

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 1916

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER, 1916.

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

QUESTIONS.**DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.**

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Premier—

“Taking into consideration the seriousness of the present coal strike, is it the intention of the Government to at once introduce a Daylight Saving Bill?”

The PREMIER (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*) replied—

“Not at present.”

THE TREASURER AND THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN PASTORALISTS AND THE AUSTRALIAN WORKERS' UNION.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Premier—

"1. Is it a fact (as stated in certain New South Wales papers) that the Treasurer, the Hon. E. G. Theodore, alone, or in conjunction with Mr. Dunstan, represented the Australian Workers' Union at a conference between the pastoralists and the Australian Workers' Union held in Sydney last week?

"2. Will he inform the House the object of the conference, and in what capacity the Treasurer attended such conference, if not, as representative of the Australian Workers' Union?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1 and 2. This matter does not officially concern the Chief Secretary, consequently, I would suggest that the hon. member inquire elsewhere."

LEGAL FEES TO ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Mr. SWAYNE asked the Premier—

"1. Did the expenditure of £3,160,674 mentioned in paragraph 110 of the Auditor-General's report include any payments for legal fees to the Attorney-General, or any other counsel, or to any public servant or servants, for service rendered?

"2. If so, will he give the particulars?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. No.

"2. See answer to No. 1."

RAILWAY ALTERATIONS ON ACCOUNT OF COAL STRIKE.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. How many trains have been removed from the ordinary timetable in force at the time of the alteration of the train running, for the alleged threatened shortage of coal caused by the coal strike—(a) in the Northern Division; (b) in the Central Division; (c) in the Southern Division?"

"2. (1) How many guards, engine-drivers, and firemen have been put off the trains on the above account? (2) How many men have been dispensed with in the railway service, consequent on the alteration of the timetables, and what were their occupations?"

"3. What were the numbers in each division of the State—viz., Northern, Central, and Southern—whose services were so dispensed with, if any?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*) replied—

"1. (a) 26; (b) 19; (c) 174."

"2. (1) 287; (2) 114.

"3. Northern Division, 23 temporary labourers; Central Division, 38 temporary labourers, 1 temporary clerk; Southern Division, 59 temporary labourers. The present timetable was necessary to conserve the limited coal stocks held by the department, owing to the indefinite duration of the strike, not

on account of the 'alleged' threatened shortage of coal as stated by the hon. member."

PERIODS OF SERVICE OF ATTORNEYS-GENERAL.

Mr. PETRIE, in the absence of Mr. Roberts, asked the Attorney-General—

"For what period did Sir S. W. Griffith hold office as Solicitor-General and Attorney-General; Hon. T. J. Byrnes as Solicitor-General and Attorney-General; Sir Arthur Rutledge as Attorney-General; Hon. J. W. Blair as Attorney-General and Secretary for Mines; Hon. T. O'Sullivan as Attorney-General; Hon. T. J. Ryan as Chief Secretary and Attorney-General?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*) replied—

"The hon. member is referred to the 'Blue Book' and the 'Queensland Government Gazettes.' No doubt the hon. member will have more leisure time to ascertain such details than I have."

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S FEES FOR GENERAL LITIGATION.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Premier—

"1. Will he give short particulars of the items constituting the sum of £113 15s. paid to the Attorney-General for general litigation as mentioned in page 43 of the Auditor-General's report?"

"2. Will he also explain why the sum of £113 15s. so largely exceeded the aggregate sum of £92 2s. 9d. paid to Professor Harrison Moore, of the Victorian bar; Mr. H. H. Henchman, of the Queensland bar; and Messrs. Blake and Riggall, the Victorian solicitors, all of whom acted for the Queensland Government in the matter?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. No.

"2. No."

EXPENSES OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S VISIT TO ENGLAND.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Assistant Minister for Justice—

"What steamer, travelling, or hotel expenses, if any, were paid by the Department of Justice in connection with the visit of the Attorney-General to England in the early part of the present year, apart from the sum of £1,835 3s. 9d., stated on the 7th September, 1916, to have been paid in respect of the Premier's party?"

HON. J. A. FIDELLY (*Paddington*) replied—

"None."

EXPENSES OF CROWN SOLICITOR'S VISIT TO ENGLAND.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Assistant Minister for Justice—

"What steamer, travelling, or hotel expenses, if any, were paid by the Department of Justice in connection with the visit of the Crown Solicitor to England in the early part of the present year, apart from the sum of £1,835 3s.

9d., stated on the 7th September, 1916, to have been paid in respect of the Premier's party?"

HON. J. A. FIELLY replied—

"The expenses of the Crown Solicitor amounted to £62 15s. 5d."

GOVERNMENT MOTOR-CAR OF GERMAN MANUFACTURE.

Mr. PETRIE, in the absence of Mr. Murphy, asked the Premier—

"Will he name the Government motor-car which he said was of German manufacture, and the year in which it was purchased?"

The PREMIER replied—

"As it might be suggested that the honourable member is endeavouring to deprive the honourable member for Mirani of any credit in regard to this matter, in justice to the letter I must ask him to await the inquiries I am instituting at the latter gentleman's instance. (See 'Votes and Proceedings,' No. 40, 15th November, 1916.)"

FEES PAID TO ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR SERVICES IN ENGLAND.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*) asked the Premier—

"1. Did not the Attorney-General, when in England, appear on behalf of the Attorney-General for Queensland in a case against the Commonwealth in respect to the powers of the Federal Government to tax State property?"

"2. What fees, if any, were paid or agreed to be paid in respect thereof to the Attorney-General—(a) By the Government; (b) by any other person?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. The Attorney-General (instructed by the solicitors representing Goldsbrough, Mort, and Co.) appeared for the Attorney-General of Queensland at the relation of Messrs. Goldsbrough, Mort, and Co. and for Goldsbrough, Mort, and Co. on an application for special leave to appeal to the Privy Council against the decision of the High Court of Australia on the question of the power of the Commonwealth to impose certain taxes.

"2. (a) No fees were paid or agreed to be paid by the Government. (b) the solicitors for Goldsbrough, Mort, and Co. are responsible for payment of any fees due in respect to the application, the payment of which does not concern the public in any way."

ALLEGED ARRANGEMENT WITH MR. H. H. HENCHMAN IN "EASTERN" CASE.

Mr. GUNN asked the Assistant Minister for Justice—

"1. Is it not a fact that the late Government, through the Crown Solicitor, had arranged with Mr. H. H. Henchman, the counsel who had represented the Queensland Government theretofore throughout the litigation, to visit England to represent it in the 'Eastern' case?"

"2. Is it not a fact that the fee arranged was in the neighbourhood of a thousand guineas, and was to cover all travelling expenses?"

"3. What were the reasons for cancelling such arrangement?"

HON. J. A. FIELLY replied—

"1. No.

"2 and 3. See answer to No. 1."

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—

Sixteenth annual report of the Bureau of Sugar Experimental Stations.

STALLIONS REGISTRATION BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. Lennon, *Herbert*): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to improve the breed of horses, and for other incidental purposes."

The leader of the Opposition has called "Not formal" to this motion, no doubt for the purpose of eliciting some information regarding it. The Bill proposes to impose a tax of £5 per head on all stallions. It also provides for the appointment of boards, whose function it will be to go to various districts for the purpose of deciding what stallions shall be classed as breeding stallions. The fund raised by the tax will be used in the first place to pay the expenses of these examinations, and from the surplus left payments will be made to the owners of high-class stallions which are successful in winning the premiums awarded by these competent boards, the object being to encourage horsebreeders to import the very best blood from abroad and thereby bring about improved strains in all classes of horses. The owners of premium stallions will receive a subsidy from the funds, and premiums will be paid, as far as the funds will permit, in relation to the quality of the horses. Some person may introduce a horse at very great cost, and if that horse wins a premium he may receive £100, £200, or £300, according to the capabilities of the funds, and the owner will be compelled to give the services of his horse to certain selected mares at a low fee, possibly £2 2s., and the stallion will be prohibited from serving more than five mares for one owner. The effect will probably be that high-class horses will be spread throughout the length and breadth of the land, and will serve mares at the lowest possible cost. If any dispute arises in connection with any of the matters mentioned, an appeal will lie to the Minister, who will have some discretionary power in regard to fees. Those are the main features of the Bill.

HON. J. TOLMIE (*Toowoomba*): This is a question that has been discussed in the House on quite a number of occasions, and also a question that has been taken up by men who have a keen desire to see the breed of horses improved in the State, and who have a very

wide knowledge of their business, too. If the hon. gentleman will read the debates that have taken place in connection with this subject, he will find plenty of food for reflection. But how is he going to improve the breed of stallions in Queensland by putting on a tax of £5 a head?

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Improve the breed of horses.

HON. J. TOLMIE: To improve the breed of horses you must first of all improve the breed of stallions. If he is going to impose a license fee of £5 most of the stallions now doing business in Queensland will continue to do business, and there is not likely to be much improvement. I think the Bill will prove a very interesting measure when it is brought forward, and will, no doubt, afford plenty of opportunities for criticism.

MR. MORGAN: I am very sorry that the Bill is not more comprehensive.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Wait till you see it.

MR. MORGAN: I am simply going on the explanation given by the Minister, which shows that all the Bill contains is a tax of £5 on stallions.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Those who own brumbies will not pay the tax and will get rid of them.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman did not say whether the Bill provides for a tax on those who own brumbies for their own use as well as a tax on stallions for public service.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They may keep them for their own use.

MR. MORGAN: That will not improve the breed of horses, as I might own a brumby stallion, and put him to 100 mares, and breed 100 brumbies.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing details at this stage.

MR. MORGAN: I recognise something should be done to improve the breed of horses in Queensland, but, unfortunately, this Bill is only going to be one of those pettifogging measures introduced to harass those who are doing their level best to develop Queensland. Only recently a commission sat in Melbourne in respect to the breed of horses, at which the different States in Australia were represented. Queensland was represented by a very able man in the person of Mr. Baynes. I followed the proceedings of that commission very closely, and many of the recommendations made by the commission were very fine, and the Minister would be wise if he adopted many of the suggestions made. Instead of bringing down a paltry tinpot affair like this Bill, he should introduce something comprehensive. We must start at the very foundation, and not only tax a few stallions. There are more horses bred in Queensland from private stallions than from stallions offered for public service. I hope, if this Bill is not up to expectations, that the Minister will withdraw it, and if he has not time this year he will later on bring down something that will be of permanent benefit to Queensland.

