

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 1915

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, 5 NOVEMBER, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

SALE OF DREDGE "GROPER."

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. What was the date of the sale of Government dredge 'Groper'?"

"2. Was the vessel disposed of by public auction or by tender; if by the latter, on what date were such tenders called?"

"3. What were the number of tenders received—(a) The respective amounts; (b) name of successful tenderer?"

"4. What was the net amount realised?"

"5. In addition to the hull, what number of boilers and parts of machinery were included in the transaction?"

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"1. Tenders closed on 5th May, 1915.

"2. By tender. Advertised on 29th April, 1915, and following dates.

"3. Five:—J. Anderson, £251; Cleg-horn, Hopkins, and Company, Limited, £325; Peters' Slip, £376 12s. 6d.; Peter Moffatt, £35; Louis A. Le Lamer, £30.

"4. The highest tender was accepted, and £376 12s. 6d. was received.

"5. Two condemned boilers; one set compound engines with broken and patched crankshaft and various wheels and shafting, which it was considered would cost more to remove than they were worth, were left in the hull and sold with it."

PRICKLY-PEAR ON CROWN LANDS.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"What action does he propose to take to clear unselected Crown lands, lightly infested with prickly-pear, and which are, as can be proved, reinfesting—(a) farms of selectors who have cleared their lands under compulsion by the Crown; (b) the roads of a local authority which, after being freed of pear, must be kept free at the entire cost to the ratepayers?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. M. Hunter, *Maranoa*) replied—

“The Government proposes to overcome this difficulty by offering such lands in terms sufficiently attractive to induce selectors to take it up and clear it.”

PUBLICATION OF QUESTION.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*), in the absence of Mr. H. J. Ryan, asked the Acting Minister for Justice—

“1. As the ‘*Courier*’ proprietary, which invariably publishes all questions asked in Parliament, suppressed certain questions asked by me relative to their catering for German residents by the publication of several pages of German matter, will he take measures to refuse the said ‘*Courier*’ proprietary advertisements until a satisfactory explanation is forthcoming?”

“2. Will he cause my questions and the answers thereto to be published in the ‘*Government Gazette*,’ alongside the accounts of our soldiers’ heroism at Gallipoli?”

Hon. J. A. FIELLY (*Paddington*) replied—

“1 and 2. I will make inquiries with a view to meeting the wishes of the hon. member.”

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

Report by the trustees of the Agricultural Bank of Queensland for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

Report of the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*), this Bill, read a third time, was ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council by message in the usual form.

REFERENDA PROPOSALS.

AGREEMENT AT PREMIERS’ CONFERENCE.

The TREASURER: Mr. Speaker,—I desire to make a statement relating to matters arising out of the Premiers’ Conference.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Treasurer be allowed to make a statement?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: The Premier communicated to me last night by urgent telegram the text of the agreement arrived at by the Premiers, and agreed to by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, in reference to matters bearing on the proposed referenda question. This is the full text of the communication—

“Following upon the discussion which arose at the Financial Conference of the Premiers on the occasion of the visit of the Prime Minister, this conference of Premiers suggests that so as to avoid the necessity of taking a poll of the electors next month, the Commonwealth authorities concur in the proposal

to postpone the referendum during the war on the following conditions:—

(1) The Premiers to bring forward in their respective State Parliaments legislation providing for the reference during the war and for the following year after declaration of peace to the Commonwealth Parliament under section 51, subsection (37), of the Constitution of the powers sought by the suggested alteration of the Constitution, subject to the following limitations:—

(A) Railways the property of the States to be exempted from the Commonwealth power so far as regards the control of management of such railways and rates and fares on such railways.

(B) In lieu of proposal number 3, “Industrial matters,” to substitute the following:—

(a) Employment and unemployment;

(b) Strikes and lockouts;

(c) The maintenance of industrial peace;

(d) The settlement of industrial disputes;

(2) The Premiers at a later date to consider what powers they will invite their respective local Parliaments to surrender permanently under section 51, subsection (35), of the Constitution.

(3) With a view to removing any doubt as to the power of the State Parliaments under section 51, subsection (37), to refer any matter for limited time only, an Act of the Imperial Parliament to be sought if thought necessary to make that power clear, and to ratify what has been done under it.”

I received an urgent telegram subsequently from the Premier, stating that this agreement had been unanimously adopted by the State Premiers, and concurred in by the Prime Minister, and that an announcement had been made in the Federal Parliament at midnight last night informing them that the agreement had been arrived at. So that, presumably, steps will be taken to postpone the submission of the referenda proposals, which it was understood would have been done on 11th December next, until the adoption by the respective Parliaments of the necessary legislation to give effect to the agreement. The alternative to the adoption of this legislation would be, of course, the submission of the referenda. As the agreement seems so eminently practical a solution of the difficulties with which the community was faced, it is quite probable, I think, that all the Parliaments will agree to what the Premiers have done, and will no doubt pass the necessary legislation. It seems to me an eminently reasonable solution of the difficulty, and confers the opportunity of doing away with the necessity for any controversy at all upon the question of amending the Constitution.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. TOLMIE (*Toowoomba*): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. member desire to make a statement?

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I do.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the leader of the Opposition be allowed to make a statement?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

HON. J. TOLMIE: I only want to say that the Treasurer was good enough to show me a copy of the statement he has just read, and I rejoice that the agreement has removed the necessity of political warfare being carried on in the country at this time. I have not the slightest doubt that it will be a source of great relief to the people of Queensland to know that there will be no occasion to carry on a political campaign just now. It is unnecessary to go into the details of the business further than for me to say that I personally am very glad to see that the necessity has passed away for the carrying out of that campaign.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—SECOND ALLOTTED DAY.

(*Mr. Coyne, Warrego, in the chair.*)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY AND SCAFFOLDING.

Question—That £11,870 be granted for "Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding, Department of Public Works"—again stated.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The Under Secretary of the Department of Public Works had been good enough to send him, before the House met, a copy of the annual report of the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding for the year ended 30th June, 1915, which was only just out, and this was the first report of the department that they had had an opportunity of seeing before the Estimates went through. He was pleased to notice from it that the work of the subdepartment had been carried on very satisfactorily through the year, in the sense that there had been a great immunity from accident. It was always gratifying to know that there was that immunity. He noticed also that reference was made to the fact that a great many employees did not take advantage of the safeguards which were provided for their protection in the various factories and workshops. Last night, when another matter was being discussed, he noticed that the expressed will of the Chief Inspector had been given effect to, inasmuch as legislation was sought to compel the employees to take advantage of the protection afforded to them. That being done, he felt certain that the present year would be even more satisfactory in the point he had mentioned than the last year. He noticed, too, that the subdepartment had become almost self-supporting. The proceeds last year amounted to something over £9,000, and the expenditure was £10,920, so that only £2,000 had to be made up. He was somewhat afraid that such a good revenue-producing department might fall rather heavily on those who were using machines. He did not think that it was the desire of the people or of the Chamber that the department should be one which pressed unduly heavily upon persons of small means, particularly beginners in the outside districts. A great many of their farmers had now to use machinery, and he knew that in some cases the inspection fees rested somewhat heavily on them. He hoped that this would be kept in view by the Minister, and, if possible, he should endeavour to reduce the burden placed upon the industry. He had heard several complaints that the fees were too high, and that inspections were made which were unnecessary, and it threw a burden upon the producer in

that way. They should take the case of the producers into consideration, because they were absolutely dependent upon the producers if the State was going to sustain itself. If they placed too many burdens on the producer there was always a possibility of crowding him out altogether, and if they did that, it would mean bad times for the people in the cities. He was pleased to know that the work of the department was being carried out in a manner so satisfactory to the State.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*) pointed out that there were two clerks down for £90 and £70 respectively. When the Liberal Government were in power there were many clerks getting under £100, and he understood that that was quoted as one of the sins of the late Government during the late election—that they paid what was considered a low wage. The people of Queensland then sent the present Government into power to rectify that sort of thing, and see that nobody got less than £110 a year.

Mr. KIRWAN: Wasn't there a condition attached to that? Look at Mr. May's motion.

Mr. GUNN: He did not know of any condition. He knew that times were hard, but they were no harder than this time last year, and if it was good enough last year it should be good enough now. When members opposite were in opposition it was a crime to pay men under £100 a year, but now it was all right. Comparing the Works Estimates of last year with those of this year, he found that last year there were sixteen clerks getting under £100, and in the present Estimates there were also sixteen clerks getting under £100, so the position was exactly the same, although the electors turned the Liberal Government out to see that these clerks were paid a minimum of £110 a year.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*) drew attention to the fact that five clerks last year were getting £500, and this year they were getting £550, which showed an increase of £50 for those five clerks.

Mr. FORSYTH: It may not be an increase.

Mr. KIRWAN: The figures showed plain enough there was an increase. The hon. member for Carnarvon talked about the minimum of £110 a year. Did he want every clerk in the service—whether he had only been there one year, or was only a probationer—to get £110 a year? He understood that that rate was to be paid when they reached the age of twenty-one years. Whenever an endeavour was made to raise the salaries of the lower-paid officials, the hon. member for Murrumba would condemn the action of the Government with all the wrath at his command. They knew that the present Government placed £5,000 on the Estimates in order to give the men over twenty-one a living wage, and not keep them at the wage paid them by the low-wage party opposite, who were placed in their right position on the Opposition benches by the electors in May last.

Mr. BARNES (*Warwick*) noticed that there was an increase of £700 in travelling expenses, and an increase of £250 in railway fares and freights, making a total increase of £950. That seemed to be a big increase when the total amount was only £3,000 or £4,000. He would like the Minister to give an explanation of the increase.

Mr. Barnes.]

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) was sorry that he had not an opportunity of going thoroughly into the report of the Chief Inspector, but the leader of the Opposition had let him have a look at the copy he received, and from a casual glance through it it seemed to be a very useful report. He was pleased to see the increase in the number of boilers manufactured in the State, and trusted that in time all the boilers and other machinery required here would be manufactured in the State, and save importing them from other parts. There was no doubt that the increase in travelling expenses and railway fares was due to the extra inspection that had become necessary in the department. With regard to the salary of the Chief Inspector, he hoped that that officer would not be overlooked when the finances were in a better position. He had not spoken to the Chief Inspector, but he knew he was a good officer, and the department he presided over was a very important one. He had to interview him occasionally, and always found him courteous and obliging, and he was well worthy of the position he occupied. Considering the position he occupied as head of a department that protected the lives and limbs of many people, he should be given a good salary for the position he held. The senior inspector was also a good man, although he did not know him personally. There seemed to be a reduction in a number of inspectors. Last year there were eighteen inspectors getting £5,120, and this year the amount was reduced to £4,870.

Mr. FORSYTH: One man less.

Mr. PETRIE asked if the inspectors of scaffolding devoted their time entirely to inspecting scaffolding?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes.

Mr. PETRIE: There were two inspectors of scaffolding, and the Minister thought there was enough to keep them going. He did not want to cast any reflection on the inspectors of scaffolding, and those of machinery also, but he would like to know if they had to qualify by examination before they were appointed. He knew that the Chief Inspector would take good care that he had good men in those positions, but he would like to know the conditions under which inspectors were appointed and what qualifications they held. He had a reason for asking this, which would be disclosed later on when a certain other matter came before the House.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): The hon. member for Brisbane stated that there was an increase in the amounts paid to five inspectors from £500 to £550. As a matter of fact, it might not be an increase at all, because of officers being frequently transferred and changed from one place to another. He understood that no officer getting over £200 a year received an increase on the Estimates. They would see that one inspector of scaffolding was getting £230, and two others were getting £210 each. That looked like an increase of £30 over last year.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That was the automatic increases that we allowed them for last year.

Mr. FORSYTH: He was not objecting to it, but he thought no increases were

[*Mr. Petrie.*

granted over £200. He noticed that £700 extra was asked for in connection with travelling expenses, but he supposed the reason for that was that last year £3,648 was spent on the vote, and the department this year were asking for £3,700. The same thing applied with regard to railway fares and freights, printing, stationery, etc., referred to by the hon. member for Warwick, for which £700 was put down last year, and

there was an increase of £250 [4 p.m.] this year. One would think the increase was very stiff, but the Auditor-General's report showed that there was no less than £915 spent last year. He supposed that the reason why the Minister had put down £950 this year was because he thought the expenditure would be less than that. Last year there were twenty, but this year only nineteen, inspectors.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There were two deaths, and only one vacancy was filled.

Mr. FORSYTH: So they carried on with one inspector less. That made it look as if there was not very much development now, and perhaps there was not the same amount of machinery to inspect as there was before, as a good deal of machinery was not being worked at the present time, and there was no occasion for any increase of inspectors. That was probably the reason why there was one inspector less this year. The total amount spent last year for the whole of this subdepartment was only a few pounds more than the amount put down for this year.

Mr. CORSER: What troubled him in connection with this vote, as it had done right through the Works Department, was the fact that one great grievance which the Government had brought up at the last general election about the large number of civil servants in receipt of under £100 a year had now been sunk by the Government. The Government had secured possession of the Treasury benches partly owing to the cry they raised about that matter, yet they found that there were still sixteen civil servants in receipt of under £100 a year on last year's Estimates, yet the same number appeared again under the Estimates of a Labour Government. That was an extraordinary state of affairs after what Government members said when they were in opposition. There were the same number of clerks receiving that salary, and the vote had not been increased to any great degree.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We have increased them to this degree: £10 which they were deprived of by your Government in respect of last year, and £10 this year.

Mr. CORSER: In 1914-15, £500 was given to the five clerks, and in 1915-16 £550 was put down, but what did they find? The lowest paid clerk in 1914-15 received £80, while under the Labour Administration the lowest paid clerk received only £70. The highest paid clerk in 1915 received £130, and the Government had increased the highest paid clerk to £150. That meant that the Labour Administration had reduced the lowest paid clerk by £10, and increased the highest paid clerk by £20. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: How do you know it is the same clerk?

Mr. CORSER: He was not referring to the same clerk, but to the position. They were reducing the wages of the lowest paid clerks and increasing the wages of the highest paid clerks. That was clear.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: Do you know what salary a probationary clerk starts at?

Mr. CORSER: He knew it started at less under the Labour Government than under the Liberal Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It does not.

Mr. CORSER: Possibly some of the £700 put down for travelling expenses was going to the good of those gentlemen, and very probably it was going to them.

Mr. KIRWAN: What do you think the auditors are doing? They know how the money is spent, and they know it is spent according to the parliamentary vote.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member was only proving his contention that the lower paid clerks were only going to receive what was placed on the Estimates. He would like to know where the £700 travelling expenses was going to. Perhaps it was going to pay some of the honorary travelling inspectors' expenses. There was provision here for some "palm oil" for the honorary inspectors. There was £700 in excess of the amount which had been previously provided.

Mr. KIRWAN: Look at page 87 of the Auditor-General's report.

Mr. CORSER: Then, with regard to railway fares and freights, printing, stationery, etc., they knew that the item for printing did not include the printing that was going to be circulated at election time. That was going to come out of the man who was compelled to join the union.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: A large excess in the vote appeared on this occasion, and hon. gentlemen opposite were making every provision to have an accumulation of funds to, perhaps, give to their honorary inspectors. He merely rose to protest against the Government not keeping down, although they claimed the Liberal Administration neglected to do so, the number of public servants who were in receipt of less than £100 a year.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member had entirely misunderstood the Estimates, and if he would give close attention to the study of the Estimates he would not make so many mistakes. If he would devote some time to the consideration of the Auditor-General's report in connection with the Estimates, he would understand the necessity for some of the increases.

Mr. CORSER: It is the decreases we are worrying about.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member has said that the Government had reduced the salary of the lowest paid clerk.

Mr. CORSER: That is so—by £10.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That was a mis-statement. As a matter of fact, the lowest paid clerk in the department who was on the last Estimates had received two increases since then—£10 in respect of last year, and £10 in respect of

this year. The clerk whom the hon. member was talking about was a new cadet, about sixteen years of age, appointed under the Public Service Regulations at £60 per annum, and he had received an increase up to £70. He had only been in the department a few months.

