

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 9 OCTOBER 1913

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 9 OCTOBER, 1913.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. D. Armstrong, *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT ON RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FIELLY (*Paddington*) asked the Premier—

“Does he purpose taking any action in regard to the grave disclosures contained in the Auditor-General's report upon the Railway Department?”

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

“The Secretary for Railways is already taking action in this matter.”

ALLEGED FALSIFICATION OF SURVEYORS' FIELD NOTES.

Mr. THEODORE (*Chillagoe*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. Does he know (a) that certain officers of his department are guilty of the dishonest practice of falsifying surveyors' field notes; (b) that as a result of such falsifications certain surveyors have been paid larger fees than they were entitled to under the regulations; and (c) that these additional fees, fraudulently obtained from the department, come out of the pockets of new selectors?”

“2. Has he taken any action with regard to the surveyors whose records were altered or to the persons who are responsible for the falsifications?”

“3. Has the work of the surveyors in whose notes the falsifications were noticed been examined on the ground?”

“4. Are the persons responsible for the fraudulent practices still holding positions in the department?”

“5. Does he know what amount of money has been paid to surveyors in excess of the amount payable under the regulations?”

“6. Is he taking any action to recover the amounts overpaid?”

“7. As suspicion of the foregoing practices may attach to officers who are in no way to blame, will he recommend a public inquiry into the whole matter?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. Tolmie, *Toowoomba*) replied—

“1 to 7. Investigation is proceeding with regard to some irregularities connected with the preparation of surveyors' vouchers, and a Public Service Board inquiry will be held later. The matter has no connection whatever with the survey fees paid by selectors. A charge against a particular contract surveyor has been inquired into by the Surveyors' Board, with the result that the board, while absolutely acquitting the surveyor of any fraudulent intention, suspended his license for a fortnight on the ground of want of care. The surveyor has given notice of appeal to the Supreme Court.”

PRIVATE WORK BY OFFICERS OF LANDS
DEPARTMENT.

Mr. THEODORE asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“Does he know that a number of officers in his department have been doing private work, and that some have been punished while others have not?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

“No.”

TESTING BRIGALOW TIMBER FOR MINE
PURPOSES.

Mr. McCORMACK (*Cairns*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

“1. Is it true that the trial of brigalow timber at Mount Morgan is to take the form of merely standing square sets in an open slope?”

“2. If so, is it to be considered a fair trial, seeing that no weight of ground will come on the sets, as the slope to be used has already remained safe without timber?”

“3. Is there no scientific method of testing brigalow for mine purposes?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

“1. Yes; the object of the test being to gain information with respect to the alleged inherent tendency of brigalow timber to split under actual conditions of mine atmosphere and working.

“2. Yes, for the specific purpose in view as indicated in answer to question 1.

“3. Scientific tests show brigalow, apart from its liability to split, to be well adapted for mine purposes. The tendency to split can only be ascertained by observation under actual conditions of use. I may add that the test is being carried out, not by the instructions of the Mines Department, but in pursuance of an order of the warden's court.”

TESTING TIMBER FOR BRIDGE PURPOSES.

Mr. McCORMACK asked the Secretary for Railways—

“Do the Railway Department test timber used for bridges by scientific methods, or do they build bridges and test them by heavy traffic?”

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

“The department employs an officer for testing all materials, and elaborate tests have been made of all Queensland timbers, both in the green state and after having been in use for some time.”

SCHOOL EXCURSION TRAIN FOR CLONCURRY
DISTRICT.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*), in the absence of Mr. May, the hon. member for Flinders, asked the Secretary for Railways—

“For the purpose of giving school children of Cloncurry, Friesland, and Selwyn and their mothers a day's outing, will he approach the Commissioner for Railways with a view to running a train once a month on a certain day as may be arranged to suit the convenience of both the Railway Commissioner and the children in the abovenamed towns?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

“Yes.”

ELECTIONS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. J. Stodart, Logan, in the chair.*)

Question again stated—That the following new clause be inserted after clause 24:—

“After section 55 the following section is inserted under the following cross-heading—

ELECTORAL EXPENSES.

No electoral expense shall be incurred or authorised by a candidate in respect to his candidature in excess of seventy-five pounds.”

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) said he did not wish to prolong the discussion on the proposed new clause, but in view of the fact that out of sixteen members who spoke on the new clause yesterday, there were only five from the Government side, and that with the exception of Ministers no member on the Government side spoke until half-past 9 o'clock, and not one clause was passed, it might facilitate business if some Government members spoke. The new clause proposed to limit the expenses of any one candidate to the sum of £75, and if that could be carried out it would, no doubt, be a good thing, but he would like a little further information on the subject, as there were so many ways by which a provision of that kind could be evaded. For instance, if an organisation contributed to the upkeep of a political newspaper, would that expenditure be counted as election expenses? He wished information on that matter, because the Australian Workers' Union had compelled its members to contribute towards the upkeep of a certain newspaper, and it seemed to him that that money would be distinctly spent in favour of a certain class of candidates. Then, again, there were unions that imposed heavy penalties upon their members who did not vote for the union candidates. It was proved in the New South Wales Arbitration Court that one union imposed a fine of £3 on any member who did not vote for the candidate nominated by that union. Therefore, the expenses incurred in the upkeep of those unions were distinctly electioneering expenses. Would they come out of the £75? Again, organisations had imposed direct levies on their members for political purposes. On one occasion an organisation imposed a direct levy of 1s. per member, to be used in securing the return of a certain candidate. Would that expense be debited against the candidate? That particular union had a membership of 21,000, and, therefore, it would be seen that under that heading alone a sum of £1,050 would be directly spent in securing the return of its candidates. Would that be included in the £75? According to the returns for 1910-11, the industrial organisations in New South Wales, which were of a political character, collected a sum of £270,000, and out of that sum only £22,000 was used for benefits, while the cost of management of those organisations was £198,000. What became of all that money? Knowing so much as they did of the actions of such bodies, it would be fair to assume that the greater part of that £198,000 was spent in electioneering expenses on behalf of certain candidates.

Several honourable members indulging in conversation which rendered the speaker almost inaudible,

Mr. Swayne.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask hon. members to observe order and refrain from conversing in loud tones.

Mr. SWAYNE: In view of those facts, what good faith was there in the amendment from the other side to limit candidates to a personal expenditure of £75? It meant that the greater part of the funds of these organisations, which they compelled every worker to join, whether he agreed with their political policy or not, on penalty of starvation, were spent in electioneering expenses. If they could show that those sums would not be spent under the amendment if it became law, there might be something in it. Take the case of the tobacco workers, twenty-seven of whom were declared to be non-unionists, because each would not contribute £1 towards the sum to establish a Labour newspaper. That was for political purposes.

The PREMIER: What happened to those men?

Mr. SWAYNE: They would have to starve.

The PREMIER: That is humanitarian, is it?

Mr. SWAYNE: No wage-earner would work with them, and every employer would have to discharge them, because they would not contribute towards the establishment of a paper to whose policy they conscientiously objected. The Liberals were never guilty of such coercive methods as these. He thought that he was safe in saying that it savoured of fraud when people who connived at such things as those asked that each candidate's electioneering expenses should be limited to £75. From the figures which he had given it was probable that more than £750 was spent on behalf of some candidates.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): He had listened carefully to the exceedingly interesting, if not very accurate, speech of the hon. member for Mirani. He said a great deal which would not bear investigation in any shape or form. He said that the Australian Workers' Union did certain things, and then never went any further to prove his case.

Mr. SWAYNE: I quoted my authority, the records of the New South Wales Conciliation and Arbitration Court, and I challenge you to look it up and prove that I am wrong.

Mr. COYNE: There was this difference between the facts and what the hon. member had said: A political organisation in Sydney at one time made such a provision, and it was naturally talked about by the Tory Press from one end of Australia to the other. But it was not done by the industrial unions—not by the Australian Workers' Union. It was done by the political Labour leagues of New South Wales, and counsel in the case before the court—as counsel often did when they had a bad case—sought to prove that it was done by the Australian Workers' Union. But the two bodies were quite different. There was no connection between them in management and control, and one might just as well say that a certain cheese factory was well known to the hon. member for Drayton because it decided that any storekeeper or business person who did not sell their cheeses, and theirs alone, would be boycotted by every member of the farmers' unions.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is a lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to withdraw.

[*Mr. Swayne.*

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I withdraw; but, nevertheless—(Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: The hon. gentleman might know whether that was true or not, but he was relying for his information on the "Darling Downs Gazette."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is untrue.

Mr. COYNE: Well, he drew the attention of the hon. member to it, so that he might get it corrected.

The PREMIER: You are probably not quoting correctly.

Mr. COYNE: He was quoting absolutely correctly. He was not giving the exact words, but he was quoting correctly in substance.

Mr. THEODORE: That matter may be sub judice.

The HOME SECRETARY: Perhaps that balance-sheet is sub judice. (Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: It was not sub judice, if the hon. member was referring to any balance-sheet with which he was connected.

Mr. KESSELL: You never made one.

Mr. MURPHY: They did not publish that in the "Darling Downs Gazette." (Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: He would like to see the balance-sheet of the Port Curtis election. It would be a very interesting document.

The PREMIER: The member for Port Curtis discharged his liabilities. (Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member for Mirani held forth on the fact that the Labour party were spending £750 a candidate to return their members to Parliament. If that was true, and the hon. member was consistent, and there was any truth about his statements, the hon. member would accept the amendment and prevent the Labour party from spending that large sum of money. The members of the Labour party were so satisfied about it—although members opposite were so dubious—that they were in favour of the amendment. He hoped that hon. members opposite who denounced the things that the hon. member said they were doing—which they were not doing and which he wished they were doing—would take the opportunity to vote for a limitation of the expenditure.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*) thought it would be a good thing for everybody if there was a reduction of expenses, but he was quite certain that there was no business in the amendment.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: To take the words of the hon. member for Warrego himself, the Labour party had twenty-six men out for that purpose. He called them industrial agents.

Mr. COYNE: Do not call them agents. I do not like that term.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: If they put them down at £6 a week each—and nobody could travel up and down the country for less than that sum—they had twenty-six men out on whom they were spending £156 per week year in and year out, not merely once in every three years. That was for political purposes, nothing more nor less.

Mr. COYNE: What organisers are you talking of?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You said you employed twenty-six.

Mr. COYNE: I said the unions.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Well, they were talking about the unions. The hon. member admitted that no union was any good at all unless it was political; and he admitted the same so far as the farmers were concerned. But, at the same time, [4 p.m.] the farmers had no political funds. What money they paid was used in organising. Perhaps the hon. member would say the same thing; but was that money going down as part of the candidates' expenses? The Farmers' Union was quite different to Labour unions. There was no pressure brought to bear upon its members.

Mr. KIRWAN: What about the Beenleigh case? I will give you something different to that.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: A member could do as he liked, and the union did not try to stop him getting another job or from selling his produce. He was at perfect liberty to join or not as he pleased, and he could go as far with the union as he could.

Mr. McCORMACK: You are going to stop the produce agents doing what they like.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They had no wish to do anything of the sort.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member for Cairns not to interject when seated at the table, and I would ask the hon. member for Drayton not to reply to interjections.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: If the amendment was an honest attempt to limit election expenses, he would support it, but there was no business in it. It was only a short time since he quoted an instance where men getting over £1 a week were penalised to the extent of 1s. in the £1 of their wages to start a newspaper. Was that money to be used for political purposes, or was it to count as election expenses?

The PREMIER: They call that industrial.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He did not see where they drew the line between industrial and political purposes on the other side, and he failed to see where they would draw the line in connection with election expenses.

Mr. McCORMACK: Have not the Farmers' Union subsidised the "Daily Mail"?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No subsidy was paid, so far as he knew, and with regard to the statement of the hon. member for Warrego regarding the "Darling Downs Gazette," he did not believe it for a moment. He was certain that the editor of the "Gazette" would not make such a statement, because he knew in the first place that there was no surplus stock of cheese in the State and that everything was shipped off every month, and he further knew that a man could buy where he liked, and the price was such that it was to his interest to buy the local article.

Mr. FOLEY (*Mundingburra*) said he had never listened to more silly speeches than he had just listened to from members on the other side. The amendment was submitted because the members of the Labour party desired to limit the amount that any candidate would be allowed to spend in an election. Yet they had the hon. member for Mirani endeavouring to bring in money subscribed towards the "Worker" newspaper as being part of a candidate's election expenses. He might just as well say that, if a member on the other side bought the

"Courier," the money that was spent on the "Courier" should be considered as a part of his election expenses.

Mr. SWAYNE: It is not compulsory to buy the "Courier," but it is compulsory to subscribe to the "Worker."

Mr. FOLEY: Not at all. Then, they were told that the Australian Workers' Union had twenty-six organisers, each of whom was paid £6 a week.

The PREMIER: How many has the Amalgamated Workers' Association?

Mr. FOLEY: And the Premier reckoned that as amounting to £8,000 a year paid to Labour organisers.

The PREMIER: It amounts to £8,112 per annum.

Mr. FOLEY: As a matter of fact, the Australian Workers' Union did not have anything like that number of organisers, and those men were employed for the purpose of organising men into industrial unions and had nothing to do with political work. He had been a unionist ever since he understood what unionism meant, and he had never been compelled to contribute a penny towards the political expenses of any parliamentary candidate, and no union ever compelled its members to pay a penny towards the election expenses of any Labour candidate.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have always been the candidate in your electorate.

Mr. FOLEY: Not always.

The PREMIER: The Registrar of Friendly Societies complains of the amount of money that the unions use for political purposes.

Mr. FOLEY: The Premier knew nothing about what he was talking of. He (Mr. Foley) was speaking from personal experience.

The PREMIER: Does not the Registrar of Friendly Societies know about it?

Mr. FOLEY: No union compelled its members to pay anything towards the election expenses of any candidate, and it was ridiculous for members on the other side to make such statements, because they knew there was absolutely no truth in what they said. The desire of the Labour party was that no candidate should be allowed to spend more than a certain amount on his election.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What about his friends?

Mr. FOLEY: They would try to limit their expenditure also. The members of the Labour party were not moneyed men. Personally, he was not able to spend a large amount of money on an election, and, if he thought his next election would cost him £75 out of his own pocket, he would not be a candidate at all.

Mr. TROUT: Whose pocket does it come out of? Somebody must spend it.

Mr. FOLEY: They had run double elections in Townsville for less than £32.

Mr. TROUT: Then the other fellow had to find the money.

Mr. FOLEY: No; that was the whole cost of the election. Their opponents never ran an election at that price, because he had known them engage as many as thirty cabs for election day at £3 each, and that meant £90 for cabs alone for the one day, in addition to all the other expenses. The Labour party were not in a position to do

Mr. Foley.]

that, and they had to confine themselves to four cabs at the outside. They therefore proposed to limit the amount of expenses to £75, which they considered was quite enough. He would confine it to £50. The amount a candidate for the House of Representatives could spend was £100. The Federal division of Herbert contained seven State electorates, and, if the election for Herbert could be run for £100, £50 should be ample for any State electorate, and if candidates were confined to that amount, their friends included, the Labour party might have a chance of coping with the other side. As it was, they heard that in Brisbane motor-cars were used by the hundred.

Mr. TROUT: You people had more at the last Commonwealth election.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Enoggera to refrain from interjecting.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY thought when a man was endeavouring to make a speech and to put the facts before the Committee, he should be allowed to do it without so much interruption. Although it had been said on the other side that there was no business in this matter, his opinion was that there was real business in it, and he was endeavouring to show that they really meant what they were trying to bring about by this amendment. It had been decided by the National Parliament of Australia—and he would remind hon. members that that Parliament was not brought into existence by the Labour party; it was established before the Labour party came into power in the Federal Parliament—that no candidate should be allowed to spend more than £100 for a seat in the House of Representatives, and £250 for a Senate seat. If the National Parliament thought it was necessary to put some limit on the amount of money that candidates should spend, surely this Committee could be excused for thinking in a similar way, and confining candidates for this House to the expenditure of a certain amount! He was pleased last night, when a little passage took place between the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, to hear the Premier admit that he had supplied certain candidates with money at the last State election—he had placed candidates in the field and financed them. The Premier admitted that, and although he did not admit having financed the gentleman who opposed him, he (Mr. Foley) was as certain as he stood here that the Premier did.

The PREMIER: And I tell you as absolutely that I did not.

Mr. FOLEY: There was just this about it: that the gentleman who opposed him at the last State election was well known not to have many shillings to throw about, and after the Premier visited Townsville and he was the accredited Liberal candidate, he could go round not only promising what he was going to do, but making presents in many cases.

The PREMIER: His admirers in Townsville must have found it for him just the same as your admirers found it for you.

Mr. FOLEY: Not at all. He was as sure as he stood here that the Premier found it from some fund or other that he controlled.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should accept my denial.

[Mr. Foley.]

Mr. FOLEY: He would accept the hon. gentleman's assurance, but although he might believe the hon. gentleman he knew there were thousands that would not. (Opposition laughter.) His opponent had an interview with the Premier, and boasted that the Premier had promised him that if he could oust Foley out of that seat he would do everything he possibly could for him, and he could get what he wanted when he came to Brisbane, and he could tell the electors so.

The PREMIER: I do not know who is romancing—the hon. member for Mundingburra or the gentleman who told him.

Mr. FOLEY: He was not romancing—he was simply giving the statements as he heard them.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are of a confiding nature.

Mr. FOLEY: He might be a bit soft in that direction. He knew that his opponent, not only on the platform, but privately, told persons that Mr. Denham informed him that if he had beaten Foley he could have got almost all he wanted.

The PREMIER: I wish he had succeeded. (Laughter.)

Mr. FOLEY: But it did not come off. (Renewed laughter.) The House should be serious and consider the amendment, because it was a great handicap to candidates who stood for Parliament when they had a rich man against them who could, without any hurt to his pocket, expend his money in such a way that he took all the chances the Labour man might have out of his hand by being able to sweep up everything that was likely to bring a voter to the poll, while the Labour man had to trust to the good sense of the people to come along.

Mr. BOOKER: That is a nasty reflection on the voters.

Mr. FOLEY: It was only a Liberal candidate who used his money for such a purpose. If he had his way he would have no canvassing or vehicles, but let everyone go to the poll and record their vote of their own volition. They should not allow a man with money to sweep up every vehicle which could be got, and leave the Labour candidate without any means of bringing his electors to the poll. The electors should come along as they could, unless they were sick or had not the time, and he felt sure then what the result of the election would be.

Mr. FORSYTH: Do not the trade unions assist politically with money?

Mr. FOLEY: No. (Government laughter.) When an election was on, a member might get up in the meeting and suggest that a subscription be taken up to assist the candidate, and a voluntary subscription would be taken up by a couple of members, when those present would give what they could afford into the fund.

Mr. BOOKER: They make a charge. They are bound to pay.

Mr. FOLEY: No. He wanted to tell the hon. member for Wide Bay that he did not know what he was talking about.

The PREMIER: He is a director of a large company in which numbers of men are paying this contribution.

Mr. FOLEY: He did not care what the hon. member was. What he wanted to tell the hon. member was that members of trade

unions had different political opinions, as the members of this Chamber had. It would be worth any secretary or president's job in a union to fix a levy on members who would have to pay it, if they were not of the same political opinion as the others were. It would not be suffered for five minutes. It would burst up the union; the men would leave if they were compelled to subscribe for political purposes. No one knew that better than the unionists, and for that reason no union funds were allowed to be touched for political purposes.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. FOLEY would take a few minutes longer. When the unionists did assist the candidates it was by voluntary subscriptions and contributions.

Mr. BOOKER: Bosh!

Mr. FOLEY: A collection was taken up amongst the men, and each gave what he could afford. That might amount to several pounds, and it was handed to the Workers' Political Organisation. There was a Workers' Political Organisation in every centre of population, which controlled the selection of Labour candidates. The funds collected by the industrial unions were handed to the Workers' Political Organisation.

Mr. FORSYTH: They must spend money.

Mr. FOLEY: Of course, they did. But they did not spend anything like £500, or £750, or £1,000, as the hon. member said they did at each election. They could not do it, as they had not got the money. He wanted to put hon. members opposite right. They seemed to have an idea that all that was necessary was for a Labour member to say to his union, "You have got to subscribe to my election expenses. You have got to make a levy of 2s. 6d. a week, or 1s. a week, from each man to pay my expenses." Members opposite seemed to think that that was all that was necessary, and the thing would be done. Nothing of the kind. Hon. members opposite did not know the working men at all. They would not stand that sort of thing for five minutes.

Mr. BOOKER: What about the newspaper levy?

Mr. FOLEY: What newspaper levy?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: The "Standard," the Sydney dailies.

Mr. FOLEY: Every £1 subscribed for the new Labour daily was subscribed voluntarily. (Government laughter.) If hon. members had shares in the "Brisbane Courier" or "Daily Mail," did that say that they contributed money for political purposes? What had it got to do with election expenses anyhow if a man did subscribe £1 to a newspaper?

Mr. BOWMAN: It is co-operation.