HON. W. D. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): I am sorry that the Bill as outlined by the Minister is not wider in its application. We

have always had a better class of stallions than mares in Queensland, and I hope the scope of the Bill will be widened so that something can be done to induce owners to introduce into the State high-class mares. After the South African war, as the Minister knows, there was a great dearth of horses in Queensland.

MR. BERTRAM: A great dearth of mares, too.

HON. W. D. ARMSTRONG: The consequence was that almost any mare at all was bred from. It would be wise for the Minister to give some consideration to the question of giving a premium or a bonus of some sort for the introduction of first-class mares.

MR. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): At the present time the people who are breeding horses get no satisfaction in breeding them, as the price of horses at the present time is very low.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Because of the deterioration in horses.

MR. FORSYTH: I know certain owners who have paid over 400 guineas to get the best class of horse suitable for export, and at the present time horses of almost any kind are an absolute drug on the market.

MR. BERTRAM: That does not apply to draughts.

MR. FORSYTH: I am saying what I know to be true, as I am speaking of horses that I have an interest in. The value of horses has gone down an enormous extent, so that there is no encouragement for anyone to get high-class stock at the present time. It is a good thing to improve the breed of horses, but nobody is going to enter into that business unless they see something in it, and I do not see that the Bill is likely to assist in that direction very much. I have no doubt that the Minister brought the Bill in with the very best intentions to try and improve the breed of horses in Queensland, but I have very great doubts whether the Bill will do what the Minister expects of it.

MR. SWAYNE: There is no doubt that the horses, especially saddle horses, in Australia are very inferior to what they were forty years ago. So far as I can gather, the Bill only concerns stallions, and the Minister proposes to effect an improvement in that direction by means of a premium system. The premium system has been long in vogue in different parts of the world. In Scotland, where the Clydesdales are bred, it was largely through that system that the breed was brought up to its present standard of perfection. In Victoria the premium system is in vogue, and as far as it goes it is an effective means of improving the breed of horses; but other factors are required, and as far as we can gather the Bill does not touch upon them. One of the first requisites is a market. The deterioration is most noticeable in regard to saddle horses, and all who have had experience in that regard will agree that the thoroughbred is the source from which the best saddle horses are bred, and it seems to me the trouble in that connection is largely owing to the trend of horseracing for a number of years, the disposition being to have short races and light weights.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will have an opportunity of discussing those matters on the second reading.

Mr. Swayne.]

Mr. SWAYNE: I only desire to express regret that the Bill does not deal with these matters. The hon. member for Carnarvon year after year moved for the introduction of legislation on this question, which, if it had been adopted, would have met the requirements I have just mentioned. I am sorry that the Bill does not touch on that aspect of the question.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I am glad to see some form of legislation is being brought forward in this direction. My predecessor, the late Hon. J. T. Bell, spoke in this House on many occasions on this subject, and his idea was a tax on stallions. This is a premium on stallions, although there is a tax in connection with it. His idea was that stallions should not be allowed for public use for stud purposes unless they were up to a certain standard. That seems to me to get at the bottom of the business, as there is no doubt a number of horses that are used for stud purposes in Queensland are very defective.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This Bill will prevent it.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know that it will. It seems to me all you have to do is to pay a fee of £5.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They will not be allowed to stand for service unless they are fit.

Mr. VOWLES: As far as that goes, I know of show horses that have passed the veterinary surgeon at one show and could not pass the test at another show. If the reputation of a stallion is not of the soundest it appears to me that his earning power ceases. The hon. member for Lockyer made a very worthy suggestion to the effect that when the Minister is taking this matter into consideration he should not forget the importance of mares. It is a notorious fact that when the

Japanese buyers came here a few [4 p.m.] years ago the animals they were after were mares of the best class. The result is that they are now doing the Indian trade that we used to do, and that is why we have not got a market for our horses. On the question of inferior horses, I think the suggestion came from a member on the Treasury benches that we ought to take into consideration the question of using them as meat. That is the quickest way of getting rid of the culls, and I should say that something ought to be done in that direction quickly. If the department would lead the way by importing horses, I think they would be making a move in the right direction, but if they are merely going to subsidise owners, or if the owners are merely going to subsidise themselves, it means that the men with the most money, who can import the most valuable horses, are going to reap the benefit.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do not forget that the board may fix the fee at, perhaps, £2 2s. That will benefit the public, will it not?

Mr. VOWLES: Do you mean to say that if you import a stallion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is discussing the details of the measure.

Mr. VOWLES: At any rate, they should begin at home, and if they import good blood horses others would probably follow their lead.

Question put and passed.

[*Mr. Swayne.*]

VETERINARY SURGEONS BILL.

INITIATION

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE, in moving—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make provision for the registration of veterinary surgeons and to regulate the practice of that calling;”

said: This Bill is required in order to try to have some sort of qualification for people who call themselves veterinary surgeons.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: How many are there in Queensland?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There are only nine at the present time properly qualified, but there are a great number who are practising without the necessary qualifications.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: And five of those nine are in the Government service.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There are practically only four in the Government service at the present time. Others who did belong to the Government service are away. There are two in Toowoomba, two in Rockhampton, one in Townsville, and three in Brisbane, usually, but some are away at the front. The Bill will provide that any one coming along with proper qualifications will be admitted on application. It also provides that those persons who have been recognised as veterinary surgeons and considered worthy, and have been practising for three years, may be permitted to come under the Bill. Of course, everyone who is practising will not be recognised. I think that in that case the Bill will be a very great service. In some remote degree, it is practically a complement to the Bill which we have been discussing. Of course, an additional reason why it is necessary is that in New South Wales they have a Chair of Veterinary Science at the University, and I think they also have a veterinary school at Melbourne. The effect is that those States do not recognise people who are not qualified, and many of those people have come across to Queensland, and therefore we have more than our proper share of that particular kind of horse doctor, if I might so describe them. I do not think I need say anything more. It is simply a Bill to qualify veterinary surgeons.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I simply rise for the purpose of asking the Minister if he will not, between now and to-morrow, consider the advisableness of withdrawing the Bill, as it is most absurd and preposterous that the time of Parliament should be taken up in dealing with nine veterinary surgeons, four of whom are in the Government service.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We want to deal with a much larger number.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: There are hundreds and hundreds of men who may be of great use to stock owners in different parts of Queensland. We will take Dalby. If a man's horse is sick at Dalby, he does not want to come to Brisbane or Toowoomba.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You can have your horse doctor. We will not interfere.

HON. J. TOLMIE: If you are going to protect these nine, surely it must be at the expense of the others. The number has increased by about 50 per cent. in the last three years.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The number of properly qualified men has decreased. The number of men not properly qualified has increased.

HON. J. TOLMIE: When we arrive at such a position that we have to introduce legislation for the purpose of dealing with a profession that is on the down grade,—

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Nothing of the kind. Be serious if you can.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member ought to be serious, and not introduce Bills of this sort. I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. VOWLES: It seems to me it is rather unnecessary to introduce legislation to deal with such a small body of the community. If it is simply a Bill dealing with registration, and the recognition of the veterinary surgeons in Queensland, like the Medical Board, who can make regulations amongst themselves, no harm is done. But, if it is going to interfere with the large numbers of men in Queensland who have some skill in treating stock and sometimes do it for nothing—for instance, these men will attend to your sick cow or your sick dog—

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We will not interfere with them.

Mr. VOWLES: What is the good of the Bill then? These men all hold diplomas.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No, they do not.

Mr. VOWLES: They do. They have got their diplomas mostly in Dublin, some of them in Scotland.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Nearly all the veterinary surgeons here are from England.

Mr. VOWLES: I have even heard members of the Government party say that the quack doctor should be allowed to ply his trade. Surely if the homeopaths are to be allowed to deal out medicines for human beings, the men I refer to should be allowed to ply their trade. The same thing applies to registered nurses and the country midwife. This Bill apparently only deals with seven men, and the thing is too infinitely absurd.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Properly qualified men will not come here and compete with the others. They go to New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. VOWLES: Where there is scope for a man he naturally goes. If it is going to be an adjunct of the previous Bill it simply means that these are the persons who are going to give certificates to stallions. The department will only accept a certificate from their own employees; they will not recognise the certificates of men who were here sometimes before the others were born.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not correct.

Mr. VOWLES: It is correct. The department only recognise the certificates of Mr. McGowan and others. Those are the men who go to the shows and give certificates for the purposes of the stud-book.

Mr. SWAYNE: I am not aware that it is a burning question in the country that this Bill should be introduced.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not traverse the same ground as previous speakers.

Mr. SWAYNE: I represent a district that contains, I suppose, more draught horses in a given area than any other in Queensland, or at any rate as many, and for some of them the owners have paid a pretty good price. There has been no demand there for such legislation as this. What I rose to ask the Minister was whether this Bill will contain any provision for dealing with stallions at show grounds.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are not dealing with horses in this Bill at all.

Mr. SWAYNE: I think the Bill should contain the means of dealing with such a difficulty as arises when one Government veterinary surgeon has refused a stallion a certificate in one show ring and he has gone to another show ring a couple of hundred miles distant and the other veterinary surgeon has passed him. As has just been suggested to me by another hon. member, this may be a proposal to create a close corporation for men like that. If we are going to do anything in regard to that, the Bill should contain provision for dealing with difficulties such as I have mentioned.

Question put and passed.

DAYS OF SITTING.

FRIDAY MORNING.

The PREMIER, in moving—

“That during the remainder of this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 9.30 a.m. on Friday in each week, and that on that day Supply may be taken either from 10 a.m. to 4.30 p.m., or from 4 p.m. to 10.30 p.m., and that in either case such day shall be an allotted day under Standing Order No. 306, and all other provisions of that Standing Order shall apply.”

said: Hon. members will understand, of course, that the hour named, of 9.30, really means 10 o'clock if we take off the half-hour that is given for the formation of a quorum. The Government had under consideration the question of whether it should ask Parliament to meet on Monday or make provision in the direction in which I am moving, and in view of the fact that Ministers have to attend to their departments, at all events for one whole day—

Hon J. G. APPEL: Their caucus meeting.