Mr. CORSER: Why not give the lowest man the same as the last Government gave him?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member asked why they should not put them in the same position in the service as the late Government did under the Public Service Act. The only difference was that they entered the service on the same footing, but this Government gave them more rapid promotion. Last year the late Government withheld the increases prescribed by the regulations. Referring to the increases in railway fares and freight, printing, stationery, etc., from £700 to £950, the hon. member suggested that there was some ulterior motive for the increased amount, but the fact was that, last year, although £700 was appropriated, there was £920 spent, and they were simply providing on that basis. The leader of the Opposition spoke of the fees provided for the members of the examining board. As he had explained last night, there was an intention to alter the constitution of the board, and give representation to the engineers and engine-drivers. The respective societies had been asked to make the necessary nominations, but they had not done so yet. The intention was to pay members of the board a fee of £1 ls. a sitting for attending to those duties. That was the reason for making provision for an expenditure of £170 for that purpose.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: One would think from the remarks of the Minister that the millennium had arrived since the present Government had assumed office. He would point out that some considerable time before the late Government went out of office they revised the scale of salaries for junior officers entering the public service, and made the starting salary very much better than it was previously. With regard to the increase the hon. gentleman had spoken about, he would remind him that the late Treasurer, when delivering his Financial Statement, stated that, in consequence of the war, the Government were going to hold their hands in the matter of expenditure, and were not putting increases on the Estimates for public servants. As a matter of fact, the Estimates had been drafted on an exceedingly liberal scale, as hon. gentlemen on the Treasury bench now knew; but afterwards, in consequence of the war, the Government had to reconsider their position before enunciating their financial policy. That was exactly what the present Government had had to do—they had had to consider their position, and they had only come forward with half of their financial policy.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We had to consider our position, and we came to a wiser determination.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: In the Financial Statement delivered by the late Treasurer it was made quite clear that if conditions improved public servants would get their increases. Conditions did improve, and arrangements were made to give them their increases.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No arrangement was made.

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

HON. J. TOLMIE: Yes, an arrangement was made, and a statement to that effect was made in this House.

HON. J. A. FIBELLY: By whom?

HON. J. TOLMIE: He (Mr. Tolmie) made the statement on behalf of the Treasurer. Further than that, they left the present Government a big lump of money with which to pay those increases.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What became of it?

HON. J. TOLMIE: The present Government endeavoured to gerrymander every penny of it, and notwithstanding the fact that they got rid of nearly a quarter of a million of money they still had a surplus. What he wished to do was to let the public know who provided the money and where it came from. (Government laughter.)

HON. J. A. FIBELLY: But they would not believe you on 22nd May.

HON. J. TOLMIE: No; but they believed it now, and the public servants believed it now. The late Government provided increases for all salaries up to £250, and they paid those increases. The present Government made the limitation £200, and it was the family man who suffered. With regard to the clerks who, as the Minister had stated, got two rises, they got nothing more than they were entitled to; they got the rise the late Government said they would give them at the end of last year, and they got a rise for this year. The Government had to put those increases on the Estimates. (Government laughter.) They had not the effrontery to come to the Chamber, after the attitude they had assumed when they were on the Opposition benches, without putting something on the Estimates for those increases, but they took jolly good care that they kept the amount down as low as they possibly could, and that they made the producers pay for it.

MR. PETRIE: With regard to the inspectors of scaffolding, he should like the Minister to answer his question as to whether the inspectors of scaffolding had to undergo an examination before appointment.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The inspectors of scaffolding were Mr. A. E. Cameron, Mr. J. McKeand, and Mr. David Hunter, all of whom, he understood, had been connected with the building trade and were competent carpenters who had had considerable experience in connection with scaffolding. He understood that they were considered by the Chief Inspector to be competent inspectors of scaffolding.

MR. PETRIE: There is no examination, then?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There was no examination, but they had to satisfy the Chief Inspector as to their qualifications to inspect scaffolding.

MR. FORSYTH: Did the Minister not know that it was distinctly stated by the late Treasurer last January that all automatic increases up to £100 would be paid?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Was it not after we moved a want of confidence motion in the Government?

MR. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman was trying to mislead the Committee, but he would not allow the hon. gentleman to mislead them. He challenged the hon. gentleman to deny the statement that the late Treasurer distinctly stated at the beginning

of the year that as the finances were looking better, automatic increases would be paid to all public servants receiving up to £100 a year, and that they got those increases. (Government dissent.) That was before the Treasurer heard anything of what the Labour party intended to do. The late Government were not dependent upon the Labour party any more than the present Government were dependent upon the Opposition. What he objected to was to the hon. gentleman's statement that the automatic increases were not paid by the late Government to public servants receiving up to £100 a year, but that those increases were paid by the present Government.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Did I not hear you say, when speaking on the Financial Statement, that we could have saved £70,000, and have added that sum to the surplus this year?

MR. FORSYTH: He was not then discussing the question of wages; he was discussing other things, and he pointed out that the Government could have saved at least £180,000, and still have paid the whole of the automatic increases. The Government could have suspended payments in connection with the sinking fund, and that would have given them all the money they wanted, and it would not have affected the finances one scrap. A person who had a revenue of £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 could economise in a great many ways if he wished to economise. All the talk of the Government about the benefits that the public servants had derived from the Labour party was only talk. He regretted that the Labour party did not pay the increases when they knew in the month of March or April that the finances had improved.

HON. J. A. FIBELLY: You admit that they held them back?

MR. FORSYTH: He did not admit that they held them back. The hon. member was mighty clever and always very smart in trying to pick up things. What he said was that the Government were willing to pay that money before the end of the year.

HON. J. A. FIBELLY: Why did they keep it back for ten months?

MR. FORSYTH: Again the hon. gentleman showed his absolute ignorance of the finances of the country. The statement was made in January of this year that there was likely to be a deficit of no less than £300,000, and how could they pay increases under those conditions? Had the finances warranted it, the whole of the automatic increases would have been paid from the previous July. As it was, increases were paid for six months in all salaries up to £100, and the balance would have been paid had the Government remained in office. When they knew in the month of April that they were likely to have the money they should have paid the increases, but they did not do so, because they believed the Labour party would have made capital out of it at the elections.

MR. CARTER: How virtuous you were!

MR. FORSYTH: What he said was absolutely true, and he defied the hon. member to deny it. Had he been in the place of the Government he would have paid the increase, notwithstanding what the Labour party might have said at the elections.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You said we gave no increases to men receiving under £100 last year.

[Hon. J. Tolmie.]

Mr. FORSYTH: No, he did not say that; he said that the late Government gave an increase to every single public servant who was in receipt of a salary of not more than £100 per annum.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That was only from January; we gave the increase right back to July.

Mr. FORSYTH: The public servants got their increases in January. Did the present Government give them the increases back to July?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Back to July.

Mr. FORSYTH: He understood that when the late Government paid the increases in January they paid them back to July. Did the hon. gentleman mean to say that the increases only started in January?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They only started in January.

Mr. FORSYTH: In any case, if the late Government only paid them back to January, he thought it was wrong, because the automatic increases were supposed to start from July. In any case, the Government intended to pay the full amount right to the end of the year. At least they said so.

Hon. J. A. FIELLY: You should know the fact before you make wild charges.

Mr. FORSYTH: He did not know that fact. But whether they did it or not, he thought it was only right that the increases should have been paid right back to July.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member for Murrumba had now shifted his ground. He was taking up a different attitude from the attitude he took up on the Financial Statement. On the Financial Statement, he contended that none of the automatic increases should have been paid, and that none of the payments should have been made out of consolidated revenue which were made by way of adjustment at the end of the financial year.

Mr. FORSYTH: What year?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This year. It was to be found on page 1366 of the pamphlet "Hansard."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in quoting from a previous debate of this session. He may refer to it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He just wanted to refer to it. The hon. member said that the Treasurer had no less than £240,000 surplus on the 30th June—

"There can be no denying that fact, because the figures are in his own Statement. He states that he took away from the loan fund and debited revenue with £52,000 in connection with wooden buildings.

That was done years before. Mr. Kidston, when he had a large surplus, did the same thing, and I do not blame him for doing these things, so long as the money is not wanted for anything else. Then there was £85,000 depreciation on loan. That was taken from loan and debited against revenue. Then he took £42,000 from trust funds. He credited trust funds and debited revenue for that amount. Coupled with that he gave the £56,000 in connection with the automatic increases, and the total amount of the money

to which I referred is £236,000, which with a small balance brought forward of £3,000 or £4,000 gives the total of £240,000.

"The Treasurer: Don't you think those items should have been paid out of revenue?"

"Mr. Forsyth: I say most emphatically the hon. gentleman was wrong to do it."

Mr. FORSYTH: You read on a little further.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It continued—

"If the hon. gentleman had anticipated a buoyant year this coming year, and had no idea of putting on extra taxation, then he would have been perfectly justified in doing what he did."

Mr. FORSYTH: You go on and read it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He could not read the whole lot. The hon. member's remark was: "I say most emphatically that the hon. gentleman was wrong to have paid that out of revenue." He could come to no other conclusion than that the hon. member would have retained that, and added it to the surplus, and—by somehow evading the Audit Act—used it as revenue for the present year. However, there was no getting away from the fact that the present Government not only provided this year for increases up to £250, but also on salaries on less than £100 last year. The balance of the amount was paid, so that the public servants got their increases from the 1st July until the end of the year.

Hon. J. A. FIELLY: He wanted to clear up one little point referred to by the hon. member for Murrumba. While he was speaking, he (Mr. FIELLY) interjected that the late Government had ten months—really eleven months—to consider the question of whether they would pay the public servants for the whole year.

Mr. FORSYTH: How did they have ten months, when they only had the money coming in?

Hon. J. A. FIELLY: The hon. member then levelled his usual charge against that side of ignorance, stupidity, and so on, his one reply to criticism, and the leader of the Opposition told him quietly that the increases always went back to July.

Mr. FORSYTH: He said that they only paid from January.

Hon. J. A. FIELLY: And, to add to the hon. member's discomfiture, the fact was that the present Government had paid them from July, because they were entitled to them from July. But when the present Government came into office, the public servants got a full year's back money of what the late Government deliberately robbed them.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That is absolutely untrue.

Hon. J. A. FIELLY: The junior clerks in the public service got their automatic increases right back to July. He just wanted to say that to clear away any misapprehension.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He could not allow the statement of the hon. member to go without replying to it. The late Government paid from January of the present year up to July, and, of course, for the corresponding six months of the year they were not paid.

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

They started paying them when they could get the money. The Under Secretary for the Treasury, as soon as they started to pay them, announced that there would probably be a deficit of £300,000. What Government would go on with additional expenditure under those circumstances?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Does the hon. member say that we only paid from January?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: I am not talking about your Government. I say that we paid the full year.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member's Government paid for the back six months. The late Government went very carefully into the matter and could not come to the same conclusion as the Under Secretary of the Treasury. They did not blame the Under Secretary. He was a very careful officer, and when he saw a possible danger he did his duty. The best of men would sometimes make mistakes, particularly when they had to judge on conditions that were changing. The Government felt that the thing would come out right in the end, and so it did, with the result that they had not a deficit of £300,000 but a profit of £240,000, which they left to the present Government, who, finding that they had an overflowing Treasury, endeavoured to make good in every possible way, to improve their position with the public servants. They did so at the expense of the late Government, at the expense of the careful administration of the late Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I want to say to hon. members that, by interjection, certain questions have crept into the debate which have drawn it away from the question before the Committee. To deal now with the whole of the financial position of the Government is irrelevant and out of order, and I will ask hon. members to now confine themselves entirely to the vote for machinery and scaffolding. I think hon. members will admit that I have given them the opportunity of replying.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He simply rose for the purpose of replying to the statement that was made, and to show that the late Government were justified in doing what they did. Had they, when they knew they were on a safe footing, desired, perhaps, to put themselves in a false position with the public, they would have paid all those salaries, but they preferred to act on the lines which they did. Had they got back, the public servants would have been paid, every one of them, because they had the money to do it. But they were not going to pay them just before the election, and go to the country with a stigma of having to force the election in their favour by buying the position. That was a plain statement of facts, and the public would realise it.

Mr. GUNN: After the ruling of the Chairman, he would like to refer to another matter. He understood that the Government motor garage now was placed under the supervision of the Public Works Department. He would like to know if there were more cars now in the service of the Government than there were under the late Government.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Not any more.

[Hon. J. Tolmie.]

Mr. GUNN: Well, there seemed to him to be a great many more running about the streets. The late Liberal Government must have left the cars in the backyards or the fowlhouses; but under the present Government they had escaped from the backyards and fowlhouses, and now one could see them in the streets at any hour of the day or night. (Laughter.) He did not know whether it was Government work or not. If it were, it appeared that the opposite sex occupied a great number of the seats. He was not complaining in any way about the present Government using motor-cars and driving their wives and friends about the city; he was rather glad—far better than going to picture shows. (Laughter.) But when they were in power, it was always held up to them as sinful even to ride in a motor-car, let alone use the Government motor-car in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is referring to a matter already dealt with. The item for the motor garage was in the previous vote.

Mr. GUNN: He had there a report from the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding, a paragraph of which read—

“The Government motor garage established last year has been placed under my supervision. The repairs necessary in keeping the departmental cars and motor-cycles in order—”

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member may deal with the supervision of the garage, but he cannot deal with other matters.

Mr. GUNN: That was what he wanted to deal with, and that was why he got his remarks in there, because he thought it was the most suitable place.

Question put and passed.

LABOUR AND FACTORIES.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved that £10,850 be granted for “Labour and Factories.” He did not know whether it was necessary to refer in detail to the changes that had taken place.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I think it would be well to give us a good deal of information.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He could refer in a general way to the reorganisation that had taken place in that subdepartment. As was well known, a Director of Labour was appointed. It was decided by the present Government that the Labour Bureau and the system of factories and shops inspection should be remodelled, and placed on a more satisfactory footing. The Government recognised that in order to do this effectively, and do the work which was supposed to be carried out in an efficient manner, it was necessary that there should be a reorganisation. Before the Government took office the total number of officers employed was twenty-nine, and their services were not utilised in the most favourable or the most desirable way, but under the reorganisation scheme a change had been brought about. A Director of Labour had been appointed, there were also additional inspectors of factories and shops, and the system of labour exchanges had been entirely altered and placed on a different footing and was now working under an Act

passed this session. The number of officers had been increased from twenty-nine to forty-five. There were additional appointments in connection with the inspectorial duties in this department. The Director of Labour, Mr. W. R. Crampton, was down for £400. The Chief Inspector of Factories was getting £330, the same as last year. The Chief Inspector still retained that title and had control of that part of the duties of the subdepartment which included the inspection of factories and shops. He was the official head of the inspectorial staff, and all reports went to him. The general supervision of the department and the immediate control of the organisation of the labour exchanges was placed in the hands of Mr. Crampton. There were certain new appointments made of new inspectors, and there were a good many alterations in regard to their location so as to get the most effective work out of them. In this way the department was put on a thoroughly sound footing. The effects of the reorganisation were already being felt in every district in which the department was operating. Breaches of awards and breaches of the Act were being discovered with greater facility than ever before, and there had been more prosecutions. It was not that the department was any more rigorous in enforcing prosecutions, but they were certainly more successful under the present system than under that which prevailed previous to the reorganisation. Previously, inspectors were stationed in districts for months without finding any evasions or breaches of the Act. Since the new arrangement the prosecutions had greatly increased in number. The labour exchanges were now working in a very satisfactory manner. The system was still in its infancy so far as usefulness was concerned, but the reorganisation of the system had done something towards getting over the evil of unemployment. Comparing the number of men who passed through the Labour Bureau under the old system with the number who used the labour exchanges, they would find that where scores passed through under the old system thousands were the number who used the labour exchanges. Employers and employees were brought together in closer relationship, and the interests of both were well served.

Mr. BARNES: Are you succeeding in finding employment for them?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Oh, yes, they have succeeded in placing a number. The employers were expressing their belief that the system would turn out satisfactorily. Hitherto, the number of employers depending on the bureau was not very great, but the employers found that they could rely on the labour exchanges to secure them reliable labour without irritation or annoyance and without cost. It was intended to develop the system of labour exchanges in every centre of the State where an officer or representative would be stationed, and everyone who desired labour would be registered, as also those who wished to secure employment. It often happened that while there was a scarcity of labour in one part of the State there were men in need of work in another part, and by using the exchanges both employers and employees in these places could be brought into touch with each other. If men in Brisbane were out of work, and it was found that employment was offering in the

remoter parts of the State, they would be assisted by the State to proceed there and take advantage of that work. He hoped hon. members would visit the head office in Edward street, and discuss the working of the system with the officers there, when they would understand thoroughly what was being done. The idea was to serve both employers and employees. The permission of the Postmaster-General was being sought to allow the post offices to be used to place letter-cards there, so that an employer who desired to obtain labour could write his requirements on one of the cards and post it to the head office. In the same way an employee needing work would use the card, stating his qualifications, and post the card straight away. The department would then see what labour was offering and what was required. The system was an interesting one, and he confidently felt that it would do much towards solving the unemployed problem. The idea was to make labour more mobile and allow men to take advantage of work that was offering in any part of the State. The premises in Edward street were not commodious enough to accommodate the officers under the reorganisation scheme, but additions were being made to meet the difficulty.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: What about that question I asked you, about a single man who was a unionist having preference over a married man who was a non-unionist?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He did not think that was a fair question. He could find one for the hon. gentleman which would be much more difficult than that. It was not right to put a hypothetical question like that, because it might never arise. If such a difficulty did occur, the officers would remit the matter to him for settlement, and he would be able to settle it on equitable lines.