Mr. FOLEY: It was like a company, and the men who subscribed took shares in it. The whole thing was raised by members opposite to throw dust in the eyes of the people. There was business in the amendment, and it should be accepted. If the National Parliament saw the advisability of putting it into their law, he saw no reason why the State should not also include it in theirs. Members opposite wanted to allow members to spend as much as they liked at election time in order to down the Labour man. If it was true, as hon. members

opposite said, that £750 was spent on every Labour man who stood for Parliament, then why not support the amendment and put a stop to that sort of thing? They could not spend that sum on a Labour man, because they had not got the money to do it. It was all very well for hon. members opposite to talk about the money spent on candidates, as they knew that money would be subscribed for them in order to wipe out as many Labour men as possible.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): It was very interesting to listen to the speech of the hon. member for Mundingburra. That hon. gentleman admitted that some money collected by trade unions was spent politically.

Mr. FOLEY: There is none spent politically.

Mr. FORSYTH: They would look up one of the documents of the House and see how the trade unions funds were spent. Take the year 1910. They would see from the report of the trade unions that in that year the trade unions of Queensland collected no less than £25,428 from its members. That was a very large sum of money to collect in one year. It was quite true, as the hon. member for Mundingburra said, that the unions contained members who did not have the same politics as others. There was no objection to this money being collected for industrial purposes. That was right enough, because every man had a right to work to get better conditions for himself in his employment. That was what trade unionism was started for. When trade unionism came into vogue fifty or sixty years ago, the question of politics never cropped up at all, simply because the members of the trade unions represented all shades of political opinion. They fixed their own industrial conditions, as they had a right to do. In 1910 the trade unions of Queensland collected £25,000. He would like to know how the People's Progressive League or the Liberal party were going to get £25,000 collected? But that was what the trade unions contributed. How was it spent? The sum of £4,621 was spent in benefits to members. Then they came to management. He presumed that included the secretaries of the unions—the £6 a week men they heard so much about. These were the men who went about and got members into the union.

Mr. McCORMACK: And got them increases in their wages.

Mr. FORSYTH: In 1910, then, there was £8,607 spent by the trade unions of Queensland in management. That left a balance of £12,821. How was that balance spent? According to the report of the Registrar of Trade Unions, Mr. Rendle, that £12,000 odd was spent in legal and political expenses. How much of that £12,000 was spent politically?

Mr. FOLEY: Not much.

Mr. FORSYTH: Not much! There must have been a good bit of the £12,000 spent politically.

Mr. McCORMACK: No. The arbitration case cost the Australian Workers' Union £10,000.

Mr. FORSYTH: Not that year.

Mr. McCORMACK and other OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. FORSYTH: If they looked up other years, they would find the figures were about the same. It had been repeatedly mentioned in the House the small amount of money

which the trade unions spent in benefits to the members in comparison with the amount collected. It all went in legal and political expenses, and also in contributions to Labour newspapers. Was that not political?

Mr. FOLEY: No.

Mr. FORSYTH: Hon. members opposite talked about £75 being the limit of a member's expenses, when they knew very well that a certain sum of money was handed over to the organisation for election purposes for themselves. How much money was handed over?

Mr. FOLEY: Not much.

Mr. FORSYTH: The Liberals did not have any fund like that.

Mr. BOWMAN: What about the People's Progressive League?

Mr. FORSYTH: Hon. members opposite made a great cry about the amount the People's Progressive League gave. How much did they give?

Mr. LARCOMBE: What about the subsidy?

Mr. FORSYTH: It was very small indeed.

Mr. RYAN: Where did the subsidy come from?

Mr. FORSYTH: At any rate, the trade unions spent £12,000 a year for political and legal expenses.

Mr. RYAN: One case cost £10,000.

Mr. FORSYTH: Let the hon. gentleman refer to the year before or the year after, and he would find it just the same. The amount of money spent in benefits to trade unionists was very small compared with the amount collected. According to Mr. Rendle's report, the bulk of that £12,000 was spent in political propaganda work.

Mr. RYAN and other OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. FORSYTH: Mr. Rendle said so, and he must have had some information to make him say so. He (Mr. Forsyth) did not say that the money went into the pockets of each member of Parliament, but it went into propaganda work in connection with each union. Where did that £12,000 go to?

Mr. BOWMAN: What has it got to do with you? You did not pay it.

Mr. FORSYTH: It had nothing to do with him, but why did members opposite talk about limiting a member's expenses to £75? How many Liberal members could get money out of the People's Progressive League?

Mr. RYAN: The Premier will not explain.

Mr. FORSYTH: A great deal of that money was not spent on individual members of Parliament.

Mr. COYNE: Give us the People's Progressive League balance-sheet.

Mr. FORSYTH: They would be pleased to give the hon. member the People's Progressive League's balance-sheet as soon as he handed over the strike balance-sheet. (Government laughter.) The money collected by the trade unions was simply frittered away. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley would not deny that some of the money was spent for political purposes. The hon. member said it was not his business how they spent it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Neither it is.

[Mr. Forsyth.]

Mr. FORSYTH: A lot of the money was spent politically, and members who did not agree with Labour principles should not be forced to contribute to their expenses.

Mr. FOLEY: They are not forced.

Mr. FORSYTH: The great bulk of members of trade unions were of one political faith; but there were some who had different political ideas, and they should [4.30 p.m.] not be forced to contribute their funds for political purposes. If it were used for industrial purposes, it would be all right. All this talk about fixing a £75 limit for election expenses was so much nonsense, for every balance-sheet for years back showed that union funds had been used for political purposes.

Mr. HUNTER was rather surprised to hear members opposite discussing this matter in the manner they were doing. They were not facing the question at all; they were dealing with general matters instead of the particular question before the Committee, which was that an individual candidate should be allowed £75 for election expenses, and no more. The amendment had nothing to do with any sort of canvassing that might go on outside privately. There was hardly anything that could be done in the present state of society, even in business, which was not in some sense political. Members opposite might just as well say that the Premier in giving £100 to the "Daily Mail" for the advertisement which appeared in that journal last Saturday week was subscribing that money for political purposes as to say that the funds of unions were used for political purposes.

The PREMIER: Don't you think we got very good value for our money?

Mr. HUNTER: That was not the question. The argument of the other side was that because a certain class of people subscribed a certain amount of money to start a newspaper and run it in their interest industrially, they were subscribing money for political support, and he contended that they might just as well say that about the "Daily Mail" and the money paid to it for the advertisement he referred to, because that journal supported the Liberal party.

The PREMIER: Mr. Stodart, let the hon. member prove his inaccurate statement.

Mr. HUNTER: Carrying the argument to its logical conclusion, if the funds of the unions were used to gain political support, the £100 paid by the Premier to the "Daily Mail"—and it was Government money—was paid for the same purpose.

The PREMIER: Mr. Stodart, I have told the hon. member that his statement is inaccurate, and he continues to repeat it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maranoa is not in order in accusing the Government of using public money for political purposes.

Mr. HUNTER: The Chairman did not call members on the other side to order when they were accusing trade unions of raising money for political purposes when their members subscribed funds for the establishment of a newspaper. He held that both things were equal. But the question before them was not how much was subscribed to start or run a newspaper, but how much an individual candidate might spend in his elec-

tion campaign. Why did not members opposite face that question? He had in his hand the balance-sheet of the Women's Electoral League, and it showed that last year they spent £551 in an election campaign, besides £104 on organising, and other sums for similar purposes, leaving a balance of £27 in hand. Their fund was a purely political fund, and was used solely for political purposes. The Premier had something to do with that league. In fact the league passed a special vote of thanks to the hon. gentleman, to the Hon. R. Philp, Mr. E. H. Macartney, the Hon. H. Whittingham, and the Hon. E. D. Miles. On Saturday afternoon last the Hon. W. H. Barnes, Treasurer, and Mr. Wynn Williams addressed a gathering of the league in a very interesting fashion. All that was part of a political campaign, but it had nothing whatever to do with any individual candidate. The hon. member for Murrumba said that £12,000 of the union funds were spent in political and legal expenses in 1910. The hon. member knew very well that £10,000 of that sum went in a single lawsuit, and that the money spent by industrial unions was spent in organising and improving the condition of their members.

Mr. FORSYTH: The year before you find the same thing.

Mr. HUNTER: No, you don't.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. HUXHAM (*Buranda*): One would imagine from the remarks made by members on the other side of the House that the Opposition were in the fortunate position of having all the money to spend. If that was the case, how came it that members on the Government benches did not accept the amendment, and so cripple the Opposition?

The PREMIER: We would not like to do an unfair thing to you. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: It was but too evident that the amount of money which went to the other side for the purpose of fighting the Labour movement was so large that they were not going to give away the great pull they had over the Labour party. Members of the Opposition were attacking the other side, not on the financial aspect of the matter alone, but also on its ethical aspect. The hon. member for Rockhampton had handed him a pamphlet which was issued by the People's Progressive League against the Labour party. It was compiled by the secretary of the Bible in State Schools' League, Canon Garland.

The PREMIER: Canon Garland has been away for twelve months now. I wish he was back.

Mr. HUXHAM: There was a cry in the House while the hon. member for Rockhampton was speaking about bringing the name of Christ into the discussions in the House. He (Mr. Huxham) said they should bring it in. They started their deliberations in that name. But he would ask them to look at what was done in the heat of political warfare. In the pamphlet he referred to, the people were invited to "Vote for peace and plenty in the home," and to "Vote against the red flag of socialism from which the cross of Christ has been removed." If there was any shame in connection with that matter, it lay with the other side of the House, for

that was one of the ways in which their political funds had been used. Large sums of money had been raised by the other side very cleverly. Two circulars from the People's Progressive League came into his hands last year, and both those circulars made a levy on merchants in order to raise, according to one, £11,000, and according to the other £25,000.

The PREMIER: The capitalising did not come off.

Mr. HUXHAM: Those circulars were issued in the names of Mr. Page, Mr. Bond, and Mr. Blocksidge.

The PREMIER: I am not disputing that. I say I wish I had got the same pull as you fellows have got and that it had come off.

Mr. HUXHAM: Let them come to the facts that had been divulged in the House. The hon. member for Brisbane had told them that his expenses for the last election were not more than £30.

The PREMIER: Lucky man!

Mr. HUXHAM: The hon. member for Mundingburra spent about the same, and his (Mr. Huxham's) total expenses for the Buranda election did not run into more than £60 at the last election. Let them compare those amounts with the expenses of hon. members opposite in the metropolitan area. He knew it cost his opponent between £300 and £400, and, whilst that pull was held by the Government side, there was very little chance of Labour getting charge of the Treasury benches. If the Government were sincere in the matter, they would provide that the whole of the election expenses should be borne by the Government, and they would have brought in compulsory voting.

The PREMIER: How are you going to enforce compulsory voting?

Mr. HUXHAM: Compulsory attendance at the polling-booths, at any rate, and the electors could make their ballot-papers informal if they wished, but be there they should as their first public duty.

The PREMIER: Fancy making a man walk 25 miles to a polling-booth if he has no horse!

Mr. HUXHAM: The hon. gentleman was bringing in the postal vote, and that could be utilised if electors were unable to get to the polling-booth.

The PREMIER: You are objecting to the postal vote.

Mr. HUXHAM: They were not opposing its use by those who were unable to attend the polling-booths, and the Government should make the electors attend the polling-booths. They would never have purity of elections under present conditions, as the pull was entirely on the other side. The Government could command the votes of the bulk of the electors, not because they were in favour of the Government policy, but by means of back-sheesh.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is utter rubbish.

Mr. TROUT: Do you mean to infer that we can buy the electors? That is a libel on the electors.

Mr. HUXHAM recognised that there was a certain amount of gratitude amongst the working people to those who gave them employment, and they did not like to vote

Mr. Huxham.]

against them. It was very natural that they should feel so, and they gave their votes to the Government rather than consider the question from their own class standpoint; but they knew, notwithstanding the large sums of money that had been spent by the Government party in days gone by, that that feeling was gradually passing away. The people were realising that they should vote for their own interests, and they recognised that it was to their interests to consider the industrial problems that arose from time to time, and to vote for the party that was likely to bring about better conditions of employment. There was business in the proposal before the Committee. He would go further and would not allow a candidate to spend a single penny on election expenses. He had no objection to the Australian Workers' Union or any other body spending money on political propaganda, but, as far as the individual candidates were concerned, they ought to be absolutely free from expenses. The Government should be charged with all elections expenses, and allow no cabs to be engaged. He sincerely hoped something would come of the proposal.

The PREMIER said he was not quite clear whether the hon. member for Maranoa accepted his assertion that the advertisement costing £100, and published in the "Daily Mail," was purely an advertisement for the State, and not for political services. He was not quite clear whether the hon. member accepted that assertion or not. He did so, at any rate, unwillingly, and he (Mr. Denham) would ask hon. members to look at the "Daily Mail" of 4th October, and glance through its pages—

"A land of wealth and luxury. The charm of life in Queensland. A country that is calling for more people."

Let hon. members look through the paper and see the various interests concerned and the comments by those who had come here and who had succeeded in life.

Mr. RYAN: You ought to give that advertisement to every paper.

The PREMIER: They would not repeat it in every paper, but that advertisement was sound business.

Mr. LENNON: Why not give it to a paper like the "Standard"?

Mr. FORSYTH: It has no circulation.

The PREMIER: The "Standard" had not made a proposition to him yet. A proposition was made by the business manager of the "Daily Mail," and a business arrangement came to—£30 for the advertisement and 16,000 copies at 1d. each, and he questioned very much whether the weight of the paper could be produced for 1d.

Mr. RYAN: Any paper I have a knowledge of did not get it.

The PREMIER: If the business manager of any other paper came along with an equally sound business proposition, he would look into it. It was purely a matter of business—there was nothing else in it. As far as he could understand the new clause, the idea was that the unions on one side and their friends on the other side should provide the money required for election expenses, above the sum of £75. If that was the proposition, he quite agreed with it. He would be very glad indeed if his friends

supplied all required over £75; but to say that he should not be permitted to carry on a campaign and spend more than £75 was an interference with the liberty of the subject. There was no mistake about it—as they had it out of the mouth of an hon. member of the House who was a high authority on unionism—that industrial unionism is considered by the Labour party as effete apart from political unionism. Let them see what the hon. member said.

Mr. RYAN: Who is he?

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Chillagoe. That hon. member said—

"The objects of the association are—

To assist in the movement for the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange."

That was not purely industrial! There was something political about that!

"To gradually replace the competitive system of distribution by a co-operative system. To secure direct representation of Labour in Parliament."

That was not purely industrial! There was something political about that!

"To establish and assist in the maintenance of Labour journals."

Not merely were those the objects of the union, but they had twenty-six well-paid gentlemen who travelled round the country on motor-cycles and with other comforts—not in the interests of unionism; it had a distinct political phase all the time. A few moments ago the hon. member for Murrumba referred to the large amount spent last year in expenses, and one hon. member interjected, "Oh! there was a law suit that year." But what about the year before? In 1909 there was a revenue of £16,869, and only £2,532 were spent in benefits and £3,598 on management. How much of that went for political purposes the unions only could tell, and £5,326 was spent in assisting unions, in political expenses, and in contributions to Labour newspapers, etc. The sum of £25,428 was spent last year, of which £12,000 went in political expenses. Was it not mere nonsense to urge that members sitting opposite were such purists that not more than £75 should be spent on the election of each one of them? If he could arrange that for fifty-two weeks in the year, for three years prior to election day, he had in his electorate a well-paid canvasser—paid by somebody else—carefully organising and arranging matters, he would be quite willing to say that £75 was enough to spend on the day of election.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

The PREMIER: He had another five minutes. He had no objection to members on the other side getting the support of their friends, financially or in any other way. That was their business and quite right, too. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. McCORMACK: You said that it was a dole.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman wanted to tie him down to the word, it was so in a sense, because there were in those organisations a large number of men who were terrorised, who dare not show their hands—(Opposition uproar)—who paid—

Mr. BOWMAN: Who told you that?

[Mr. Huskham.

The PREMIER: He could have brought there a letter, one of the cruellest letters that he had seen for a long time.

Mr. RYAN: Oh! Why did you not bring it?

The PREMIER: Well, for one reason, he did not think of doing so, and for another, the poor fellow was being terrorised enough as it was. He had been hounded about enough already.

Mr. McCORMACK: What is his name?

The PREMIER: Of course, he would not give his name. He went into one shop and soon the boss was told, "That is So-and-so. He is a blackleg," and so he was put out.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why don't you give him some of the subsidy?

The PREMIER: What he was trying to do was to find him a job in the Government or some other service where he would be honestly treated. And he would say that one reason why employers suffered was because they allowed themselves to be humbugged and terrorised in that particular regard. If that was the point of the hon. gentleman, if he wanted to tie him down to a word used in the rush of language—

Mr. RYAN: Oh, a slip?

The PREMIER: He would say that it was a "dole," because it was given quite unwillingly. These men knew that they had to give a certain amount weekly to their unions, and they knew that portion of that money was used for political purposes in which they had no interest. The Registrar of Friendly Societies had called attention to it, and had refused to register certain unions because they comprised within their rules such unreasonable and unfair things as he had indicated. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman chose to pin him down to the word "dole," he would accept it. There were scores—he dared say he might say hundreds—of men in Labour organisations who had to pay a weekly levy towards their unions—which they would do perfectly willingly if they were the old-fashioned organisations, in which benefits were obtained. But what was the use of talking about benefits when they knew that in the last year he had quoted, out of £12,000 only £2,532 was spent in benefits, and all the rest in political purposes?

Mr. RYAN: Do you think it is necessary that you should be discussing this?

The PREMIER: He did not think so.

Mr. RYAN: If we have to finish by 10 o'clock to-night? It is just a reminder.

The PREMIER: He was greatly obliged to the hon. member. And he believed that he had to-day received the real reason for unreasonable obstruction. It was a letter from the Amalgamated Workers' Association of Queensland, which said—

"I have the honour, by direction, to convey to you a unanimous protest, passed at a general meeting of the members of the above association, held here on the 6th instant, against electoral reform."

There was an objection to electoral reform.

Mr. RYAN: Read the rest of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: I believe our party got that, too.

Mr. RYAN: You cannot see the sarcasm.

The PREMIER: It was perfectly clear that hon. gentlemen opposite were in sympathy with the Amalgamated Workers' Association, and they did not believe in electoral reform.

Mr. RYAN: Are you sure that it is not "de-form"?

The PREMIER: They had been proposing amendments one after the other, and so soon as the closure was applied, and one was disposed of, up came another. Hon. gentlemen had during the last week been searching through the Federal law and clipping out various clauses, and so soon as one was negatived another was proposed. And the Committee might just as well discuss whether he was to be allowed to spend more than £75, or whether he should be allowed to make a levy, as anything else. He wished he had the same complacent people to deal with as hon. members opposite—people who would supply him with buggies and motor-cars and not cost him £30 or £40.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. McCORMACK (*Cairns*): The Chief Secretary had shown a good deal of ignorance in regard to union matters, although he had given them a good deal of interesting information. Whilst they were prepared to admit—he was prepared to admit it—that a certain amount of political organisation was done by industrial organisers, it was very small. What were the benefits accruing from industrial organisation throughout Queensland, benefits of which the hon. gentleman had no idea? There might be twenty-six men, or thirty-six, or fifty-six, or even 100.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Warrego said twenty-six.

Mr. McCORMACK: There were considerably more than twenty-six, if that would satisfy the hon. gentleman, engaged in industrial organisation throughout Queensland. The Hon. the Premier had gone to a good deal of trouble to prove that the funds were spent in political purposes.

The PREMIER: Mr. Rendle says so.

Mr. McCORMACK: Queensland was the only country in the world where the unions could not get the protection of the law, simply because of the obsolete nature of it. Look at the improvements that had been made in the conditions of the workers by unionism!

Mr. MACARTNEY: No one objects to that.

Mr. McCORMACK: Then, why bring it up there and try to prove that the whole of the money spent by organising agents was spent for political purposes? It was a ridiculous statement to come from the head of the Government, when he knew that such was not the case. He had considerable experience, and he could say that 90 per cent. of the work through the three years was industrial. At the present moment, in connection with the sugar industry, they were trying to get better conditions and get their case before the court, and they had any amount of industrial work to do. As a matter of fact, all the political work that was done was to get names on the roll.

The PREMIER: That is the most important work that could be done.

Mr. McCORMACK: And it would be the hardest so soon as the Elections Bill was

Mr. McCormack.]

passed. If ever there was a time when the unionists of Queensland should devote their money, time, and labour to the political side of the question, it would be when that Bill was passed. Previously it was not hard to get on the roll, but now it would be hard. The hon. member for Mirani stated that the unions used their money for political purposes. He (Mr. McCormack) stated on the previous evening that no money taken in the form of ticket money was used for political purposes. The organisation collected money from its supporters in the same way as the People's Progressive League raised money from its supporters; but any amount of unionists did not subscribe to election expenses, and he was sure hon. members on the other side would not deny that they did not collect money from their supporters. The Premier had been at some pains to read a document in connection with the Amalgamated Workers' Association, and he was now going to read a document in connection with the People's Progressive League. The letter read as follows—

[5 p.m.] Mr. KESSELL: What is the paper?

Mr. McCORMACK: It was dated "Brisbane, 27th March, 1913," and was addressed to "Hon. D. F. Denham, M.L.A."

The HOME SECRETARY: What are you quoting from?

Mr. McCORMACK: He was quoting from this letter.