THE PREMIER: It is considered desirable that the time should be allotted as proposed here. I am sure every hon. member is desirous of finishing the business—and there is a considerable amount of business to be finished—between this and Christmas, and it is hoped that if a reasonable attitude is adopted by hon. members we will be able to do that. I, therefore, move accordingly.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The Premier cannot complain that the Opposition have not assisted him to the fullest possible extent in getting through the business of the House this session. We have shown ourselves to be

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

willing workers right from the very beginning, and it seems to me that there is a tendency on the part of the Government to make the willing horse suffer additional burdens. If the Government had done the right thing, they would have met the House at the proper time and introduced legislation for the well-being of the State. If we had not been called upon to deal with a lot of superfluous legislation, then there would be no need to sit another day at this stage of the session. By this motion the Premier is asking us to meet another day. The hon. gentleman must remember that we have worked four days a week right from the beginning, and that extra day should have been requisite for the Government to introduce the legislation necessary for the well-being of the State. But the Government have been bringing forward a lot of legislation, and some measures of a trifling character, and we can only come to the conclusion that they are imposing on members too great a strain by asking them to sit an extra day a week. Would it not be better if the Premier were to alter his motion, that the House should meet on Tuesday instead of Friday? The hon. gentleman says that he wants one clear day to attend to the business in the departments. It will not take away very much between now and Christmas if we met on Monday. It is too much of a strain to ask members to sit from 10 o'clock on Fridays till, perhaps, 2 o'clock on Saturday morning.

The PREMIER: What day does your caucus meet?

HON. J. TOLMIE: It is a great strain to put on you, Mr. Speaker, to ask you to sit in the chair from 10 o'clock on Friday morning till the early hours of Saturday morning. At any rate, if the Premier is going to make a departure, then he should make the day on which the long sitting is to be held start on the Tuesday instead of Friday. Members are fresher then to carry out the whole day's work. If the hon. gentleman will alter his motion to Tuesday, it will meet with the approbation of members on this side, and I am sure hon. members opposite will also approve of it. On Tuesday the Minister's table will be clear of any accumulation of work that must exist on Friday. Consequently, it would be better from the Cabinet point of view if we sat on Tuesday. If we sit in the morning on the last day of the week it will mean that members will be tired out with all night sittings. At times, members opposite show a zeal for work, and they want to sit all night, and we have no desire to check them. We always help them with the greatest cheerfulness when they make us sit all night.

The PREMIER: Is that a threat?

HON. J. TOLMIE: We never threaten on this side. All the thunder and lightning comes from the front Treasury bench. When the hon. gentleman says he is going to sit all night we have to submit.

Mr. MURPHY: And commandeering their motor cars. (Laughter.)

HON. J. TOLMIE: Yes. Under the new regime the Government share their motor cars with members on this side. We do not know yet when the session is going to close, and we have not the slightest idea what business is going to be introduced. Probably, the hon. gentleman in charge of the front Treasury bench does not know himself what legislation is going to be introduced, because

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

he has to get his instructions later on. If an alteration is to be made I hope that we will sit on Tuesday morning instead of Friday.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I have no particular objection to the motion. The real reason for the motion is because the House was called together so late in the year.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is why you are so late yourself.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If the hon. gentleman knew the reason I have been absent from the House I do not think he would interject. There is something in what the leader of the Opposition suggests. If it means finishing the business before Christmas, then it might be necessary for us to sit on two or three mornings in the week.

The PREMIER: We may have to do that yet.

HON. J. G. APPEL: In view of the fact that we are likely to have a hot summer it is not desirable that we should sit after the Christmas vacation. While we are willing to sit additional hours, I would suggest that no fresh legislation be introduced that does not affect the welfare of the community. If a lot of legislation is to be sprung upon us, then there is nothing to be gained in sitting a greater number of hours.

The PREMIER: I can assure the hon. gentleman that only reasonable measures will be introduced. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: One measure has been introduced which I consider most unreasonable. However, if it expedites the business of the House I do not object to the motion. If the Premier can see his way to alter the date, I have no doubt he will do so.

The PREMIER: Give this a trial first.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am sure if the hon. member finds that another day is more suitable he will adopt it, but I would suggest that he should not introduce any more experimental or sentimental legislation.

Mr. GUNN: I have no objection to sitting for a longer time on Friday, but I think it would be fairer to the officers of the House if we sat on Monday, because it is too long to ask them to be here from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10.30 at night. Hon. members sitting on the Government benches believe in an 8-hour day, bank to bank, but that is not an 8-hour day. It is too much of a good thing to ask the officers to work those long hours.

Mr. MAY: What about overtime?

Mr. GUNN: I do not know whether they will get overtime for it. I think it would suit the officers of the House better if we sat on Monday.

The PREMIER: Your anxiety for the officers of the House has suddenly developed. You were not so anxious about the officers of the House when you sat over here.

Mr. GUNN: I do not ever remember sitting 12 hours a day when I was sitting over there, except when we had all night sittings. The all night sittings then were caused by members of the Opposition. (Laughter.) We had far more all night sittings when the hon. members opposite were in opposition than we have had since they have been on the Treasury benches. I

think it would be better to do double duty on Thursday instead of Friday, because a number of Downs members have to go away from Brisbane at the week-end.

Mr. FORSYTH: I, personally, would rather sit on Monday from 10 o'clock until 4.30 than have a Monday's sitting, because that would mean sitting five nights a week, and it is too much to ask hon. members to do that during this hot weather.

The PREMIER: How can we attend to our departments?

Mr. FORSYTH: The usual thing is to sit three days a week for a considerable time, but we started this session with four days a week, and that extra day should have been ample to make up. The Government have introduced a lot of Bills, and we do not know what other Bills are to come forward. If the hon. gentleman could tell us what other legislation he is going to introduce we would know exactly what we could do. If he brings in many more Bills, then it will not matter if we sit six days a week. I would like to know what business the hon. gentleman intends to bring before the House between this and Christmas. The hon. gentleman said that if the Opposition were reasonable we would finish by Christmas. I consider that the Opposition have been most reasonable. The business of the country has been carried through expeditiously when you consider the enormous quantity of Bills that we have dealt with. I consider that the Government have had splendid assistance from the Opposition, and while we are giving them every consideration we expect the same from hon. members opposite. With regard to sitting on Friday mornings, it has been pointed out that there is always a thin House on Friday, because a large number of members have to go away at the end of the week. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that that will be a good time to get his legislation through because there are very few people here. It is not a fair thing to pass legislation in that way.

The PREMIER: You are putting ideas into my head.

Mr. FORSYTH: This is not the first time that the hon. gentleman has done it, so the idea must have been put into his head before. In any case, I think it would be a wise thing to alter the [4.30 p.m.] day from Friday to some other day in the week. The Premier has said that the reason he does not want to sit on Monday is that Ministers want some time to look after their departments, and there is probably some force in that argument. If the hon. gentleman cannot see his way clear to sit at 10 o'clock on Monday and finish at half-past 4 on that day, then he might change the day to which this motion refers to some other day than Friday.

The PREMIER: Would you not give this a trial? If we find that members are too tired to sit all day on Friday, we can change the day.

Mr. FORSYTH: A number of members generally go away on Friday night, and it would be very much better to have some other day, in order to give those members a chance of being present.

The PREMIER: Of course, I will consider that, and put on Estimates on Friday.

Mr. FORSYTH: I presume the hon. gentleman desires to meet the wishes of members. The matter does not really affect me personally, but it affects a considerable number of members who generally go away early on Friday. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not bring in fresh legislation. He has been introducing lately some peculiar legislation, which has caused a good deal of discussion, and which is not for the good of the country. I do not see any reason why we should be kept here long hours during the hot days and nights, as that is not good for the health of members, and I hope the hon. gentleman will consider the suggestion I have made to choose some other day than Friday.

Mr. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*): I do not intend to oppose the motion, but I would remind the Premier that many members on this side of the House, particularly Downs members, like to leave for their homes on Friday morning in order to assist at harvesting on their farms during the week end; and that he would meet the convenience of country members generally if he would make this long sitting on either Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, instead of Friday. I admit that it is a fair thing to have extra sitting time in order to finish the business before Christmas, and I am sure that the Opposition will give the Government every assistance.

The PREMIER: If you assist me enough, we may not need to use the extra time.

Mr. GRAYSON: It is not the desire of members on this side to keep the House sitting after Christmas; we all desire to finish the work before Christmas if possible, and it is a very small concession that we ask for when we ask the Premier to make the long sitting day either Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday.

Mr. MURPHY (*Burke*): If I were not opposed to the motion, I would not say anything on it, but I am opposed to it. I have to be opposed to it in order to be consistent, because in the past I have frequently assisted the present Premier and his supporters to oppose a motion for an extra sitting day. It was pointed out then that, so far as this House is concerned, if it became necessary in the public interest, that members should be prepared to come here after Christmas. The hon. gentleman proposes now to have what is really an extra sitting day on Friday, in order that the House may adjourn by Christmas. I do not see that there is any urgency for this extra sitting day. I think we can get through the business of the country without meeting at 10 o'clock on Friday morning. The Premier knows how he used to oppose Monday sittings, and how we all supported him, and how, on one occasion, we even went so far as to take a division on the question in order to show our disapproval of the action of the then Government. However, things have now changed, and the Premier says Ministers must be in their offices on Monday, and Government members have ceased to advocate meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning and knocking off at 6 o'clock, and having no night sittings. Although it has been said that the Premier may later on find it convenient to meet the wishes of some of the Downs members, my opinion is that if this motion is carried, the Premier will give very little consideration to any complaints which may arise later on.

Question put and passed.

Mr. Murphy.]

INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

The several clauses of the Bill were agreed to without amendment or debate.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment, and the third reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

MARSUPIAL BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I may state that considerable information as to its main features was afforded hon. members at the initiatory stage. The Act which the measure proposes to amend has been in force for a considerable time, and very heavy contributions have been made by pastoralists in their own interests in order to extirpate as far as possible the native dog, the fox, and the marsupial. During the time the Act has been in force a subsidy has been contributed by the Government. No subsidy was paid in the four years 1891 to 1895, nor was the Act in force during that period, but leaving out that interregnum, the total contribution paid by the Government by way of subsidy from 1877 till the present time amounts to no less a sum than £289,111 5s. 5d. This Bill is introduced because it has been asked for by all the bodies concerned. The leader of the Opposition must be familiar with the fact that we have in Brisbane what is known as the "deputation season." At the time when our National Show is held, people from all parts of the State make it a point to lay their wants before the various departments, and during the last two years I had deputations urging upon me the necessity for amending the Marsupials Boards Act.