HON. J. TOLMIE: This was an interesting vote. It was interesting to members and to people throughout the State. They were at a disadvantage in discussing the vote at present. He was not personally blaming the Minister in charge of the Estimates, as circumstances may have operated to bring about that condition of affairs. He knew the Minister was a man very much worried at the present time, but the department was one of the most important they had in the public service, and they were absolutely in the dark as to the work that was being performed by that department. They knew what the department was like by the wealth of information shown in the report. It was a department that dealt with the social conditions of the great mass of the people of the State. This was the one department under which the working men of the State could be discussed, and at times such as this it was very necessary that they should be in a position to discuss all these matters with the absolute knowledge of what the working conditions had been during the past twelve months. They must have been very good indeed, because if there had been any defect they would have heard of it from the other side of the Chamber. They would have had question after question asked them, pointing out where the Government had been defective in carrying out their work. The very fact that no question had been asked and no denunciation made were the strongest proofs of the excellence of the administration of

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

that department under the late Treasurer. Since the late Government left office and the present Government had come in there had been a departure in a very important subdepartment. They had appointed a Director of Labour. He had only seen that Director of Labour once, having come into business relations with him a few days ago. He had heard of the Director of Labour, and he had known him to be a strong political partisan of the present Government. This was the first exhibition they had had in Queensland of the application of the Tammany system.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Shame!

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: The chairman of the prices board which your Government appointed was a chairman of the late Premier's committee.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Here was a man appointed to one of the most important subdepartments in the State.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do not malign a good man or you will hear some home truths.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was prepared to to hear the home truths. The Government had made a political appointment of the first water and—

MR FREE: What about Kidston's appointment? Was not that political?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No.

MR. T. L. JONES: Is not Mr. Crampton a good man for the position?

HON. J. TOLMIE: He knew nothing about his qualifications. He had under him the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops, who had been in the department many years and knew the whole of the work, having everything right at his finger-tips. What encouragement was it to these men in the public service if this kind of thing was going to be allowed? Surely the Public Service Act, which was administered by hon. gentlemen opposite, should protect him. That Act said that no man should be brought into the public service unless there was no one in the public service fit to take the position.

MR. McPHAIL: What did you appoint David Hunter for?

HON. J. TOLMIE: Mr. Hunter was a competent officer.

MR. KIRWAN: You are speaking against Mr. Crampton because he is a Labour man—therefore, he is no good.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The Chief Inspector of Factories was a man who was thoroughly qualified for the position, but he had been passed by, and somebody had been taken from outside who had no knowledge of administrative work under the Government. The Secretary for Public Works had pointed out what he called the great

[5 p.m.] usefulness of the labour exchange, and the great number of persons going through at the present time, but was not that a clear indication of the perilous condition into which the State was drifting by reason of the number of unemployed? One hon. member told him the evening before last that in his electorate there were 2,000 men out of employment. In the city of Toowoomba there were at the end of last week over 240 registrations for employment, and, of this number, employment had been found for only ten men at the asylum works which were started at

Willowburn. He was told that in one district there were only two working men in one area who were employed at the present time, and relief to the unemployed was being given week after week. Notwithstanding that, the Minister said that the labour exchange was the means of giving employment to a large number of persons. With regard to the question of preference to unionists, the Minister said that he (Mr. Tolmie) was justified in asking the question which he had asked, and he would point out that all these things which he had mentioned were happening. There were many men in Queensland who could not get employment because they did not happen to be unionists. He had received a letter the other day from a person in Brisbane who had been out of employment since June. He went to a Federal job and asked for employment, and the first question put to him was, "Are you a unionist?" and he had to admit that he was not a unionist. The advice given to him was to go and join a union.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Good advice.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Very good advice. The man went to the union and endeavoured to obtain admission into the union, and the organiser wrote him a very courteous letter, pointing out that at the present time there were more men out of employment in that union than they could find work for, and, that being the case, he could not see his way to register him in the union. That was the position they were drifting to in Queensland, and how was the labour exchange going to improve it? In Cairns they had had to employ a clerk at £100, and the same at Bundaberg, Mackay, and Townsville, and thus increase the vote. Nevertheless, they could not cope with the industrial position, and were not able to find work for the workers, because the Government was not providing it. What was the use of the Minister belauding an institution of this kind when it could not perform the duties expected of it? He maintained that a great wrong had been done to the Chief Inspector of Factories in turning him down in the way which had been done.

* MR. SWAYNE pointed out that while £10,850, the amount put down for this branch of the Works Department, was not a large one, it was an increase of over 40 per cent. on the previous year's vote, which was £7,650.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Perhaps you would make a saving by wiping out the increases.

MR. SWAYNE was not making that suggestion for a moment, but, at the same time, as the whole of Queensland was bearing the additional taxation which was being imposed, the question naturally arose as to whether these increases were necessary. He did not think there was a single member on this side of the House who objected to the increase of salary of lower paid officials, but when it came to the creation of new billets the question arose as to whether, in such a critical time as this, action could not have been delayed in that matter. The highest salaried officer in the vote was the Director of Labour, who was a new man with no previous departmental training.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He has a thorough knowledge of industrialism.

[Hon. J. Tolmie.]

Mr. SWAYNE: Were there not men who had served the State for years who were equally entitled to the appointment? It would have a bad effect upon those who were already in the department when they saw the "blue ribbon" positions in the service going to outsiders. He was not going to say anything about this gentleman's political opinions. He did not think politics should come into the question at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Did the late Government never appoint anyone from outside the service to a high position?

Mr. SWAYNE: The Treasurer was unduly touchy on this point; it almost looked as if he had a guilty conscience on the subject. He felt quite safe in saying that, as far as the late Government was concerned, a man's political opinions did not come into question when an appointment was made. The only question in the past was as to the man's efficiency. They found there were lady inspectors appointed at Rockhampton and Townsville, and, so far as he could see, these positions did not exist before. There were five additional clerk assistants appointed at Ipswich, Bundaberg, Mackay, Townsville, and Cairns, at £100 each. He was not complaining about the salaries paid to these people; perhaps they might be small, but the question was whether this was an opportune time for making new appointments, and whether they should not have gone on for a year or two as they were till times improved. That was a fair question for the producer to ask.

Mr. FOLEY: They have been wanted for a long time.

Mr. SWAYNE: They could have been held over till times improved, as nobody could say that Queensland was unduly suffering from the lack of these appointments. There was a still more important question involved. He took it that the Director of Labour would receive applications for labour, not only from private employers, but from the State, and would be the means of securing work for men on railway construction and other work. He would ask the Treasurer whether it would be that officer's duty, when an applicant for work came along, to take a note as to whether a man was a member of a certain organisation or not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Director of Labour will have no instruction on that point. Labourers on railway work are engaged with that stipulation. The department itself has to say that preference is given, other things being equal, to unionists.

Mr. SWAYNE: The official then would receive instructions from the department to send them labour of a certain school of political thought. He thought that no more iniquitous principle was ever devised than that a man who was employed by the State, and paid by the taxpayer, should only be employed if he was a member of a political organisation. That should have nothing whatever to do with his getting work. The sole question that should come into the matter was as to whether a man was a competent workman, irrespective of what his politics might be. The State was paying him out of revenue which was received from people of all shades of political opinion. Such a system was opening the door to, perhaps, the greatest corruption. Talk about graft in the United

States! This was going to beat all that. The Government were disbursing a revenue of something like £7,000,000 per annum, raised from the taxpayers generally, and, under cover of this system, they would be paying wages from that revenue to men of one shade of political opinion only. Under the legislation now being passed it would be compulsory for everyone to join a union. The system of compulsory preference to unionists was objectionable in private employment, and it was doubly so in connection with the State. The sole duty of the Government was to see that a man was capable, and their duty ceased there. He was sorry to see that the principle of preference to unionists was being initiated in the public service.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: You are talking rot.

Mr. SWAYNE: It was not rot. Could any fair-minded man contend that a person's political opinions should weigh with the Government as to whether they should give him a job or not? It had been admitted all through that these bodies were political, and he contended that the moment a body became political in its objective its members should not have preference. A policy of that kind must lead to corruption, and it would not improve our reputation in the eyes of the world. He noticed that the Minister had again evaded answering the question raised by the leader of the Opposition as to whether preference would be given to a single man who was a unionist over a married man who did not belong to a union. The hon. gentleman said it would be time enough to discuss that matter when the occasion arose, but he (Mr. Swayne) held that it would then be too late to consider the matter, after a man with a family dependent upon him had been passed over for such a reason, and the job given to a single man, and that the Committee were entitled to a straightforward answer on the point.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): The argument of the Opposition seemed to be that the Government were making political appointments, but the members who used that argument did not seem to realise that when they were in power they made many political appointments. They apparently forgot that when it was necessary to appoint a certain gentleman as Chief Justice of the State the Liberal Government increased his salary by £1,000.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: A Liberal Government did not do that.

Mr. COLLINS: They also forgot that they appointed Henry Cowap, a defeated candidate for Mount Morgan, to the position of an inspector, and that they appointed Mr. David Hunter, who was defeated in 1912 for Maree, to the position of an inspector of scaffolding.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: We did not make those appointments.

Mr. COLLINS: In his travels throughout Queensland, which had been fairly extensive, he never met a single public servant receiving over £300 a year who was not a strong supporter of the Liberal party, and he had a strong suspicion that they received their appointments from the political party then in power. The appointments that a lot of Labour people got were pick-and-shovel appointments; they were debarred from the higher-paid offices, which were left for Liberal supporters. A great deal had been said about spoils to the victors and

Mr. Collins.]

preference to unionists. He had no hesitation in saying that if the member for Mirani knew a man was a unionist he would not employ him.

Mr. SWAYNE: That is not true.

Mr. COLLINS: If it was not true that the hon. member would not do that, it was true that many persons in the electorate represented by the hon. member would follow that course. He remembered when it was a crime to be a unionist and for a man to dare to assert his British rights and liberties.

Mr. SWAYNE: Never in my eyes.

Mr. COLLINS: He had been in the electorate the hon. member represented, and he knew how the men used to tremble owing to the power the employing class exercised in that part of Queensland. They were afraid to join unions because of the power of the men belonging to the same class as that to which the hon. member for Mirani belonged. The Labour party were now in the ascendant; they had the workers organised, and they were going to give preference to the men who were organised. What was wrong with that? There was nothing wrong in giving preference to a unionist, because he was the stamp of man that they wanted future Australians to be, not a man who would crawl on his chest to his employer until the hairs were worn off. Even to-day men were victimised in Queensland for being members of a union, for daring to organise and fight for their rights; and yet they had members of the Opposition talking about injustice and corruption, as if they were the Simon Pures—as if they never put their friends in public positions! That was what they lived on; that was the reason why they retained their hold on the Treasury benches. Their inspectorships were a farce. If they were not a farce, why was it that there were not more prosecutions in the past when there was a Liberal Government in power? Why didn't the inspectors enforce the different awards made by the wages tribunal? Because, he supposed, the strings were pulled, and the Liberal inspectors were told not to prosecute their Liberal friends. And now, because the workers are coming in to their own, they had the leader of the Opposition crying out, "What is going to happen to the married man with a big family if he is not a unionist and a single man comes along who is a unionist? Are you going to give preference to the single man?"

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Not if he comes to me for employment. I will see that the married man gets employment.

Mr. COLLINS: He had no doubt that the hon. member would put the single man in a position in which he would not be able to marry. He (Mr. Collins) claimed that a single man had just as much right to work as a married man. If the single man was to be debarred from getting work, then he would have to remain single all his life. He did not know whether that was the position taken up by the leader of the Opposition or not.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: He would employ a kanaka.

Hon. J. TOLMIE rose to a point of order. The Assistant Minister for Justice, by interjection, said that he would employ a kanaka. The hon. gentleman knew that such was not

[*Mr. Collins.*

the case, and he asked that the hon. gentleman be called upon to withdraw the statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the interjection, but if the hon. member made that statement, and the leader of the Opposition objects to it, I ask him to withdraw it.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: He did not know that the statement was one which should be withdrawn, but in deference to the Chairman he would withdraw it, though he knew that the hon. gentleman belonged to the black labour party.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He asked that the hon. member be called upon to withdraw that statement, because, as a matter of fact, he had supported the white labour policy all his life.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Bowen.

Mr. COLLINS: The question of preference to unionists had been before the people of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KIRWAN: We had an election on it.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, and the people of Queensland took part in that election. The Government party would be acting cowardly if they took possession of the Treasury benches and did not give preference to unionists. They believed in the organisation of society. He supposed that hon. members opposite believed in the organisation in Great Britain with reference to the manufacture of munitions; and what was that but a compulsory form of organisation? He believed in compelling those wormlike creatures, who took advantage of the improved conditions the unions had got for them and would not contribute towards the cost of getting those improved conditions, to do their duty in this matter. It was stated that the whole of the people of the State had to contribute towards the payment of those employed by the State. He was well aware of that fact. He remembered that when he had to contribute towards the revenue of the State, he had to pay for the Cowpays and Hunters whom the Liberal Government used to appoint. Again, reference was made to the appointment of Mr. Cramp-ton as Director of Labour. What the Government required was brains, and if a man outside the service had got some brains why should he not be appointed to a position in the public service? The Government should make use of the best brains of the community. It was not the fault of men who held Labour views that they were not in the public service. The Liberal party took good care when they were in power that they did not get there. The individuals who were appointed as inspectors did not look after the interests of the workers; they looked after the interests of the masters. And now members opposite complain because one or two Labour men have been appointed to positions in the service. What astonished him was that the Government did not clear out the biggest portion of the public servants. It was no use passing Acts of Parliament unless they were sympathetically administered, and administration did not altogether lie with the Minister. What was the use of asking a blue-blooded Tory to carry out Government inspection under a Labour law? He would lean towards the Tories. He hoped that there would be more

Labour inspectors appointed, and that justice would be done to the worker; in the past they had had one-sided justice. He had heard people in England sing—

“Justice is in England,
This free and happy land,
Justice is in England,
I cannot understand
Justice for the rich and poor;
They tell their different tales,
For the rich man always seems to get
The balance of the scales.”

He hoped they would hear no more in this Parliament about preference to unionists. Members opposite knew full well that the people had endorsed that policy, and why did they not take their beating like men, like Britons?

Mr. PETRIE: After the dramatic exhibition of his friend, the hon. member for Bowen, he felt a little bit nervous about saying anything on this vote. It appeared to him that members had been drifting away from the vote to a number of things outside the vote. He did not take exception to that. But what members on the [5.30 p.m.] Opposition side objected to was that certain things were taking place. If a man wished to get employment, he would have to become a unionist. Preference was brought in in every case. It was said that the late Liberal Government appointed their friends to positions, but he (Mr. Petrie) had often blamed the Liberal Government for not doing that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This discussion would not have taken place if the leader of the Opposition had not raised it.

Mr. PETRIE: He objected to the hon. member who referred to the political opinions of members getting over £300 a year. Any-one could make statements of that kind without proving them. These men had grown up in the service from the time they were young men. He did not care whether a man was a public servant or not, he should have his freedom politically, religiously, and in any other way, and he hoped that as long as he was in this world he would not interfere with it. But the present Government were all for one class. Everybody had got to go under except the unionists. They did not object to unionism, but they did object to the methods adopted by an outside institution and the pressure brought to bear upon the Government. He believed that the Director of Labour was a very capable man, and had qualifications that would fit him for the position, but he thought that at a time when they were experiencing such a great drought and a war unequalled in the history of the world, it was the duty of the Government to go slow. Was it not possible to appoint someone in the office, such as the Chief Inspector, who was holding the dual position and was now head of the factories branch, until such time as conditions were better and the department had grown considerably? He believed that the department was a very good one, and carried out its work without political consideration, and he thought it would do a deal of good to the State. To a certain extent, they could not blame the Government, who had to carry out their promises to their friends, and he had nothing to say against Mr. Crampton, because he thought he knew he was there for

certain work, and he hoped he would carry it out to the satisfaction of the whole community. He would like to ask the Minister whether the Labour Agent at present was the same gentleman as last year? He was down at the same salary as last year, and had occupied the position for many years—Mr. Townsend.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Caulfield is the person now carrying on those duties.