Mr. KESSELL: The "Worker."

The HOME SECRETARY: What are you quoting from? You cannot read a printed copy of a letter as your authority.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN rose to a point of order. Last night the Chairman refused to allow an hon. member to quote a letter bearing on the same subject from a paper on the ground that the hon. member had not given his authority.

Mr. RYAN rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member right in haranguing the Committee like that?

Mr. MORGAN: I am in possession of the floor.

Mr. RYAN: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MORGAN: He was in possession of the floor, and he asked the leader of the Opposition to resume his seat. He had no right to get up.

Mr. RYAN said he was not going to resume his seat. He rose to a point of order.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Sit down! Order!

Mr. MORGAN said he rose to a point of order first.

Mr. RYAN said he rose to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN rose.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Chair, chair! Order! Sit down!

The CHAIRMAN: Will the leader of the Opposition resume his seat?

Mr. RYAN: I will, but I expect the hon. member for Murilla to resume his seat also.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for Murilla resume his seat?

Mr. MORGAN: Certainly, Mr. Stodart.

[Mr. McCormack.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member for Murilla wished to raise a point of order.

Mr. RYAN: And then he started to make a speech.

The CHAIRMAN: The leader of the Opposition interrupted the hon. member before he stated his point of order. Will the hon. member for Murilla state his point of order?

Mr. MORGAN: The point of order he wished to raise was that the hon. member for Cairns was quoting from some newspaper, of which he refused to give the name, a letter which another hon. member tried to quote last night, and was ruled out of order for so doing. He asked was the hon. member for Cairns in order in endeavouring to read that letter?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member quotes from a paper, he must give his authority.

Mr. McCORMACK: He wished to quote a letter written by the Queensland Liberal League, as the Premier had just quoted a document from the Amalgamated Workers' Association.

The PREMIER: I quoted from an original document.

Mr. McCORMACK: The letter read—
"Dear Sir,"—

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order in reading a document which he had not stated was an original?

Mr. RYAN: The Premier did not say that he was quoting from an original.

The PREMIER: I said it was a letter I received to-day.

The HOME SECRETARY submitted that the hon. member was not in order if he read a document unless it was an original or a properly authenticated copy.

The CHAIRMAN: I ruled only a few minutes ago that the hon. member must give his authority. If the hon. member intends to read from a copy of a letter, he will not be in order. He must quote from the original letter.

Mr. McCORMACK: He was going to quote from a paper.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member name the paper?

Mr. McCORMACK: The "Worker."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Ah, ah! (Uproar.)
Mr. McCORMACK: The document was a photograph from the original document.

The HOME SECRETARY and Mr. KESSELL: A stolen document!

Mr. McCORMACK: If hon. members opposite desired the photograph, he would produce it.

Mr. HAMILTON rose to a point of order. Were the Home Secretary and the hon. member for Port Curtis in order in saying that the document was stolen?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a stolen document.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not in order to say that a document is stolen.

Mr. McCORMACK: If the Chairman desired it, he would give him the photograph of the original.

The PREMIER: Why not the original?

Mr. McCORMACK: He would make a bargain with the Premier. If the hon. gentleman would tell them where the subsidy came from, he would produce the original letter.

The PREMIER: That shows you have the stolen document now.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. McCORMACK (continuing) said the letter read—

"Prior to the departure of Mr. John Reid, on holidays, he instructed me to furnish you with particulars of the total amount that has been contributed towards the Federal campaign that is now upon us, exclusive of the sum recently received from you, and I have now to advise you that the amount of subscriptions paid into the Liberal fund and donated to the various branches and sections of the People's Progressive League throughout the State reaches the sum of £930 13s. 2d, since 23rd November, 1912, to date.

"Mr. Reid instructed me to ask that you would be good enough to arrange for subsidy on that amount to be placed at the disposal of the above fund.

"Thanking you in anticipation, yours faithfully,

OSBORN J. FENWICK,
Secretary to the Trustees."

Across the letter was written—

"My dear Macartney,—

"Will this be satisfactory as certificate?

D.D. 28/3/13."

The PREMIER: And it was paid—that is better.

Mr. McCORMACK: He would give the Premier the document if he would tell them where he got the subsidy from.

The HOME SECRETARY: There can be no compromise in connection with a theft.

The PREMIER: That would be compounding a felony.

Mr. McCORMACK: The hon. member for Murrumba objected to them collecting money—

The HOME SECRETARY: Not at all; but you deny that you are doing it.

Mr. McCORMACK: And the Premier had stated that it was a "miserable dole."

The PREMIER: I did not say "miserable." You call it "miserable," and so it is in a sense.

Mr. McCORMACK: It was no dole at all. The contributions were made on the same lines as contributions to the party on the other side, and if the one was a dole, the other was a dole also. He might say, however, that the Labour organisations had never circularised Labour members or people holding positions in the Labour movement, telling them that they were rated at so much.

The PREMIER: We have no means of compelling compliance, and you have.

Mr. McCORMACK: Neither had they any means of compelling it; it was purely a subscription. In his own electorate he kept well within the sum mentioned. It was a small electorate, and there was no occasion to spend money. It was only occasioned by the party which had to misrepresent things; the Labour party had no occasion to spend money. All they asked for was that the poor man should have an equal

opportunity with the rich man in contesting an election. That was a reasonable demand. All that they asked for was that their opponents, who were the representatives of wealth, and who acknowledged that they were the representatives of wealth, should be confined to the spending of a certain amount of money. It was admitted that money played a great part in electioneering, and, if that was so, there was a necessity for such an amendment as this. Seeing that the weight of wealth and power was on one side, as against another party who were proposing to take some of that wealth away from the people who had it—because there was no denying that that was the objective of this party, they were out to better the distribution of wealth—they openly said what they were after. On the other hand, the Liberal party should openly say that they were there to retain that wealth for the people they represented. If that was so, the electoral law should make provision that all parties going to the poll should have equal opportunities—that the man with wealth should not have a pull over the man who had no money at all. The amendment was reasonable and logical.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*), who was received with "Hear, hears!" said: The hon. member who had just spoken had made the statement that the Labour party had no cause to misrepresent things. The letter which the hon. member had referred to perhaps furnished the best proof that could possibly be offered that the Labour party's policy was a policy of misrepresentation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition dissent.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The document which the hon. member read was stolen from his (Mr. Macartney's) possession.

Mr. RYAN: By whom?

Mr. FOLEY: You do not mean to say it is a fraud, then?

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was absolutely a correct reproduction of an original letter which was stolen from his possession.

The PREMIER: He knows where it is.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. member who represented Cairns and the hon. member who came from Woolloongabba knew it, and when that letter was published in the Labour Press a few days after it was stolen the hon. member knew it; and it was left for the Federal member for Brisbane to make an insinuation—indeed, to make a statement—that the subsidy which was referred to in that letter was paid out of the public Treasury by the Premier. No worse misrepresentation was ever uttered. He knew that the Federal member for Brisbane denied it, but he had witnesses for the statement, and active use was made of the assertion throughout the last election. There was no truth in it, and he wished the leader of the Opposition and his party luck with their association.

Mr. RYAN: Who? Do you refer to me?

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did. The hon. gentleman led that party, and he supported the attempt which was made to get that letter in last night. He supported it by interjection.

Mr. Macartney.]

Mr. RYAN: That is right, and I will support it now. I specially pointed out during the election that I did not suggest that that was consolidated revenue. I was particular to point that out.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did not say anything about what the hon. gentleman had said at the election. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to assist the getting in of that letter last night, well knowing it had been publicly stated that the letter was stolen. The hon. gentleman was associating himself with that.

Mr. RYAN: I do not think it was stolen now—not because you say it was stolen do I think it was.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was taken from his possession.

Mr. RYAN: I doubt that very much.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was to-day in the possession of a thief or his friend.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition dissent.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the hon. gentleman wished to associate himself with a thief, then he wished the hon. gentleman luck in his association.

Mr. RYAN: Do you suggest that I am associating myself with a thief?

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman was prepared to take the results of the theft—to receive it, if he might so term it—and the hon. gentleman was prepared to lend his moral support to a theft. The fact was that the letter was stolen.

Mr. RYAN rose to a point of order. If he had heard correctly, the hon. member for Toowong deliberately said that he (Mr. Ryan) was prepared to lend his moral support to a theft.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Yes.

Mr. RYAN asked if that was parliamentary, and he asked the hon. member for Toowong, as a man, to withdraw it, because he had no right to say it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: There was no temper as far as he was concerned in the matter. He was speaking of what was absolute fact. The letter which was put before the people of this country with misrepresentation was stolen.

Mr. RYAN rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member for Toowong in order in saying that he (Mr. Ryan) lent his moral support to a theft? He asked for a ruling on that point. He was not going to allow such things to be said here, and no one knew better than the hon. member for Toowong that that was not correct.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Toowong said that "If the hon. member."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: He said he was.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member for Toowong is out of order.

Mr. MACARTNEY had no wish to say anything at all extreme or harsh; but if the hon. gentleman was prepared to use or countenance the use of a letter that had been stolen from him (Mr. Macartney), he did not know what otherwise a man could say.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Opposition interjections.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why make the innuendo?

[Mr. Macartney.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Leichhardt to abstain from interjecting.

Mr. MACARTNEY was answering directly the statement of the hon. member for Cairns that the Labour party had not any call for misrepresentation. When that letter was published in the form of a photograph in the Labour Press, there was a direct innuendo—"Where did the subsidy come from?" and there was the direct statement of the hon. member for Brisbane in the Federal Parliament, who said that certain persons had had a financial subsidy from the Treasury.

Mr. HUNTER: We are still asking where the subsidy comes from.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Asking where the subsidy came from! The hon. member for Maranoa was lending his moral support to it now.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear hear! and disorder.

Mr. HUNTER rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order in saying that he was lending his moral support to a theft?

The HOME SECRETARY: You are.

Mr. HUNTER: A while ago the Chairman ruled that the hon. member for Toowong was in order in saying "If," and that hon. member had deliberately made the assertion that he (Mr. Hunter) was doing so. He asked the Chairman's ruling. The Chairman could not give rulings for one side different to the other side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I use my own judgment in regard to the decisions which I give, and I will not be corrected by the hon. member for Maranoa or any other member of the Committee. I do not think the hon. member for Toowong is in order in stating that the hon. member for Maranoa has lent his moral support to a theft.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. member for Maranoa had no moral support to give to anything.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. KIRWAN and other OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. RYAN (to the Chairman): What about suspending him?

Mr. HUNTER (rising): The hon. member for Toowong should withdraw that remark.

Mr. RYAN: What about the hon. member for Toowong's remark?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Maranoa wishes to speak.

Mr. RYAN: Much prompter action was taken the other day.

Mr. HUNTER: I could not be so immoral as the hon. member for Toowong, but is he in order in saying that I had no moral support to lend to anything? I ask for a withdrawal of both of those statements.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did not wish to pursue the subject any further. He thought he had said enough—

Mr. HUNTER: I ask for a withdrawal of the expressions made use of by the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Toowong is not in order in using those expressions, and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. RYAN and other OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. MACARTNEY: He would like to call attention to the manner in which the hon. member introduced his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. RYAN: What is the use of prevaricating? Why don't you withdraw?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Toowong made a statement with regard to the hon. member for Maranoa, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: In deference to the Chair, I withdraw.

Mr. RYAN: I should think so.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. member for Maranoa made an insinuation just now that he was not as immoral as the hon. member for Toowong.

Mr. HUNTER: I withdraw that without being asked to do so. I only used it because of what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He had said enough to show that their friends opposite had no need to talk about misrepresentation, because they took the fullest possible advantage of it. That letter which was referred to was a letter which was actually in existence, and it was taken from him. Anyone who read the correspondence at the time would see that there was nothing in it. The correspondence would show that the subsidy came from the Liberal fund which was subscribed to by Liberal supporters generally, and in connection with which he held an honorary position. Anyone would see from the letters which he (Mr. Macartney) wrote to the Press at the time that the whole sum spent by the People's Progressive League right throughout Queensland, from one end of the State to the other, was but a paltry sum of £3,000, as against the wild statements of hon. members on the other side who talked about thousands and tens of thousands of pounds being spent by the Liberal party.

The PREMIER: I wish we had it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Reference was made by the hon. member for Maranoa to the Queensland Women's Electoral League and the sum of £500 that was spent by them during last year. As a matter of fact, he had seen the report which the hon. member quoted from, and he saw that the £500 which the hon. member spent for organising was nearly all represented by the ordinary office expenses of the league. The whole object of that league was to support objects in which women were interested. Surely women had a right to have their own organisations and take part in these things, and if they did spend a few hundreds of pounds per annum, what was that to talk about? He thought that the hon. member for Maranoa had little to do to make an attack like that on an organisation which was doing very good work.

Mr. HUNTER rose to a point of order. He made no attack on anybody. He just gave it as an instance as to how political money was being spent.

Mr. RYAN: Another instance of misrepresentation.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was nearly time that members on the other side made themselves familiar with points of order. He did not know what was the object of the amendment. He did not know whether the object of the amendment was to protect hon. members on the other side from any call on their parliamentary salary, or whether it was to prevent members on the Government side from spending more than £75. All he could say about it was that if he could get through an election without an expenditure of three times £75 he considered himself particularly lucky. They had to spend that amount of money. They were not in the position of hon. members opposite, who had got voluntary and free workers to work for them, not only for a few weeks before the election, but right from the end of one election to the commencement of another election. (Hear, hear!) The hon. member for Brisbane said that his election only cost him £30. He did not know what was included in that £30, but certain work had to be done, and if it was done, and if the hon. member for Brisbane only paid £30, then he (Mr. Macartney) was ashamed of the rate of wages the hon. gentleman paid.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It would cost more than that for the postage stamps and the clerical work that had to be paid for during an election. He strongly objected to the limitation of expenses. He did not know that the limitation would be of any use at all. He did not know whether the Federal members really restrained themselves and confined their expenses to £100.

The PREMIER: That would not pay for all their cabs and motor-cars.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did not know whether it would pay the expenses incurred by Mr. Sharpe at the recent Federal election. He very much doubted it. There was a tremendous amount of expense incurred by Mr. Sharpe, and he (Mr. Macartney) was very curious to see the Federal return so far as that gentleman's expenses were concerned. A declaration was made by Mr. Sharpe, presumably, that he only spent £100. He (Mr. Macartney) knew of one instance where the "Otter" was taken advantage of by Mr. Sharpe and his friends and they paid a visit to Dunwich during the election. As soon as the vessel left the wharf, cases of merchandise were produced and distributed in different parcels by the members of the party, and when they reached Dunwich these goods were distributed amongst the inmates.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. MACARTNEY (continuing): All this was done in the presence of an eye witness who stated that it was remarked when the distribution was made that the presents came from Mr. Sharpe.

Mr. FOLEY: You are misrepresenting now.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If it were true, then he would like to know if in Mr. Sharpe's return of expenses there was any information about the goods which had been distributed in Dunwich. At any rate, he was rather inclined to think that their friends opposite in some way or other were able to get over the form provided in the Federal Act. He did not think if they had a limitation to expenses in Queensland that they

Mr. Macartney.]

would be in any better position. At any rate, he, for one, objected to a limitation of what were necessary expenses in connection with the proper conduct of an election.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) was surprised to hear the accusation made by the last speaker against members on the Opposition side accusing them of being the associates of thieves, simply because there was a document read in the House which the hon. member for Toowong said was stolen from him. The hon. member said that every member on the Opposition side was the associate of thieves. He (Mr. Hamilton) could remember not long ago when a document was purported to be stolen from the House, and a very high official of the House was suspended until a member got up in the House and acknowledged that he was the person who got the document.

Mr. KIRWAN: He was not a Labour man either.

Mr. HAMILTON: No; he was not a member of the Labour party; he was a Liberal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RYAN: It was not stolen.

Mr. HAMILTON: No; it was not stolen. It was picked up. This letter might have been picked up in the same way. There was an unfair use made of the document which was picked up by the member of the House, and an official of the House was suspended. This document may also have been picked up, but there was no unfair use made of it, because the publisher's name was attached. The hon. member had a lot to say about Mr. Sharpe going down to Dunwich and distributing presents. He (Mr. Hamilton) had been to Dunwich, and he knew it did not require any presents from Labour men to get votes from the inmates there. They were men who had been working men all their lives, and they knew that whatever betterment they got in Dunwich was owing largely to the advocacy of members on that side of the House. He did not wish to deprecate what the Home Secretary had done for the people in Dunwich, but members on the Opposition side had always advocated better conditions for them. A lot had been said about members of Labour organisations being compelled to contribute to political funds, and the Premier read a letter purporting to come from a member of an industrial organisation. If he was a member of an industrial organisation—and he did not believe he was—then he was what he called a "scab" to write such a letter as that to the Premier.

The PREMIER: I did not read any letter.

Mr. HAMILTON: The hon. member read a letter from a member of the Australian Workers' Union. He was surprised that any member of an organisation would write such a letter as that to the Premier of the State when he must know that the Premier was opposed to industrial organisations.

The PREMIER: I am not opposed to industrial organisations at all.

Mr. HAMILTON: The Australian Workers' Union was an industrial organisation. The chances were that the letter was written the previous night, so that the Premier could read it in the Chamber to-day.

The PREMIER: I did not read it.

[*Mr. Macartney.*]

Mr. HAMILTON: The hon. gentleman referred to it, and said the document was in his possession. He (Mr. Hamilton) said that no bonâ-fide Labour man or unionist would write a document of that sort and send it to the Premier. Members of the Opposition thought the amendment was a fair and proper one, and they had every right to move it and speak in support of it, without any base motive being attributed to them.

The PREMIER: Let us go to a division on it.

Mr. HAMILTON: They would go to a division when they were ready, but every member had a right to speak for the time allowed him by the Standing Orders, if he chose to do so. The amendment was moved in all sincerity. Members on that side knew very well that in the past large sums of money had been paid out by candidates and organisations in order to fight Labour. He knew himself that in many instances large sums had been expended to try to compass the downfall of the Labour candidate, and he held that that was not a fair thing. All that members of the Opposition asked for was equal opportunities for all, so that every man appearing before the electors should stand on an equal footing.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. HAMILTON: He had another five minutes, and he would just add that when one man with thousands of pounds became a candidate at an election and he distributed his money lavishly and broadcast, while his opponent could hardly raise sufficient money to pay ordinary election expenses, the contest was unequal. The amendment was a fair one, and he hoped it would be carried.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*) understood that during his absence from the Chamber the hon. member for Toowong, whether from absolute ignorance or deliberate intention he could not say, had suggested that the reason why he (Mr. Kirwan) could run an election for £25 was because he sweated somebody. He was both candidate and secretary on that occasion, and the only money he spent, outside advertising, was £12 on cabs. The men who canvassed for him did so, not because they were canvassing for Mick Kirwan, but because they were canvassing for the cause, and he hurled the insinuation back into the teeth of the hon. member for Toowong. Such mock heroic statements suited the hon. member, but he would ask him to read some of the statements made by men on his own side during the last Federal election when they suggested that the late Prime Minister of the Commonwealth had purchased his house out of funds obtained from the consolidated revenue.

The PREMIER: This is the first time I have heard that.

Mr. KIRWAN: If the hon. member for Toowong was anxious to discuss this matter, he now publicly challenged the hon. member to debate the question as to who was fairest and squarest on the platform in the Centennial Hall, admission to be by ticket only, and those admitted to be Liberals. (Laughter.) He knew that candidates in speeches at the last Federal election did the dirty work of making base insinuations against men occupying high and responsible positions.

Mr. TROUT: Your people would not allow them to speak.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member for Enoggera could give out the tickets, and limit them to Liberals, keeping out the supporters of the Labour party entirely, because it was the Liberals he wished to address. The challenge was open to anybody from the Premier down.

Mr. FORSYTH: What is the discussion about?

Mr. KIRWAN: He noticed that those reflections came from Ministerial supporters continually.

Mr. MURPHY: Why not have it in aid of the hospital?

Mr. KIRWAN: They could have it in aid of the hospital, which, he believed, wanted money very badly—admission 2s. 6d. front seats, and a bob for back seats.

Mr. KESSELL: Admission by coupon. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member was silenced the previous night when he tried by innuendo to get in a lying insinuation against the leader of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KIRWAN: He withdrew the remark. But when the hon. member was asked to put up his money he "squibbed" over it. With regard to the proposal to limit the expenses of a candidate at an election, they heard from members opposite that the Labour party rolled in millions and spent thousands of pounds at an election.

Mr. TROUT: So they do.

Mr. KIRWAN: Well, now they had an opportunity to settle the Labour party once for all, and yet they would not vote for the amendment.

The PREMIER: We don't want to take a mean advantage of you.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. KIRWAN: He would say, "Perish the thought that the Premier would take an advantage of the Labour party." The Elections Bill gave evidence of that. If the Premier thought he could down that party by any move, in conjunction with the move embodied in the Bill they were now discussing, the hon. gentleman would very readily do it.

The PREMIER: Let us get to a division.

Mr. KIRWAN: They would get to a division in good time after he had finished. A great deal was said about the way in which the Labour party got funds. He would quote an example of the way in which funds were obtained by the fusion party, of which members opposite were great admirers and the State representatives.