Hon. J. TOLME: Didn't your deputations want to wipe it out?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No. I would like to do that, but that was objected to strongly by a very large number of boards and pastoralists. The number of dingoes and foxes paid for throughout Queensland during the year 1915 totalled 25,000. That shows some vigour in the efforts which had been made to extirpate dingoes and foxes. Greater activity in this connection was displayed last year than was displayed the preceding year. Dingoes are increasing in the far West and the far South-west. They also come from other quarters, and the dingoes are increasing, notwithstanding the fact that such large numbers were destroyed last year. In order that the work may be more effective, we propose to prohibit, by this measure, the practice that has grown up in recent years, of marsupial boards granting exemptions in respect to large areas of their territory. Under this Bill it is proposed to discontinue that pernicious system. Another very important point is in regard to the minimum to be paid for scalps. Under the present Act the minimum was fixed at 5s. Representations were made to me from as far north as Cloncurry right to the extreme southern end of the State, and as far as the extreme west in regard to the matter, and varying sums were suggested at which the limit should be

fixed. Some people wanted it to be fixed as high as £1 10s., but I do not think that rate would meet with general satisfaction. It is interesting to know that at present twenty-nine boards are operating, and bonuses paid as follows:—Eight boards pay £1; two boards pay 15s.; eleven boards pay 10s.; one board pays 7s. 6d.; and seven boards pay 5s. minimum. That shows an average of 11s. 9½d. per scalp. A sensible and moderate solution of the matter is to make the minimum 15s., and that, I think, will give more general satisfaction than any other figure named, and, of course, it is only desired to give satisfaction to those people concerned in a measure of this sort.

Mr. MORGAN: Can you give a few more reasons why you are not going to allow exemptions?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: For the reason that such places become breeding-grounds. If you have large areas where no killing is going on they naturally become breeding-places for dingoes and marsupials. Some people thought it would be much better to bring in what they call a Pests Act, and representations were made to me in that direction. Considerable thought was given to the subject, with the result that I could not see my way to bring in a Pests Bill this session, because local authorities have power to declare certain animals as pests, and if they were brought under this Bill in any shape or form it would require so much trouble that I do not think hon. members would give the necessary attention to it to make it law this session. It would require alterations in the following Acts of Parliament:—Local Authorities Acts; the existing by-laws of many local authorities; the Land Acts of 1910 and 1913; Prickly-pear Destruction Acts of 1912 and 1913; Marsupial Proof Fencing Acts, 1898 to 1913; Marsupial Boards Acts, 1905 to 1910; Rabbit Acts, 1885, 1889, and 1913; Diseases in Stock Act of 1915; Fruit Cases Act of 1912; Grape Vines Diseases Act, 1877; Diseases in Plants Acts, 1913 and 1914; Native Animals Protection Acts, 1906 to 1910; Native Birds Protection Acts, 1877 to 1884; Sugar Experiment Stations Act of 1900; and the Commonwealth Quarantine Acts, 1908 to 1915. I am assured by the Parliamentary Draftsman that to bring in a Bill such as is desired by some people would involve an alteration of all those Acts of Parliament, and an alteration of all those by-laws passed by local authorities. The Bill also provides that in future endowment will only be paid in regard to the amount actually expended in the destruction of marsupials and dingoes. Hitherto endowment has been paid on the total disbursements of the board, and complaints have come from certain quarters that some boards have been somewhat lavish in their expenses; their office expenses and the cost of administration generally has been unreasonably high. Suggestions were made that these should be regulated by the Act. That seems to be an unwarrantable interference with the business of those boards, and the end can be attained in a better way—that is, by not paying subsidy on those expenses, and paying the subsidy on the work of extermination only. The Bill, I think, will meet with general acceptance. I have given, as far as it is practicable, effect to what I might call a general consensus of opinion regarding the matter. It is not easy to do that when you have a large number of

[Hon. W. Lennon.

people making representations. You cannot satisfy everybody, but I think this Bill will be a marked improvement on the existing law, inasmuch as it will prevent—what is now quite a common practice—certain boards paying only 5s. for the scalps of dingoes and foxes. Such boards practically have no business, but boards that offer a higher fee do a good business.

Mr. MORGAN: Are you making it compulsory to pay 15s. for foxes?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, it is compulsory to pay 15s. for foxes. The word "dingo" includes "fox." I think that will give general satisfaction.

Mr. GUNN: Can you make it include blowflies?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We cannot do the impossible. Some people wanted emus and wild pigs included, but in order to do that a number of Acts would have to be altered. I think what we are doing is quite sufficient for the purpose, and I feel satisfied that hon. members opposite, who are interested in the measure, will pass it without any alteration, but if they can point out any alteration that will improve the Bill, it will, of course, receive sympathetic consideration. I do not wish to delay the House any longer, because we have a lot to do this session, and very little time in which to do it, and therefore have no time for long speeches. I beg to move—That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister stated that he is introducing this Bill at the request of people who are concerned. In one respect he is right, as the people who are concerned do require certain amendments in respect to the Marsupial Boards Act, but the Minister, in some directions, is going further than those who are actually concerned had asked. When the Minister asked permission to introduce this Bill, he forgot to tell us that certain alterations were being made which I, as one who has had practical experience in the work of marsupial boards and as one who has to pay taxes in connection with those boards, know the stockowners of Queensland do not want. I would draw attention to the fact that this Bill provides that in future no exemptions will be allowed in respect of certain holdings. I am quite sure that the pastoralists and stockowners of Queensland have not asked the Minister to introduce an amendment in that direction.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You do not know what they have asked.

Mr. MORGAN: I know perfectly well what they have asked, as I introduced several deputations to the previous Minister on the subject. I have taken a very keen interest in the Marsupial Boards Act, and before the present Minister occupied the position of Secretary for Agriculture I attended many conferences on the subject, and I know that the stockowners of Queensland have never asked the Minister to abolish subsection (4) of section 19 of the principal Act. The Minister stated that exemptions have been given by certain boards, and these areas become breeding-grounds for dingoes and marsupials. That is a reflection upon the marsupial boards of Queensland. Section 19 of the principal Act states that exemptions cannot be given by the boards unless the boards are thoroughly satisfied that the whole of the conditions, so far as the destruction of dingoes and foxes is concerned, have been

carried out in respect of the area. The provision which the Minister wishes to eliminate from the Act is as follows:—

" Provided that the owner or manager of any holding may apply in writing to the board that his holding shall be exempt from the operation of this section, either absolutely or during a specified period, on the grounds stated in such application. Whereupon the board, after hearing all persons interested who desire to be heard and taking into consideration the application and any evidence adduced in support thereof or in opposition thereto, may by order—

(a) Grant the application without modification or with any modification which appears to the board to be proper; or

(b) Reject the application."

Therefore, before any exemption is granted, the board must be thoroughly satisfied that the owners of the holding are destroying the marsupials and the foxes and dingoes on that holding. I would also like to point out in this respect that the definition of holding applies to freeholds as well as to all classes of leases that exist in Queensland. By the abolition of subsection 4 of section 19 of the principal Act the Minister is going to allow the board, if they so desire, to give permits to trappers to go upon a man's freehold or any country he may desire, irre-

[5 p.m.] spectively of the fact whether that holder is doing his duty with regard to the destruction of marsupials, dingoes, and foxes, or whether he desires the trappers to come on to his land or not. This is the most important alteration which the Minister proposes to bring about. If the people of Queensland knew that this amending Bill contained such a provision as that, they would resist it to the utmost extent. This is an attack upon the boards in one direction, and, so far as the Minister is concerned, it allows the boards, if they so desire, to give permits to undesirable men to enter upon the holdings of those who have done their duty so far as the destruction of these pests is concerned. I know myself that in the western parts of Queensland, where men are engaged on the different stations in the destruction of dingoes and marsupials for a certain period of the year, that they are usually men who are engaged in work on the station, such as mustering and the like, and when they are not earning wages from the station they are allowed to trap and destroy the marsupials and other pests. This privilege is reserved by the owners of the property for certain individuals who assist them during certain portions of the year in the working of the property. If this subsection is eliminated from the original Act, it will mean that any Tom, Dick, or Harry can obtain a permit from the Marsupial Board to trap. It says that the permit "shall" be given, not "may" be given. These men will be able to go on any property and engage in the destruction of marsupials, dingoes, and opossums irrespective of whether the owners of that particular property are doing their best to destroy the pests or not. That is not fair. The Minister cannot tell the House that on any occasion when the owners of property have asked him to bring in an amendment of the Act in that direction.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are stating what is not true. They did ask me, many of them.

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: I would like the Minister to mention the names of any deputation of holders of property that asked him to introduce this legislation. He may have been asked by the trappers.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This Bill has nothing to do with trappers.

Mr. MORGAN: There are certain restrictions so far as trappers are concerned, but there are some men engaged in trapping whom it is not desirable to give permits to.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Subsection 4 of section 19 has nothing to do with trapping at all. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. MORGAN: I will read the balance of the section from the principal Act, and members of the House can judge whether it deals with trapping or not. It says—

“If the board grant the application without modification or with such modification as aforesaid, notice of the order of the board shall, at the expense of the applicant, be published in some newspaper generally circulating within the district during two consecutive weeks next after the making of the order; and at the expiration of such two weeks it shall not be lawful during the period, if any, fixed by the order for any scalper to destroy marsupials or dingoes upon the holding therein referred to or to enter upon such holding for the purpose of such destruction.”

I see the word “scalper” is mentioned there. I used the word “trapper” instead of “scalper.”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't you understand that if that section is repealed there will be no such thing as granting an exemption for any particular area?

Mr. MORGAN: Exactly. That is what I say. At the present time a scalper cannot go on to land that is exempt.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There are no exemptions under this amending Bill.

Mr. MORGAN: That is so. The hon. gentleman is only trying to quibble out of it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not. How dare you say that? You can do nothing but use insulting language. You are not intelligent enough to understand plain English.

Mr. MORGAN: I am endeavouring to show the Minister that he is wrong when he says that it does not refer to trappers.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You cannot show me where I am wrong. I challenge you to show me where I am wrong. You have not brains enough to show me where I am wrong.

Mr. MORGAN: So far as brains are concerned I may say that during the period I have lived I have made a success in life. Can the Minister say the same?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I am a greater success than you will ever be.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I am only replying to the interjections made by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order!