Mr. PETRIE: He had nothing further to say at present, except to thank the Chairman for the latitude he had given them in enabling members on that side to express their opinions and reply to criticisms of members opposite.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He could not allow the leader of the Opposition's remarks to go by without challenge so far as his criticisms of the Director of Labour were concerned. He regretted exceedingly that he should introduce such a criticism during the Estimates, or at any other time.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Not against the man.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Crampton was a man who was filling the position in a way highly creditable to himself and the department. (Hear, hear!) He would not mind if the hon. member had some criticism against his administration, or had attacked him as an officer, but to attack his alleged political proclivities—

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I questioned the action of the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member did, for making an appointment of what he termed a bitter political partisan, who would not be able to do his duty because of his partisanship. That was absolutely incorrect. He did not think that there was any man in Queensland more fitted for the position than Mr. Crampton, a man thoroughly steeped in industrialism, and with a thorough knowledge of the industrial requirements of the State, who could undertake the work of reorganising the department.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That it wanted reorganising nobody who knew it could doubt, and it wanted reorganising because the late Government carried on the principle which they now condemned, the principle of putting their political friends into positions, the principle of making that department practically a dumping-ground of political derelicts, because that was what it was. The late Government had appointed ex-Liberal members, ex-Liberal supporters, and men who were useless for the positions. The hon. member had opened up that debate, and he wanted now to point out to him some of the sins of the late Government. The late Government appointed Mr. Hunter, who for years was one of the bitterest political partisans in that House, and a man who was not at all moderate in his views. Shortly after he was defeated as a candidate for the House of Representatives, he was pitchforked into a billet in the Works Department. Mr. Cowap was another ex-Liberal member.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: An ex-Labour man, wasn't he?

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member knew perfectly well that both those gentlemen were Liberal men at the time of their defeats and at the time of their appointment. What was worse still, from the point of view of the hon. member, he was responsible for the appointment of his own private secretary to a position in the public service only a short time ago.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was in the department when I went there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: And his own predecessor, Mr. Barnes, was successful in engineering the appointment of the secretary of his political committee, Mr. Kidston, the son of the late leader of the Liberal Government. Then, one man who occupied a prominent position in the department which he was administering was a brother-in-law of a very prominent supporter of the other side. There was no necessity to mention his name—the hon. member would know to whom he referred. A man who occupied a position in the Cairns district was a man who had stood a number of times in the Liberal interest, Mr. Tills, who was pitchforked into the position when he was defeated. What about Mr. Jones, the defeated Senate candidate, who was appointed to a position in the Agricultural Department?

HON. J. TOLMIE: Is he in the service now?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What about Mr. Aitcheson, who only last year was pitchforked back into one of the departments? What about Mr. Watson, well known as a supporter of Mr. Denham, secretary of his committee, for years one of the staunchest supporters in Oxley of the Liberal party? Was he not given a safe position as chairman of the Control of Prices Board? Was not that a public scandal? What about Dent, the man who came out against the Labour Government of the Commonwealth, and gave that scandalous evidence to the commission on electoral matters? So soon as he gave it, was he not pitchforked into a position by the Liberal Government? What about all the defeated Liberal candidates who at various times had been pitchforked into honourable positions in the Upper House? What about those political appointments? Why, if anyone was deserving of censure for that kind of Tammany, that kind of corruption, that kind of disregard for the public interests, the men who represented the Liberal party were to blame.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Labour party had tried to keep appointments to the public service absolutely clean and aboveboard. They had tried to keep that sort of consideration out of the question, and he thought that they had succeeded. Because one man happened to have definite opinions regarding politics, was that any reason why they should deny to him recognition of his worth? He thought it would be a wrong principle to say that because a man had definite views of politics he should not have an appointment in the public service.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Personally, he did not think it was a fair attitude. Nor did he think that it was correct to pitchfork men into the service

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

without any regard for merit, but simply because they had been adherents of a political party. The Labour party had never and did not now stand for that sort of thing. They had never believed in that small mean-spirited kind of recognition of their public duties, and never would. They did not stand for the policy of "spoils to the victors." The man whose appointment was under discussion was a man whose appointment was well justified.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: His administration showed that his appointment was justified. He was working well with the officers, and they were working well with him and spoke highly of him, and he was reorganising the department in a manner which would stand to his credit and to the credit of the department. He thought it was regrettable that the leader of the Opposition so far forgot himself as to make a slanderous attack upon a public servant.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. TOLMIE: He could not allow the hon. member's remarks to go without reply.

MR. FREE: You will make it worse.

HON. J. TOLMIE: So far as Mr. Crampton was concerned, whatever his qualifications were, he did not attack him—he dealt with the Government, and with the Government only. If Mr. Crampton had all the virtues they were told he possessed, he was very glad, because the position was such that it would be a shame to appoint a man whose qualifications did not warrant it. But he wanted to point out that there was a man well qualified to fill the position, who occupied the position of Chief Inspector, and that man had been passed over, and somebody from outside the service altogether had been taken.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Well qualified to occupy the position of Chief Inspector? He occupies that position now.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member referred to his private secretary. It was absolutely untrue that he was appointed to the public service by him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Appointed at your suggestion.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Not at his suggestion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Is he in the public service?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Was he not in the public service immediately before the election?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No, or he would be in it now. He was not under the Public Service Board. (Government laughter and uproar.)

MR. STOPFORD: Side-tracking again?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Crampton himself is not under the Public Service Board.

MR. FREE: I told you you would make it worse.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was not side-tracking at all. He hoped the Chairman would keep order, because he was not going to talk while there was a tumult. When

he went into the Lands Department, the private secretary mentioned was there in the position of private secretary to his predecessor, and he was private secretary to the Minister who followed him. And he was sure that the Minister had the same opinion that he had, that he was filling the position with every satisfaction. He never saw the gentleman till he went to the department.

HON. J. A. FIBELLY: Did he pass the public service examination?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No. As the hon. member by that time probably was aware, a number of public servants did not come under the Public Service Board.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Crampton happens to be one of those.

HON. J. TOLMIE: That did not make the position any different. What he was doing now was showing that he had nothing to do with the appointment. He was there just the same as the Under Secretary, when he went, and he was there when he left and he was fulfilling the duties to his successor. The hon. member read out a list of names of men who had been appointed during several years past who happened to be supporters of the Liberal Government, and he said that one or two politicians were appointed. Very good. They appointed politicians from the Labour side. What about Mr. Allen? What about Mr. Reinhold? Those were men in the public service to-day.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: You only reinstated them.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was not finding fault with the capabilities of these public servants, any more than he was finding fault with the capabilities of Mr. Crampton. The appointment of a man who had no official qualification whatsoever to the charge of a great subdepartment of the State, a department that was dealing with all the labour of the State—should not have been made.

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

MR. CORSER: The Government evidently intended to make the department to suit those who put them into power. It had been repeatedly stated in the Chamber that the Tory party had been in power for fifty years, but the Minister read out a list a few minutes ago which showed that only eight appointments had been made of Liberals during that term of fifty years. The Minister made the best case for himself, and got the total number of appointments that were made, and they amounted to only eight in fifty years. They knew that during the few months of the present Government's term of office they had made something like sixteen political appointments in the public service. He had asked for a return of the number of appointments that had been made, so that he could give the correct figures, but those figures had not been made available. They had been locked away in a cupboard. During its term of office, the present Government have exceeded all expectations in the number of political appointments they had made. The appointment of a Director of Labour at £400 a year, at a time when the lower paid servants could not get all they required, was unreasonable, unnecessary, and unjust.

MR. GILLIES: What salary would you suggest?

MR. CORSER: He suggested that the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops should have received an increase in his salary, and he would have been capable and willing to have fulfilled the position of Director of Labour. He (Mr. Corser) had no reason to apologise for indulging in personalities, because never since he had been in the House had he been called on to withdraw any personal reference to anyone. He was sorry to hear hon. members opposite say that the Director of Labour was fulfilling his duty so far as they were concerned. The Director of Labour should fulfil his duty to the best of his own ability, and should mete out justice and fairness to all who made application for employment. When they heard that the Director was fulfilling his duty to the credit and the pleasure of members on the Government benches, it was time for them to object, because they knew that he would give employment to a certain section only. The men looking for employment would not have any freedom at all; they would have to join a union to get employment. He did not say that he would not advise every man to join a union, but they should not allow the Director or anyone else to coerce people into joining a union, and make them contribute to any particular fund. They had a right to join a union that was giving them increases and better conditions, but they should not be compelled to do so. The Director must be doing something of that kind to receive the sympathy and pleasure of members opposite. Members opposite told them that members of the community were being victimised because of their union principles. How could that be when there was a Labour Government in power—when it was possible for them to put their thumb or their heel on the people who were guilty of victimisation? They could not blame the Opposition for that, because they were numerically weak—at any rate, the Government had the power to deal with it. For many years the appointments in the public service were made from young men who qualified by passing an examination.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Who appointed Mr. Hunter and Mr. Cowap?

MR. CORSER: He was not responsible for that. It was the young lads from schools who were appointed to the public service, and they grew up until they reached the highest positions.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Would you give the position of Director of Labour to a lad from school?

MR. CORSER: He was not referring to the Director of Labour. The hon. member for Bowen said that the men in the service getting £300 a year were not Labour sympathisers.

MR. COLLINS: That is my experience.

MR. CORSER: The public service had been filled with young fellows who grew up until they reached the high positions. There were as many men in the service getting £300 a year who were Labour sympathisers as there were Liberal sympathisers.

MR. KIRWAN: How do you know?

MR. CORSER: It must be so, or members opposite would not be occupying the Government benches at the present time. There was no doubt that men drawing high salaries in the service must be Labour sympathisers,

Mr. Corser.]

because these were the men who gave the information to members opposite last year. The information that was used by members opposite could only have come from the highly paid officials, and not from the lower paid members of the service.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: Don't slander a good body of men.

Mr. CORSER: He was not slandering the members of the public service at all, but the hon. member knew that the information he received last session came from the higher paid members of the service.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: What case was that?

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member knew only too well. He knew the Government intended to do everything that was possible to foster this incubator, from which it was hoped to hatch many Labour votes to enable many more people to become Labour sympathisers. If it was turning out directors and inspectors and placing on the Estimates large sums of money for inspectors, [7 p.m.] then they were doing pretty well in their desire. This was a time when persons employed in the public service would be satisfied if they were able to retain their positions, and it was undesirable to make a lot of new appointments which necessitated the imposition of increased burdens on the taxpayer. The Government had found it necessary to increase taxation in order to secure sufficient revenue to meet the increased expenditure on the public service, and it was a remarkable thing that they should make so many new appointments under those conditions. The few inspectors at present employed were apparently sufficient for the work in times of plenty when there was a considerable expenditure of loan money, and if that was a fact—and there had been no complaint that inspectorial duties had not been efficiently performed—then the staff should be sufficient at a time when there was a slackness in business, and no extra appointments should be made. The increased expenditure for inspectors alone amounted to £1,300.

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

Mr. CORSER: If the Government went on appointing inspectors at the rate they had been doing, then the whole community would consist of inspectors or members of some board or another, and they would simply be watching each other. If the Chief Inspector had represented that it was necessary that these inspectors should be appointed, there would be no complaint by members of the Opposition, but they had not been furnished with the report of the inspector, and, therefore, did not know whether he had made any recommendation or not. If his report showed that the department were labouring under disability owing to the fact that they had insufficient inspectors, then members might approve of the action of the Government in making these additional appointments. At any rate, it would be much easier for members to criticise the administration of the Government if they had in their hands the report of the Chief Inspector, as they would then be in a position to say whether good reasons were given for these appointments. Probably there was some reason for keeping the report back. Members of the Opposition believed that if they were furnished with a report they would

[Mr. Corser.

find that the present inspectors were sufficient for the work, and that there was no necessity to increase the vote by £1,300 for the payment of new inspectors. Most of the new inspectors, he noticed, were appointed in and around Brisbane, with the exception of a lady inspector at Rockhampton and another at Townsville.

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

Mr. CORSER: There was an item of £246 on the vote for a travelling inspector. What the duties of this officer would be it was very hard to say, and no information had been given on that point by the Minister. It struck him that this officer was going to be an inspector of the honorary inspectors, the whip of the party, as it were. In any case, he thought these appointments should be looked upon with some suspicion. Besides the amount set down as salary for the travelling inspector, there was an increase of £700 in the item for travelling expenses. He contended that the Opposition had every reason to regard these appointments with some suspicion. If a travelling inspector was required, some good reason should be given for his appointment, but the Minister had not shown that there was any necessity for such an officer. He contended that members had a right to know why the Government had appointed so many new inspectors. He noticed also that the vote for clerks had been increased from £390 to £725, and he should like to know whether that increase was justifiable. He did not say that those officers were receiving too much money, but he should like to know if the action of the Government in appointing so many more clerks could be justified. The number of clerks in 1914-1915 was four, and this year the number was six. Last year the number of labour agents and inspectors was six, and this year the number was nine. Members had been given no information as to the necessity for the additional appointments made in those cases. The Government had not the money to spend this year that had been available in previous years, and it was not right that they should increase expenditure in this way unless it was absolutely necessary. He sincerely hoped that before the increase of £3,200 in the total vote was agreed to, the Minister would give them some information on this matter.

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

Mr. GUNN: The hon. member who had just sat down was very anxious to know the cause for the increase in the number of inspectors. He found that Nature showed how increases came along. It was a very well-known law in Nature that when the weather was bad lettuces rushed to seed in no time, and he noticed that inspectors invariably rushed to seed in bad times. It was a sign of bad times when they required so many inspectors. During such periods plenty of people in the country rushed to the Government or members supporting the Government, and said, "I was on your election committee at the last election and I want you to find me a job."

Mr. CARTER: Are you speaking from experience?

Mr. GUNN: He could see by the expression on the faces of the members sitting behind the Government that that was their experience at the present time. They had

any number of men coming down from the bush and saying to them, "I was chairman of your election committee; I want you to find me a job." And they had to go around the departments and scratch their heads to find a position. The next thing was, "Can't we get you in somewhere as an inspector?" He had a lot of unfortunate farmers in his electorate at the present time, and he was afraid that if the drought continued much longer they would come down and worry him to get them positions as inspectors. Unfortunately, he was afraid he was on the wrong side of the House. As to the policy of "spoils to the victors," he did not expect anything else. All Governments saw that their political supporters got the positions, although in the past Liberal Administrations had been rather too honest. They did not give enough rewards to the victors; but he was thinking that there was no fear of that in regard to the present Government. They had all sorts of inspectors now, and he was quite convinced that they wanted some inspectors of inspectors, to see that the inspectors performed their duties. They had provision made for a travelling inspector; whether he was to do that he did not know.

Mr. GILDAY (*Ithaca*) thought that the leader of the Opposition recognised the fact that during the last three years there had been a strenuous endeavour on the part of persons who desired proper administration to have a travelling inspector to look after the various awards, and he thought that the Government should be congratulated on doing something to carry out the legislation which had been passed to protect people who could not protect themselves. No doubt, the travelling inspector was going to see that justice was done and that Acts were carried out in their entirety. But it was only natural that that sort of thing should not be palatable to their friends opposite. As one who had taken a great deal of interest in the industrial movement, he thought that the department was being remodelled in such a way that it would be a credit to the Government and a lasting monument to them in the future. Their friends opposite recognised that the system of carrying out industrial legislation was going to be so perfect that it would be a menace to them. They were unscrupulous individuals, and during the three years he had been a member, times out of number reputable firms had communicated with the Chief Inspector asking that the machinery for preventing unscrupulous employers from fleecing the workers should be put into operation, but in many cases his hands were practically tied. An inspector might find that a man had violated certain awards and made a recommendation to the department. That was sent to the Minister, and then the Crown Solicitor, and the result was, perhaps, that some political influence came in, and no prosecution was taken. He believed that the inspectors had done everything they could to bring about justice, but he thought it was a recognised fact that the Government had no desire to administer industrial legislation which had for its object the doing of something to the people of Queensland. The hon. member for Burnett stated that it was unfortunate that he had no report. If the hon. member, during the last three or four months, had been taking notice—if his mind had been directed to the welfare of the people who required protection—he would have seen that there had been a larger

number of prosecutions for violations of the law than hitherto. Up to March, 1915, there were only twenty-two. In Brisbane and suburbs last year a little over £3,000 had been got for the employees as arrears of wages, whilst in the rest of Queensland only a little over £1,000 had been obtained. That would show how country districts were administered in the past. According to the Estimates, the Government intended to put on sufficient inspectors to remedy that state of affairs. He thought that was most essential. The hon. member for Burnett commented on the fact that it was costing £1,300 more for inspectors. Was not the fact that £3,000 was collected in arrears a justification for the appointment of extra inspectors to see that the people got justice? He predicted that during the coming year not only £3,000 but many thousands of pounds more would be got for the employees, because they would have better administration than hitherto. So far as the appointment of Mr. Crampton was concerned, the Minister had justified the position and his efficiency as Director of Labour. If any man in Queensland understood the importance of that particular post, it was Mr. Crampton, and he thought that hon. members of the Opposition should realise that, because they knew exactly what interest he had taken in industrial matters in Queensland for many years. He thoroughly understood his position, and he was going to deal out justice to both employers and employees. He was not a partisan. He had had the pleasure of working with him for many years, and he knew his value, and he could speak in no other way than to say that both classes were going to get justice at his hands.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The employers always had confidence in him.