The TREASURER: What are you reading from?

Mr. KIRWAN: He was reading from a circular issued by "The People's Liberal Party, The Block, 284 Collins street, Melbourne, 27/11/12."

The HOME SECRETARY: What are you quoting from?

Mr. KIRWAN: He was quoting from "The Labour Call."

The HOME SECRETARY: Ah!

Mr. KIRWAN: The circular was published in that paper, and it was an appeal to the supporters, or supposed supporters,

of the party for funds. There was another document which showed that the Pastoralists' Union made a levy of so much per hundred head of sheep as a contribution to the funds of the Liberal Association. He had no objection to his political opponents getting funds to fight a political campaign, but he asked, why all this talk about the Labour party? Were not their supporters entitled, if they were so disposed, to subscribe to a fund to fight for the cause in which they believed?

The PREMIER: Certainly.

The HOME SECRETARY: What we object to is the theft of letters.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. gentleman had better make that statement outside the House. Was the Home Secretary prepared to make that statement outside?

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, he is.

Mr. KIRWAN: Let the hon. gentleman do it if he were game, and not be like the Treasurer, who burked in connection with the statement he made. The opportunity was now afforded to members of the Government party to prove their sincerity, and if they voted against the amendment it proved that all their speeches were so much hypocrisy.

Mr. WINSTANLEY, who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the elections expenses of members of the Government party were three times as much as those of Labour members. The amendment to limit the expenses of individual candidates to £75 was a reasonable one, and if the statements made by hon. members opposite were true, he did not see why they should object to it, as it would certainly be more in their interests than in the interests of Labour members. As far as his experience of elections went—and he had been engaged in six or seven, and in a double electorate in most instances, when there were two candidates, and the whole of the expenses had not come to anything like £75 for each candidate, and any work that had been paid for had been paid for at current rates. The statement of the hon. member for Toowong that members of the Labour party sweated those who worked for them at election time, was entirely uncalled for. It was a well-known fact that men who worked for Labour candidates worked for the good of the cause, and they were quite willing to give their time as well as any money they possessed, in the interests of the cause. It was well known to members on both sides of the House that the organisation funds were entirely separate and were spent for industrial purposes, and election expenses were provided by voluntary contributions. The Liberal candidates, generally speaking, spent three times as much as Labour candidates. When it depended on paying organisers, paying for literature, hire of cabs and motor-cars, the Labour candidate had very little chance; but when it depended on the people themselves, the Labour candidate had a very good chance. A lot had been said about a document being stolen; and the statement of the hon. member for Toowong that that document had been stolen did not prove that it was stolen.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Cairns said he could produce the original.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That did not prove that he stole it. It was a well-known fact

Mr. Winstanley ?

that there were a hundred and one ways by which he could have got possession of the document without having stolen it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then he is a receiver of stolen property.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: What was the hon. member doing when his correspondence was stolen? It did not say much for the hon. member's own credit's sake when he admitted that his correspondence could be stolen from him. At any rate, the hon. member had admitted that the statement was absolutely true. Was it not a fact that the hon. member for Mirani quoted a document during 1911 that had been stolen by a person who was a member of the House at the present time? So that it was quite evident that documents that were alleged to be stolen were frequently made use of in the House by members opposite. If hon. members opposite made use of them it was a justifiable proceeding, but if members of the Labour party did so, it was a disgrace and perfectly unjustifiable. It was difficult to understand why members opposite got into such a tear.

Mr. SWAYNE rose to a point of order. As far as he could hear, the hon. member for Quenton accused him of, in some way, being connected with a stolen document.

Mr. McCORMACK: You read a stolen document in the House.

Mr. SWAYNE: Such a statement was distinctly untrue, and he asked the hon. member to withdraw it. (Opposition laughter and disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member accused another hon. member of having stolen a document he is entirely out of order, and I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. WINSTANLEY said he did not say—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is entirely out of order in making a statement that the hon. member for Mirani stole a document, and I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He knew quite well what he had said.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. WINSTANLEY said he would not withdraw. He had stated that the hon. member read a document that was alleged to have been stolen. It was from the member for Cairns to the secretary in Mackay. It was on private business, and it got into the hands of the hon. member for Mirani, who read it in the House, and there were just as many grounds for saying it was stolen as there was in saying another document was stolen.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He would not withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member to say that the hon. member for Mirani said he knew it was a stolen document.

Mr. RYAN: He did not say he knew it was stolen.

[Mr. Winstanley.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I did not say he knew it was stolen.

Mr. SWAYNE: Why did you not say so in the first place?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It was evident that hon. members on the Government side could say anything to the discredit of the Labour party, and it was perfectly justifiable, but if hon. members on the Opposition side did the same thing they were branded as thieves and the associates of thieves, and when the accusation was asked to be withdrawn it was only withdrawn out of respect to the Chair, and not because it was an untrue statement. The amendment was a perfectly justifiable one, and was certainly in the interests of electoral purity. It was a well-known fact that money was spent like water if there was a probability of getting a Liberal candidate returned, and in many instances it had been spent in ways it should not have been spent according to the Elections Act.

The PREMIER: Question!

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): Why this frenzied haste? (Loud laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the stolen documents?

Mr. BARBER: The Secretary for Railways interjected something about stolen documents. He did not know that members on that side were blameless in that connection. The questionable actions of a certain member on that side would not be tolerated even in the sneak-thief kitchen of a 'Frisco joint. (Loud laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order! Withdraw!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the hon. member to use such language, and I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. BARBER: Do you ask me to withdraw, Mr. Stodart?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BARBER: Out of respect to the Chairman he withdrew; but he could furnish the House with proofs of the statement he had just made.

Mr. BOWMAN: What was it? (Laughter.)

Mr. BARBER: If hon. members on the Government side went to Government departments and perloined the correspondence of another hon. member, he said that conduct of that sort was most contemptible and despicable.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: The hon. member for Port Curtis knew something about that business.

Mr. KESSELL: What was that?

Mr. BARBER: He said that such actions were of a sneak-thief character.

Mr. KESSELL: Make your first statement.

Mr. BARBER: He could bring officers of the Railway Department to prove what he said. He could bring one of the leading officers and his secretary. He had been there twice and was told that the member for Port Curtis had claimed it, and he (Mr. Barber) would take their word against that of the hon. member.

Mr. KESSELL: To what are you referring?

Mr. BARBER: To correspondence that did not belong to the hon. gentleman;

correspondence which he (Mr. Barber) had left at the Railway Department, and which the hon. gentleman had claimed.

Mr. KESSELL: What kind of correspondence? Tell me the correspondence.

Mr. BARBER: That was not creditable to a member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must call on the hon. member to address himself to the amendment.

Mr. KESSELL: Mr. Stodart, I rise to a point of order. Is this irresponsible noodle from Bundaberg—(loud laughter and disorder)—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the language which he has used.

Mr. KESSELL: I withdraw.

Mr. BARBER: The hon. gentleman wanted to know what correspondence it was, and he would tell him.

Mr. KESSELL: I rise to a point of order. (Uproar.)

Mr. THEODORE: He does not rise to points of order; he rises to insult hon. members.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member rises to a point of order, I must ask him to put his point of order in parliamentary language.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and disorder.

Mr. KESSELL: Then I say that the hon. member must put his statements in parliamentary language also. (Renewed uproar.)

Mr. KIRWAN: That is dictation to the Chair.

Mr. KESSELL: Is the hon. member for Bundaberg in order in saying that I stole letters—

Mr. KIRWAN: He never said anything of the kind.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: He said "purloined."

Mr. KESSELL: He said "purloined" letters—that I claimed letters from the Railway Department belonging to somebody else. I absolutely deny it.

Mr. BARBER: He repeated the statement. (Continued uproar.)

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman was not in order, and I ask him to withdraw his statement. I understood him to say that the hon. member for Port Curtis went to the Railway Department and purloined correspondence from the hon. member.

Mr. BARBER: He had the statement of the Railway Department officers.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. RYAN: Withdraw "purloined," and say "claimed."

Mr. BARBER: He would say that the hon. member claimed it.

Mr. KESSELL: Mr. Stodart, I insist on that goat withdrawing that statement. (Loud laughter, and disorder.)

Mr. BARBER: He went to the Railway Department and certain correspondence—

The CHAIRMAN rose amidst great disorder and asked members to observe order.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I rise to a point of order.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member resume his seat. I gave my ruling on the point of order, and I ask the hon. member for Bundaberg to withdraw the statement that correspondence was purloined by an hon. member.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Ask the hon. member for Port Curtis to withdraw.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. BARBER: If the word "purloined" was objected to, he would withdraw it and say that the hon. member claimed correspondence that did not belong to him.

Mr. KESSELL: To what are you referring?

Mr. BARBER: To correspondence that the hon. member had in his possession.

Mr. BERTRAM: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Port Curtis in order in referring to the hon. member for Bundaberg as a "goat"? (Loud laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. BERTRAM: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Stodart.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Port Curtis used that expression, he was certainly out of order and should withdraw.

Mr. KESSELL: I withdraw.

Mr. BARBER: However, he would get away from that question and say that the hon. member claimed it.

Mr. KESSELL: What are you referring to?

Mr. BARBER: To correspondence that was in the possession of the Railway Department in reference to the Gooburrum crossing.

Mr. KESSELL: I asked half a dozen members to whom it belonged. (Uproar.) That is an absolute misstatement.

Mr. BARBER: The hon. gentleman claimed it. (Disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask members to keep order.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Bundaberg in order in discussing this matter in reference to the purloining or claiming of a letter? Has that reference to the amendment before the Committee?

Mr. BARBER: He would advise the hon. member for South Brisbane not to try the game of bluff.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order. I am trying to keep order as well as I can, but hon. members do not seem to obey my calls. I hope they will assist me to maintain order.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: He intended to support the amendment and he could give a number of reasons why he was going to do so. Listening to the Premier and other hon. members that afternoon, one would think that it was only members on the Labour side of the House who called upon the supporters of their movement to supply

Mr. Barber.]

funds for their political campaigns. Last session and the session before, on the Address in Reply, he produced documents or copies of circulars that had been sent to large landowners, commercial men, and practically all leading men in the different centres of Australia calling on them to subscribe so much per head of their employees. He had there a copy of a circular issued by the Liberal Association of New South Wales, which asked the people to whom it was sent to supply funds. It was issued on the 1st of August last year, when they launched forth on their campaign. That was a sample—a sample similar to that he produced last year from South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in referring to these matters.

Mr. BARBER: Well, the Premier referred to those things. From the discussion, one would think that it was only Labour supporters who subscribed funds for [7 p.m.] an election campaign; but it was well known that the organisations of the fusion party on the other side called upon their members and supporters to subscribe to their funds. It would be very interesting to know who was finding the £25 or £26 a week to run the Brisbane office of the Liberal organisation, of which the organ of the party opposite complained last Sunday.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You spent more than that in Bundaberg.

Mr. BARBER: He was never lucky enough to have it to spend. He was not associated with a party like the hon. gentleman, whose local organisation—the Australian Sugar Planters' Association—subscribed £50 to the party funds during the late Federal campaign. That was only one item, and yet the money was expended in such a manner that the secretary of the People's Progressive League in Bundaberg threatened to institute legal proceedings to secure her salary before she left.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They do not get money as easily as you.

Mr. BARBER: When the Australian Sugar Planters' Association paid in a cheque for £50, he should say they got it fairly easy. All the fusion party had to do was to intimate to their supporters that they were a bit short of funds, and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and all the big trusts and monopolies poured money into their exchequer in thousands of pounds. There was a great deal of noise, criticism, and bluff about a certain document, but hon. members on the other side had not proved that it was stolen, as they asserted.

The HOME SECRETARY: The owner of the document says it was stolen. What more do you want?

Mr. BARBER: Of course the owner of the document said it was stolen! To show how easy it was for the party opposite to secure funds, only a few weeks ago the statement was made by a prominent member of the party in Melbourne that during the Federal campaign he wired £500 to a certain district in Western Australia to enable their candidate to win the seat, and he was honest enough to say that he would do it again. And yet they made all this talk about the few pounds that the Labour party was able

[Mr. Barber.

to collect! In a State electorate the sum of £75 should be sufficient to enable a candidate to carry on a considerable amount of political work. He intended to support the amendment.

Mr. KESSELL (*Port Curtis*): The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that he (Mr. Kessell) "purloined" some correspondence. The hon. member had to withdraw that statement, and then he said that he (Mr. Kessell) "claimed" it. Well, he did not claim that correspondence. Fortunately he had the correspondence at his hotel, and he would read the letter he received from the Railway Department—

"Brisbane, 11th September, 1913.

"J. H. Kessell, Esq., M.L.A., Parliament House, Brisbane.

"Sir,—With reference to your call at this office regarding an application for an increase in wages, gatekeeper, Gooburrum—I beg to inform you that the gatekeeper is being kept in mind for an increase when the Estimates are passed."

When he received that letter, he did not know to what it referred. In a big electorate like Port Curtis he had several communications from railway employees, and, knowing that Gooburrum was somewhere near the southern end of his electorate, he asked the hon. member for Burnett, and the Secretary for Agriculture, whose electorates adjoined Port Curtis, to try to find out whom the letter referred to. He did not think for a moment of inquiring of the hon. member for Bundaberg, as he did not think anybody would be foolish enough to go to the hon. member for Bundaberg for anything. He was absent for some ten days in his electorate—he was not like the hon. member for Bundaberg, who lived in Brisbane—and unfortunately he had to go to Sydney last week on urgent private business, otherwise he would have attended to that letter.

Mr. THEODORE: That is no excuse for taking the hon. member's correspondence.

Mr. KESSELL: He did not take the hon. member's correspondence. He should have referred the correspondence to the Railway Department, as it did not belong to him; but he would like to point out to the hon. member for Bundaberg that a business man would have something on his correspondence to connect it with him. If the hon. member's name had appeared in the correspondence, the Railway Department would have sent the letter to the hon. member. For the hon. member to attribute sinister motives to him in such a paltry matter was a scandalous abuse of the privileges of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member should not do more than make a personal explanation.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The letter was sent to you by the Railway Department?

Mr. KESSELL: He was endeavouring to point out that there was possibly some defect on his part—that he should have sent it back to the Railway Department. He wished to find out to whom it referred. If the hon. member for Bundaberg had come to him, as he should have done, and said that the correspondence referred to him as a member of the House, he would have returned it. The correspondence was absolutely of no use, and to get up and impute motives to

an hon. member other than the highest showed that the hon. member had a mind like a sewer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BARBER said that he was assured by the officials at the office that the hon. member claimed the correspondence as his.

Mr. KESSELL: That is an absolute misstatement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BARBER: The hon. member had not put the position correctly.

Mr. KESSELL: I have.

Mr. BARBER: He had made a very lame excuse. He (Mr. Barber) took a covering letter with that correspondence, on the promise that a report would be obtained on the matter referred to, and brought the covering letter away. Subsequently, he went to find out what had been done in the matter, and to ask for the correspondence, and the officers told him that the hon. member for Port Curtis claimed it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the hon. member making a personal explanation?

Mr. BARBER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: He should have asked leave to do so. I will allow him to do so.

Mr. BARBER: The officials in the department assured him that the hon. member for Port Curtis had claimed that correspondence.

Mr. KESSELL: I do not believe it.

Mr. BARBER: The hon. gentleman had made a most miserable excuse.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BARBER: The hon. member knew where the Gooburrum Crossing was. He knew it was not in the Port Curtis electorate, but that it was in the Bundaberg electorate.

Mr. KESSELL: I did not.

Mr. BARBER: Had he (Mr. Barber) received correspondence belonging to another member, he should have immediately handed it over to the owner. If the hon. member did not know where the Gooburrum Crossing was he ought to know.

Several honourable members interjecting,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under the Standing Orders interjections are disorderly. I want hon. members to understand that I cannot allow these continual interjections, otherwise I shall never be able to maintain order. I will do my best to avoid any disorder.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: During the course of the debate this afternoon the best arguments had been given by the Government and their supporters why this amendment should be carried. They had been telling the Committee all the afternoon that the Labour party in Queensland—and they referred to the Labour party in the Commonwealth—had money in their hands for every call. What objection could they have to this amendment which provided that a candidate at every State election would be limited to the expenditure of £75? The Premier must have spent an hour that afternoon describing what an enormous amount of money the supporters of the Labour party were compelled to contribute, and all such nonsense

as that. He had sat here all the afternoon listening to the ridiculous statements of the Premier, and the hon. gentlemen on the front Treasury bench, in reference to the rules of Labour organisations, and about this stolen letter.

The PREMIER: That question was not raised by this side at all.

Mr. PAYNE: In his opinion it was raised on that side. One hon. member deliberately accused this side of the House of being associated with thieves. His honest opinion about that letter was exactly the same as about a letter he held in his hand, which was handed to him a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Aubigny. He was not going to compliment the hon. member for Aubigny, but he would just as soon take his word as that of any man on the opposite side of the House. He was one of those men whose word could be taken, and a few minutes ago he came over to him (Mr. Payne) and said, "I picked this up on the balcony; it belongs to Mr. Hardacre." That was exactly what had happened in regard to the other letter.

The HOME SECRETARY: Someone picked it up, and retained it.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: The hon. member for Aubigny did not use that, because he was honest.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call hon. members to order for interjecting.

Mr. PAYNE: They had heard a great deal about that letter. There was no party that had ever been in power that had played so low down as the Liberal party in the Commonwealth Parliament. He had seen a pamphlet circulated all through the Wide Bay electorate stating that Mr. Fisher was connected with a big company that had taken up a lot of land in Western Australia, and that gentleman had never had an inch of land. It was some other man of the name of Fisher who had taken up the land. Was there anything as low down as that?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must keep to the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE: It would be just as well if the Premier and the Home Secretary, and their colleagues on the front Treasury bench, would hold their tongues about misrepresentation. If he cared, he could take up hours in reading facts about the most deliberate misstatements. They would see the Liberal supporters with a card at polling-booths which stated, "If you do not vote this way your vote will be informal." The Labour candidate's name was scratched clean out, and their candidate left in. Talk about misrepresentation, about low down tricks! They talked about the old conservative party, which the hon. member for Townsville was associated with, but that party never played as low down as the present Government did.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. PAYNE: He would continue, because he had been sitting in his place all the afternoon without saying anything. Knowing what he did know, and seeing what he did see, it ill became the Premier and Home Secretary to talk about the Labour party.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have never said a word.

Mr. Payne.]

Mr. PAYNE: The hon. gentleman talked about the misrepresentation of the Labour party. The Labour party was the only party that had been before the public for the last twenty years that had got a clean programme to put before the people, and they were prepared to stand by it. When Mr. Sumner was standing for the election for Brisbane North—

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: What has this got to do with the amendment?

The PREMIER rose to a point of order. Standing Order 255 read—

“When a clause or amendment is under discussion, a member speaking shall confine himself to the matter of that clause or amendment.”

From the time the hon. member had risen to speak he had not touched on the amendment at all. His point of order was that the hon. member had not touched on the amendment, when the Standing Order said he should do so.

Mr. RYAN wished to speak on the point of order. He held that the hon. member for Mitchell was in order. He was surprised at the Chief Secretary raising such a point of order, seeing that he sat still when the hon. member for Toowong characterised hon. members on the Opposition side as the associates of thieves. Now he desired to prevent hon. members from replying. He trusted that the point of order would not be pressed, seeing that the hon. member allowed other members to make the most extravagant charges he had ever listened to in the House, and which he hoped to have an opportunity of referring to later on.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that hon. members have been very much to blame for the way they have avoided the question. I am not saying that hon. members from one side or the other are to blame, as I think that both sides are to blame very much, and I have the greatest difficulty in keeping members to the point before the Committee, although I have tried my best to do so. I have already explained that to the Committee. I shall insist now on the Standing Orders being adhered to with regard to interjections and keeping to the question. I think it is high time that hon. members kept to the question before the Committee. I do not think that the hon. member for Mitchell strayed away from the question any more than any other hon. members, and I do not say that the hon. member is out of order after what has taken place. I would ask hon. members to pay some respect to the Chair, and keep to the question before the Committee.

Mr. PAYNE: He would keep to the amendment. He thought that £75 should be sufficient to spend on an election. There were plenty of people without money, and he did not know it was a crime to be without money.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a misfortune.

Mr. PAYNE: Was the Home Secretary any better off to-day because he could sign a cheque for a few thousand pounds?

The HOME SECRETARY: I wish I could do so.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. PAYNE: Have I exhausted all my time?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

[Mr. Payne.]

Mr. PAYNE: Then it was taken up by the Premier and others arguing the point. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN supported the amendment. A very good example had been set by the Federal Parliament in limiting the amount of the expenditure at an election. There was no doubt that members opposite received more assistance from the money powers than members now in Opposition, and they were much more effectively able to do their work with the money they received than what members in Opposition could do. A good deal had been said about union supporters and their contributions to political funds. They heard the Chief Secretary and the hon. member for Toowong say that they did not object to industrial unionism at all. He had heard that story for years in the House, but he reminded hon. members that Sir Hugh Nelson gave them some good advice which they had acted upon. They had had industrial turmoils in 1891, and Sir Hugh Nelson advised them to get direct representation in Parliament. They took that advice; hence the trouble on the other side. It was all because they had grown so strong. In his opinion, trade unionism was not worth a twopenny rap unless it was alive politically. He had never hidden that from any platform from which he had spoken. He knew the time when trades unionists were fined for discussing political matters in their lodge rooms. There were few trade unions in Queensland that did not recognise that they could only get their reforms through their party in Parliament. It had been suggested by hon. members opposite that a large amount of money had been subscribed by trade unionists for political purposes. The trade unions recognised to-day that political action was necessary. The organisers had work to do both industrially and politically. They had their Labour papers, and they gave subsidies to them, particularly to the “Worker,” to which they subscribed 5s. per member per year. They did that because the paper disseminated the views which they believed in. Did hon. gentlemen object to that?