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

Mr. MORGAN: You should deal with the interjector, as he is responsible for the interruption.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Because you insulted me.

Mr. MORGAN: You said I did not have any brains. If I only had as little brains as you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to be less personal in his remarks.

Mr. MORGAN: If you had only listened to the Minister for Agriculture you would find that the personalities originated from the Minister himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to address himself to the Bill.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, I will endeavour to do so, but I wish for fair treatment. The Minister was the first to introduce the personalities.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I was not.

Mr. MORGAN: I will finish the section I was reading from, which continues as follows:—

“It shall not be lawful during the period, if any, fixed by the order for any scalper to destroy marsupials or dingoes upon the holding therein referred to, or to enter upon any such holding for the purpose of such destruction. And any scalper who offends against this provision shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.”

According to that section, any man engaged in the industry of scalping or trapping, if he goes on areas that are exempt, will suffer a penalty of £20. The Minister desires to have that clause eliminated from the Act altogether, and that is something we do not desire. I am sure that the people who are paying the bonus and carrying on the work in connection with this particular Act will not agree to it so far as that particular provision is concerned. There is also another important matter in regard to this Bill which I shall refer to. Subclause (3) of clause 3 does away with the fixing of a maximum assessment. The Minister has not explained that to the House as fully as he might have done. Had the Minister so desired he could have told the House that so far as this Bill is concerned it is going to double and treble the taxation on the stockowners of Queensland for the destruction of dingoes and foxes, whilst the Government of Queensland are going to get out of it practically scot free. The Act provides that the assessment shall not be more than 7s. 6d. per twenty head of cattle or 100 head of sheep. This Bill abolishes that proviso and gives the board a free hand as to the amount of assessment they may impose. They can do what they like so far as that form of taxation is concerned. The Minister is permitting the marsupial boards to put whatever taxation they like upon the stockowners of Queensland. That is a matter which I am sure the stockowners of Queensland did not ask the Minister to include in this Bill. There is another important amendment here which the Minister has not explained. At the present time, if there are not a great number of marsupials or dingoes, and the board does not think it necessary to strike another assessment rate, but has sufficient revenue to carry on for another year, it need not strike a levy at all. Under this Bill, however, it is

provided that the board must make the assessment whether they like it or not. What does the Minister intend to do with the funds that accumulate year after year? That is another amendment that the Minister has not been asked to make so far as the stockowners of Queensland are concerned. There is another important amendment here. At the present time, if the board finds it necessary to make a second assessment, they cannot exceed 5s. for each twenty cattle or 100 sheep, but the Minister is wiping out that provision altogether, and he is introducing an amendment to increase it to 7s. 6d. I am sure that the marsupial boards did not ask for that amendment. Now we are coming to a most important amendment so far as this Bill is concerned, and that is the part played by the Government in the assistance given for the destruction of foxes and dingoes upon the Crown lands in Queensland. We, who have had experience of this matter, know that there are, unfortunately, hundreds of thousands of acres of vacant Crown land in Queensland under no form of tenure whatever, and it is a breeding ground for dingoes and pests generally. The State take no responsibility at all so far as this Government land is concerned. The land is not occupied. Yet the Government come along now and they are not prepared to share their full responsibility in the destruction of these pests on Government land. The original Act provides that if the marsupial board spends, say, £4,000 in a district on the destruction of dingoes and foxes the Government will come along with a subsidy equal to one-fourth of that amount, and they will advance the board £1,000. If the board spend £8,000 the Government will give £2,000, and so on. So far as this Bill is concerned we notice that the amount placed on the Estimates for the payment of bonuses for the destruction of marsupials is £5,000. The Minister has already said that during the past six or seven years he has discovered that that is the average amount paid by the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: During the last ten years.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, during the last ten years, the Minister says that the average amount paid by the Government has been £5,000 a year. The Minister fixes the amount at £5,000, yet he proposes to increase the subsidy from 5s. to 15s.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No, he does not. You had better stick to facts.

Mr. MORGAN: I should say rather that the Minister is going to increase the bonus. I made a slip in the word. I am sorry that it is not a subsidy. The Minister is going to allow the marsupial boards of Queensland to pay a bonus of 15s. a head on dingoes, while under the original Act they were only compelled to pay 5s.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They have asked to be compelled.

Mr. MORGAN: I agree with the fact that the Minister has seen fit to bring in a Bill to raise the bonus to 15s., but, because I agree with one particular section, it does not follow that I agree with all the Bill. The Minister has agreed to compel the board to pay a bonus of 15s. for every dingo, and I say that it is a very good provision, but that is going to increase the taxation on the stockowners, and while the annual amount paid by the Government when the bonus was 5s. amounted to £5,000, the

Minister is still only going to pay £5,000 when he has increased the taxation by 200 per cent. On those figures alone, if the Government were going to pay their equal proportion, they would place £15,000 on the estimates—that is, providing only the same number of dingoes are destroyed each year, but the Minister knows perfectly well—at least, I think it is his intention—by increasing the bonus to 15s. more dingoes will be destroyed. Last year he told us 23,000 dingoes and foxes were destroyed in Queensland. That is the number the board paid for, but no doubt there were many more destroyed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I said 23,000; it was really 25,000, and that is in excess of any year for the last three years.

Mr. MORGAN: If 25,000 dingoes and foxes have been destroyed during the last twelve months, when the bonus was 5s., I think the Minister will agree that during the next twelve months, when this Bill becomes law and the bonus is raised to 15s., there will most likely be 50,000.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: So much the better for the stockowners.

Mr. MORGAN: We hope that this will be the means of getting rid of the dingo quickly, instead of spreading it over a number of years. If it is going to be the means of a quick destruction of the dingo, is it not fair that the Government should come forward and give the same subsidy as before, namely one-fourth? Instead of that they say if 50,000 are going to be killed next year, they are going to get out of the taxation by only paying a paltry £5,000. It is not just, not right, and it is not encouraging the people to go on the land. The Minister is placing—as this Government has always done—the whole of the responsibility on the people who are on the land. I say that the destruction of dingoes—the same as the destruction of prickly-pear or any other pests—is of as much concern to the people of Brisbane as to the people on the land. It is a national matter.

Mr. KIRWAN: More socialism. I thought you did not like socialism.

Mr. MORGAN: Never mind about socialism.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you not think the subsidy is a very liberal one for the Government to give?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not. When the previous Government made it one-quarter, I objected, and said they should make it one-half, the same as in Victoria, where the Government came forward and said the people of Melbourne were interested in the destruction of the pests, the same as the men on the land, and they subsidised to the extent of one-half. When Mr. White was Minister I advocated as strongly as I do now that the Government has the right to subsidise to the extent of one-half, but this Government is pursuing its policy of taxing the man on the land, and making his position worse, and more burdensome. It is the duty of the Government not to interfere with the subsidy, but to let it remain at one-quarter, and I hope the Minister will be reasonable when we move that in Committee, or that he will withdraw his proposal and say "now we are going to increase the amount to 15s."—and it is a wise thing to do that—"we are

Mr. Morgan.]

going also to be fair to the stockowners of Queensland and bear our proportion of the extra expense, recognising it is a national matter, and not a local parochial affair." The Minister must admit that this proposal to increase the bonus will make the taxation on the stockowners much greater than at present. If he admits that, he must also admit it is a fair thing for the Government to take their share of the responsibility. The people have come through a severe drought, and some of them have lost 50 to 75 per cent. of their stock, and this is not the time to put extra burdens on them. Let the Government be fair, and say they are prepared to bear their share of it and subsidise to the extent of one-quarter. If the Minister will do that, he will show that he is genuine in his desire to bring about the quick destruction of the marsupial pest and in his desire to assist the man on the land. The Minister said in his speech, in reply to interjections, that it is the proposal of the Government to make it compulsory to pay 15s. for foxes. I said that was not so. The Minister said foxes came under the definition of dingoes, and they would be compelled to pay the same amount as for the dingo.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They may be compelled to pay £5 if the board so decide. I said 15s. was the minimum.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister stated that the board would be compelled to pay a minimum of 15s. for foxes as well as dingoes. I want to show that the Minister is wrong, and I will show that by clause 31 of the original Act. The only alteration the Minister proposes to make there is the substitution of the word "fifteen" for "five." Clause 31 reads at present—

"The rate for the scalp of a dingo, irrespective of age, shall not be less than five shillings."

He is going to eliminate the word "five" and substitute the word "fifteen." But he forgot to make the other alteration to bring about what he thinks is necessary—that the bonus should be the same for foxes as for dingoes. He forgot to read the balance of the section, which states—

"But the rate fixed for the scalp of a fox need not be the same as the rate fixed for the scalp of any other dingo."

Will the Minister turn up the original Act and see if that is not there? It shows that the Minister has not made himself acquainted with the original Act. The board will be able to pay only 5s. or 2s. 6d. for foxes' skins, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister was bringing in this alteration, and I hope when we go into Committee, and he recognises he has made that mistake, he will make the alteration. If the Minister will agree to that, it will certainly make the Bill a better one than it is at the present moment. I had experience of foxes in Victoria. We have not had much experience of them here, except in the last few years. When I was lamb-raising in Victoria, I have gone into my paddocks and found eighty lambs dead, with only the tongues taken out. They say the fox will only eat the turkey or the poultry in the farmhouses. That may be so while the foxes remain few in number, and while they can get food of that description, but if they become hungry, and there is no

[Mr. Morgan.]

food of that sort to eat, the fox will attack a lamb and kill it just as well as a wild dingo. The fox certainly will not attack a full-grown sheep, but he will do considerable damage to a lamb, and while the foxes remain few in number, as they are at the present time, I say that is the time we should endeavour to exterminate or as nearly as possible wipe them out.

Mr. D. RYAN: The cattlemen will not like that.

Mr. MORGAN: I admit the cattlemen have a different opinion as far as foxes and dingoes are concerned. They say they keep down the wallabies and the marsupials generally, and while the dingo may kill an odd calf or two they do some good by keeping down the marsupials and wallabies. I do not agree with them in that contention. I look on that as a narrow view for them to hold. I am a cattleman myself, and the reason why I am a cattleman is that on my country, owing to the dingo, I cannot carry sheep. If there were no dingoes in Queensland, or very few, while wire netting costs anything from £80 to £100 a mile, though it is more now, a man would only have to put a six-wire fence round his property, and he could run sheep. At present the country is not fit to carry sheep, as the dingo is so plentiful.