Mr. GILDAY: There was no doubt about that, and he felt sure that in respect of his administrative powers he would be a great acquisition to the Labour Department.

Mr. BARNES (*Warwick*): It was to be expected that a vote which showed an increase from £7,650 to £10,850, or an increase of 40 per cent., an increase in the number employed from twenty-nine to forty-five, would demand some criticism from the Opposition. He thought it was extraordinary that at a time like the present a huge expenditure of that kind should take place.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You would like to see the department wiped out altogether?

Mr. BARNES: Not at all. He was not going to complain in that direction, and he had no reason for complaint. But these were proposals with a degree of unfairness to the community generally to the imposition of fresh taxation and in the direction of the appointments that have been made. He was not going to complain one bit about the appointment of the travelling inspector. He thought that, perhaps, nothing was more essential to see that the work of the ordinary residential inspector was carried out. Frequently an employer of labour required information, and it was not to be supposed that the residential inspector would have at his finger's end every aspect of labour legislation and conditions, and it was necessary for such an employer to be posted up by a person who had full and general knowledge, such as he imagined a travelling inspector would have. The same remark applied to

Mr. Barnes.]

the lady inspectors. They were a wonderful advantage. The great bulk of employers were reputable, and desired only to do a fair thing. And if, in ignorance, they might be doing what was not right, they only required to be put right. Men were entirely dependent in those days on the goodwill of those who served them, and it was wretched poor policy for any man to impose on those who were in his employ. Consequently, no one feared the greatest ventilation on those points. But however good Mr. Crampton might be—and, no doubt, he was a good man—he had not graduated in the public service, and in all fairness the righteous thing would have been to appoint somebody in the service.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: Did Mr. McGhie graduate in the public service?

Mr. BARNES: He was not sure. They had a very efficient officer in the service at present, the Chief Inspector of Factories, and he might have been passed on to the position. He gradually worked his way up to a position of honour. If they were to have a perfect public service, they would provide that all the members would have equal opportunity of working up to the best positions. The Minister dis-

[7.30 p.m.] associated himself from the idea of rewards to the victors, or making political appointments. He scorned the very idea, yet this afternoon he said that, all things being considered, the right thing to do was to give preference to unionists. The hon. member for Bowen was horror-struck with the idea at the wrongs done by Liberals in making appointments of Liberals to certain positions in the State, yet he said no one should get an appointment who was not a unionist. According to him, the unionist was the only person who could do the right thing in the country. He did not believe that the party with which he (Mr. Barnes) had been connected had any idea of giving preference to Liberal supporters. No doubt, Liberal supporters received appointments, but it was utterly false to say that they were appointed because they were Liberals, because that was foreign to the Liberal policy and contrary to the provisions which guided Liberals in their conduct with their fellows. The hon. member for Bowen insinuated that unionists were not able to get work because they were unionists. He did not believe that bald statement. As an employer of labour, he did not care whether a man was a unionist or not.

Mr. CARTER: So long as you can make a profit out of them.

Mr. BARNES: The hon. member judged other people by himself. They found in another great department in the Commonwealth, when they wanted to make provision for the imposition of the income tax, they handed over the control of the work to the Land Tax Commissioner. All that extra duty was cast upon him to do.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: Has he not got an extra staff to do it?

Mr. BARNES: He would have an extra staff if it was essential.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: He has also got the experience.

Mr. BARNES: So did Mr. Crowther have the experience. They now had two heads in

[*Mr. Barnes.*]

the Department of Labour and Factories. What would the country come to if the departments were to be conducted on that very liberal scale by increasing the number of appointments? Was it possible that there was anything in connection with the amount of employment coincident with the Labour Government being in power? Was there any greater necessity for having an increase in the number of men to find employment for the people to-day than there was any other day? A large number of citizens of Australia had gone to the front, and their places had to be filled, yet it would appear from the fact of this vote, on account of that increase of unemployment it was necessary to have an increase in the number of inspectors in order to find employment for the unemployed. They knew there was a vast amount of unemployment to-day, and that might be associated with the fact that the Government were running on lines inimical to the best interests of the country. He strongly protested against a big increase of that kind.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): Nearly every member of the Opposition speaking on this question had raised a cry about the increased number of inspectors appointed. If the Ryan Government could not see that the administration of the various Acts was carried out better than the late Government, then he was sorry for them. Hon. members asked the reason for these appointments of extra inspectors. They all admitted that money was scarce, and that things did not look too prosperous, but anyone who lived in the Western districts would know that they had epidemics of typhoid fever there owing to the sanitary conditions which were allowed to prevail. That was a disgrace to any Government. When they looked at the travelling shearing plants, and the accommodation provided for men to-day, they could say it was inferior to what it was thirty years ago when he was shearing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman can discuss that on the Estimates of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PAYNE: He was dealing with the appointment of inspectors, and there was no doubt more inspectors were needed in the Works Department to see that the Act was properly administered. The lopsided way the Act had been administered in the past was a disgrace to any Government. If the Ryan Government were not going to protect the people, and provide decent accommodation for them, then they were failing in their duty. When humanitarian Acts were put on the statute-book, they should be carried out. Members opposite talked about the tyranny of unionism. He had been blackballed himself all over Queensland for being man enough to stand up for his rights. What started the unions in Queensland long before the workers attempted to organise? At that time one of the strongest unions in Australia was the rich, wealthy pastoralists' union. Any man who had the moral courage to stand up for his rights was blackballed from one end of Queensland to the other. There were very few stores in Western Queensland then, and they existed 50 to 100 miles apart. On some of the station stores the names of certain individuals were posted up, stating that no provisions were to be supplied to them under any consideration.

Mr. BARNES: What was the reason?

Mr. PAYNE: Because of the industrial upheavals in the eighties and nineties. The hon. member for Warwick seemed to be very innocent. Members talked about the tyranny of unionism, but he hoped he would never live to see the day when unionists would be unreasonable. He hoped they would never be as unreasonable as the capitalistic class was twenty-five years ago. He heard charges levelled at the Government about the tyranny of putting their own class into positions. In the past fifty years, when the Liberals were in power, if a man stood up for his rights he would get nothing for himself. He hoped the Ryan Government would give fair play to everyone, and he was sure they would do so. He was sure the Ryan Government were going to do good work for the country. It was about time that the toilers of this country got a little bit of their own way. They had been fighting for the past thirty years, and fighting an uphill battle, and they were going to get something now. If the Ryan Government did not carry out the legislation which was submitted to the people—if they went back on the Premier's statement at Barcaldine—what kind of people would they be? He knew they were not going back on that, and so far as the criticism was concerned, it was very weak indeed.

Mr. McPHAIL (*Windsor*): The Labour party not only insisted on making laws, but he believed in them being sympathetically administered. When this Government came into power they found certain industrial machinery had been allowed to rust because it had not been properly put into use. The Government overhauled the industrial machinery, and put it into proper use, and they expected the department to work more smoothly and accomplish the purposes for which the Government was returned. They found that the Opposition were now taking up the attitude to disagree with the policy of the Government. In the past, previous Governments made no attempt to put the industrial machinery into proper working order. With men who understood the conditions as they should be understood, he was confident they would get better results, and the Queensland workers, in whose interests these laws were introduced, would get what they had not been able to get in the past. He maintained that there was, perhaps, only one other gentleman in the State who was better fitted for the position of Director of Labour than the present head of the department, and that was the present Treasurer. Mr. Crampton had made practically a life study of the industrial movement, and had carefully considered the industrial laws in existence in Australia and in other countries of the world, and so was eminently fitted for his position. As far as his integrity was concerned, he ventured to say, notwithstanding what members opposite had said about his political beliefs, that there was no man at present in the service of the Queensland Government who would give fairer treatment to both employees and employers than they would get from Mr. Crampton. Some members opposite said that he should not have been appointed to the position he occupied because he was not a public servant and had not worked his way up in the department. Some of the public departments had been failures because they had been administered solely by officers whose experience had been confined to the Government service. It was necessary in some

departments that men from outside should be selected for responsible positions, and that the choice should not be restricted to men who were trained in a particular groove. It had been said that the Government had no right to make extra appointments at the present time. He contended that if a department was cramped, and could not do its work properly for want of assistance, it should be given the necessary assistance. During the last four years, no less than 1,716 appointments had been made in the civil service of Victoria, and of that number a great percentage were inspectors in different callings. The increase proposed in this vote was a comparatively small one—from twenty-nine inspectors to forty-five. With regard to a sympathetic administration of the law, he was quite convinced that in the past, if inspectors made reports or recommendations with reference to prosecutions for a non-observance of the law, and certain employers made representations to the Minister, the prosecutions were not proceeded with. Now, we had Ministers who were prepared to see that every man who did not obey the law was prosecuted. During the year 1914-15, up to March, there were only twenty-two prosecutions by this department. That did not include a number of prosecutions which were recommended but were turned down. Since the advent of the Labour Government, the prosecutions made and pending numbered 100. That showed that, when inspectors made their reports, their recommendations were likely to be carried out, no matter what might be the position of the employer who had broken the law. The increase in this vote was only an increase which would cover the proper administration of the department. Had the same amount of work been done by the department in the past as it was doing at the present time, more money would have been required in previous years; but because it did not suit the previous Government to offend their friends, many things were not done which should have been done. He believed the department was now well equipped with inspectors who understood their business, and who would work conscientiously with the head of the department. The department would treat all those who were seeking work fairly, and there would be no discrimination between the applicants, just as there would be no discrimination made between those who broke the law. The Minister was to be commended for remodelling the department and bringing it into a condition which would give the very best results to the State.

Mr. BRIDGES (*Vundah*): He had a grievance which he wished to bring before the Committee. A hairdresser in his district had been summoned for breaking the law, and he believed that he was the only hairdresser in Queensland who had been summoned for that particular offence.

Mr. KIRWAN: No, that is not correct.

Mr. BRIDGES: Well, he was the only one who had been summoned at that time. All he could say with regard to the matter was that he could get his hair cut and his beard trimmed at almost any hour at hairdressers' shops—not in his electorate—and that those persons had not been prosecuted. He thought at the time that the amendment made in the Factories and Shops Act dealing with the hours of work in hairdressers' shops was a mistake, and he had spoken to the Secretary

Mr. Bridges.]

for Public Works on the subject. The hon. gentleman had led him to believe that some small amendment would be made in the Act, and he should like to know from the hon. gentleman whether it was his intention to amend the Factories and Shops Act in this particular.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He was having inquiries made as to whether it would be practicable to make an amendment in the direction the hon. gentleman suggested, and he thought that he would be able to devise some scheme which would meet the circumstances.

Mr. SWAYNE: At the beginning of the discussion on this vote he spoke of the matter of giving a monopoly of Government employment to certain people, and so far the reply of members opposite had been, "You're another; your party did the same thing when they were in office." That was not correct. When the Liberal party were in office, no man seeking employment under the Government was asked what his political opinions were. As a matter of fact, they would find that men who had stood as Labour candidates and had been defeated had been appointed to positions in the service by the Liberal Government. A typical instance which occurred to him at that moment was the appointment of a gentleman now a member of the Commonwealth Parliament to a responsible position in Sydney, after he had been defeated as a candidate for the Commonwealth Parliament. That appointment was made by Mr. Kidston, and if he had time he had no doubt he could find a dozen similar instances in which men who were not Liberals had been appointed to positions in the service by the Liberal Government. The principal argument used by members opposite in defence of the action of the Government in giving preference to unionists was that the people of Queensland knew that this preference was going to be given when they returned the Labour party to power. The people of Queensland never had any idea that such preference was going to be given. The one thing that was instilled into their minds was that if the Labour party were placed in power they would reduce the price of food, and he was sure that if the party had announced their intention of giving employment only to members of certain organisations they would not be in the position which they occupied to-day. Not only did one hon.

member on the other side tell [8 p.m.] them what he had just said, but he made the pregnant statement that it would be quite a fair thing if every Government official who did not hold the same opinion as the Government were removed. He spoke about the necessity of having officials in sympathy with the Government for the time being, and he suggested carrying out the iniquitous principle that with the advent of a party to power there should be change throughout the whole of the offices. That was said by those behind the Government, who drove the Government, and would make them do such things whether they liked it or not. It was just as well that the people should realise before the next election that when they returned to office they had to expect a clean sweep.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He wanted once more to ask for a definite answer from the Minister in charge of the Estimates in regard to the employment of unionists. The Minister

[*Mr. Bridges.*

in charge said that he was taking an unfair advantage by asking a parenthetical question. The case would occur again. The people ought to know exactly where they stood. He had quoted the case of a man out of employment who was a non-unionist and was told to register. He endeavoured to register, and whilst the organiser did not say that they would not register him, he did not say that they would. It was put to him as a man whether he did not think that there were so many out of employment who had been unionists before he had been that they ought to have first place. There was no attempt to register him. He would also like to raise the question of the employment at the agency of all persons who were seeking employment in various Government departments. They were told that they were going to be employed through the agency only, and he thought it was the hon. member for Toombul who asked certain questions in regard to applications for employment, ten at Ipswich and twelve at Enoggera. The men at Ipswich were paid 7s. 6d. per day. He did not know whether that was the standard wage, but probably the Minister would be able to tell him whether the Government were going to give the standard wage prevailing outside in regard to employment of that sort. Further, they passed an Act that where men were employed in large construction works, certain arrangements were to be made by the employers with regard to tent accommodation, cooking utensils, and matters of that kind. He thought that it was on the 5th October last that a question was asked as to whether a number of persons were told by the Railway Department that they must bring their own appliances. He would like to know whether the policy of the Government was to discriminate against persons outside, but more particularly was he interested in the question he first propounded. Surely the Government should have no hesitation in saying whether it was going to be preference to unionists in all cases. He wanted to know, given a non-unionist who was of equal ability with a unionist, but who happened to be a married man, whether preference would be given to the unionist who was unmarried.

Mr. FOLEY: Can you give us a reason why he should not be a unionist?

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was not called upon to give a reason.

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

Mr. FOLEY (*Mundingburra*): It was very refreshing to him, after six years on the other side, to hear members of the Opposition complain so bitterly about the action of the Labour Government in appointing certain inspectors to see that the laws which had been forced on the statute-book by the late Liberal Government themselves were carried out. They knew that some of those laws had been simply flouted by the capitalist employers. They might just as well not be on the statute-book as be there in the way they were administered by the late Government. He knew that he had brought cases under the notice of the department where shops in Townsville had been allowed to keep open after decent tradesmen had closed their establishments. He had given a case where two respectable tradesmen found no fewer than fourteen Chinamen's shops doing an illegitimate business after

hours, and reported to the inspector. He supposed that the inspector reported to the Minister or the head office in Brisbane, but no action was taken. He brought the matter up in the House, and the late Minister for Works told him that five summonses had been issued. The news was flashed to Townsville on the wire next morning, and he got a wire immediately to say that no summonses had been issued, although three days afterwards five summonses were issued. He mentioned that to show the necessity for more inspectors. They wanted men they could rely on to see that the legislation they passed in that House was properly administered. He remembered that on one occasion he complained that there should be a woman inspector in Townsville. A goodly number of girls working as tailoresses, seamstresses, and dressmakers had not been getting the 5s. per week which it was provided that they should get. It had been the custom to pay them nothing for six months, 2s. 6d. per week for the next six months, and at the twelve months turn them adrift and take on others in their places. A large number of girls were put on, but the employers carried out the same rule, because there was no inspector there to see that they got the 5s. The Government decided to send up one of their women inspectors, and there were dozens of cases in which it was found the girls were not getting the wages provided by law. A good many employers were called upon to pay, not only 5s. per week from then onwards, but 5s. from the time the law was passed or they should have been getting it. One member said it was a waste of money to appoint a female inspector in Townsville and another in Rockhampton. Whatever hon. members opposite might think, it was plain that inspectors were needed to see that the girls got even the small wage to which they were entitled. Hon. members opposite also pointed out that the Government were appointing none but Labour supporters or sympathisers. Even if the Ryan Government could be charged with that, it was well known to members opposite that it was previously no use for a man with Labour sympathies to apply for a Government billet.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: We cited cases.