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes; when it is compulsory.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman would have them believe that everything he did was done voluntarily. They passed laws and compelled people to abide [7.30 p.m.] by them, and even in the House the Chairman compelled members to obey the Standing Orders laid down for keeping order. The hon. member for Murilla stated that the Fortitude Valley election cost some hundreds of pounds. It did not cost more than £70. It was the same in many other electorates. It did not cost the Labour members so much, because whereas in the case of Liberal members they had an army of men and women workers who had to be paid, in the case of the workers for the Labour member it was a labour of love with them, and they gave their assistance without any monetary recompense at all. The hon. member for Murrumba and the Premier gave quotations from the reports of officials as to the expenditure of trade union money, and he would give a quotation himself from “Australia's Awakening,” by Mr. W. G. Spence, the president of the Amalgamated Workers' Union of Australia. Mr. Spence said—

“To return to the economic. In order to present in a concrete form the monetary gain, I have taken the number of

sheep in the four States in which the union has hitherto operated. Making a deduction for those slaughtered unshorn, I find the average per year about 76,000,000. I have taken the last twenty-one years."

"Making allowance for actual increase in shearing rates, abolition of second price, saving in cost of rations, etc., and adding on the gain to shed hands in wages, together with the direct return in union benefits beforementioned, the total gain for twenty-one years in round figures reaches about £4,000,000. For this shearers in Southern States have paid £12 17s. 6d., and shed hands £7 15s.; in the aggregate £306,329, including Queensland. The gain to the shearer would be about £1 per week on the average. The shed hands in Queensland organised about the same time as the shearers, but in the Southern States they did not unite till 1890. In Victoria-Riverina they did not rally into the union until 1900. Since that date their increase in wages can safely be stated as 10s. per week per man. The gain in South Australia would be similar. The gain in other States is not quite so much on the average, but is not less than 5s. per week in any case. Taken all round, the gain would be from 5s. to 10s. per week above what the employers wanted to cut it down to. We must also never forget the fact that the rate offered in the face of an existing organisation is itself much higher than it would be under full 'freedom of contract,' as desired by employers."

There was a statement from a man who had perhaps the best all-round knowledge of any individual in Australia regarding trade unions, and who held the honoured position of president of the whole of Australia. Yet members opposite said the men got no benefit from the unions, and that the money subscribed by them was used for political purposes. He was glad that unionists had at last recognised that they had to fight politically in order to undo the work which was being done in that House at the present time by the Government and their supporters. This Elections Bill would make them more determined than ever to fight.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BOWMAN: It was true that they were going to fight.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not the question before the Committee.

Mr. BOWMAN: No; the question before the Committee was that the election expenses of a candidate should be limited to £75. But £75 would not stop them fighting, for he believed that the passing of this Bill would stir up every man and every woman in Queensland to do their duty more than ever they had been stirred up before.

Mr. TROUT: Why all these tears, then?

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member might shed a few tears at the next election, and he hoped to lend a hand in making him shed a few tears. (Hear, hear!) During this debate a remark was made by the hon. member for Toowong respecting the leader of the Opposition. He (Mr. Bowman) had never heard such a disgraceful remark made in the House before, as that in which the hon. member for Toowong said the leader of

the Opposition was an associate of thieves. It only showed how far a man could get down into the political gutter as the hon. member for Toowong had done that afternoon in attributing such a thing to the leader of the Labour party. He was certain that the remark would do no harm to the leader of the Opposition, but that, on the contrary, it would remain a serious reflection on the character of the gentleman who made it.

At 7.35 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under Standing Order No. 11 I call upon the hon. member for Bremer to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. CRIBB took the chair accordingly.

Mr. THEODORE (*Chillago*) believed in the amendment, because he thought it would make for clean politics, and would enable them to have a system which would, perhaps, prevent corruption, and which would certainly tend to prevent intimidation and coercion in the matter of extorting money. The Liberal Association gave facilities for extorting money from their supporters, or from people whom they thought should be their supporters. He had in his hand a letter issued by a Liberal association, in which certain rules were laid down in connection with the collecting of money for the assistance of candidates. It amounted to an attempt to compel business men to contribute and to fleece farmers. He should like some of the alleged representatives of the farmers in that House to follow closely his reading of an extract from that letter, particularly as this Liberal association had adopted the land tax, and was putting it into active operation. The letter was issued last year.

The PREMIER: Where is it taken from?

Mr. THEODORE: It was issued to supposed supporters of the Liberal party, consisting of business men, farmers, and others.

The PREMIER: In Queensland?

Mr. THEODORE: It was issued by a Liberal association. If the hon. gentleman liked, he would hand the letter over to him. The letter said—

"It is not desirable or right that the funds of the Liberal party in the electorates should be contributed by a limited number of subscribers. What is required is that each Liberal supporter should take an interest in the Liberal organisation, and in the same way as he insures himself, his house, or his property against death or accident, so should he contribute to his political organisation. It is an insurance against the far-reaching effects of class and socialistic legislation."

The PREMIER: That was not issued in Queensland.

Mr. THEODORE: The hon. gentleman did not like this information.

"Infinite pains have been taken to draft an equitable basis upon which to appeal for contributions."

The PREMIER: You have time to waste in reading deceitful documents.

At this point several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. THEODORE: Now that the Chairman had restored order, he would proceed. In this equitable arrangement the association had adopted a land tax, and their proposal

Mr. Theodore.]

with regard to contributions was as follows:—Under table A, holders of land up to and including 100 acres were to pay at the rate of 1s. per year, and the maximum contribution was fixed at £15 15s. Under Table B, holders of land up to and including 500 acres were to pay 8s. per year, maximum amount £15 15s. Under Table C business people were to pay a minimum of 5s. and a maximum of £10 10s. Under Table D subscribers other than business people or property-owners, were to pay a minimum of 1s., maximum 10s.; under Table E property-owners were to pay a minimum of 5s., maximum £5 5s.; and under Table F dairy farmers, orchardists, and viticulturists were to pay a minimum of 5s., maximum £5 5s. That compulsory tax was to be levied on dairymen and other primary producers.

Mr. TROUT: Is that in Western Australia?

Mr. THEODORE: If the hon. member wanted more information like this, he would supply it to him. The Liberal associations of Australia were one and indivisible; there was no difference between the Liberals of Queensland and the Liberals of New South Wales. They were the same. Surely, hon. members opposite did not attempt to repudiate the Liberal associations in New South Wales or any other State? It was the great Liberal association that adopted that method of bullying the farmers, and fleecing the primary producers, in order to do what? To support the Liberal candidates at election time. If they limited a candidate's expenses to £75, there would be no necessity to intimidate the farmers, dairymen, viticulturists, and other primary producers. The amendment was one that should commend itself to the Committee, and the Committee should accept it.

The PREMIER: Question!

Mr. FIELLY: Mr. Cribb—

The PREMIER: More obstruction.

Mr. FIELLY was astonished at the interjection of the Premier.

The PREMIER: More deliberate obstruction.

Mr. FIELLY: How could the Opposition be accused of obstruction when Government members in the corner had been making personal explanations all the afternoon? He hoped they were not going to have a repetition of the scene that took place before tea, when the member for Toowong gave an edifying spectacle of how a gentleman could keep his feet in the gutter.

The HOME SECRETARY: He objects to having his correspondence stolen. We all object to that.

Mr. HUNTER: He does not object to vilifying the Opposition.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Cairns said he could produce the original.

Mr. FIELLY: They knew that a good deal of the political funds of the Government side came from the United Pastoralists' Association. The United Pastoralists' Association believed in the gospel of the Liberal party, and he (Mr. Fihelly) could show where the president of the United Pastoralists' Association stole a document, and he had to admit it on the floor of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He did not steal it.

[Mr. Theodore.

Mr. FIELLY: He used the word "stole" in the sense in which it was used by the hon. member for Toowong. He (Mr. Fihelly) was not a dictionary. He was not giving his own definition of the meaning of "stole"; he was giving the definition supplied by the hon. member for Toowong, who was competent to fill any lexicographer's place. The president of the United Pastoralists' Association appropriated a Bill which should have been presented to the House, and gave that Bill to the papers in a most peculiar manner. It got a public servant into serious trouble, and then when that public servant was on the point of being dismissed, he owned up to it.

The TREASURER: He was man enough to admit it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: John Cameron's word would be taken as soon as that of anybody else.

Mr. FIELLY did not know why hon. members opposite put themselves on such a pedestal. They were constituting themselves judges of all kinds of people. It was an extraordinary situation. If hon. members opposite wanted to hear what the President of the United Pastoralists' Association said, he would read it to them. There was some trouble about getting the thing introduced, and the Premier objected very strongly to the discussion, but eventually Mr. Cameron said—

"In connection with the matter of which I have given notice, I have been informed to-day that a prominent and highly respected public servant is likely to suffer serious injury through the publication of the document referred to in my letter [Mr. Burrows: Someone ought to suffer.] I am not going into that just now. Now, I think it is just as well that the House and the public should know the exact facts regarding the matter, and, as far as I am concerned, no person in the community, whether he be a public servant or otherwise, will suffer injury through any action of mine. Now, I published that document."

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. FIELLY: He would take another five minutes. That Bill which ought to have been laid on the table of the House was dropped.

Mr. MORGAN: What has that to do with the amendment?

Mr. FIELLY: He was explaining that the man who made that explanation was the person who supplied the funds to the Liberal party to carry on the campaign, and he would remind the hon. member for Murilla that he was one of the disgruntled people who complained because he did not get enough money from those funds.

Mr. MORGAN: That is a deliberate lie.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. MORGAN: What I said is that the statement was a deliberate lie.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member withdraw?

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw, and I think the hon. member should withdraw the statement.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order! Sit down!

Mr. FIDELLY said his time was being frittered away—

Mr. MORGAN rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order in saying that he (Mr. Morgan) objected because he did not get funds from the association to fight his political battle?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

Mr. FIDELLY: He was interrupted in the same manner that Mr. Cameron was. Mr. Cameron went on to state how he became possessed of that document and how he had it published in a paper before any member of the House had an opportunity of seeing it. He (Mr. Fidelity) agreed with the amendment in every detail, as it would make for cleaner politics and less corruption.

Mr. MORGAN: There would be less corruption if they could get you outside the House.

Mr. FIDELLY: He had evidently got on the nerves of the hon. member.

Mr. MORGAN: You are the dirtiest politician in the House.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. FIDELLY: He would not ask the hon. member to withdraw, because they knew the hon. member's reputation.

Mr. MORGAN: You will not say that outside the House.

Mr. FIDELLY: You make me quite nervous. They knew that condemnation from the hon. member was really praise in another form.

Mr. MORGAN: My reputation is better than yours.

Mr. FIDELLY: It could not be worse than yours, anyhow. Before he finished, he would bring under the notice of the Committee that, from what had been said by hon. members opposite, the Labour party were financed by three or four millionaires, and that they represented the rich party, while hon. members opposite represented the hardworking man who could not afford to give them a bawbee, but, peculiarly enough, they were standing for something more than £75, and, notwithstanding the thousands of pounds coming in from their organisations, the Labour party wanted the election expenses cut down. The hon. member for Toowong said he could not carry out an election under £250. What a contrast to the hon. member for Brisbane, whose election cost £25. More than 1,000 per cent. He was sorry hon. members opposite had to assess the various business people. He had seen circulars and had received complaints from business people. He saw one circular where a man was assessed at £10, and another circular where a man was assessed at double that amount, and so on. They were assessed according to the value of the business of the individual. Those circulars came out, and the People's Progressive League secretaries, in between fighting forlorn hopes and fighting plebiscites, waxed fat on it.

Question—That a new clause to follow clause 24 be inserted (*Mr. Adamson's amendment*)—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 24.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" Lennon
" Coyne	" May
" Fidelity	" McCormack
" Foley	" Murphy
" Gillies	" O'Sullivan
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Hardeacre	" Ryan
" Hunter	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. Gillies and Mr. Kirwan.	

NOES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Bobbington	" Mackay
" Blair	" Mackintosh
" Bouchard	" Morgan
" Bridges	" Paget
" Corser, B. H.	" Petrie
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Philp
" Denham	" Swayne
" Douglas	" Tolmie
" Forsyth	" Trout
" Grant	" Vowles
" Grayson	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White
Tellers: Mr. Kessell and Mr. Morgan.	

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Gilday. No—Mr. Walker.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. FIDELLY desired to move an amendment at this stage. He fancied that in a way it would radically alter the whole trend of the Bill, if accepted. He hoped that the hon. gentleman would accept it, and to save a lot of discussion amongst those persons who liked to obstruct, he would read it first, so that the hon. gentleman could consider it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is it printed?

Mr. FIDELLY: Unfortunately it was not. He had been very busy during the last few days and had not had time to have it printed. His amendment was a new clause to follow clause 24—

"No electoral expense shall be incurred or authorised except in respect of the following matters:—

- (1) Printing, advertising, publishing, issuing, and distributing addresses by the candidate, and notices of meetings.
- (2) Stationery, messages, postages, and telegrams.
- (3) Committee rooms.
- (4) Public meetings and halls therefor.
- (5) Scrutineers.

'Electoral expense' includes all expenses incurred by or on behalf of or in the interests of any candidate at or in connection with any election, excepting only the purchasing of electoral rolls and the personal and reasonable living and travelling expenses of the candidate."

The amendment had been devised mainly with the intention of not permitting one candidate simply to overwhelm another by money power. During the last debate they heard of the various sources of revenue of hon. members opposite, and if they could only curtail their printing, their advertising,

Mr. Fidelity.]

their publishing and issue of addresses, they would be conferring a benefit on the State, because there was little doubt that at election time, organisations, particularly Liberal organisations, worried the people with unnecessary literature. Some of it was not only involved and incoherent, but also contained unduly long sentences.

The HOME SECRETARY: I thought that you were an advocate of the "Kathleen Mavourneen" sentence. (Laughter.)

Mr. FIHELLY: The hon. gentleman must be an authority on it, because he was continually coming back. At any rate, that literature was not calculated to raise the moral tone of the public, and it would be a good thing if it were restricted in some way. He had explained that in his contest he could not get about in the northern part of his electorate on account of the literature that was circulated. Immediately you tried to do any personal canvassing, you found it floating round the back yards and stopping up the gates, and almost before you got the gate open the dog had you by the leg. (Loud laughter.) Then he came to a more important matter. Advertising should certainly be curtailed. It was hardly fair

at election times to find the daily [8 p.m.] papers filled with photographs and huge flowing autobiographies of the fine looking gentlemen opposite. They were told of the mighty deeds those hon. members had done in the past, and that and the photographs in conjunction were apt to mislead the electors, who were prone to imbibe what was inferred—if not exactly said—by newspapers. When they saw those things, they imagined that a candidate was a gifted genius; they credited him with virtues that he did not possess, and all that militated against the unfortunate Labour candidate. He admitted, as before, that the Labour candidate had the backing of two or three millionaires and that he received thousands of pounds from various unions; but that was not sufficient to get his advertisements and photographs into the papers. With regard to the third item—postages, telegrams, and so on—in the Labour movement they could not afford to bother about postages or telegrams. The Premier was so much worried at the last election that he had to wire £200 out to Barcoo for a certain person to oppose the leader of the Opposition, but Labour candidates had not time for that sort of thing, and they wanted to curtail expenditure in that direction. The next item was committee rooms. All the metropolitan Labour members knew the difficulty there was in getting suitable committee rooms. Representatives of democracy were in a difficulty all the time in not being able to outbid the other fellow, and it would be a healthy thing if expenditure in that respect were curtailed. With regard to expenditure on public meetings and halls it was needless for him to expatiate on that. The public halls were bought up and monopolised, and Labour invariably had to hire a gin case and an acetylene lamp and do the best it could under the circumstances. That alone should appeal to the Home Secretary. Perhaps at this stage he might stop and ascertain from the hon. gentleman whether he was prepared to accept the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am going to listen seriously to argument in support of it.

Mr. FIHELLY: The same argument applied with regard to the limiting of

[Mr. Fihelly.

expenditure on scrutineers that applied to advertising. The interpretation of "electoral expenses" was comprehensive. It included "all expenses incurred by or on behalf, or in the interests of any candidate." He was sure that hon. members would welcome some definition of the kind, so that they would know what expenses they might legitimately incur, because he was certain that none of them would intentionally commit a breach of the law. He trusted that the amendment would find a great deal of favour on the other side—if not with the Home Secretary, at least with the rank and file.

Mr. THEODORE thought it would be a good thing if the amendment were accepted and if it were supplemented by additional amendments which would make the thing complete. It was an excellent idea to lay down what should be considered legitimate expenses, and confine candidates to those expenses. The principle was sound, and it would place all candidates on the same footing so far as expenses were concerned. It was not a good thing that the moneyed candidate should be given an advantage over all other candidates, because it did not follow that the man with money would make a good legislator. He was inclined to think that the Home Secretary personally favoured such a limitation of expenses and the objects upon which money might be expended, but the hon. gentleman was so anxious to get to clause 59, so that he could move those retrogressive amendments which he had circulated, that he was apt to give too little consideration to amendments moved earlier in the Bill. That was probably the frame of mind that the hon. gentleman found himself in.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The amendments that he has printed are progressive.

Mr. THEODORE did not know in what direction they were progressive. He wished that they had a chance of discussing them. But, as showing how rotten they were, the Premier proposed to guillotine them through to-night at 10 o'clock, so that they would not have a discussion on them. The amendment of the hon. member for Paddington must appeal to the good sense of the Committee, and would make for cleaner elections. It would certainly prevent corruption.

Mr. RYAN: Before the question went through he trusted that the Home Secretary would rise in his place and make some answer to the very intelligent amendment moved by the hon. member for Paddington. They had had a lot of discussion about the matter of expense at elections during the debate on the last question. Now they had taken a different line, and were asking that expenditure should be confined to certain things. If they could not limit the amount, let them limit the direction in which money could be expended, so that any money which might be expended on behalf of candidates would be spent in a way which was proper for the promotion of the interests of the party to which the candidate happened to belong. It seemed to him that the Government had determined to accept no amendments on any lines which would enable them to place a limit on any money which they might spend in order to have their candidates returned; so that all the talk about the amount of money spent, and so forth, had been idle. It had shown the hollow pretence of the

Government in the allegations they had made against this party and those who supported this party. During the debate on the last proposed new clause, a discussion arose over a certain document. Anything with regard to that document might be as properly said on this motion as on the other, because they were dealing with the manner in which funds might be used. So far, he had heard no explanation as to the source of the fund from which the subsidy referred to in that document came. He did not wish to press the Chief Secretary to give an explanation now, but he only referred to it because the hon. member for Toowong went out of his way to make certain references to him (Mr. Ryan) and his party—

The PREMIER interjected.

Mr. RYAN: At a time when his time for speaking had expired. He had no opportunity of replying, and he had no doubt the hon. member was aware of that at the time, and took the opportunity of it that he did.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: He is not built that way.

Mr. RYAN: However, the hon. member chose to refer to him as an associate of thieves, and he chose to refer to the hon. member for Maranoa as being an associate of thieves.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member is right in discussing that. He must confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. RYAN: He was proposing to show that he was not the associate of thieves, and he was prepared to leave it to the people of Queensland to say who was right or wrong on that matter. Whether he was in order or out of order, he was not going to allow a statement of that sort to be made in that House without replying.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are going to defy the Chair.

Mr. RYAN was not going to defy the Chair, but he was going to find a way through the Standing Orders so that he would be able to reply to that statement. He was not going to have a charge of that sort made, and sit silent under it. He had lived for a good many years in Queensland and in other parts of Australia, and he defied any man to point a finger of scorn at his career in any way, and yet he was told here that, because he happened to be the leader of the Labour party, he was the associate of thieves. That was the only reason—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member had his chance when the Speaker was in the chair. He must speak to the question before the House.

Mr. RYAN: The Speaker could not take any notice of what happened in Committee. He was satisfied that the Committee would allow him to make a personal explanation, and he asked leave to do so.

The PREMIER: Now you are coming at it properly.

Mr. RYAN: He would find a way—make no mistake about that—he could look after himself.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Are hon. members willing that the leader of the Opposition should have leave to make a personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Don't you think you ought to wait till the hon. member for Toowong is here?

Mr. RYAN: It is his place to be here; let him come in. He (Mr. Ryan) was in his place, and he took the opportunity of making a personal explanation when he could. The hon. member was in the precincts of the House—send someone for him; he would only be too pleased to see him in his place, as it would give him (Mr. Ryan) a little more ginger to reply to him. (Laughter.) If he had not been the leader of this party, if he had been simply outside Parliament—a supporter of the Liberal party practising at the bar and making efforts to get a big brief which his firm could distribute—such statements as that would never be made, he would be a white-haired boy—but because he happened to belong to this party and be an associate of this party that accusation was made against him. He was glad that he was in good company.