Mr. D. RYAN: That shows the selfishness of the cattlemen.

Mr. MORGAN: It does. I admit that the cattlemans has no argument when he says the dingo or fox should not be killed. I say the fox, and the dingo as well, should be wiped out as quickly as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And you object to the means of wiping them out.

Mr. MORGAN: No, I agree with the means, but the Minister only provided for an amount of 5s., or 2s. 6d. if the board so desires, in the case of the fox. I know it is a mistake, and I say it ought to be 15s., the same as for the dingo. In other respects the Bill can be altered so that those who desire to see the dingo wiped out as quickly as possible, and the fox also, will have the means to have that carried into effect. I speak from experience, and the Minister, I feel sure, will be well advised that in some directions this Bill, which is aiming in the right direction, can be altered in certain aims to make it a better Bill in order to bring about the quick extermination of the dingoes and the foxes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You will have a chance in Committee.

Mr. MORGAN: We want to bring this up in Committee.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you not see by the definition in the principal Act the word "dingo" includes foxes?

Mr. MORGAN: You cannot get over the fact that the third paragraph of clause 31 of the principal Act states that the rate fixed for the scalp of a fox need not be the same as the rate fixed for the scalp of any other dingo. And that is where the Minister overlooked the principal Act when he framed the provisions in the Bill. I believe he is in favour of making the rates for foxes the same as that for dingoes, but it is necessary to alter that portion of the principal Act as well as the portion which he says will bring about the alteration. I also wish to draw

the Minister's attention to the fact that in this Bill section 8 provides that if a board wishes to be exempted from payment for a certain period in consequence of so many scalps being sent in, the consent of the Minister will not be given unless the board have levied an assessment in the aggregate of at least 2s. 6d. on every twenty head of cattle or 100 sheep. Some of the boards have found that the number of foxes, dingoes, and marsupials sent in has been so great that their year's assessment has not been sufficient, and they have not been able to pay, and they want an extended period of two or three months' or perhaps more. In the principal Act, it provides that no board can get that exemption unless their rating was 2s. 6d., and the Minister proposes to bring about an amendment that the board must have made an assessment at the rate of 5s. That is increasing the assessment in that respect by 100 per cent. Under the amending Bill, unless a board levies a rate equal to 5s. on twenty head of cattle or 100 sheep, they cannot get exemption. That is not as it should be; it will be harassing to a certain class of people. Clause 9 provides that the Minister may grant leave to a board to discontinue operations under certain circumstances. When a board finds that the dingo or the fox has decreased in numbers and is practically extinct, they may apply for exemption from carrying on their work for a certain period. The old Act provided that if the fox, marsupial, or dingo had decreased to a considerable extent, they could apply for exemption.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is very hard to define that.

Mr. MORGAN: Quite so, and the new provision in this measure is a good one. It would not be fair that the scalps of dingoes or foxes caught in a district where the dingoes or foxes do not exist in any numbers should be taken to some other board where they would be paid for. We have had instances where one board was more generous than another, and paid 10s. for fox or dingo skins, while another board paid only 5s.; and the skins were taken to the board which paid the larger bonus. I am pleased to note that the Minister intends to make it compulsory that every board shall do what may be regarded as a fair thing. I am also pleased to know that he does not intend to give exemptions, and I hope he will be very strict in that connection, because certain boards want to escape their responsibilities. When a board makes application for exemption, the Minister ought not to be satisfied with their statement as to the number of dingoes or foxes in their area, but should have strict inquiries made as to whether the area is free from dingoes or foxes. We know that foxes and dingoes are on the increase and that they do a considerable amount of damage throughout Queensland, and we must admit that the present way of dealing with them has not proved successful—has not brought about the desired result. In my opinion the time will come—in fact I think it has come at the present moment—when we should abolish marsupial boards, and allow the shire councils and the municipal councils throughout the State to deal with the matter. In Victoria and other States the bonus paid for the destruction of dingoes is paid by the municipal councils, and that means the doing away with a certain number of boards and a corresponding decrease in the expenditure. We are now going to have

large boards which will deal only with the destruction of dingoes and foxes. The Bill does not make it compulsory for the boards to pay for the scalps of wallabies, kangaroo rats, and other marsupials.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The skins will pay for them.

Mr. MORGAN: Exactly; I agree with the hon. gentleman. But seeing that we do not make it compulsory to pay for marsupials, is it necessary that we should have a board composed of six or seven men, with a secretary and offices and other expenses for the purpose of dealing with foxes and dingoes? The whole of the work could be carried out by the local authorities, who could be given power to raise rates on stock for the destruction of dingoes and foxes in the same way as the boards make levies for that purpose. Why should we have a number of boards and a number of secretaries and other officials to deal only with dingoes and foxes, when those pests could be dealt with by the local authorities throughout the State?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Why are they not dealing with the dingo menace now?

Mr. MORGAN: Because the local authorities have not the power to deal with them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Some of the boards in the most thickly-infested portions of the State only employ three men to deal with them, and they will not give a bonus to any outside man.

Mr. MORGAN: They have power to issue permits to scalpers, and this Bill does not take that power from them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Of course, it does; they must give 15s. to the men.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, but the boards you speak of will only give 15s. to the three men they employ.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No; they only give them so much a week.

Mr. MORGAN: Under this Bill they will have to pay 15s. for scalps, but it does not say that boards cannot employ men at so much per week. I hope that when the Bill goes into Committee the Minister will be reasonable and listen to suggestions from members on this side of the House, and accept reasonable amendments. If he takes up that position, there will be a chance of getting the Bill through in such a form that it will not be necessary to alter it to any great extent in another Chamber, and we shall have a measure which will do more good than the present Act is doing, as it will bring about a more complete destruction of dingoes and foxes than is likely to be brought about under the provisions of the existing Act.

Mr. SOMERSET (*Stanley*): I think the hon. member for Murilla should be congratulated on the interest he has taken in this question of marsupial destruction.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What does he mean by "the lousy shire councils"? (Interruption.)

The SPEAKER: The hon. member can make a personal explanation.

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to only do so with the permission of the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. Somerset.

Mr. SOMERSET: I very willingly give it.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister, by interjection, stated that during the course of my

Mr. Morgan.]

speech I made use of the words "lousy shire councils." I wish to say that I did not do anything of the sort, and I do not wish that to appear in "Hansard" without contradiction. I hope the Minister will withdraw.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member disclaims having used the expression, of course, I give in to him; but I certainly understood him to say so.

Mr. SOMERSET: I regret that the Minister, misunderstanding what the hon. member for Murilla was driving at, lost his head, and for some considerable time afterwards was not attending to what the hon. member was saying. (Dissent.) I am quite satisfied of that, because I saw another hon. member of his own party talking to him, and he was giving no attention to the hon. member who was speaking. The sole desire of the hon. member for Murilla, I feel sure, is to make this Bill a good one. (Hear, hear!) I am in favour of the introduction of the Bill amending the principal Act, but I have some objection to it, and my objection—particularly in reference to freehold properties—is to doing away with exemptions altogether. I want to point out to the Minister that if he will take the case of freehold properties given up to the purpose of fattening bullocks he will find that the scalper may be allowed to come in and travel about the paddocks just as he likes, on foot, ostensibly with the object of destroying dingoes, yet, perhaps, there is no dingo within miles.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you think they go there for a holiday?

Mr. SOMERSET: I do not know that people will go there for a holiday, but I know the paddocks in my mind's eye, and the class of people who live on them, and I can foresee that unless we have those exemptions, on the condition that we destroy the dingoes ourselves—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are not doing it.

Mr. SOMERSET: Make the conditions as strict as you like; compel us to destroy the dingoes ourselves; but give us the right to keep these people out of our boundaries.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You have kept them out all along; but you have not destroyed the dingoes.

Mr. SOMERSET: We have destroyed them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They have increased.

Mr. SOMERSET: At any rate, I have drawn attention to that, as the hon. member for Murilla has also. Another clause is to the effect that the board is compelled to levy an assessment in each area. The board may have ample funds at their disposal to pay for all the scalps likely to be presented, at the same time they are compelled to make a levy whether it is required or not. I do not know that that is wise. I suppose time really will soon show whether that amendment should be repealed or not. Another matter to which the hon. member for Murilla has drawn attention is the endowment by the Government. It seems to me a very unfair thing that, whereas under the principal Act the Government paid one-fourth of the amount expended in the destruction of dingoes, they now intend to adhere to the

[Mr. Morgan.

same old sum in the aggregate of £5,000, which is arrived at as being the average for about ten years.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Is that not a fair thing to do?

Mr. SOMERSET: No; that was the average when 5s. was the bonus paid for scalps. Now the bonus is 15s., and surely the subsidy should be increased in proportion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have already told hon. members in my second reading speech that the average has been 11s. 9½d.—nearly 12s.—so that there is nothing to make a song about.

Mr. SOMERSET: I understand that not quite £5,000 has been the average for about ten years. Make the total subsidy now not quite three times that amount, and we shall be perfectly satisfied. If you multiply the bonus by three, you ought to increase the subsidy in the same proportion. With regard to the exemption of freehold paddocks, it so happens that I have a little mob of pet kangaroos in my paddocks, and I object to anybody destroying them, because every wild animal we have is gradually being wiped out. As the lion is emblematic of England, and the bear of Russia, so the kangaroo is emblematic of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Australia.

Mr. SOMERSET: Of Australia. I have a strong desire to retain those few kangaroos, but if I am not allowed to prevent undesirable persons from coming into my paddock owing to the repeal of this exemption clause, then away go my kangaroos. I do not intend to say any more, but I think the Minister should consider what the hon. member for Murilla has said and accept his assistance in the spirit in which it is offered, because it will certainly tend towards making the Bill better than it would be otherwise.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*): This is a very important question. Dingoes have been increasing in number in Queensland to a very much greater extent of late years than has ever been known before in Queensland. I was speaking the other day to a man who had nearly fifty years' experience, and he told me that last year the dogs had increased more than he had ever known before.

Mr. FORSYTH: In some parts.

Mr. LAND: There are two reasons why native dogs have increased. One particular reason is the fact that as a rule cattle-owners will not allow anyone to destroy the dogs on their holdings, neither will they destroy the dogs themselves, and consequently their runs become breeding-grounds.