Mr. FOLEY: It was of no use the leader of the Opposition objecting, because he knew such was the case. He had known men himself who had been affected after the Government had decided that only public servants should conduct elections. The hon. member seemed to forget the time when a large family of returning officers and poll clerks were kept hanging on in order to attend all elections—parliamentary and local authority elections.

Mr. MURPHY: That is the system in New South Wales to-day?

Mr. FOLEY: It used to be the system in Queensland. He had known the same people every time when an election was taking place to be always appointed as returning officers or poll clerks. That practice was altered in Queensland, and the Government decided that they would appoint public servants and police magistrates to conduct elections, but they still had the power to retain the old type of returning officers to carry out the elections. He knew that some of those public servants had a wish to appoint men with Labour leanings as well as those with Liberal leanings. Men had come to him and

said they would like to employ certain individuals, but that they would be afraid to appoint them to any position in the town for fear it should be polling, but that they would send them to polling-booths in the country where no one would know them. If they had appointed them in the town, the chances were that their employment would have been jeopardised. The position was that the Labour party were putting men into positions who had been their supporters all their lifetime. They had a right to see that the men who had fought the battle of Labour for years, if other things were equal, should get the billets.

Mr. MURPHY: But the trouble is that it is the new comers in the Labour movement who are getting all the "splash."

Mr. FOLEY: He knew that some of the recent appointees had been battling in the Labour cause for years. It was well known that the late Government when they had a billet vacant always gave it to the man who they thought was a supporter of their interests. He did not blame them too much for that, but he used to say sometimes that where a man was an honest, straightforward man, and in some cases more capable than the Liberal supporter, he could not get the job because he was a Labour supporter. Yet they were told that this Government had no right to put men into positions if they were Labour supporters. The hon. member for Bowen said that he was surprised that the Labour party had not turned out half the public servants, but he (Mr. Foley) did not think that the public servants should be made to suffer for the sins of the Government they had had to serve, but everything else being equal, the Labour party should have the same right to put their men into positions as the Liberal Government had always claimed for themselves. He had seen the time when people had simply been told that they had no right to apply for jobs. He could have had any amount of good jobs in Townsville if he had not been a Labour man. He was told that it would never do to allow him to hold the political opinions he had if he went into a Government position, and for that reason he never went into a Government position.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You were better off.

Mr. FOLEY: He had had an independent spirit and had been able to say what he liked on the political platform, but a Government servant could not do so, or he would get the sack. He had got the sack from a Liberal employer for expressing his political opinions, but he lived through it. On the debate on the Address in Reply he had stated that he had been fighting for thirty years in Queensland for the day when a Labour Government would be sitting on the Treasury benches. They used to be told that when the laws did not suit them they should send their representatives in to alter them, and they were altering them now, and he knew it would not suit hon. members opposite. They would naturally cry out, but notwithstanding that, they were going to put the planks of their platform on the statute-book. If that were done, with proper administration the result would be the best for the whole of the State and not for any particular portion of it only.

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

Mr. Foley.]

Mr. FOLEY said that he would take a few minutes longer. Hon. members opposite said that the Labour legislation was class legislation, but in answer to that he wanted hon. members opposite to understand, if it was class legislation, that the working class was the great class. They were legislating for the greatest class and trying to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number. Their object was to legislate in the best interest of the whole community.

Mr. GUNN: Non-unionists, too?

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, non-unionists as well as unionists. They wanted to make conditions such that all men could live under good conditions, and in order to do that it might be necessary to ask some of the big capitalists to disgorge some of their big profits, in order that the worker, who created wealth, should have a better share of the wealth he produced. He did not say that the Labour Government any more than the Liberal Government could find work at once for all and sundry, but their object was to find work for everybody, and in order to do that they were going to make land available at such prices and in such quantities that a man who wished to take up land and make a living on it could easily do so. By putting land into cultivation he would find work both for himself and others. They had only been in power a few months, and had not been able to know what they could do. Under the drought conditions they could not make the progress which they would have made in good seasons, but their object was to make conditions such that everybody who would work would be able to provide for himself and his family a decent living.

Mr. GUNN: If the ideas of the hon. member were carried out, no one would have any objection. The hon. member said that everybody should have a job, whether he was a unionist or a non-unionist, but the object of the Labour party was to take care of those who took care of them. They had no time for anybody unless he was a unionist. It might happen that a selector might meet with misfortune, and lose all he had got, and he would have to join a union to get work, but he might not have the money to pay the fees. He had heard of a man in this city who was looking for a job, but he was not allowed to join a union. He would like to quote a telegram from Melbourne, which appeared in the Brisbane "Telegraph." It read—

"In further reply to the charge that the Federal Government is not carrying out its professed policy of giving preference to unionists, and to the specific instances cited by the secretary of the United Labourers' Union, the Minister for Home Affairs says that he had obtained reports from his clerks of works, and these showed that all the men employed on works connected with the Works Department were unionists except one or two in out-of-the-way places, where there were no unionists."

What chance was there for a non-unionist? A man must be a unionist if he wished to live. It had been said, in reference to the election of members to the Water and Sewerage Board, that everybody who bought groceries over the counter in Queen street helped to pay the rates, and should have a voice in the election; but here,

[Mr. Foley.

where everybody paid rates, only one class had a say in the profits pertaining to the Government departments, and that was the unionists. A non-unionist could either starve or die.

Question put and passed.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE.

* HON. J. A. FIELLY (*Paddington*) moved that £11,535 be granted for "Chief Office." A few changes had occurred recently in the department. In the first place, he wished to refer to the death of the late Under Secretary for Justice, Mr. J. B. Hall. The deceased gentleman was a very faithful officer, who had served the State for many years, and they all sincerely regretted his death. (Hear, hear!) They had amalgamated the office of Under Secretary and Crown Solicitor, which he thought would result in a fair saving. It would be noticed that £1,000 more was asked for this year than was granted last year. That increase of £1,000 was on account of the appointment of four court shorthand writers at £250 each. Shorthand writers were very necessary in the courts. The savings effected in the department enabled them to give increases amounting to about £240, and also to appoint a barrister at £240.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Can those shorthand writers take up the work which has been done by the "Hansard" staff?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: They would take up the work in the court which the "Hansard" staff had been doing. He was afraid that for a while they would not be able to relieve the "Hansard" staff altogether, but possibly later on they would increase the number of shorthand writers in the court.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: What are the barrister's duties?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He was one of the legal assistants, and he thought he conducted all the cases for the Railway Department in regard to appeals, and so forth. He knew of his own knowledge that during the last couple of months he had been kept particularly busy with respect to butter and other necessary commodities. (Laughter.) He knew he had worked very hard.

Mr. MURPHY: What is his name?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Mr. Hutcheon. He was a man of very wide experience and a very capable officer. He had [8.30 p.m.] spent a few years in the Agent-General's Office in London. He was not singling him out for any special praise, but as his name had been mentioned, he thought it only right to say that he was a very capable officer.

HON. J. TOLMIE: His views coincided with the statement of the Minister with regard to the late Mr. Hall. He was a gentleman who had been in the service for more than forty years. He was a very good officer, and he had always found him willing to assist him in any way he could whenever he had occasion to wait on him. His death had been a loss to the department, and the Minister's eulogy of the gentleman was well deserved. The Minister had some opportunity of meeting the late Mr. Hall in connection with the work of the office, and

knew that he carried out duties in a capable manner. His place had been taken by the Crown Solicitor, and the two offices had been amalgamated. Whilst he deplored the death of Mr. Hall, still he thought that the gentleman who succeeded him was one who would discharge the duties of the office in such a way as to command the admiration of all members of the Chamber. (Hear, hear!) He knew that gentleman a longer time than any member of the House, and he knew that as a lad he always gave great promise. That promise had been amply fulfilled by the position to which he had attained. He was sure that Mr. McCawley would discharge the functions of his office in such a way as to secure the hearty co-operation of all members of the staff and make his department a credit to the State. There had not been many changes in the head office, and the items which appeared were very much the same as before. He did not know that there was much room for criticism. He saw provision was made for a legal assistant. He presumed that was the gentleman to whom the Minister had just referred. Mr. Hutcheon was one of the boys of Queensland. He graduated in the department over which the Minister for Agriculture presided, and he was an excellent officer. He went to the Agent-General's Office in London, and whilst there qualified for the bar. He was very glad to see him back in Queensland, and to know that he was associated with the public service still. Probably later on he might, like other young men who had joined the service, find a wider field for his employment. The Minister made reference to the possibility of a readjustment in connection with the courts. The Minister might give them some information about the four shorthand writers appointed at £250 a piece.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: They were found to be successful.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: His Government appointed them temporarily to ascertain how the experiment worked, but there was a disposition on the part of the judges—he would not say to resent the appearance of the shorthand writers—

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: You need not mind saying it. I will not take exception to it.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: It was quite possible that the shorthand writers might not be as expert in the taking of evidence as the judges, but the judges had come to the conclusion that their labour could be very much shortened by the use of the shorthand writers. That made up the £1,000. It was a wise step to appoint four shorthand writers, because it would lessen litigation and be a great saving to the general public. He did not quite understand the Minister when he said he would not take any exception to his remark about the resentment of the judges in regard to this matter. He did not know whether anything had taken place which caused the hon. gentleman to make that remark.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: None whatever. It was purely that shorthand matter.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He did not know whether the incident which he referred to had reached that stage that they might ask the Minister in charge to give them an explanation.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: It would be indiscreet for you to do so.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Would the Minister give them an explanation of the attitude taken up by the Chief Justice?

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I do not know that any incident exists.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He did not know whether the Chief Justice was not right in taking up the attitude he did in regard to a certain matter.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: It would be just as well to postpone that matter.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He was wondering whether the Minister thought it was a fair thing to go into that question.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: It has nothing to do with me.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He noticed that some hon. gentleman said that the Attorney-General had the matter in hand.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I said nothing at all. I simply expressed profound astonishment. (Laughter.)

Hon. J. TOLMIE: The Minister did not astonish members when he expressed astonishment, as that was his normal condition of mind. (Laughter.) However, if the hon. gentleman thought that matters were in such a position at the present time that they could not fully discuss it, he would defer it to another occasion. Did the Minister give him that assurance?

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I do not know that the incident exists. I have not been referred to so far.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That was only working round the question. The hon. gentleman knew that a situation had arisen, and the Chief Justice expressed himself strongly in regard to some matters. He did not know if the Minister was dealing with that question.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I only know what I saw in the papers.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: In the absence of the Attorney-General, he would not raise the question. It was a matter that the public mind would like to see settled in some way, because there could not be discord between the Justice Department and the Chief Justice. It was just as well that full light should be thrown on to the matter. Could the hon. gentleman give them some information as to whether it was proposed to increase the number of judges of the Supreme Court? It was a question that arose in connection with certain legislation that had been passed. For instance, a new judge would have to be appointed in connection with the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: The decision of the Government in that direction will be disclosed in due course.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: The due course was the present time.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I have no knowledge of it.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: From the legislation that had been passed, they gathered that another judge would have to be appointed. Could the hon. gentleman give them some information on the matter?

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: I have none.

Mr. COLLINS: He noticed that in this vote there was an item of £400 for "Gratuity

Mr. Collins.]

to widow of J. B. Hall, late Under Secretary," and he should like the Minister to give some information regarding that item.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That is in accordance with the law.

Mr. COLLINS: It might be in accordance with the law, but the law might be a wrong one. Some persons were paid large salaries for a number of years, and when they died their widows received a considerable sum as a gratuity.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: They are entitled to a certain gratuity according to length of service.

Mr. COLLINS: That did not apply to lengthmen and other workers in what some persons called the "lower grades," and he thought it would be just as well to extend the principle to the whole of the people employed by the State. There was a sum of £1,000 put down for "Travelling Expenses of the Honours Judges of the Supreme Court." He should like to know whether the judges had reserved carriages. A very eminent writer said on one occasion that judges sat in judgment and that never in the whole of their career had they occasion to commit a crime, and that they knew very little about the world. He should like to know how those expenses were made up, and if judges had to give an account of the money they expended. As an organiser of the Australian Workers' Union he had to give an account of every penny he spent, and he should like to know whether judges had to do the same—whether at the end of each month they presented a voucher showing how the money had been expended. He should like to know also how many hours per week the judges worked.

Mr. STOPFORD: Oh, stop! (Loud laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: They were proposing to fix the hours for the bulk of workers at forty-eight hours per week, and he should like to know if these gentlemen, who used their mental faculties to earn their livelihood, worked forty-eight hours a week. They were paid very big salaries. It might be said that their training cost them a good deal, but he would remind hon. members that the workers had to build the universities at which they were trained. It might be that he himself would have made a very good judge if he had had an opportunity of being trained. At any rate, he should like to know how many hours a week judges worked, and how many days per year. He would further like to know whether they received full pay when away on holidays. When he was working as a navy and it happened to rain and he had to stop work for two hours, the pay for those two hours was deducted from his wages, and he was a servant of the State.

Mr. CARTER: Scandalous!

Mr. COLLINS: The judges were servants of the State, and he understood that they had six months' holiday, and would like to know if their salaries went on while they were away on holiday. He would also ask the Minister to explain what was the reason for the reduction of the item "Postage, Telegrams, and Incidentals," from £1,000 to £900, and the reduction of the item for the defence of aboriginals from £100 to £50.

Hon. J. A. FIBELLY: We did not use the amount voted last year.

{Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS: If any people needed defending when they had committed a crime, they were aboriginals, because many of them knew nothing about our laws and customs. He did not think there was anything more he wanted to say except that a good few people seemed to be getting fairly decent salaries, so that there was no reason for complaint on that score.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): Knowing as much as he did about the taking of depositions in the law courts, he thought that the reason it had been such a success since it was instituted a year or eighteen months ago was that they had available the members of the staff of Parliament. It had proved such a success and so absolutely reliable that the judges had decided that in future, if it was at all possible and Parliament would make the necessary appropriation, which was proposed under that estimate, the shorthand notes should be taken. Whether they were going to have the same success in the future, unless they could get first-class shorthand writers as they had had in the past, remained to be seen. They would also have to take into consideration that the members of the shorthand staff had been receiving so much per folio for their work in recess, and that had been taken into consideration in regard to the payment of their services as "Hansard" reporters, and if they were going to remove from the "Hansard" staff the emoluments earned in recess, he thought they would have to look forward to making some other provision for the "Hansard" staff. He would have more to say on that point when the "Hansard" vote was before the Chamber. He would like to say to the leader of the Opposition, while he was on his feet, that if he asked his question when the Home Secretary's Estimates were before the Chamber he was more likely to get the papers. He could quite understand that the Minister knew nothing officially about the difficulty with the present Chief Justice, but the hon. gentleman knew a good deal privately, and he had seen in the papers that he had said that he was very much surprised and all the rest of it. Had he been in the Home Secretary's Department, there was a great deal of material which would supply the information the leader of the Opposition desired.

Mr. GUNN: He had not had much to do with the Justice Department, but the little he had had to do showed him that it was a very well run department indeed. He had every respect for the officers of the department, and particularly the late Under Secretary. He thought they had lost a good man when they lost him.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: He had been pleased to see that the Government had brought in a Bill in reference to trusteeship and executorship. It had happened recently that a soldier who was going away to the front and had not been long in Queensland wanted to make a will. He came to him as member for the district, and he did not feel competent to do it. He did not want a lawyer.

Mr. MAY: Why not get a shilling form?

Mr. GUNN: That was all very well, but he had to leave a trustee or an executor. He took the man to the Justice Department, and one of the clerks very kindly assisted him in drawing out his will, and they agreed to act as trustees and executors.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: The Bill that was brought before the House would enable that to be done in many cases, and it would be of untold value to many people who had not relatives or friends to leave as executors. The hon. member for Bowen had commented upon the travelling expenses of the judges. He noticed that on the previous vote a sum of 29,600 was put down for travelling expenses. The hon. member never said a word about that. He thought he could see through a stonewall as well as anybody else, and it appeared that in years to come the hon. member might be looking for a situation as inspector under the Works Department. It was very natural that that should take place, but he did not think that there was much danger of his occupying the position of Chief Justice, not because he was not mentally equipped, but because he had not had an opportunity of getting a University education. They must pay for brains.

Mr. MAY: It was not a question of salary, but travelling expenses.