The PREMIER: The Committee only gave leave for a personal explanation.

Mr. RYAN: The hon. gentleman must not try to gag him from making his explanation. The hon. gentleman referred to the hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Finlayson, and said that he had suggested that this money—this subsidy—was obtained out of the consolidated revenue of Queensland. He did not think that that was so, but he did remember once seeing a letter in the Brisbane Press written by the hon. member for Toowong, in which he published notes that he had taken of a conversation which he had with the hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Finlayson; and, like the pettifogging lawyer which he was, he had made notes at the time.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: That is a nice personal explanation.

Mr. RYAN: He was ashamed when he looked and saw the private conversation he had with Mr. Finlayson in the street. The hon. member made notes of what happened at the time and put them in as his notes of the conversation. Who was going to prove that they were not the conversation, or that the notes he took were the notes of the conversation? That was the kind of tactics that they got from the hon. member for Toowong, the legal adviser of many big companies, which very often had some legislation before the House affecting their interests.

The HOME SECRETARY: He cannot be a pettifogger, then.

Mr. RYAN was quite satisfied that any words he used were parliamentary, and he thought that the occasion on which he was now speaking demanded that he should say what he felt—and he was not afraid to say what he felt. He did not care for the firm of solicitors that had the biggest briefs in Australia or the biggest interests in Australia. He was here in the interests of the people, and he was not going to fail in his duty when an occasion of this sort arose. The hon. gentleman had been a failure. An attempt had been made to boom him in certain quarters. He had been a failure as a politician, a failure as Secretary for Lands, and he had now come down to this. Could there have been a more villainous, more vicious, more vitriolic, or more venomous personal attack made on any man than to say that he would be an associate of thieves? He trusted that his record was honourable. They could look through the list of fees from

Mr. Ryan.]

the Queensland Government, and they would not find ls. in the last return, or in the offices, and they could look through the fees of the Commonwealth Labour Government for years while they were in power, while he was the leader of this party and while he was practising at the bar, and not ls. from the Labour Government ever came into his hands by way of fees. He felt very strongly on this matter—to think that an hon. member could come in and make such an attack as that. He had appealed to him at the time, as a man, to withdraw it, and, instead of that, he repeated it. He would let hon. members know what he said as soon as he saw that document. As soon as he saw a fac-simile of the letter in the paper—and many Liberals could bear out what he said, as they rode in the train with him from Auchenflower when that letter was published and was being discussed—from the moment he first saw it he said at once that he was satisfied that it was not the consolidated revenue that was referred to in the letter. He had always said that, and he said it again now. If he did not say that, he would not be an honourable man. He said it on every occasion that he had an opportunity of speaking on it, and he completely exonerated the Chief Secretary and the hon. member himself from spending any of the consolidated revenue in that subsidy. Although he said that, he should be sorry to be associated with such a suggestion as that, still he thought the Government were called upon to state from what fund it came. He did not want to force the Premier to make a personal explanation if he did not think this was the occasion.

The PREMIER unwillingly rose to a point of order and called attention to a ruling by "May." He had not the least objection to the Hon. the leader of the Opposition dealing with the question as fully, but as a personal explanation only. "May" said—

"General arguments or observations beyond the fair bounds of explanation, or too distinct a reference to previous debates, are out of order; though a member has been permitted by the Speaker to make, upon a subsequent sitting, an explanation regarding alleged misrepresentation in debate."

The hon. gentleman was going much further than a personal explanation, and he (Mr. Denham) wished to discourage a bad precedent. For the sake of subsequent rulings in the House, and the guidance of members, they should stick to the ruling given by "May." The hon. gentleman could debate the matter fully, but not as a personal explanation.

Mr. RYAN, speaking on the point of order, said he had been accused of being the associate of thieves.

The PREMIER: You repudiated that.

Mr. RYAN: Yes; and he had brought evidence of it. He did not think that the document was stolen at all. If the hon. member for Toowong said it was stolen he should tell them where he left it and all the circumstances that led up to its being stolen. So far as he was concerned, he had no knowledge of how they became possessed of the letter; but he always took up the attitude with regard to it that he had just explained. It was regrettable that the hon. member for Toowong should make an attack on him as leader of the Labour party, and he associated other members of the party with the

[*Mr. Ryan.*

same suggestion, subsequently applying it to the hon. member for Maranoa. He would be lacking in his duty to his party and to himself if he did not take this opportunity to make the reply he had done. He trusted that the Premier would accept the amendment and would endeavour to exercise some influence over his followers who made statements like that they heard this afternoon. Members opposite made charges, and members on the front bench said "Hear, hear!" to them. If it were not for those "hear, hears!" such statements would not be made by hon. members, yet these were the very men who afterwards criticised their action when they took any public step. He should not be surprised if the Attorney-General or the Secretary for Public Instruction were raised to the bench to see that the very first man who would criticise them would be the hon. member for Toowong.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If there was an hon. member who took advantage to make statements and innuendoes and such like it was the hon. member who had just resumed his seat.

Mr. RYAN: You are wrong.

The PREMIER: He exceedingly regretted that his colleague, the hon. member for Toowong, was absent.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must deal with the question before the Committee.

The PREMIER: He bowed to the Chairman's ruling at once; but the hon. member who had just resumed his seat took unwarranted license in making a personal explanation.

Mr. HUNTER supported the amendment. It would be wise to restrict the use of money which would be used in influencing the decision of the electors. Elections should not be interfered with when great questions were put before the people to decide. The candidates for the time being should simply address the electors and express their political views. The Premier and his party were great offenders at elections, as they inherited from the old Tories the practices of times gone by, yet they called themselves Liberals. That was why he supported the amendment, as it would restrict these practices, and give the electors a fair opportunity to decide things for themselves. Very often the electors were confused by the conflicting statements and the literature issued to them. He was told that at the last election Cobb and Co.'s coach was full of literature.

The PREMIER: That was the Federal election, with the papers for and against the referendum.

Mr. HUNTER: That was not so bad, as it let the electors judge it on its merits. It might have been the Federal elections, but when the hon. member for Warrego told him he thought it was the State election he referred to.

The PREMIER: The hon. member might have carried it in his motor-car.

Mr. COYNE: Is it any shame for a member on this side to ride in a motor-car?

The PREMIER: No; certainly not.

Mr. HUNTER: The hon. member for Warrego was to be congratulated that he had friends who would give him a ride in their motor-cars.

The PREMIER: I congratulate him.

Mr. HUNTER: If the principle laid down in the amendment were accepted he proposed to move other amendments. He did not intend to refer to what had been said by the hon. member for Toowong in regard to himself or in regard to the Opposition members. The leader of the Opposition had clearly replied to him, and did it very effectively. He could only say that if the hon. member for Toowong's career, privately or publicly, could stand as close an investigation as his (Mr. Hunter's) he could count himself a happy man. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MURPHY (*Burke*) intended to support the amendment, and to try to pour a little "oil on the troubled waters." He thought that if the leaders of both parties would keep their followers in [8.30 p.m.] hand, and make them come to heel when they started upon a policy of abuse, it would be far better for politics. They ought to deal with matters from a political standpoint, and not from a personal standpoint, and that was how he proposed to deal with this amendment. They had heard a great deal about the amount of money spent at election times. He recollected that a political party with which he was connected found it necessary two or three years ago to raise some funds to run an election. On that memorable occasion it was decided—there were ten of them in the party—that in order to raise funds to carry on the campaign a call of £1 each should be made, and they went to the election with that fund of £10.

The PREMIER: And you were treasurer?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes. Only two of them came back from that campaign, which showed that it was no good trying to conduct an election in Queensland on a tenner. As treasurer he took the £10 up North with him.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you bring it back?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; he brought it back and handed it over to the party. To those who were beaten he returned the amount of their call, and there was no doubt that it came in very handy to some of them. After a man had contested an election and had been beaten, even a pound came in handy. However, he thought it would be a very good idea to place in the Bill a provision fixing the amount which might be spent in election expenses.

The PREMIER: The amendment does not say how much.

Mr. MURPHY: No; it did not say how much.

The PREMIER: That is the ridiculousness of it.

Mr. RYAN: It shows the channels in which money may be spent.

The PREMIER: It shows pure, hollow obstructiveness.

Mr. MURPHY: The provision was in the Federal Act.

The PREMIER: Yes; but that Act limits the sum which may be spent.

Mr. MURPHY: There was a provision in the Federal Act, limiting the sum which a candidate might spend, but there was no limitation of the amount that might be spent by the supporters of any candidate or by an organisation running a candidate. An

association had, however, to forward to the Principal Electoral Registrar a return showing the channels of expenditure. He did not see that any reasonable objection could be taken to the inclusion of the proposed new clause in the Bill.

The PREMIER: The amendment was evidence of hollow, unscientific obstruction. Members opposite just went to the Federal law, and picked out at random sections and submitted them as amendments or new clauses, instead of permitting the Committee to get on with the solid business they had before them. Nothing more was needed to expose the absolute puerility and obstructiveness of the action of the Opposition, and the country would recognise that those very members who the previous day made such a plea for more time in which to discuss the measure were not sincere in their protestations.

Mr. THEODORE: Why squeal?

The PREMIER: The hon. member who talked about squealing might perhaps be associated with the particular quadruped which usually emitted a squeal; he might have more affinity with it than he (Mr. Denham) had. Members opposite yesterday pleaded for more time—till the 30th instant—for the discussion of this measure. Anybody who had but little time at his command, if he was possessed of ordinary common sense, would utilise that time to the best possible advantage, but hon. members, instead of doing that, simply started to propose amendments and new clauses. What could be more stupid and inane than the new clause proposed by the hon. member for Paddington? They had negatived a new clause limiting the amount which might be spent by a candidate at an election, and now they were asked to insert a provision that a candidate might only spend money in certain directions. Could they imagine any direction outside all those mentioned in the new clause in which a candidate might spend money?

Mr. RYAN: Oh, yes.

The PREMIER: Then it must be bribery and corruption, and according to our law that was absolutely forbidden. The very men who protested that they wanted more time to deal with the Bill were now frittering away time on amendments and new clauses which had no significance. Having passed out, after some hours of debate, a new clause limiting the amount which might be spent by a candidate at an election, those members now came along with a new clause which said a candidate might spend money on all manner of things. The leader of the Opposition said he knew of methods outside those mentioned in the new clause in which money could be expended.

Mr. RYAN: I said you do.

The PREMIER: He did not, and he said this was a grossly grotesque, ridiculous, and absurd proposal, and simply showed how members opposite were wasting time. The proposed new clause said that no election expenses should be incurred, except in respect of printing, advertising, publishing, notices of meetings, stationery, messages, postages, committee rooms, public halls, scrutineers, and so on. He thought they might let the proposal go to a division and knock it clean out. He did not suppose the leader of the

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

Opposition would be so unwise as to call "Divide," and waste time over a division, because he knew perfectly well that of all the ridiculous things attempted during this wearisome debate, this was the apex.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*) said there was such a thing as having so little time that it was no use at all. He had a number of amendments which he could not possibly get an opportunity of moving.

The PREMIER: You could have reached everyone of them.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Committee had not had a chance of discussing one up to the present time, and the amendment before the Committee was really a consequential amendment on the one which had been defeated. Both the amendments were foreshadowed and spoken of before the guillotine was carried as being amongst the amendments that the Opposition wanted to discuss. If the previous amendment had been carried, the present proposal would have been an excellent amendment, and although the previous amendment had not been carried, the present proposal still had merits. While it did not restrict or limit the amount of money that could be expended by a candidate, it would compel a return to me made.

The PREMIER: What good is that?

Mr. HARDACRE: It would show the country the innumerable ways money was expended by political candidates, and if they could not carry legislation now to limit the amount of money to be expended, the information that would be gained under that amendment would be such a revelation to the people in the country that they would insist upon some limitation in the future. The hire of motor-cars and all kinds of expenses were not included in the amendment.

The PREMIER: Far more motor-cars were used by the Labour party at the Federal election than were used by members on this side.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was admitted that the Premier sent £200 to the Barcoo electorate, not for a legitimate purpose—that money was sent to a man to spend in all kinds of bribery, and they knew very well that no good could come of it. They knew very well that the man could not get in, and it was sent there to disturb the electors and put them to a lot of unnecessary trouble and expense. They had to walk miles and leave their business and other important occupations, for what purpose? Simply for the purpose of preventing himself (Mr. Hardacre) and other candidates going to other parts of the country to do legitimate election business. The amendment was a reasonable one and he would support it.

Mr. RYAN said he was surprised at the somewhat angry speech which came from the Premier.

The PREMIER: I am angry at the waste of precious time.

Mr. RYAN: The speech was one that he hardly expected from the leader of the Government on an important occasion like this. He would ask the hon. gentleman to cast his mind back to yesterday. Let them consider things quietly and calmly. On two occasions yesterday he (Mr. Ryan) appealed to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, and almost besought him to tell the Committee what he was prepared to accept—to

give some indication as to what he was prepared to accept in the way of amendments in the balance of the Bill—fifty-five clauses. He had asked the hon. gentleman to communicate wherein any amendment proposed by the Opposition would be accepted, and the hon. gentleman did not say. Would he do so now? They had yet an hour and a quarter for the fifty-five clauses, and if the hon. gentleman would indicate what amendments he was likely to accept or what modifications of amendments and in what clauses he was likely to accept amendments, they might have a chance of making progress. It was over twenty-four hours since he had made that appeal, and the hon. member for Maranoa had made it twice afterwards, and it also was made by other hon. members on that side, because he was anxious in an important matter of that kind—

The PREMIER: You are beginning to see what a blunder you have made.

Mr. RYAN: He was only telling the hon. gentleman what he had told him twenty-four hours ago. They had only two days on the whole Bill, and the hon. gentleman made no effort at all to attempt to tell the Committee what amendments he would accept. Why? There was only one answer. Because the hon. gentleman was prepared to accept nothing. The hon. gentleman had shown clearly that he would accept no limitation of candidates' expenses. He (Mr. Ryan) could show ways in which a candidate could spend money which was not provided for in the amendment. For instance, on cabs and motor-cars. He wanted it clearly understood that he invited the Home Secretary and the Premier to point out in what way they would accept amendments to the Bill, but they had not done so. There was still an hour and a quarter, and if the hon. gentleman gave some indication of what amendments he would accept, they might make an effort to get on—

The HOME SECRETARY: Withdraw this senseless amendment.

Mr. RYAN said he had no power to withdraw the amendment, which he thought was a very reasonable one and he intended to support it.

The PREMIER: Once more the hollowness and senselessness of the whole thing was shown and the hon. member was endeavouring to cover his tracks. They blundered, and blundered egregiously. The hon. member said that twenty-four hours ago he made a proposition. His own common sense indicated that he had blundered. Look at the amendments circulated in the hon. member's name! But for the fatuous blundering of the Opposition the amendments circulated in the hon. member's name should have been reached and each one of the propositions would then have solved themselves. But no. That was not the design. They might have reached the amendments which had been circulated by the hon. member and his friends, without any stretch of imagination, in an hour, and they would then have had the whole of last evening and the whole of to-day in dealing with such amendments. But no. They thought they would be able to tell the country—reiterate the stupid statements they had been making—that the whole scheme of the Bill was to keep the Government in power. Not at all. The object of the Bill was to secure the fullest exercise of the franchise by those who were entitled

[*Hon. D. F. Denham.*]

to it. Therefore the Opposition were trying to prevent it being passed into law. They knew the Opposition were opposed to electoral reform.

Mr. PAYNE rose to a point of order. Had not the Premier already spoken three times on the amendment?

The PREMIER: He had not spoken three times, and he was replying to the very shallow endeavour of the Opposition to cover their own blunders. He had never seen a party blunder as that party had done. (Up-roar.) It was a series of blunders—huge blunders—and now they wanted to cover their tracks. They might readily have proceeded with amendments as circulated.

Mr. RYAN: You ought to be pleased.

The PREMIER: He wanted the country to understand the hollowness of it all. They might well have reached the amendments yesterday, and they would have solved themselves. But look at the amendment now—as he had said once or twice already, a mere slavish going to the Federal electoral law to find some means to obstruct. And what did they find? They first came along with section 169 of the Commonwealth Act, and, that having been knocked out after three or four hours' debate, they followed it up with this. The inanity of the thing! He understood that the hon. member for Paddington plumed himself on his high literary attainments and acumen, and yet he allowed himself to bring down an amendment that practically comprised sections 170 and 171 of the Commonwealth law, which immediately followed section 169, which they had knocked out, and which were meaningless, unsupported by a clause limiting amount. If the hon. gentleman had been able to control his followers or had followed the course which, from the amendments which had been circulated in his name, he had mapped out for himself, they would have been able to get on with business.

Mr. FHELLY: Would you have accepted any of them?

The PREMIER: He would. (Opposition derisive laughter.) All he knew was that some of them would have been accepted.

Mr. RYAN: What on?

The PREMIER: Hon. members had made a horrible mess, and they could just stew in their own fat. (Interjections and disorder.)

Mr. THEODORE: The Hon. the Premier had just given an exhibition of the spleen which he felt and the temper which he sometimes displayed against the Opposition, simply because he wanted that Bill, that iniquitous Bill—

The PREMIER: An excellent Bill.

Mr. THEODORE: Because he wanted that de-form Bill to go through without any alteration. Really he wanted it to go through in a worse form than that in which it was now, because he desired that the Home Secretary should move his amendments, which would make clause 39 even worse than it was now. But the Opposition were not going to allow that. He would have to guillotine his own amendments, just as he had to guillotine his own Bill. And that was what he was annoyed at. He was not annoyed at that side getting from the Commonwealth Act some important reforms and improvements to the Bill and seeking to insert them. As a matter of fact, the Bill was an example of the hon. gentleman's

picking and choosing of the very worst features of the electoral laws in the different States of the Commonwealth.

The PREMIER: One of your colleagues in the Federal House, Mr. Page, said it was a good Bill.

Mr. THEODORE: The argument of the hon. gentleman, or, as they could hardly dignify it by the name of argument, the tirade of abuse which he had just delivered across the floor of the Chamber, was utterly ridiculous, because of his own action in choosing in that way. The amendment was not inane, as the hon. gentleman had said, but was reasonable, as it aimed to find what were the general election expenses, and was perfectly logical. If it was inserted it could be supplemented by another proviso, calling for a statement showing what had been expended under those items. If it was carried it would prevent the Liberal organisations from putting up dummy candidates to split the vote—an old trick. It would prevent that sort of corrupt practice, and that was what they wanted to prevent. The hon. gentleman was annoyed because they wanted to restrict him. And one could easily see his cause for annoyance. One could easily see that by introducing the measure and causing the contumely that had been placed upon him for his actions in that Chamber he would have to face the electors in a very bad light. But his annoyance now would be nothing to his annoyance when he faced the electors on election day. The hon. gentleman would be squeezed into utter political oblivion.

The PREMIER: Why these tears?

Mr. THEODORE: Why did the hon. gentleman fly off in that manner? Why did he come in and tear his hair and screech about the tactics of the Opposition? Why did he get the Home Secretary, the bull-roarer, to come in and roar down the Opposition. His own little squeak was hardly heard.

The HOME SECRETARY: It seems to have touched you up, anyhow.

Mr. THEODORE: The Opposition would go on in the way in which he had been going.

The PREMIER: Blundering.

Mr. THEODORE: No; in their opposition to that most pernicious Bill.

Mr. HUNTER: The Chief Secretary had charged that side of the House—

The PREMIER: With obstruction—blundering obstruction.

Mr. HUNTER: In doing that he was not doing himself justice, because his penetration was keener and more accurate than that. He knew perfectly well that it was to the other side that the charge of delaying the measure must be laid. Did not that House plead from 10.30 one night to 6 o'clock the next morning for the Committee to retire or for some arrangement to be made as to how it should go through the Chamber? Did they not ask him to accept amendments from that side, and so was it not rather late in the day for him now to tell them that he would accept some amendments? Why did he not tell them that a week ago? Why did he not put a stop to the stonewall, when the power was in his hands, instead of compelling them to stay there all night?

The PREMIER: That was on the first amendment in the name of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hunter.]

Mr. HUNTER: And after they had sat all night an arrangement was made, because they were weary and they disposed of clauses from 14 to 23.

The HOME SECRETARY: And I accepted three amendments.

Mr. HUNTER: Yesterday, he rose and asked that the two leaders should consider the position in the same way, and see if they could not arrive at some understanding whereby they could get on with the business. There was no use in telling them that the obstruction started on that side.

The PREMIER: Where did it start?

Mr. HUNTER: It started over there. (Government dissent.) The hon. gentleman described the amendment as a foolish amendment, but he knew well that it was a restrictive amendment.

The PREMIER: It is not. It is a declaratory amendment. It declares what may be done.

Mr. HUNTER: There was nothing to prevent a proviso being added to it, saying that no more than a certain sum

[9 p.m.] should be spent in those things.