Mr. FORSYTH: Not only cattle-owners.

Mr. LAND: It applies to cattle-owners principally, because the sheepowners do their best to keep the dogs down. Many sheepowners have had to do away with their sheep altogether on account of the dogs being so bad. In my opinion, the boards should be done away with altogether; in fact, they ought never to have been brought into existence. The destruction of marsupials has been turned over to these boards, and as the boards are principally composed of cattlemen, they have become practically useless. It is the duty of the Lands Department to take this matter up, as they have a better opportunity of dealing with the matter than

the Agricultural Department, because the Lands Department have officers of their own all over Queensland, whose duty it is to look after land matters generally. The hon. member for Murilla suggested that the work should be handed over to the shire councils, but the shire councils, as a rule, are principally composed of cattlemen. The boards should be wiped out altogether, and a bonus of £1 should be put on all dogs and foxes. I do not suppose any man ever killed a dog for 5s., and no one would bother his head to kill a dog for 5s.

Mr. GUNN: I kill them for nothing.

Mr. LAND: A man who kills dogs on his own holding does not want a fee for doing it. As the hon. member for Murilla knows, the expense of running the boards is absolutely unnecessary. I am glad that the Minister has taken this matter up, and I hope more effective attention will be given to the work in the future than has been the case in the past. The shire councils do not even look after tame dogs, and a good deal of the trouble arises out of the fact that dogs are allowed to run wild and they breed a worse kind of dog than the dingo. Foxes are getting more numerous every day and the rabbit has been thinned out a good deal, not because of the number killed by the boards but through the drought and by foxes. Some people argue that foxes will not interfere with sheep while they can get rabbits. We all know that as soon as the rabbits are thinned out the fox will turn his attention to the herds, and it is just as much our duty to destroy foxes as to destroy the dingo. I hope the Minister will keep his eye on the boards, and see how they get along, because they have been a failure in the past, and the sooner they are wiped out of existence the better.

Mr. GUNN: Like the hon. member who has just spoken, I am against the marsupial boards. They may have served a good purpose in years gone by, but they have outlived their usefulness. I do not wish to inflict a long speech on the House, but I have had a considerable experience amongst marsupials and native dogs. When I was on my father's place thirty or forty years ago the same condition of affairs existed as exists to-day—the dingoes were becoming a great menace and people had to go out of sheep. We got up an agitation and brought into being, through the late P. R. Gordon, the Marsupial Act, and got dingoes included with the idea of protecting our flocks. After fighting the dingo pest with poison for twenty odd years, we found it was only money thrown away, as the dingoes seemed to increase all the same. We then came to the conclusion that the only method of coping with the dingo was to fence him out. My father imported a lot of netting from Great Britain, and we fenced out the native dogs. That got over the difficulty. Since then, my sons and myself have taken up property in the Balonne electorate, and we tried time after time to poison the dingo and to catch him in traps, but we have found that there is only one method of getting rid of the dog, and that is to fence him out. The only thing the Government can do is to supply the lessees, as they are doing at present under the Rabbit Act and Marsupial Act, with a sufficient quantity of wire-netting to put [7 p.m.] around their holdings. I do not say that I am the only man that knows anything about dingoes, but I am

only giving my experience. I understand that other people think differently to me. If people want the Marsupial Act amended for the purpose of killing dingoes, then the Minister is doing quite right to bring in a Bill to assist them. Whether this Bill is going to do that or not I do not know. Time will show. I have no objection to raising the fees from 5s. to 15s. In the past we have made many mistakes in dealing with this matter. I know that we have upset the balance of nature in a way detrimental to our industries. Some years ago, I was told that in the district where I lived the rabbits were a frightful pest, but I did not find them to be a pest at all. Then we were told that the foxes did an untold amount of damage so far as sheep were concerned. We were told that the farmers could not keep anything away from the fox. I remember five or six years ago when I had my first experience of foxes that we could not keep any poultry or tame turkeys from them. The foxes used to come in and pull the tail feathers out of the roosters. (Laughter.) I admit that they are a horrible nuisance, but there is a far greater menace than the fox, and that is the blowfly pest. The blowfly pest has outdistanced all the other pests. I think that the blowfly is attributable to some extent to the destruction of the rabbits by poison. The use of phosphorus has contributed to it. Many of our insectivorous birds have been killed, such as the mutton bird and others, and these were the birds that used to kill the flies. Then, again, the dead carcasses of the rabbits encouraged the blowflies to multiply very much. The drought came along and killed a great number of our birds, and, on top of the drought, comes the fox. He also has killed a great number of our birds. It is all very well killing the dingoes where sheep are kept, but in the Gulf of Carpentaria and up towards Cape York there is no need to kill the native dog. They might be fulfilling some purpose of nature, and they are not a great menace to anyone up there. The dingo is always described as a mean and disreputable creature and no one has a good word for him. At the same time the dingo is one of the most intelligent animals we have. I have often wondered how it was that the dingo always took the fattest sheep of the mob. I found out afterwards that he drives the sheep along the road through the bush. Everyone knows that when sheep are travelling every now and again one of the sheep who thinks he knows more than the rest will drop out and circle around. It is the sheep that does this that the dingo seizes and takes away. I consider that the dingo has forgotten more than the fox will ever know. I know that on one occasion my brother, who had a station on the Maranoa, kept a dingo as a pet. In those days, travellers used to come up the river. Some people call them "Walers" and others call them "Sun-downers." They always carried two ration bags, one filled with rations which they left at the creek, and the other empty one which they brought up to the station. On one occasion, when one of these men came to the station with his empty ration bag, and asked for rations the dingo disappeared, as he always did when a stranger came to the place. On this occasion the traveller got his bag filled with rations at the store and went away. As soon as he had gone the dingo came back with the full bag of rations which he found on the creek and delivered them to

Mr. Gunn.]

my brother. (Laughter.) The dingo is a nuisance to some cattlemen, but taking them all in all, the cattlemen in the Gulf district would not care to be taxed for the purpose of getting rid of these dingoes. I do not see why they should be assessed for the purpose of killing the dingo out at Cape York.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: How far would a dingo travel in a day?

Mr. GUNN: He would travel a great distance. The dingo has a district the same as the union organiser, and he takes it in rotation. (Laughter.) I do not wish to go into details about the measure, because we will have plenty of opportunity to do that when we get into Committee. I do not believe in destroying dingoes by traps or poison. There is only one way to get rid of the dingo, and that is to fence him out of the holding. If you have a wire-netting fence you can keep him out.

Mr. MAY: What height of fence would you require to keep the dingo out?

Mr. GUNN: My experience is that we put up a rabbit fence at the bottom, and 3 feet of marsupial netting on top—6 feet out of the ground and 6 inches in. I have at the present time sons living on the Maranoa in the middle of districts that are infested with dingoes, and the dingoes are fenced out. I notice that there is an anomaly in this Bill. Although it is called a "Marsupial Bill," it declares that marsupials are not marsupials but dingoes are. Under the old Act the marsupials were the marsupials and dingoes were not. Under this Bill the marsupials are turned out and the dingoes put in. I do not wish to oppose the second reading, but I do not think the Bill is going to do as much good as some people think.

Mr. FORSYTH: I think this Bill, with some alteration, will do some good. The trouble is, for some years past dingoes have not been numerous, and all at once they come along in great waves. They have come along in the last twelve months, and in the south-western part of Queensland there have been more dingoes than for many years past. How they come in these waves no one can tell. A great deal of money is spent in connection with the dingoes, more especially on the sheep stations. We have been told how much the various boards pay—from 5s. to £1, averaging about 10s.—but as a matter of fact no one has the slightest idea as to the amount paid by the squatters and selectors in connection with the destruction of dingoes. I notice that some of the boards only pay 5s. As a matter of fact the holders in the Charleville district are paying £1 and £1 5s. a scalp. That is a good rate, and it pays to do it, because the amount of destruction caused by even one or two dingoes amongst a flock of sheep in a night is a very big item. It is known that one dingo will kill 50 or 60 sheep in a night; that is a very heavy loss, and therefore one can easily understand how it is as well to try by all means to knock out the dingo. They come from the South Australian border, where not very much care is taken; they are allowed to breed in very large numbers, and at certain times of the year they come along in great waves. I think the Minister stated that 25,000 dingoes were killed in Queensland last year. If that is so, it only shows

[Mr. Gunn.

what an amount of destruction can be caused by dingoes. I know that one or two boards in the south-western part of the State have killed as many as 4,000 or 5,000 in a year. They cause a great amount of damage, and while that is so, if by some means we can arrange to have them kept out, it would be a very good thing to do. I can quite understand that the best way to keep them out is to fence them out, but that is a very expensive job, and to anyone who has a large area of country it amounts to a huge sum of money. It is quite true that a rabbit netting fence is about 3 feet out of the ground, and you can get marsupial fences about 3 feet 6 inches; but I was talking to a man who had put up netting for 7 feet out of the ground, and even then some old dingoes had managed to get across. Therefore, while I believe that netting is a great preventive of the dingoes, it is a most expensive thing, and at the present time you cannot get netting. A great many holdings have put men on at £1 10s. a week to trap, and on top of that they give them £1 a head for every dingo, and that is subsidised by the various local boards from 5s. to a higher rate. One of the great reasons why the dingo, so far as the sheep people are concerned, is a great menace is because in a great many places where cattle are adjoining sheep the people on the cattle run do not take the same interest in trying to destroy the dingoes as sheep men do, and consequently a large number of cattle holdings are really the breeding grounds to a large extent, and the sheep men have to suffer the damage. We know that the dingoes kill a few calves, but not very many, but when they get among sheep they can do a great deal of destruction, and they are doing it all the time. I know of one pastoralist in the western district who lost in one paddock alone over 5,000 wethers, because a great mob of dogs had got in. He went to the expense of putting up a wire netting fence—marsupial netting on top of rabbit netting—and even then, because he had not sufficient marsupial netting to complete the work, the dogs are still getting in. We can, therefore, see the amount of damage and loss accruing from dingoes, and there is not the slightest doubt they appear to be increasing all the time. There is not the number of dingoes at the present time as there were twelve months ago, but we know they are steadily increasing and going north. At the present time they are about Blackall and Barcardine. We know that they travel long distances, and I have been told by some people they travel as many as 50 miles a day. But, in any case, there is no doubt of the fact that any legislation that is to help in any way to kill the dingo will be a step in the right direction. Personally, I have no objection at all to the rate being raised from 5s. and making it compulsory on the basis of 15s. Some people have not been properly endeavouring to keep dingoes out, and they have been let off because some of the boards, in my estimation, have not been pushing in this matter, and consequently there has been no action taken by some of these boards. I think it is most essential, no matter whether a man is a cattle man or not, while he may not lose anything, on the other hand, he should not allow his country to become the breeding ground for dingoes, and, therefore, any legislation of that sort is something in the right direction.