Mr. GUNN: Brains were no good unless they were shifted from one place to another. They might want to shift them to Charleville or somewhere else. He quite agreed with the vote for shorthand writers. He had had something to do with them in connection with the Elections Tribunal cases, and he quite appreciated the advantages of shorthand writing in the courts. He thought it was a pity also that in the country the clerks of petty sessions did not understand shorthand, so as to be able to take down the evidence in shorthand. He could show lots of situations which were filled by people under £100 a year, but he did not want to accentuate that position.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: Every clerk, on his passing, is appointed at £60.

Mr. GUNN: At what age?

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: He must be between sixteen and twenty-one, I think.

Mr. GUNN: It was a very fair screw, but he noticed that meat was pretty high, and if he had, say, 2 lb. a day, 14 lb. of meat a week at 9d. meant £27 6s. a year for meat, so that he would not have a very fat screw after that. (Laughter.) As he had said before, he had had every courtesy from the Justice Department, and he hoped it would continue in the same way as in the last.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): This was a department that they were all anxious to see curtailed as far as expenses were concerned. The Minister took certain action in regard to the closing of a court at South Brisbane for the purpose of curtailing expenses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member may discuss that question on the next vote, but not on this vote.

Mr. CORSER noticed that it was the intention of the Minister to curtail expenses wherever it was possible, but he found that on this occasion they had an excess of £745. This department should be made use of to individuals in the community who

[9 p.m.] might make application to it through the local bodies, or through the various Government offices. The Rawbelle Council had for a good

many years been in serious trouble with regard to the control of river beds and watercourses in their area. Many deputations had visited Brisbane and many conferences held, and the assistance of the Home Department and the Lands Department had been sought, and on every occasion they had been told that the matter should be referred to the Crown Solicitor, who alone could give an opinion on the difficulty. A deputation visited Brisbane during exhibition time with regard to a matter which could be settled only by the Justice Department, and that department should see that its opinions were made available at an early date, and such opinions should be accompanied with suggestions as to how to get over the difficulties.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: You want to socialise the law?

Mr. CORSER said they wanted to bring into being the operation of the machinery that had been placed there by the past Administration. It was only reasonable to ask that where a local authority was in serious difficulty, and where they found that the Rights in Water and Water Conservation and Utilization Act was operating against their interest in a matter of clearing pear, that one department or another department should do more than say that they would refer matters to the Crown Solicitor.

At 9.5 p.m..

Mr. FOLEY relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. CORSER: They should see that a solution of the difficulty was brought about. The matter had been brought before the official heads of the department repeatedly, and only as recent as last August a deputation was down here and the Minister for Lands said it was not a matter for him, but that it was a matter for the Home Department. The hon. gentleman said, "We do not know what you can do, but you had better get an opinion from the Crown Solicitor, or probably you had better go to the association's barrister." What good was that to the local authority? If they went to the Home Department the matter was not straightened up and they were told the same thing. All that time the local authority was in the dark, and was not able to carry out the provisions of the Local Authorities Act in the matter of clearing pear in their area and keeping selections clear adjacent to watercourses. According to the Act the people adjacent to the watercourses were compelled to clear their pear and to keep the land clear of pear, and yet a neighbour's stock or stock from some distance could travel those clean roads and could go into the huge watercourses containing hundreds of thousands of acres of dense pear, and, as far as the local authority knew, they could not impound that stock. He sincerely hoped that whatever could be done would be done to relieve a position like that. The selectors were told on the one side that they had to clear the pear to the centre of the creek, and yet their survey pegs were probably on top of the bank; and then the Water Conservation Act stated that the alignment of their selection was the edge of the water, or the edge of the sand.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: Do you think this is a matter to discuss on this vote?

Mr. Corser.]

Mr. CORSER: It was a serious matter for those concerned, and it was a matter that might be discussed on that vote. The Crown Solicitor should unravel the difficulties that were found in regard to the Water Conservation Act, the Lands Act, and also the Local Authorities Act. The Lands Department did not know what instructions to issue to the Crown land rangers as to where the selections should be cleared. On the one side the selector was asked to clear lower than his survey, and yet on the other side he was informed that he was responsible to the edge of the rubble, and if he was so responsible, why could not he impound the stock coming on that land? Although the late Administration had been turned out for paying low wages, on looking up the vote, he found that there were sixteen clerks in receipt of salaries under £100, and under the late Administration there were only ten clerks under £100. He was in favour of the increased fees for the defence of poor prisoners. Every possible defence should be provided for those who were not able to pay for their own defence because of poor circumstances, and everything done to prevent them from being put into "quod" if necessary. He noticed also that the railway fares and freights were increased by £200. No doubt, that was to make provision for honorary inspectors.

Mr. PETRIE: He was very pleased to hear the remarks of the Minister in relation to the late Under Secretary for Justice, Mr. J. B. Hall. All who knew the late Under Secretary would agree that he was a most capable officer, and that during his long years of service he had served the State well. He noticed that £400 had been placed on the Estimates as a gratuity to the widow of the late Under Secretary. He understood from the Minister that that was the rule laid down with regard to any officer who died after a service of twenty years—that his widow was entitled to the gratuity mentioned. He could say that the late Mr. Hall and himself were boys together, and he could speak of him as a true friend. He was glad to see that the Government had arranged to combine the office of Under Secretary and Crown Solicitor, which he thought was a step in the right direction. They had now an Under Secretary who was a professional man. He understood that the occupant of the office was a very capable young man, who would do credit to the department. (Hear, hear!) There were other officers in the Justice Department whom they could well be proud of. He was hardly surprised at the hon. member for Bowen taking exception to the travelling allowance of the judges of the Supreme Court, but the hon. member must remember that there was more than one judge, and that tipstuffs accompanied their Honours in their travels, and those additional expenses would be included in the amount. Reference had also been made to the fees paid for the defence of aboriginals, which last year was £100, and was now put down at £50. He saw that only £38 10s. 5d. had been expended last year. He was glad to know that it had not been necessary to increase the vote. The step taken by the late Government in that regard was taken none too soon. The aboriginals were worthy of far more attention than they had received in the past, and, unfortunately, a great many of them were dying

[Mr. Corser.

out. He was very pleased that matters had been so arranged that the Government were able in some directions to cut down expenses in the department. He did not think that the item put down for the department, considering its great importance, was too large.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): In company with a great many more people in Queensland, he was very anxious to know just how the £1,000 travelling expenses for the judges of the Supreme Court was to be allocated. When reading the report of the Auditor-General for 1914-15, he found that £385 2s. 9d. was purported to have been used by these judges during their tours to different places, which worked out at £177 0s. 6d. per judge. He was led to believe that it was not customary to receive an itemised statement of account from these judges, showing how the money had been expended when they were travelling about from place to place. He thought that was a most extraordinary proceeding. The judges of the Supreme Court must surely be the only persons in the Commonwealth who were able to travel round at the country's expense and to put down their own travelling expenses without any check being kept upon them, and he was rather curious to know in what way the money was being spent. He would like to know whether they were allowed their hotel expenses, or whether they were allowed certain sums for beer purposes, or anything of that sort.

Mr. KIRWAN: They don't drink beer.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No; champagne! (Laughter.)

Mr. POLLOCK: Ordinary beer would, perhaps, be too common a beverage for these gentlemen to indulge in. It would be as well if the Minister could give them some idea as to how the money was being spent. The amount of £1,000 was a great deal of public money to be going out without any check being kept on it, and while he did not impute any ulterior or dishonest motives to their Honours, still, it would be only fair if they were to give some sort of statement to the representatives of the people in the House.

Mr. BARNES: Is it not a fixed daily allowance?

Mr. POLLOCK: It did not seem to be a fixed daily allowance when the amount was put down as £1,000. When the expenditure reached £385 2s. 9d. for 1914-15, and it was proposed to allocate £1,000 for 1915-16, it did not seem as though there was any fixed amount or any limit. It seemed to him this had been a vexed subject, and no one seemed to know what had been done with the money. Surely they should know what was being done with such a large amount of money! In common with the hon. member for Bowen, he would like to know what holidays the judges received. The ordinary railway porter, the station-master, and the men doing manual work in the public service did not receive any long extended holidays on full pay. They received their holidays every year, but did not get any pay for them, whereas the judges received four, five, and six months' holidays on full pay. The salary of a Supreme Court judge was £2,000, and that of the Chief Justice £2,500. They had unlimited holidays whenever they asked for them. Why had it been the custom to allow

one set of State employees to have these long holidays while another set, who belonged to a different strata of society, did not get the same good conditions? He thought further information on the question should be furnished to the Committee. He noticed that a legal assistant had been appointed at £240. This was the first time since he had been in the House when an appointment had been made that members opposite did not ask whether he was a unionist.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY. He is a unionist.

Mr. POLLOCK: Of course, he was. He must be a unionist, because the union he belonged to had the greatest form of legalised preference. He knew a solicitor at present employed in Brisbane who passed all his examinations in the old country and went as high as any solicitor or barrister could go. He came to Queensland and was starving, because he could not find the £100 necessary to enable him to pay into the organisation or union before he would be allowed to practise.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: It is fifty guineas.

Mr. POLLOCK: A barrister had to pay £10 for the first examination, £10 for the second, and £10 for the third, and then he had to pay £31 10s. before he could practise.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You said he had gone through all that.

Mr. POLLOCK: That was the amount he had to pay to join this organisation of lawyers, who were nothing but legal sharks. (Laughter.) A man had to pay that before he was allowed to practise in the legal profession, yet hon. members opposite asked why they gave preference to unionists. This was one of the most insidious unions that could be brought into Queensland society. In connection with the trade union, they did not impose any restrictive conditions; everyone who wanted to obtain work was allowed to come in on payment of a very moderate fee indeed. It was only wealthy men who could join the barristers' union. The legal man he referred to was an exceptionally clever man, and had to work for 10s. per day as a temporary clerk till a friend found the money to enable him to practise along with the other legal lights, or unionists, as hon. members opposite would call them. He noticed an item in the Estimates of £400 as a gratuity to the widow of J. B. Hall, late Under Secretary. There was no doubt Mr. Hall must have been a capable, conscientious public servant, judging by the remarks of hon. members, but, at the same time, he did not agree with the policy of giving away money to the dependants of any public servants who had been in receipt of a big salary.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Introduce a Bill; it is all in your own hands.

Mr. POLLOCK: A public servant in receipt of a salary of £800, such as the late Under Secretary received, could have purchased a policy which would have provided for his dependants for twenty years. If there was any annuity to be given to anyone, it should be to the widow and dependants of the man earning from £2 5s. to £3 per week. He hoped the Minister would give some explanation of the matter.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Go down on your knees and he will give it.

Mr. POLLOCK: It was not necessary for him to do that, as the Minister seemed able and ready to provide all the information. He noticed that the fees for the defence of poor prisoners was increased from £350 to £450.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Do they expect more prisoners?

Mr. POLLOCK: That amount was perfectly justified, and he heartily congratulated the Justice Department upon their foresight in that respect—in providing money for those who were unable to defend themselves. It was not always the man who was guilty who was sentenced to a term of imprisonment. It was sometimes the man who was poor. His greatest crime was poverty, not having sufficient money to pay the legal sharks.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): In connection with the appointment of four shorthand writers at £250 each, it occurred to him that it would not be possible to get men of the necessary ability at that salary. When they knew the nature of the work they would be called upon to perform, which would be equal to what the "Hansard" staff were performing, they knew that these men would have to be very able men, and they would have to be very competent, because it was not advisable in court cases for mistakes to be made. It was only a fair thing that they at least should get what the lowest paid man on the "Hansard" staff got, and that was £300 or £310. Possibly the Minister might have some explanation to make about that.

Mr. STOPFORD: They would not have any all-night sittings, at any rate.

Mr. KIRWAN: Perhaps these men might be permitted, in performance of their duties, to make extras. He believed it was the practice in connection with these reports that if there was an appeal the reporters supplied a copy of the report of the evidence at 4d. per folio for the first copy, and 2d. per folio for the second copy. He understood that previously it was the practice for the judge's associate to practically impound the copy and charge a larger fee [9.30 p.m.] than that fixed by the Governor in Council for the original copies to the parties to the litigation. The chief argument in support of the appointment of shorthand writers was that it would cheapen law, and if that was the object the fees fixed by the Governor in Council should be strictly adhered to, and it should not be permissible for the associate, who did absolutely no work in connection with the matter, to sell the copy at three times the amount paid to the shorthand writers. He hoped that the Minister would go into this matter and see that if any extra work of this kind was done the fees should go to the shorthand writers who did the work, and not to the associate. He understood that in one case alone the cost of copies of the evidence supplied to the parties to the dispute was between £200 and £300 more than the amount paid to the shorthand writers who did the work.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: £200 in one case?

Mr. KIRWAN: He was informed on very good authority that that was what the extra charge amounted to, the rate per folio being 2s., instead of 6d. He might say that it was a very long case, and not an average

Mr. Kirwan.]

one. He trusted that the Minister would go into this matter, and see that those who did the work received the remuneration.

Mr. SWAYNE: In common with other members, he must express his regret at the decease of the late Under Secretary, who was a very courteous and efficient officer. He was quite sure that his successor would also prove an excellent officer. There was one item in this vote which was the outcome of legislation passed by the Kidston Government in 1907—namely, the vote for the defence of poor prisoners. He remembered that last year the Denham Government increased the grant for that purpose from £130 to £350. Now it was increased by another £100, and he congratulated the department on that increase, because it was most desirable that every man should have a fair chance when he was before the court. The State was fully justified in stepping in to see that no wrong was done to any person merely because he was not able to put his case properly before the court.

Mr. BRIDGES thought this was the proper place to speak of what he considered as a nuisance, and that was the man in Queen street offering a big motor-car for raffie. This man had been there for a time almost beyond memory, and might be regarded as a nuisance. He thought it might be as well to put in force the move-on regulation in that case.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: Several members had referred to one item more than any other, and that was the travelling expenses of the judges. The hon. member for Bowen and the hon. member for Gregory in particular criticised the judges and their travelling expenses. It was only fair, therefore, that he should give an outline of the method followed by the judges in regard to travelling expenses. The department had no control over those expenses. The judges claimed the right to draw cheques at their own convenience to pay their expenses, and the department simply received a claim voucher. They had no receipt of any sort to show the nature of the expenses or how they had been incurred. It was not a modern system, certainly. For July, September, November, and October last year Mr. Justice Lukin received £253 as travelling expenses, the largest amount being in September—namely, £81 12s. 4d. For February, April, May, and June of this year the same judge received £473 18s. 10d. Mr. Justice Shand, for February, March, April, May, and June of this year received £259 13s. 9d., the largest amount being £72 10s. in April. He simply gave this information in justice to the Committee, and made no comment upon it. He had not been in the department sufficiently long to make inquiries into this matter. Lately he had been very busy, and had not had an opportunity of making a close scrutiny of such items, but he certainly thought that there could be some improvement in connection with these accounts. Ministers had to keep to some sort of a rule, and the judges should do the same. He had heard that the High Court had a definite rule that so much per day should be paid. Sir Samuel Griffith, two years ago, had a rather prolonged argument with Sir Josiah Symon, then Attorney-General, on this matter, and they arrived at a satisfactory agreement, which was that a judge should be allowed

[Mr. Kirwan.

three guineas per day, and that where three judges were travelling in company the total allowance should be five or six guineas per day. The same hon. member asked what was the number of holidays enjoyed. He found that the winter vacation consisted of twenty-seven days and the summer vacation of fifty-five days, making a total of eighty-two days when the court did not sit at all. Of course, there might be other holidays. He fancied that there were. He did not think that the judges were overworked, but, of course, they were men engaged in special duties, and there were certain traditions that had to be observed in connection with all legal matters, part and parcel of them being the vacation, yearly or twice a year, as the case might be.

Mr. COLLINS: Who fixes them?

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: That also was a pertinent inquiry. He thought that the custom of the District Court always was to consult the Attorney-General's Department, and, of course, as a rule the department fell in with their desires, but it was entirely within the right of the Supreme Court judges to arrange their own vacations. Another matter touched upon by hon. members was the defence of aboriginals. Last year only £38 was spent, so that they were cutting down that item; but if it were necessary to spend more, more would be spent, because they made it a rule on no occasion to refuse counsel in such cases. They also gave poor prisoners every opportunity to clear themselves and get what might be termed "genuine justice," and any prisoner who applied for counsel or solicitor was, as a rule, accommodated. In fact, last year they spent £50 or £60 more than was voted. The hon. member for Bowen and the hon. member for Gregory referred to the gratuity of £400 to the widow of the late Under Secretary. That practice was not confined to the Justice Department. It was settled by regulation under the Public Service Acts; and, speaking from memory, he thought that every public servant of twenty years' standing was entitled, on retirement, to six months' salary. For instance, the police magistrate at South Brisbane would retire at the end of the year, and he would get six months' salary. It was only fair to give the same thing to the widow of the man who would have been entitled to it if he had retired.

