoroughly enjoyed the all-night sitting last night. We got through a good deal of work. If anyone was to blame for the breach of agreement in connection with the Home Secretary's Estimates it was the Home Secretary himself, because he promised on the day before that he would go through about twice as much of the Estimates on Wednesday's sitting that he did go through. The result was that we had to make up for that deficiency last night. I object to sit all night on one occasion and then only for two or three hours the next day. I hope that in the future we will agree to sit on a regular number of hours each day.

Mr. LESINA: The leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government have come to an arrangement about adjourning to-night, and I think that it is a proper thing for those who sit behind the leader of the Opposition to recognise that that arrangement should be faithfully kept.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COYNE: You are a model disciplinarian. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: That is recognised as the accepted order of things, and coming from me it ought to be all the more acceptable. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) If such an arrangement as that cannot be observed in its entirety, then the Premier will probably knock off making arrangements with the leader of the Opposition, and the House will drift into a chaotic condition.

[Mr. Lennon.

Mr. COYNE: What do we care about that?

Mr. LESINA: Last night eighteen members spoke on the Government side of the House, and twenty-one members spoke from this side of the House, on the Home Secretary's Estimates, but as the reporting was stopped after 1 o'clock it meant that everyone who spoke after that hour was penalised by not having his speech reported. It was because of that that I got up this morning to speak as a personal protest, and spoke till half-past 6 o'clock.

Mr. COYNE: It was only a gag.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, it was practically a "gag" after 1 o'clock. We were "gagged" from that hour, as our speeches were not reported. If there is any objection to adjourning at this hour it should be this: If we adjourn early to-night, then we lose the chance of getting reported and we lose the time that we might devote to discussing the Estimates. Another night the reporting will cease at 1 o'clock. The Government members talked all the time this morning—(laughter)—and we never got any reporting at all. Now, if the Government pursue that line of conduct, I will certainly offer every protest that I am capable of offering according to the Standing Orders. I do not object to adjourning now. We are all more or less tired, and I see that members are all anxious to get away to their homes.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Question!

The SPEAKER: I wish at this stage to refer to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon. The hon. member raised a point of order as to the procedure on motions for adjournment. As the matter is of great parliamentary importance, I wish to refer to it again now. The hon. member for Cairns has been good enough to show me the ruling which I gave and which is contained in *Hansard* of the 28th. of July last. My ruling then was merely in agreement with the ruling laid down by Mr. Speaker Morgan, which he gave in this Chamber on more than one occasion several years previously.

Mr. MANN: There is also another ruling by Mr. Speaker Leahy.

The SPEAKER: I know that there has been a contrary ruling given by Mr. Speaker Leahy, but I choose to follow the ruling of Mr. Speaker Morgan. On this ruling I find that on a motion for adjournment there can be no general discussion. In the ancient practice of the House of Commons, which we generally follow in actual practice as much as we can in our own Standing Orders—the ancient practice of the House of Commons was that on motions for adjournment anybody could get up and talk on any subject under the sun. It was found in practice that such a practice was absolutely hostile to the effective conduct of public business in Parliament. Ultimately, as a result of experience, it was laid down that on a motion for adjournment the sole subject for discussion should be propositions and questions actually apposite to the point as to whether the House should adjourn or not. That was the dictum laid down by Mr. Speaker Morgan, and it is the dictum that I intend to follow as long as I am in the chair. It does not mean that the discussion is confined to the leaders on either side of the House. It is equally open to any hon. member to speak, but the point to which he must address his observations is whether the House should adjourn or not.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 9 o'clock.