And even in the form in which it was, it restricted the hon. gentleman and his party from expenditure in ways which they knew were frequently used, and which they knew were not in the interests and for the purification of their electoral system. The hon. gentleman told them that if they had gone on with the Bill the Committee would have considered their amendments on their merits. The Committee did not do anything of the sort. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill had sat there and allowed amendments to be moved, and, in spite of all the arguments with which they were supported, when the bell rang, his followers fell into line behind him and that was the end of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I gave proof that I was reasonable by accepting three of your amendments.

Mr. HUNTER: The Government would say, "This is the Bill as it passed through the Assembly"; but the country would say, "No; this is the Bill as it was gagged and guillotined through. It is the Government Bill pure and simple." There had been no discussion of the Bill, and the Government would have to guillotine even their own amendments. In spite of what the Premier had said, the Government had not been able to do what they liked, how they liked, and when they liked. When any Government set itself to do that, and defied the Opposition, it was time that some stand was made. Even now there was an hour within which the Home Secretary could be reasonable and say what amendments he would accept.

The HOME SECRETARY: You withdraw this ridiculous amendment and get to business.

Mr. HUNTER: The hon. gentleman asked the Opposition to spike their guns; but they were not so foolish. They were not going to let the hon. gentleman turn his guns on them after theirs were spiked. All the wisdom did not lie on the other side—not even a big percentage of it. The Bill would be very much improved if the amendments which had been printed and circulated by the Opposition were accepted.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. ADAMSON: The Premier had referred to him as the arch obstructionist, so

[Mr. Hunter.

that it was only right that he should have a word to say in reply to the hon. gentleman. The Opposition aimed at improving the Bill; but the aim of the party on the other side was to restrict the franchise, disfranchise some of the best citizens of Queensland, and prevent the rolls being made as complete as the Opposition desired they should be made. The Opposition had moved amendment after amendment, not with a desire to obstruct, but with the object of making it a better Bill. They had not only tried to secure the fullest rolls possible, but they had tried to secure purity of voting, and the reason why the last amendment was moved was so that those who had large sums of money to spend should be prevented from spending it on illegitimate objects. The amendment now before the Committee was moved to point out how the money might be legitimately expended. To show that what the Premier said about the Commonwealth law was not true, he would read the Commonwealth law on the subject. Section 170 provided—

"No electoral expenses shall be incurred or authorised except in respect to the following matters:—

- (1) Printing, advertising, publishing, issuing, and distributing addresses by the candidate and notices of meetings;
- (2) Stationery, messages, postages, and telegrams;
- (3) Committee rooms;
- (4) Public meetings and halls therefor;
- (5) Scrutineers."

If those were legitimate objects on which money might be spent, there were things on which it would be illegitimate to spend money, and hon. members on the front Opposition bench had indicated some of those illegitimate ways of spending money with a view to helping those who had plenty of money against those who had only a small amount of money to spend. The Premier and the Home Secretary said that the Opposition had blundered in their tactics. Well, if they had blundered, the people would punish them when they had the chance. But the Opposition held that they had not blundered. They were driven into the position they had taken up by the unreasonableness of the Premier and the Home Secretary. Those hon. gentlemen now talked of a compromise; but all through the discussion last week the leader of the Opposition again and again offered a compromise. It was only when the Government were beaten to their knees that they compromised and accepted a few of the amendments moved by the Opposition. It was necessary for them to keep about forty of their men there all the time; but when they were getting down to thirty they were afraid they might fall into a trap, and so they accepted a compromise. The leader of the Opposition was willing all along to meet the Premier. Why had not the Premier met the leader of the Opposition before the House met that afternoon and indicated what amendments he was prepared to accept? Why did not the Home Secretary do that now?

Mr. MACROSSAN: Why don't you come along and find out?

Mr. ADAMSON: He had a great deal of respect for the ability of the hon. member for Windsor, but he had not a great deal of respect for the want of sense he sometimes displayed. If they had not discussed every

clause of the Bill as it ought to have been discussed it was not to be laid at the door of the Opposition but at the door of the Government. The discussion would serve a good purpose if it did nothing else but indicate the kind of literature that hon. members on the other side were prepared to issue at election time. His own feeling was that it would be a good thing if some penalty was attached to the issue of literature like some that had been issued by the other side. No pamphlet or address was issued by his party in Rockhampton which contained a single reflection upon the Premier or upon any of their opponents; but the other side scattered broadcast a pamphlet entitled "The Revolutionary Strike." Archbishops, bishops, and ministers of religion in Brisbane were quoted against the Labour party as if they were the worst kind of men in the country. The amendment had to do with the distribution of literature and other things. A more disgraceful thing was never issued than this, which was taken from the last part. Listen to this—

"TO THE ELECTORS.

"Electors of Queensland,—Vote for maintenance of freedom and constitutional government."

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: When their kindly and humane friend, who had a voice like a lion, had done he would speak. (Laughter.) It said—

"Vote for the maintenance of freedom and constitutional government and against the friends of mob law."

The HOME SECRETARY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Who was showing the mob spirit now? (Government laughter.)

"Vote for 'Peace in the street and plenty in the home.'"

The HOME SECRETARY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. ADAMSON: That came from a capitalistic lot of people who were paying the smallest wages they could pay, and getting the greatest amount out of the workers that they could get, and then they talked peace in the street and plenty in the home! This was a crying shame. What else did it say—

"Vote against the red flag of socialism from which the Cross of Christ has been removed."

The HOME SECRETARY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: They had tried to pull him up and put him out of order last night, because he quoted Scripture. The man who said that every man on this side of the House was a man who had put up the red flag of socialism, and had trailed in the dust the Cross of Christ, was not speaking the truth.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: There were as many good men on this side as on the other side, and they claimed to be just as sincere as they were, and they stood for their religious principles and believed in them and worked for them just as much as hon. members opposite did.

Mr. TROUT: Who said you didn't?

Mr. BOWMAN: The dirty pamphlet.

Mr. ADAMSON: This party had not got a monopoly of atheism.

Mr. TROUT: Nor of virtue.

Mr. ADAMSON: They would not claim a monopoly even of virtue; they would give those men a chance of having an equal amount of virtue. He was not going to begin to be a Pharisee; he would rather be in the position of the publican than the pharisee any time. When they hurled the charges of atheism at this side of the House, it would be well to remember when they said that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley and the Hon. Andrew Fisher were the men who welcomed Mr. McCabe to Brisbane, that a man who held the chief place in this House, and another member who sat on that side of the House, belonged to the society that helped Mr. McCabe to come to this State and to Australia. He did not say anything against that.

Mr. MACROSSAN: What has that to do with the amendment? (Government laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: If a man thought fit to be an agnostic, let him be an agnostic; if he thought fit to be a Christian, let him be a Christian, but let a man honestly try to be what he professed to be, and have freedom of thought and action for everyone. When a party issued a pamphlet like that, full of contemptible references to this party, and full of innuendoes and lies, it was very desirable that they should have a clause like this in the Bill. It would also be a good thing to have a provision that those who issued libellous statements should be penalised.

Mr. KESSELL interjected.

Mr. ADAMSON: He thought nobody needed penalising more than the hon. member for Port Curtis. (Laughter.) He supported the amendment, just as he had supported other amendments from this side, because he believed the Chief Secretary had been utterly unreasonable. He was going to put the Bill through how and when he liked. They had taught him that he was not going to put the Bill through how and when he liked, and he was going to have to guillotine the Bill through with all the abominable clauses in it, which would disfranchise some of the best citizens in Queensland and give a monopoly of power to the party on the Government benches at the present time.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It was rather amusing to hear hon. members complaining that the Opposition was obstructing the passage of this measure. (Government laughter.) Every member of this party was satisfied to let the clause go through to a vote until the Premier rose and made a lot of unscrupulously inaccurate statements about members on this side, about their ideals and aspirations; and it was natural that the debate should then have been continued. The Liberal party were the most contemptible obstructionists in Australia. The Liberal party in New South Wales were refusing to let business be proceeded with. The most disgraceful exhibition of larrikinism in Australia came from the Liberal members in the New South Wales Parliament, who had had to be removed by the sergeant at arms.

The HOME SECRETARY: A lot of corrupt political practices committed by the Labour Government.

Mr. LARCOMBE: No member of this Chamber was better able to judge of corrupt

Mr. Larcombe.]

political practices than the hon. member. It was very significant to find the Premier complaining bitterly that they had made a mistake. They realised that they were doomed to political perdition by forcing this measure through by the gag and guillotine; they realised what fair-minded electors in the State would think of their action. He intended to support the amendment which, even though it did not accomplish all that was required by the hon. member for Paddington, would be a step in the right direction. One would think from the loud protestations of hon. members opposite that they were paragons of political purity, and yet, when an amendment was introduced to prevent corruption at elections, they refused to support it. The amendment could not do any harm; it must do good. Here was a very important aspect in connection with this and also the previous debate. The Minister positively refused to discuss the amendment, or to give the Committee his idea about it. The custom of the House and of all parliamentary Governments in Australia was for the Minister to get up and reply to any amendment that was moved and explain the attitude of the Government on it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, when it is a sensible amendment.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Hon. members on the Opposition had proved that the amendment was essential to the Bill. If the Home Secretary had outlined the attitude of the Government on the amendment, the debate would have come to a close long ago. He had previously referred to high constitutional authorities, such as Professor Freeman, who, in his work "English Constitution," said the word "obstruction" was meaningless by itself as it all depended on the thing obstructed. The Opposition could not be accused of obstruction. If it had not been for the gagging and guillotining methods adopted by the Premier, better and more reasonable progress would have been made. The Premier and Home Secretary both stated that if the Bill had been proceeded with, there would have been amendments accepted. Carlyle said that they could judge the future by the past, and therefore they judged the actions of the Government by their past. The Home Secretary said he accepted an amendment from the Opposition on Friday. He could not help himself as he was physically exhausted. If it had not been for the gag and guillotine, and if they had sat all night, they would have got a number of amendments in themselves. If there was any delay in the passage of the Bill, or any departure from the ordinary methods of discussion, it was because of the unprecedented action of the Premier in using the gag and guillotine. In New South Wales, notwithstanding the frequent points of order raised, the Labour Government there sat all night rather than introduce a guillotine measure such as the Premier introduced.

Mr. KESSELL: What is their majority?

Mr. LARCOMBE: It was greater than Joe Cook's majority of one, at any rate. The arguments from members in Opposition were sufficient to secure the passage of the amendment. A similar amendment was in the Federal Act, and its operation in Central Queensland had had a good effect. It made

[Mr. Larcombe.

the union officials careful and it made the other side careful. They should give the amendment three years' trial at any rate.

The PREMIER: What is the good of it? It is merely declaratory.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It had a good effect when it was exercised in the Federal elections in Central Queensland. There were various avenues through which money could be spent outside those stipulated in the new clause. The amendment declared for equal opportunity for all.

The PREMIER: That is the theory we believe in. No preference to unionists.

Mr. LARCOMBE: He did not believe in preference to unscrupulous employers, which was what the Premier and his party stood for. They knew from experience that the Liberal party had enormous sums of money at their command.

The PREMIER: Nothing like what you have got.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Just fancy comparing a labourer with 8s. a day to the Home Secretary! Look at the difference in their financial positions!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman must keep to the amendment.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The amendment was justified, as it placed all parties on an equal plane. The Labour party in the States of Australia were subject to great disadvantage at the present time because of the enormous money power wielded by their opponents. They had no money to spend in motor-cars like hon. members opposite.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member who had just resumed his seat and other members who had spoken had called upon him to offer some remarks on the amendment which was now before the Committee.

Mr. RYAN: And generally as to what amendments you are likely to accept.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was quite prepared to consider even that matter. Hon. members could not accuse him of having taken up much of the time of the [9.30 p.m.] Committee. He was desirous that the business with which the Committee was charged should be proceeded with, and with that object in view he was prepared to remain silent and allow members on the other side of the House the fullest opportunity of discussing the clauses of the Bill. With regard to the preceding amendment and the amendment now before the Committee, he was somewhat in doubt as to whether they had been moved in a spirit of mockery, or a spirit of hypocrisy, or for the purpose of obstructing the passage of the measure.

The PREMIER: Sheer obstruction.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was inclined to think that their action was due to each of those three causes, and that no one realised that more than the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition. That hon. member, with his legal knowledge, must know that the whole object in moving the amendments was to obstruct the passage of the Bill.

If the hon. member had not professional knowledge, and a knowledge of the laws of debate and of the Standing Orders of the House, and a knowledge of the method of conducting the business of the House, one might believe otherwise; but he admitted that the hon. member did possess that knowledge, and that being so, he could only come to the conclusion—as every unbiassed elector in the State must come to the conclusion—that the tactics of the Opposition were simply adopted for the purpose of obstructing the passage of this measure, and preventing electoral reform being placed on the statute-book of Queensland.

Mr. RYAN: Didn't I help you through on Friday?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Rockhampton, for whom he again said he had the greatest esteem and respect personally, admitted that the whole object of the first amendment, of which he was the mover, was simply to render the postal vote nugatory. Now they had the hon. member for Rockhampton, in that dogmatic style of his—the dogmatic style of the pulpit orator, who laid down certain theories which no member of his congregation could rise up and debate with him—they had him laying down certain noble aphorisms, certain magniloquent ideals—ideals which he admitted on a former occasion were merely idle chimeras and fallacies. He thought the hon. member was satisfied that the political gods of the Labour party had feet of clay. The hon. member talked about the Labour party standing up for something grand, something to improve and better humanity, and yet he countenanced the action of that party which gave evidence once more of "man's inhumanity to man," to use a quotation given by the hon. member for Burrum. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. member for Rockhampton would deny the right of the manhood and womanhood of this State to live.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who?

The HOME SECRETARY: You, the hon. member for Rockhampton.

Mr. ADAMSON rose to a point of order. Would the hon. gentleman quote any speech or word of his in which he said he would prevent any man or any woman having a chance to live?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

The HOME SECRETARY: As he was saying when the hon. member rose to a point of order, the hon. member stood with that party and for that party which professed to have such high ideals, which believed in the brotherhood of man, and yet denied a section of the community the right to live—the right to go out and work in order to earn a livelihood, unless they were prepared to sink their manhood and freedom of action and come under the heel and tyranny of the Trades Hall. The hon. member supported an amendment which would circumscribe men who had to pay their way, not cadge from their fellows, but who had to provide horses and vehicles, and compel them to supply them without fee or reward. Those democrats on the other side of the House, those men of liberal ideas,

would prevent men from going out and disabusing the minds of those who had been placed under the tyranny of the Trades Hall. The hon. member for Rockhampton supported an amendment of that kind. All he (Mr. Appel) could say was that he did not wonder that the hon. member, as he said himself on a former occasion, left Chamber in disgust, being dissatisfied with the hollowness and hypocrisy of Parliament. He took it that his particular knowledge was of the party with which he was associated, and that his reference was to the hollowness, the mockery, and the hypocrisy of that party.

Mr. ADAMSON: It is not true; I never said that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then they had another champion, the hon. member for Keppel, who stood for something that was high and noble and great.

Mr. MURPHY: You are not going to hit a little fellow like that, are you?

The HOME SECRETARY: He was sure the hon. member for Keppel did not consider himself a little man. He felt satisfied that that hon. member considered that he filled a very large amount of space indeed; and he occupied a very large space in "Hansard" and of the time of the House. That hon. member, no doubt, had been a considerable student in his spare time—and apparently he had had a considerable amount of spare time to occupy his attention—and he had learned by heart certain noble ideals of socialistic and other writers. When that hon. member first entered the House there was no doubt that what he said was novel. Some of them had not heard it before and had not read it—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must keep to the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: That hon. member had quoted from time to time noble aphorisms in connection with the policy which he desired to impose upon the electors of the State, and on the first occasion he had heard the hon. member he struck him as having some very fine ideals; but when time after time he repeated the same ideals in absolutely the same words in a parrot-like way, just as a gramophone roled off a record time after time, he confessed he got weary of it. They lost their force, and he (Mr. Appel) was inclined to think that, losing their force, he, as Minister in charge of the measure, could not place any weight in the arguments. The hon. member appealed to him, and he had heard those same arguments—if the hon. member called them arguments—repeated ad nauseam in the same words, the same gestures, and the same movements, and they failed to impress him. Those two hon. members in particular appealed to him to accept the amendment, because they said the Bill would be of much greater value than it would be if passed by the Legislature without those amendments.

Mr. RYAN: Are you going to speak right up to the execution time?

The HOME SECRETARY: The amendment was a consequential amendment. It was admitted in all deliberative assemblies that when an original amendment was lost the consequential amendment was not pressed. What did they find? Here, again, they had the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition, with all his legal knowledge,

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

pressing the consequential amendment on the amendment which had been lost—pressing it, and then urging that he was genuine—

Mr. RYAN: This is not a consequential amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: That it was genuine. The hollowness and hypocrisy of the whole thing was absolutely clear and apparent. The hon. member might think to gull the electors of the State. He might gull them for a time, but he could not gull them for all time. The hon. member posed, furthermore, as a prophet. He had told the Committee of all the evils that would befall them at the next election—how they would fall down like ninepins.

Mr. RYAN: I did not say that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Those were not exactly the words, but the hon. member certainly made a statement equivalent to that. He (Mr. Appel) had seen a considerable amount of the prophesying of the Labour party, and when he looked at the benches opposite and saw the number of prophets who had turned out false prophets he quite agreed possibly to their profit; he would not begrudge them that profit.

Mr. RYAN: What is the use of drivelling on as you are doing?

At 9.45 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

The HOME SECRETARY: They had been threatened with what was going to happen to that party if the amendment was not accepted. The members of the Liberal party had been threatened before. But they were still there, and members of the party opposite who prophesied their destruction—alas for them! some of them were not there. Alas! that place knew them no more!

Mr. RYAN: What drivell!

The HOME SECRETARY: Was that fair of the leader of the Opposition? Had he (Mr. Appel) at any time referred to the remarks of the hon. member as "drivel"? Would he not have risen up in indignation and said, "My honour is concerned. My honour is dear to me"? And the hon. member would have demanded a withdrawal. It was not fair for the hon. member to interject in a certain insulting way.

Mr. RYAN: This is nearly as good as going to the theatre.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was, earlier in the afternoon. The hon. member wanted to make it appear that he was genuine. See the indignation of the hon. member! Why, it was not even genuine! You could even see the hollowness of the indignation.

Mr. RYAN: Do you propose to go on till 10 o'clock?

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members had urged that the Liberal party had enormous funds.

Mr. RYAN: Leave me five minutes.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had received a little information with regard to the great unions' funds. The latest figures were those for 1911.

Mr. RYAN: What are you quoting from?

The HOME SECRETARY: From an extract. The latest figures were those for 1911. The 1912 figures were not yet available on account of the delay of a number of unions in sending in their returns. The larger unions had since withdrawn from registration, consequently the figures with regard to

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

those unions would no longer be available. The expenditure of the unions in 1911 amounted to £11,960, made up as follows:—Benefits, £3,551; management, £6,679; and other payments, £2,130. He supposed that those were the douceurs that the hon. member for Paddington would say were put into one's pocket so gratefully. Out of that sum amounting to £11,960, the unfortunate members of the unions received only £3,151, and those organisers of whom they had heard and other officers of the unions—those unhappy persons—managed to retain a sum of £6,679, more than double the amount of benefits; and in addition, in one way and another, they had managed to have placed otherwise a sum of £2,131. And yet they spoke of being unable to finance their candidates!

Mr. ADAMSON: Sit down and give somebody else a chance to reply.

The HOME SECRETARY: He did not for one moment object to members on that side receiving financial assistance from their unions, but it was pure hypocrisy for them to come there and tell them that they were receiving none. What did those figures show? Did hon. members think for one moment that if the members of the unions were not compelled to allow it, they would permit such a large sum to be paid away for management and in "other payments"? They had an instance in that co-operative concern which was so ably managed by the hon. member for Herbert, who unfortunately was not there, in which they did not seem to be perfectly happy. Here they had an example of the tyranny of the Trades Hall. Once a man was there, he must remain there. He was followed to the courts, if he happened through sickness to fail to meet the calls made on him. Bailiffs were put into his house and his poor traps of furniture sold up. He was not permitted to obtain a livelihood. As he had already said, man's inhumanity to man was not more greatly exemplified than it was in the action of the unions, of which the political Labour party were the representatives, than in their action of enforcing preference to unionists.

Mr. PAYNE rose to a point of order. Had the hon. gentleman any privilege over and above other hon. members? He looked at the clock when he rose and he could say honestly that it was half past nine.

The CHAIRMAN: The Home Secretary has unlimited time under the Standing Orders.

Mr. THEODORE: And he is going to exhaust it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members pointed out that their desire was not to allow the postal vote to come into force in Queensland. Now, they found Mr. Page, a member of the Labour party, who only recently told the people, the electors of Australia, how he had acted when it was in force in that State previously.

Mr. THEODORE rose to a point of order. Was the Home Secretary in order in not speaking on the amendment before the Committee?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did you not speak to it?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is receiving the same latitude as other hon. members.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: In Federal "Hansard" for the 30th October, 1913, page

1597, he found that Mr. Page said on the Electoral Bill—

Mr. BERTRAM rose to a point of order. Was the Home Secretary in order in dealing with the postal vote, which was in clause 39, and they were on a new clause to follow clause 24?