Mr. STOPFORD: You would not do the same thing with the police.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: So far as those who came under the Public Service Acts were concerned, every officer was treated alike, but men who came under the Police Acts and the railway men were in a different position, and members who had interjected could well look into the matter and suggest some sort of reform when those Estimates came along. He himself thought that the practice he had mentioned was very fair. Nobody could cavil at it. The hon. member for Lockyer mentioned the relation of the "Hansard" staff to the court shorthand writers. That also could be discussed when the "Hansard" Estimates came along in their turn. The hon. member for Burnett spoke at length about the advisability of getting, not only opinions, but also suggestions from the Crown Law Office. He fancied that they might dismiss that without any

further consideration. The department gave opinions. It was not there to make suggestions or to set up machinery. It was not there to do all the work of all the local shires. The department certainly would assist, and, while he was in his present position, every shire—and every individual for that matter—would be assisted to the utmost of his ability and the utmost of the ability of the office. (Hear, hear!) The Public Curator Bill, which was recently passed in this House, would assist municipalities and shires, and also the poor man who wanted to go to law. The same hon. member said that there were sixteen clerks receiving less than £100. He was afraid that the hon. member was something of a tyro, and found it difficult to make correct calculations in regard to Estimates. His statement was absolutely ridiculous. The men under £100 under the Liberal Government had received two substantial increases since the Labour Government had been in power—which was only a few months. If they had other officers under £100, they were young fellows who had passed public service examinations, and were undergoing their probationary periods. They were appointed, he thought, at £60 for the first six months, and they had their salaries raised by £20 increments in normal times to about £110 or £120, provided that conditions relating to good conduct and other things were observed. The hon. member for Brisbane raised a fresh matter connected with the associate to a judge, and also incidentally with the position of the shorthand writer. He did know of the case to which that hon. member referred, and he certainly thought that it was a scandal. The "Hansard" reporters—or they might be shorthand writers from his own office; he did not know which—did the work, and he understood that the associate and the judge took the various papers, said that they were his certified copies, and the associate farmed them out, so to speak. He did not think that that was a right thing. The reporters did all the work and the associate nothing—only collected a large sum of money. Personally, he did not blame the associate. He saw that there was something doing, and he made the best of his opportunity. It was a pity that it occurred, and he certainly deprecated it. Perhaps the Bill dealing with shorthand writers which would come before the Chamber before very long—he hoped this session—would arrange that the clean copy would be the certified copy. He supposed that later on they would have to consult the judges.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Do you consult them? (Laughter.)

HON. J. A. FIELLY: It might be necessary sometimes to consult the judges. The relation existing between himself and the bench was of the most harmonious nature. (Hear, hear! and renewed laughter.) The hon. member for Nundah referred to a motor-car and a certain big person who was selling tickets. He thought that the difficulty of the department in that respect was apparent to every hon. member. Application was made for permission to hold an art union, and they had a certain set of rules by which they were bound. In this particular case the application was of a formal nature. The conditions were fulfilled and approval was given. Beyond that they could not go.

MR. BRIDGES: Can he go on for ever?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: That was where the decency of those concerned in the matter came in. He did not know that the Crown Law Department could interfere.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Could you not withdraw the permission?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: That could be done. But they had to consider whether it would make the fund suffer. He could have inquiries made, but it was a difficult matter for them to handle, and he would sooner see the ticket or the card pulled out of the barrel very quickly. He did not like to carve in there, but he would have the matter looked into with a view of having the car disposed of in some way.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. gentleman, just before sitting down, stated that within three months certain public servants had received two increases.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Since the election.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was going to say that that was not in accordance with the Public Service Act.

Question put and passed.

COURTS OF PETTY SESSIONS.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved that £37,320 be granted for "Courts of Petty Sessions." A slight increase was shown in the vote, which was made up entirely by automatic increases to juniors in the service.

HON. J. TOLMIE thought the Minister might have given the Committee some explanation of the change that had taken place with regard to the South Brisbane Police Court.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: I will be glad to do so. There are so many courts of petty sessions that I could not traverse the lot.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He desired to raise the question in the absence of the hon. member for South Brisbane, as it was agitating the minds of a section of the people in both North and South Brisbane. He had noticed in the Press from time to time that the work in the North Brisbane Police Court had become congested; that cases were postponed from day to day, as there were too many cases for the magistrates to deal with, and that meant piling up the costs to the litigants. The police magistrates worked right down to Southport, and how far up the North Coast he did not know, but the amount of work cast on them seemed to be excessive. They were working the full hours in the day, and sometimes working overtime as well, without getting extra remuneration. He could scarcely credit the Government with taking any action that would increase the inconvenience to the general public, and would have thought—as the Government was kept in office by hon. members opposite—that they would have been instructed to appoint an additional magistrate, so that the general public would not suffer by having to pay legal expenses for adjournment after adjournment. He had brought the matter up, as the unfortunate city of South Brisbane seemed to be without a representative at the present time. There was no one to speak up for it, unless it be that the hon. member for Oxley, as being a near neighbour, desired to perform a kindly action. He would much like to know the reason for

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

casting additional burdens on the community of North Brisbane by having taken away the South Brisbane Police Court.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Do you think a police court is an advantage?

HON. J. TOLMIE: There were so many people attached to a police court that it was an inconvenience to be without one, and it was laid down in the Estimates that there had been an increase, since the present Government came into office, of criminals and lunatics.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: What about the previous Liberal candidate?

HON. J. TOLMIE: How were the Government treating South Brisbane with justice when they took away the police court? He had no fault to find with the administration of the department. So far as Toowoomba was concerned, they were extremely fortunate, as the magistrate there was regarded as one of the best magistrates in the State. They had a clerk of petty sessions who had served his time in Brisbane, and he was sure that the department, as well as the people of Toowoomba, thought a lot of him. Whether they had the full amount of assistance they required he did not know. He certainly had no fault to find with the department so far as the Toowoomba court was concerned, and if there was anything there that was not quite as good as it ought to be, he was certain the department—if proper representation was made—would remove the difficulty. It was very desirable that some explanation should be given with regard to the treatment of the courts in North and South Brisbane.

Mr. COOPER (*Bremer*) confessed that enlightenment sometime came from unexpected sources. He had not anticipated that the leader of the Opposition would have supplied him with some information he had been searching for, but for some considerable time he had been thinking that it might be necessary that the police magistrates of the State should be examined as to the state of their health, because the first time he came into contact with one police magistrate, he was of opinion that there was something wrong with his liver, he was so irascible and peevish.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Overworked.

Mr. COOPER: He had now come to the conclusion that this officer must have been overworked. The case he referred to was an appeal by a railway employee named Welsby, who was discharged by the Railway Department for speaking at a political meeting. That was under regulation 18, which, he believed, that this side, when in Opposition, asked to be abolished, but which the then Government did not abolish. Welsby was discharged from the service because he spoke at a political meeting, and he naturally appealed, and he (Mr. Cooper) was allowed to go into the appeal court to take shorthand notes on behalf of Welsby. The magistrate was a Mr. Morris, who treated Welsby in a way which he (Mr. Cooper) had never heard a criminal or a "drunk" treated in a court of this State. He did nothing but browbeat and check the man Welsby—as he called him—in a most disgraceful manner, and practically allowed him to make no statement. He snarled at him, wanted to know what he knew of law, and how he could conduct an appeal case in

a proper manner. He refused to allow the man Welsby to put his case as he thought it should be put. The thing got that bad that, after a quarter of an hour of this peevish procedure, the magistrate woke up to the fact that his remarks were being taken down in shorthand, and he ordered the shorthand writer to retire. He (Mr. Cooper) had waited for three years to make these remarks, and he was pleased that he now had an opportunity of giving his opinion of "that man"—that police magistrate. (Hear, hear!) If it was due to overwork, something should be done to relieve magistrates who tried men in that way. The only other magistrate he had noticed was the magistrate in Ipswich, Mr. J. S. Burge, who worked exceedingly hard, and took cases all hours of the day. He had a big district to travel over, and there was a difficulty in fitting in cases. In his opinion, when magistrates were in the frame of mind as in the case he had mentioned—whether from overwork or anything else—they were not fit to conduct important trials, such as appeals by men who were standing up for what they considered to be their rights.

* HON. J. A. FIDELLY did not think the case in regard to the South Brisbane Police Court needed much explanation. The court there was simply not wanted, and the building was being wasted. Probably the leader of the Opposition had taken his cue from the members of the South Brisbane Municipal Council, but the hon. member need not worry about it, as the hon. member for the district had not seen fit to bother about it. The members of the South Brisbane Municipal Council were a quaint body of aldermen. (Laughter.) One very humorous gentleman, who represented a secluded ward, said that his opinion of him (Mr. Fidelity) had lessened considerably. He had known that alderman for some considerable time, but his opinion of him had never altered. (Laughter.) It had been found necessary to close down the courthouse, as it could be done without. The members of the legal fraternity found Brisbane more convenient, and those litigants who had occasionally to travel over to the south side were also glad to have the court away from South Brisbane. The building would now be put to some better use, which would probably be appreciated by the residents. The hon. member also mentioned the delays in connection with the Brisbane Police Court and the overwork of the police magistrates. He did not think the police magistrates were overworked, and the delays were not due in any way to the department, but more than anything else to solicitors who wanted adjournments. He had a cutting from the "Courier" of the 27th October with reference to the overwork and the congestion of business. The report stated—

"All adjournments herein referred to were at the request of litigants."

That disposed of the suggestion that the magistrates were overworked.

Question put and passed.

At 10 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

CROWN SOLICITOR (TOWNSVILLE).

HON. J. A. FIDELLY moved that £415 be granted for "Crown Solicitor (Townsville)." The Crown Solicitor at Townsville was appointed with the right to private

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

practice, and had given the department a good return for the money expended. There was a small increase in the vote on account of postages, telegrams, railway fares, etc. They had put down the amount which was expended last year.

Question put and passed.

DISTRICT COURTS.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £9,153 be granted for "District Courts." There was an increase of £223 in the vote over the amount asked for last year, which was brought about by provision for fees for acting Crown Prosecutor and deputy District Court judge.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He had noticed it had been found necessary to appoint acting District Court judges occasionally and an Acting Crown Prosecutor. Was that due to the fact that the work had increased or that the judges were otherwise engaged? If it had become a standing necessity to appoint an acting District Court judge, would it not be better to make a permanent appointment? He thought that an extra judge was necessary. He believed that the work of the District Courts had been well done by the judges, and the administration of justice throughout Queensland was such that they had no reason to feel ashamed of it. They differed from judges sometimes, but that did not prevent them from recognising good work when it was performed by them. Was there any necessity to appoint an additional judge? The late Attorney-General had in contemplation the doing away with District Court judges and making more Supreme Court judges. Perhaps the Minister would say if the present Government intended to follow out that idea.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He presumed that the hon member referred to the unfortunate District Courts Bill?

HON. J. TOLMIE: Yes.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: It appeared in two or three sessions, and—

HON. J. TOLMIE: Then it got into the hands of the lawyers.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: It was settled when it got there. (Laughter.) However, the general matter of the appointment of District Court judges and Supreme Court judges would be inquired into next year. Hon. members would recognise that since the Government had come into office they had little spare time to go into the question of further judges. They had a heavy programme of legislation, and they had also had a pretty busy administrative time. The subject would, however, be inquired into. Regarding the appointment of acting District Court judges, the Industrial Court was in a state of congestion at the present time. They only appointed judges when they were asked for by Judge Macnaughton, of the Industrial Court, or any District Court judge. When those judges made recommendations they were inquired into, and their wishes were complied with. Judge Rutledge was also frequently engaged at the Land Court. If it were found next year that another District Court judge was required, they would certainly appoint him.

Mr. GUNN: He had been requested by the people of Stanthorpe to see if it were possible to have a bailiff appointed at that town.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: That matter will also be inquired into next year.

Mr. GUNN suggested that the police might do the work.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: There are limitations to that. You saw the report of the deputation to me the other day, and you will appreciate the point.

Mr. GUNN: If the hon. gentleman would look into it next year, he was satisfied.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: I will look into it.

Question put and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £1,540 be granted for "Friendly Societies."

Question put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL COURT.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £600 be granted for "Industrial Court." There was provision for £500 for the salary of the judge, and £100 for travelling expenses, the same as last year. The £500 was supplemental to the salary of the District Court judge.

HON. J. TOLMIE asked if the Minister had any information as to what was proposed in connection with the Industrial Courts.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: I have no knowledge whatever. The Bill was so mutilated in the other House that we do not know where we stand. If you ask your friends there what they are going to do, then I might be able to give you some information.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He had no knowledge of what was being done by another place. The present judge received £1,500 a year, and the Government contemplated appointing a Supreme Court judge. He thought the Government would have anticipated the appointment by providing the amount of the salary on the Estimates. As the hon. gentleman had no information to give on the matter, they could not get any.

Question put and passed.

INSOLVENCY, INTESTACY, AND INSANITY.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £2,830 be granted for "Insolvency, Intestacy, and Insanity."

Mr. BRIDGES: There was one item that gave him a great deal of concern, and it also greatly concerned him when the Estimates were going through before.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: You were afraid to make any noise about it.

Mr. BRIDGES: Some members received letters from a man named Thompson, and he had also received letters from a man named Thompson.

The TREASURER: George Campbell Thompson?

Mr. BRIDGES: Yes.

Mr. Bridges.]

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: You can discuss that on the Home Secretary's Estimates, but not on this vote.

Mr. BRIDGES: Were they not dealing with the insanity vote?

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: If he had any estate, the department would administer it.

Mr. BRIDGES: There were two members opposite interested in this individual.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: You should do it on the right vote.

Mr. BRIDGES: Then they might not have the hon. gentleman in charge.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that matter on this vote. He may discuss it on the vote for "Insanity," in the Home Secretary's Department.

Mr. GUNN: He supposed that if a person died intestate his estate would be administered by the Curator in Intestacy and Insanity.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: The Public Curator Bill will alter the whole of the staff when it becomes law.

Mr. GUNN: Then this office will be practically wiped out?

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: It will be absorbed in the new department.

Hon. J. TOLMIE said he should like the Minister to inform the Committee when the change would take place under the new Bill.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: The Bill was not yet passed, and he had no information to give on the matter, but he took it that when the new law came into force this office would be amalgamated with the new office.

Question put and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £650 be granted for "Parliamentary Draftsman."

Hon. J. TOLMIE wished to point out that members had been very forbearing in regard to the drafting of amendments, and to suggest that, if the Parliamentary Draftsman was overworked, he should be given some assistance. Sometimes they passed the second reading of a Bill late at night, the Committee stage came on the next day, and—

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: I know; I will endeavour to meet you there.

Question put and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £460 be granted for "Public Service Superannuation Board." The only increases in this vote were automatic increases.

Question put and passed.

SHERIFF—SOUTHERN AND CENTRAL AND NORTHERN.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £4,395 be granted for "Sheriff, Southern and Central and Northern."

[*Mr. Bridges.*

Mr. GUNN: He did not see anything put down on this vote for the hangman, and he was wondering whether they had abolished the office of hangman.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That has been abolished for years.

Mr. GUNN: Then, the sheriff would have to do his own hanging.

Mr. MAY noticed that the bailiff at Townsville received £150, at Charters Towers £125, at Cooktown and Cairns each £75, at Cloncurry £40, at Mackay £40, and at Normanston £40, and wished to know why this discrimination was made in the salaries.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY replied that he would have inquiries made into the matter.

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURT (SOUTHERN DIVISION).

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £6,612 be granted for "Supreme Court (Southern Division)."

Mr. GLEDSON: There were one or two items in this vote on which he should like some information. He noticed that the associate to the Chief Justice received £300 per annum, the associate to the Senior Puisne Judge £250, and the associate to Mr. Justice Chubb £250. What he wished to know was who appointed these associates, what qualifications were required for the office, at what age were they appointed, and what were the names of the associates?

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: The appointment of an associate was the privilege or prerogative of the judge. As a rule, an associate was some young friend of the judge, who was studying for the law. When he passed his examination, he usually resigned, and another young man was appointed in his place. What were the precise duties of an associate he did not know; but he appeared to be part of the furniture of the court. The Committee had no control over him; they simply provided his salary.

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURT (CENTRAL DIVISION).

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £1,470 be granted for "Supreme Court (Central Division)."

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURT (NORTHERN DIVISION).

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY moved that £2,760 be granted for "Supreme Court (Northern Division)."

At 10.30 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the operation of Standing Order 306, I now leave the chair, and make my report to the House.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at thirty-one minutes past 10 o'clock.