The CHAIRMAN: The Home Secretary was alluding to the postal vote in the same way as other hon. members.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was endeavouring to refute the allegations that were made.

Mr. RYAN rose to a point of order. He wished to press it. What the Home Secretary was trying to do was perfectly obvious. He was trying to get in a lot of stuff—

Mr. THEODORE: Tripe!

Mr. RYAN: And not allowing hon. members an opportunity of replying, before the hour of execution. It was the rule at an execution that the condemned man had an opportunity to say what he wished before he died. He trusted that the Chairman would rule him out of order, as he contended that he was clearly out of order.

Mr. FORSYTH: He says that he is not out of order.

The CHAIRMAN, amidst uproar, was understood to say that the hon. member was not strictly in order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: He was urging that the reason why hon. members desired to get the form of vote which they had moved by way of amendment was because it was better than the postal vote.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: That is not the question.

Mr. FIDELLY: That was yesterday. He rose to a point of order.

The Home Secretary continued to speak and Mr. Fihelly endeavoured to make himself heard amid uproar. When order had been restored,

Mr. FIDELLY asked the Chairman whether the Home Secretary was in order in unloading this awful twaddle on them? (Loud laughter.)

The PREMIER: Mr. Page said it.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was no greater evidence of the desire of hon. members to indulge merely in obstruction, so far as that Bill was concerned, than that they desired to block him from placing on the pages of "Hansard" the opinions which had been given by Mr. Page on the proposed postal vote in the Queensland Bill.

Mr. ADAMSON rose to a point of order, the statement of which was inaudible in the gallery, amid the disorder.

Mr. THEODORE: He is a coward, an absolute coward.

Mr. ADAMSON continued to speak in competition with the Home Secretary and was understood to say that the hon. gentleman did not want to give them a chance to reply to one of the misstatements that he had made. If the Home Secretary was going to quote anything, he would like to have an opportunity of quoting something in reply.

The HOME SECRETARY, reading from Federal "Hansard," said Mr. Page, in concluding his remarks, said, "I venture to say, if the postal vote for the Commonwealth were safeguarded in a similar way, that not half a dozen honourable members on this side would be found to oppose it."

At 10 p.m.,

Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 251, and of an order of the House made on the 8th instant relative to this Bill, at 10 o'clock p.m., the CHAIRMAN proceeded to put every question necessary to the disposal of the outstanding clauses of the Bill.

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

AYES, 23.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" Lennon
" Coyne	" May
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Gillies	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley
" Huxham	
Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. Larcombe.	

NOES, 38.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Appel	" Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kessell
" Barnes, W. H.	" Luke
" Bebbington	" Macartney
" Bell	" Mackay
" Blair	" Mackintosh
" Booker	" Morgan
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Rankin
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Roberts
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Douglas	" Trout
" Forsyth	" Vowles
" Grant	" Welsby
" Grayson	" White
Tellers: Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Grant.	

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Gilday. No—Mr. Walker.

Resolved in the negative.

Question—That clause 25 stand part of the Bill put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 38.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Bebbington	" Mackay
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Macrossan
" Booker	" Morgan
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Rankin
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Roberts
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Douglas	" Trout
" Forsyth	" Vowles
" Grayson	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White
Tellers: Mr. Mackay and Mr. Vowles.	

NOES, 24.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" Lennon
" Coyne	" May
" Fihelly	" McCormack
" Foley	" Murphy
" Gillies	" O'Sullivan
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Hardacre	" Ryan
" Hunter	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Murphy.	

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday

Resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. J. G. Appel.}

Question—That clause 26 stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided.

This division was identical with that last recorded—"Ayes," 39; "Noes," 24.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 27 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

This division was identical with that on clause 26, with the exception that Mr. Appel did not vote—"Ayes," 33; "Noes," 24.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 28 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

This division was identical with that on clause 26, except that Mr. Appel voted, and Mr. Vowles did not—"Ayes," 33; "Noes," 24.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 29 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

This division was identical with that on clause 26, except that Messrs. Forsyth, Grant, and Vowles did not vote—"Ayes," 36; "Noes," 24.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 30 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

This division was the same as that on clause 26, except that Messrs. Forsyth and Grant did not vote, and Mr. Walker did—"Ayes," 37; "Noes," 24.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 31 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 52.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kessell
" Allan	" Kirwan
" Appel	" Land
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Bebbington	" Mackay
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Macrossan
" Booker	" May
" Bouchard	" McCormack
" Bowman	" Morgan
" Bridges	" O'Sullivan
" Caine	" Paget
" Corser, B. H.	" Petrie
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Philp
" Coyne	" Rankin
" Cribb	" Roberts
" Denham	" Ryan
" Douglas	" Swayne
" Fihelly	" Theodore
" Foley	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Trout
" Gunn	" Vowles
" Hardacre	" Welsby
" Hodge	" White
" Hunter	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

NOES, 6.

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Huxham
" Gillies	" Larcombe
" Hamilton	" Murphy

Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 32 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 37.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kessell
" Appel	" Luke
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macartney
" Barnes, W. H.	" Mackay
" Bebbington	" Mackintosh
" Bell	" Macrossan
" Blair	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philp
" Caine	" Rankin
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Cribb	" Tolmie
" Denham	" Trout
" Douglas	" Vowles
" Grayson	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White
" Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. B. H. Corser and Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" May
" Coyne	" McCormack
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Hardacre	" Ryan
" Hunter	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 33 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Luke
" Appel	" Mackay
" Barnes, G. P.	" Mackintosh
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macrossan
" Bebbington	" Morgan
" Blair	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bouchard	" Philp
" Bridges	" Rankin
" Caine	" Roberts
" Corser, B. H.	" Swayne
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Tolmie
" Douglas	" Trout
" Grayson	" Vowles
" Gunn	" Welsby
" Hodge	" White

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Mackay.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" May
" Coyne	" McCormack
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hunter	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Murphy

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 34 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 29.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Kirwan
„ Appel	„ Luke
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Mackay
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Mackintosh
„ Bebbington	„ Macrossan
„ Blair	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Paget
„ Bouchard	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Philp
„ Caine	„ Swayne
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Tolmie
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Trout
„ Douglas	„ Vowles
„ Grayson	„ White
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Macrossan and Mr. Vowles.

The “Noes”—19—were the same as in the division on clause 33, except that Messrs. Adamson and Payne voted, and Messrs. Kirwan and May did not.

PAIR.
Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.
Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 35 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 30.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
„ Appel	„ Kessell
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Luke
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macartney
„ Bebbington	„ Mackay
„ Blair	„ Mackintosh
„ Booker	„ Macrossan
„ Bouchard	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Caine	„ Philp
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Swayne
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Tolmie
„ Denham	„ Trout
„ Douglas	„ Vowles
„ Grayson	„ White
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Mackay.
The “Noes”—20—were the same as in the division on clause 34, except that Mr. Kirwan voted.

PAIR.
Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.
Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 36 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

This division was identical with that on clause 35, except that Messrs. Bell, Hodge, Morgan, and Welsby voted with the “Ayes”; Messrs. Douglas, Mackay, Philp, and Vowles did not vote; Mr. Hardacre voted with the “Noes,” and Messrs. McCormack and Theodore did not vote.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 37 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
„ Appel	„ Kessell
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Luke
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macartney
„ Bebbington	„ Mackay
„ Bell	„ Mackintosh
„ Blair	„ Macrossan
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bouchard	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Caine	„ Swayne
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Tolmie
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Trout
„ Denham	„ Vowles
„ Douglas	„ Welsby
„ Grayson	„ White
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Hodge.

The “Noes”—19—were the same as in division on clause 36—19.

PAIR.
Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.
Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 38 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
„ Appel	„ Kessell
„ Bebbington	„ Luke
„ Bell	„ Macartney
„ Blair	„ Mackay
„ Booker	„ Mackintosh
„ Bouchard	„ Macrossan
„ Bridges	„ Morgan
„ Caine	„ Paget
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Petrie
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Tolmie
„ Denham	„ Trout
„ Douglas	„ Vowles
„ Grant	„ Welsby
„ Grayson	„ White
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. B. H. Corser and Mr. Kessell.

NOES, 19.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
„ Barber	„ Land
„ Bertram	„ Larcombe
„ Bowman	„ McCormack
„ Coyne	„ O'Sullivan
„ Foley	„ Payne
„ Hamilton	„ Ryan
„ Hardacre	„ Theodore
„ Hunter	„ Winstanley
„ Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Coyne and Mr. Huxham.

PAIR.
Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.
Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 39 was identical with that on clause 38, except that Mr. Forsyth voted with the “Ayes.”

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 40 was identical with that on clause 39, except that Mr. Roberts voted with the “Ayes”; Messrs. Hodge and Morgan did not vote; and Messrs. Fihelly and Murphy voted with the “Noes.”

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 41—“Ayes,” 30; “Noes,” 17—was the same as on clause 40, except that Messrs. W. H. and G. P. Barnes voted with the “Ayes”; Messrs. Blair and Macrossan did not vote; and Messrs. Bertram, Hamilton, Kirwan, and O'Sullivan were absent from the “Noes.”

The division on clause 42—“Ayes,” 32; “Noes,” 18—was the same as on clause 41, except that Messrs. Blair, Hodge, Macrossan, and Tolmie voted with the “Ayes,” and Mr. Bertram with the “Noes.”

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 43—“Ayes,” 30; “Noes,” 20—was the same as on clause 41, except that Messrs. Blair, Morgan, and Tolmie voted with the “Ayes”; Messrs. Bebbington, Grant, and Kessell did not vote; Messrs. Bertram, Hamilton, Kirwan, and O'Sullivan voted with the “Noes,” and Mr. McCormack did not vote.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 44 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.	
Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Luke
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macartney
„ Bell	„ Mackay
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bouchard	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Roberts
„ Caine	„ Swayne
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Tolmie
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Trout
„ Denham	„ Vowles
„ Douglas	„ Welsby
„ Forsyth	„ White
„ Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Caine and Mr. Mackay.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Coyne	" Murphy
" Fihelly	" Payne
" Foley	" Ryan
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardaere	" Winstanley
" Hunter	

Tellers: Mr. Bowman and Mr. Theodore.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 45—"Ayes," 28; "Noes," 19—was the same as on clause 44, except that Mr. Bebbington voted with the "Ayes," and Messrs Forsyth and Kessell did not vote.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 46 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kessell
" Barnes, W. H.	" Luke
" Bebbington	" Mackay
" Bell	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Roberts
" Caine	" Swayne
" Corser, B. H.	" Tolmie
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Vowles
" Denham	" Welsby
" Forsyth	" White
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Mackay and Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Coyne	" Murphy
" Fihelly	" Payne
" Foley	" Ryan
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardaere	" Winstanley
" Hunter	

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Fihelly.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 47 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Appel	" Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Mackay
" Bebbington	" Paget
" Bell	" Petrie
" Booker	" Roberts
" Bridges	" Swayne
" Caine	" Tolmie
" Corser, B. H.	" Trout
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Vowles
" Denham	" Welsby
" Forsyth	" White
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Luke.

NOES, 16.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Hunter
" Bertram	" Huxham
" Bowman	" Kirwan
" Coyne	" Land
" Fihelly	" Larcombe
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hardaere	" Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 48—"Ayes," 27; "Noes," 15—was the same as on clause 47, except that Messrs. Appel and Kessell voted with the "Ayes"; Mr. Payne voted with the "Noes"; and Messrs. Bertram and Fihelly did not vote.

Question—That clause 49 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kessell
" Appel	" Luke
" Barnes, G. P.	" Mackay
" Bebbington	" Morgan
" Bell	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Roberts
" Caine	" Swayne
" Corser, B. H.	" Tolmie
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Trout
" Douglas	" Vowles
" Forsyth	" Welsby
" Grayson	" White
" Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

NOES, 13.

Mr. Bowman	Mr. Land
" Coyne	" Larcombe
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Hardaere	" Ryan
" Huxham	" Theodore
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Murphy and Mr. Payne.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 50—"Ayes," 27; "Noes," 16—was similar to that on clause 49, except that Messrs. Barber and Winstanley voted with the "Noes," and Mr. Coyne did not vote.

The division on clause 51—"Ayes," 29; "Noes," 16—was similar to that on clause 49, except that Messrs. Blair and Mackintosh voted with the "Ayes," and Messrs. Barber, Bertram, and Fihelly with the "Noes."

The division on clause 52—"Ayes," 27; "Noes," 16—was the same as on clause 51, except that Messrs. W. H. Barnes and Grant voted with the "Ayes."

Question—That clause 53 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Mackay
" Bebbington	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Douglas	" Vowles
" Grant	" Welsby
" Grayson	" White
" Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Luke.

NOES, 16.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardaere	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 54—"Ayes," 28; "Noes," 14—was the same as that on 53, except that Messrs. Allan, Appel, and Denham did not vote with the "Ayes."

The division on clause 55—"Ayes," 26; "Noes," 14—was the same as on clause 54, except that Messrs. Grant and Vowles did not vote.

The division on clause 56—"Ayes," 28; "Noes," 14—was the same as on 55, except that Messrs. Allan and Trout voted with the "Ayes," and Messrs. Grant and Vowles did not vote.

[1 a.m.]

The division on clause 57—"Ayes," 27; "Noes," 13—was the same as on clause 56, with the exception that Messrs. Bell and Denham voted with the "Ayes," and Messrs. Bridges, Mackay, and Tolmie did not vote; Mr. Bowman voted with the "Noes," and Messrs. Bertram and Larcombe did not vote.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 58 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 28.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Mackintosh
" Bebbington	" Morgan
" Bell	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Denham	" Trout
" Douglas	" Vowles
" Forsyth	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White

Tellers: Mr. Hodge and Mr. Welsby.

NOES, 14.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bowman	" Land
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardacre	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Barber.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 59—"Ayes," 28; "Noes," 17—was the same as on clause 58, except that Messrs. Bridges and Gunn voted with the "Ayes" and Messrs. Grayson and White did not vote; Messrs. Bertram, Hunter, Larcombe, and Ryan voted with the "Noes" and Mr. Murphy did not vote.

Question—That clause 60 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 24.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Gunn
" Barnes, W. H.	" Kessell
" Bebbington	" Luke
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Denham	" Trout
" Douglas	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Bebbington and Mr. Morgan.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Fihelly	" Payne
" Foley	" Ryan
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardacre	" Winstanley
" Hunter	

Tellers: Mr. Fihelly and Mr. Hunter.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 61 put and passed.

The division on clause 62—"Ayes," 26; "Noes," 16—was the same as on clause 60, except that Messrs. Appel, Grayson, Hodge, Tolmie, Welsby, and White voted with the "Ayes," and Messrs. E. B. C. Corser, Morgan, Petrie, and Philp did not vote, and Mr. Murphy voted with the "Noes," and Messrs. Bowman and Hamilton did not vote.

Question—That clause 63 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 29.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Appel	" Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kessell
" Barnes, W. H.	" Luke
" Bebbington	" Macartney
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Roberts
" Caine	" Swayne
" Corser, B. H.	" Tolmie
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Vowles
" Denham	" Welsby
" Douglas	" White
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Luke.

NOES, 16.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" Payne
" Hardacre	" Ryan
" Hunter	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Murphy.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 64—"Ayes," 30; "Noes," 15—was the same as on 63, except that Mr. W. H. Barnes did not vote, Messrs. Grant and E. B. C. Corser voted with the "Ayes," Mr. Bowman with the "Noes," and Messrs. Bertram and Fihelly did not vote.

Question—That clause 65 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

The division on clause 65—"Ayes," 30; "Noes," 16—was the same as on clause 64, except that Mr. Bertram voted with the "Noes."

Question—That clause 66 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 29.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Bebbington	" Mackay
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Booker	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Grant	" Vowles
" Grayson	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White
" Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. Caine and Mr. Swayne.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" Murphy
" Fihelly	" Payne
" Foley	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley
" Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 67—"Ayes," 23; "Noes," 16—was the same as on 66, except that Messrs. Caine, Bebbington, Hodge, Petrie, Swayne, and Welsby did not vote with the "Ayes," and Mr. Murphy was absent from the "Noes."

Question—That clause 68 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 23.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kessell
" Barnes, G. P.	" Luke
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Bell	" Mackay
" Booker	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Corser, B. H.	" Philp
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Roberts
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Grant	" Vowles
" Grayson	" White
" Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 14.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Bowman	" Payne
" Fihelly	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. Larcombe.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 69—"Ayes," 23; "Noes," 14—was the same as on 68, except that Mr. Appel voted with the "Ayes"; Mr. Grant did not vote; Mr. Land voted with the "Noes," and Mr. Larcombe did not vote.

[2 a.m.]

The division on clause 70—"Ayes," 25; "Noes," 14—was the same as on 69, except that Messrs. Caine, Douglas, and Swayne voted with the "Ayes"; Mr. Macartney did not vote; Mr. Larcombe voted with the "Noes," and Mr. Land did not vote.

The division on clause 71—"Ayes," 26; "Noes," 16—was the same as on 70, except that Mr. G. P. Barnes voted with the "Ayes" and Messrs. Foley and Land with the "Noes."

The division on clause 72—"Ayes," 28; "Noes," 17—was similar to that on clause 70, except that Messrs. Blair and Mackintosh voted with the "Ayes" and Mr. Hamilton with the "Noes."

The division on clause 73—"Ayes," 27; "Noes," 17—was identical with that on clause 72, except that Mr. W. H. Barnes did not vote with the "Ayes."

Question—That clause 74 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 29.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Appel	" Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kessell
" Barnes, W. H.	" Luke
" Bebbington	" Mackay
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Paget
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philp
" Caine	" Roberts
" Corser, B. H.	" Swayne
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Tolmie
" Denham	" Welsby
" Douglas	" White
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Mackay.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Fihelly	" Payne
" Foley	" Ryan
" Hamilton	" Theodore
" Hardacre	" Winstanley
" Hunter	

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Kirwan.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division on clause 75 was the same as on clause 74, except that Messrs. W. H. Barnes, Douglas, and Mackay did not vote, and Mr. Grant voted with the "Ayes."

The division on clause 76 was identical with that on clause 74, except that Mr. Grant voted with the "Ayes."

The division on clause 77—"Ayes," 31; "Noes," 18—was the same as on clause 74, except that Messrs. Grant and Vowles voted with the "Ayes," and Mr. Murphy with the "Noes."

The division on clause 78—"Ayes," 31; "Noes," 18—was the same as on clause 77.

Question—That clause 79 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
" Appel	" Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kessell
" Barnes, W. H.	" Luke
" Bebbington	" Macartney
" Bell	" Mackay
" Blair	" Mackintosh
" Booker	" Paget
" Bridges	" Petrie
" Caine	" Philp
" Corser, B. H.	" Roberts
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Douglas	" Vowles
" Forsyth	" Welsby
" Grant	" White
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Mackay.

NOES, 18.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Huxham.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg to move that the Bill be now taken into consideration.

Question—That the Bill be now taken into consideration—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
„ Appel	„ Hodge
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Kessell
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Luke
„ Bebbington	„ Macartney
„ Bell	„ Mackay
„ Blair	„ Mackintosh
„ Booker	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Caine	„ Philp
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Roberts
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Swayne
„ Denham	„ Tolmie
„ Douglas	„ Vowles
„ Forsyth	„ Welsby
„ Grant	„ White
„ Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Luke and Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 18.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
„ Barber	„ Kirwan
„ Bertram	„ Land
„ Bowman	„ Larcombe
„ Fihelly	„ Murphy
„ Foley	„ Payne
„ Hamilton	„ Ryan
„ Hardacre	„ Theodore
„ Hunter	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Bertram.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that the third reading stand an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Mr. RYAN thought that to take the third reading then was an evidence of indecent haste, seeing that the Government must know that they had reported a Bill which was not in a form of which they could be proud. It did not include even the Home Secretary's amendments, which would really make it worse than it was. He thought that members were very weary of the long sitting, and they should have time to consult the members of his party and also the members of the country party, for he noticed that one of the most important planks of that party's platform—preferential voting—was not included in it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: He did not wish to digress further at this stage, but he hoped that from what he had said there would be a chance of negotiation with that party, so that even yet Queensland might be saved from the infliction of a measure such as that which had been reported to the House. He did not desire to delay the House further then, but he hoped that members would consider that his remarks were germane to the question and would accept them in the spirit in which they were made.

Question—That the third reading stand an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Gunn
„ Appel	„ Hodge
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Kessell
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Luke
„ Bebbington	„ Macartney
„ Bell	„ Mackay
„ Blair	„ Mackintosh
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bouchard	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Caine	„ Philp
„ Corser, B. H.	„ Roberts
„ Corser, E. B. C.	„ Swayne
„ Denham	„ Tolmie
„ Douglas	„ Vowles
„ Forsyth	„ Welsby
„ Grant	„ White
„ Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Caine and Mr. Gunn.

NOES, 18.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
„ Barber	„ Kirwan
„ Bertram	„ Land
„ Bowman	„ Larcombe
„ Fihelly	„ Murphy
„ Foley	„ Payne
„ Hamilton	„ Ryan
„ Hardacre	„ Theodore
„ Hunter	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Hunter and Mr. Payne.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker. No—Mr. Gilday.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at two minutes past 3 o'clock a.m.