One of the objections in this Bill has already been mentioned by the hon. member for Murilla, and that is in regard to exemptions. I think that subsection (4) of section 19 should be retained, and I will give you my reasons for that. I think the Minister will remember that when he introduced the Brands Act Amendment Bill recently he knew the special reason why some of those amendments were introduced was because there are some people who manage to get brands very like the brands of other people, and they are able to utilise those brands in such a way that they can brand other people's stock. Under the new Act the Minister has the power to change the brand when he likes, and I believe it was a good thing to introduce that provision, because certain individuals were in the habit of living on other people. With regard to exemptions under this measure, I think it is only right that subsection 4 of section 19 of the principal Act should be retained, because the same thing applies in connection with permits as applied in cases where men possessed cattle brands similar to brands already in existence. There are some people who simply make an excuse to get permits in order that they may go on the lands of other persons and do all sorts of things other than killing dingoes. We know that in the far western districts a considerable number of stock are stolen in the course of the year, and that men use permits for that particular purpose.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The boards have power to issue permits.

Mr. FORSYTH: We take that power away by this measure. The Minister must be satisfied from the information he has received in his office that such things as I have referred to are taking place. If you take away from the board the power to grant exemptions which is given in subsection (4) of section 19, then a permit must be granted to anyone making an application. I agree with the Minister that anyone who kills kangaroos will get sufficient for the skins to pay him for his work, but if you take away from the board the power to grant exemption to the holder of a run, permits may be issued to suspicious individuals who want to go on the land belonging to other persons for no good purpose. If the owner of a station applies for an exemption it is necessary for him to explain why he objects to anyone getting a permit to go on his holding, and unless he gives a satisfactory explanation, the board are not likely to grant him exemption. I think I have given good reason why we should retain subsection (4) of section 19 of the principal Act. I could give the hon. gentleman a great deal more information with regard to the matter, and with regard to the excuses that men make so as to get permission to go on a holding when they have no more intention of killing dingoes than my boots. I know some station-owners in the West who lost a large number of horses after these gentlemen with permits to kill dingoes had been on their holdings, others who lost a large number of sheep, and others again who had some of their cattle taken away. I do not brand every man who gets a permit as dishonest, because I believe that many of those men get permits for the perfectly honest purpose of killing dingoes, but it is a well-established fact that some of these persons go on to holdings for no good pur-

pose. The members of the boards, as a rule, are men who own runs, and they know the men who apply for permits, and can form a just decision as to whether those permits should be granted or not. I hope the Minister will make inquiries from his own officers with regard to this matter. If he does, I have not the slightest doubt that they will confirm what I have said. One or two cases came before the department during the last four months with regard to which the officers of the department said they were most suspicious cases. There is no occasion to grant permits in connection with sheep stations or selections, because it is in the interest of any man who has sheep to get rid of the dingoes as soon as possible, as while they are there they are killing sheep all the time.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The object of this clause is to make the whole of the State subservient to the Act.

Mr. FORSYTH: I contend that the board should have power to refuse a permit to a man to go on a holding for the purpose of killing dingoes in cases where the owner does not desire that such permit should be granted. The owner should have the right to get exemption if he can show sufficient reasons why exemption should be granted.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: One board has already granted as many as thirty-eight exemptions in its area.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not know about that, but I am sure that if the Minister will make inquiries he will find that evidence has been given lately in connection with matters of this sort where the actions of the men concerned have been most suspicious. Station-owners should be protected from men of that character. As a matter of fact, I believe that each of the stations out west employ trappers. I know some which employed five or six trappers during the past twelve months for the purpose of killing dingoes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Is it not a strange fact that out of 143 exemptions granted in the State no less than thirty were granted by one board?

Mr. FORSYTH: That may be so, but the hon. gentleman knows that there are certain little sections of Queensland where these things do occur. There is a large section in the Gulf country. There is also a considerable number of men in Windorah who are getting a lot of scalps, and I [7.30 p.m.] think that those men who are doing their best should be protected. If the hon. gentleman will make inquiries, he will find that what I am saying is correct. Under the Bill, the maximum rate of assessment which might formerly be levied is taken away. I do not know that that is a bad thing. The boards had no power to charge more than 5s. without the permission of the Minister. The Act provided that, except with the approval of the Minister, no assessment should exceed 5s. on every 100 head of cattle or sheep. Although the maximum of 7s. 6d. was there, no one could increase the amount above 5s. It is more than likely that the same number of dingoes will be killed this year, but I hope it will be a great deal less, and if the amount is raised to 15s. it will come to a very large sum. I think it would be better to adopt the suggestion of former speakers—

Mr. Forsyth.]

that the Government should not fix a rate at all, but pay one-fourth of the total whatever it might be.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Remember that the average of the present scale is about 12s.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the amount is raised to 15s., more especially where dingoes are prevalent, it will mean that a larger amount of money will have to be raised. I think it would be better to subsidise the boards to the extent of one-fourth of the total amount. The Government have stated in the Bill that only £5,000 will be granted. On looking up the report I find that only £4,370 was paid last year, and that was on a basis of an average of 10s. Consequently, the average has been exceeded by 50 per cent., and if the basis is 15s. a very large amount will be required. In the far West there is a large portion of Crown land where dingoes breed, because no one bothers about that country, and the dingoes then go on to other country which is stocked. These breeding-grounds are a great menace, and the Government should assist the boards more materially. I trust they will see their way to do so. It is proposed to repeal, in section 34 (a) of the principal Act, the words "diminution in the number of marsupials," and to substitute the words "practical extinction of." While you may in some cases believe that the dingoes are extinct, they sometimes come back again and upset the whole of your calculations. I shall be glad if the proposals made will lead in any way to the stamping out of the terrible pest. I quite agree that the blow-fly pest has been a great evil, and I do not think it has ever been worse in Queensland than it is at the present time. That has been caused through the continuous rains all over the State, the muggy weather having given them a great chance to increase. There is another pest which has not been mentioned by any previous speaker, and which is doing an enormous amount of damage—that is, the eagle hawk. In Western Queensland people pay 2s., and in many cases 2s. 6d. for every eagle hawk destroyed and brought in. It is a pity that the Minister has not provided in the Bill for a certain amount to be paid for eagle hawks, as he will find that in the south-western districts they have been very prevalent during the last twelve months, and have caused heavy losses amongst the lambs. Some of the men out there have been doing remarkably well by shooting and poisoning eagle hawks. I sincerely hope that this Bill will do good, and that the Government will see their way to increase the amount provided, because the Minister will see that, as it is compulsory to pay a much higher rate than was paid before, the boards will have cast upon them much greater financial burdens. It would be very hard on some of the boards, and they will have to raise some big amounts, and that is probably why the Minister has taken away the maximum amount of 7s. 6d.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Is not that a good reason?

Mr. FORSYTH: There is no doubt that in some cases the boards will have to apply to have the amounts increased to a considerable extent above those mentioned in the Bill, if the dingoes are as bad as last year, and it is only fair that the Government should assist the boards to a greater extent, more especially as a good many of the dingoes come from Crown lands. The very fact that

[Mr. Forsyth.

Crown lands are great breeding grounds for dingoes and foxes shows that it would be a very good thing if the Government were a little more liberal to the boards. In fact, so far from their trying to assist the boards, it appears to me that they are going to appoint them and let them find the money themselves. The hon. the Minister has told us that during the last nine or ten years the average subsidy has not been more than £5,000, and that in the last year about 25,000 dingoes were killed, and the Government subsidy amounted to £4,370. Therefore, they have not paid a great deal. I feel inclined to agree with some hon. members who have already spoken, when they say that the subsidy should be increased from one-fourth to anything up to 50 per cent. There is one thing I will say—that I hope this will be the means of making cattle runs immediately adjoining sheep runs take a little trouble in getting dingoes killed. I know of some cases where they do not do it, and the cattle runs are breeding grounds of dingoes. Something should be done to provide that the cost of exterminating a menace to the whole community should be borne by the whole community. I believe the pest can be rooted out if drastic measures are taken by everybody. But if only a certain number kill them and others do not take the trouble, then certain areas are simply breeding grounds, and the sheep men bear the brunt.

Mr. MAY (*Winders*): I welcome this Bill. I think it is one of the best Bills that have been brought in for some time for the benefit of the pastoralist and the grazier in the Western parts of Queensland. I think it is going to do a lot of good. During my recent tour in my electorate a good many people expressed themselves as being in favour of placing the matter under the shire councils. Others are of a different opinion, so that they are not unanimous, and my own idea follows that of the hon. member for Balonne, who thinks there should be a separate board entirely, administered by the Lands Department. The hon. member for Carnarvon mentioned dingo fences. He said they must be something over 6 feet high, but I think any amount of dogs could get over a 6-foot fence.

Mr. FORSYTH: It would be only an odd dog. Not many would get over 6 feet.

Mr. MAY: I think there are a good many who could. I have seen terriers go over a 6-foot fence.

Mr. FORSYTH: You could not.

Mr. MAY: No, but the hon. member might, because his legs are longer than mine. (Laughter.) Anyhow, I do not sit on a fence like the hon. member. (Renewed laughter.) If the grazier had to put a 6-foot fence round his selection, it would be a terrible cost to him. We notice that through the extension of our railways, sheep raising is extending into what was cattle country. People are finding that the country is absolutely suitable for the rearing of sheep, but the cattle man takes very little notice of the dingo, as most hon. members who have any knowledge of the Western part of Queensland know, with the result that that land is dingo infested, and a large amount of the burden falls on the sheep man. And we know that, as a national asset, the sheep is the better. In cattle country we find that most of the rates are low, but in sheep country the rates for scalps are much higher.

Mr. FORSYTH: Some rates are low.

Mr. MAY: If we had a good stiff tax all round and allowed the trappers to get to work we would certainly kill a good number of dingoes. Sometimes I know the scalpers or trappers can do a little bit of harm, and the hon. member for Murrumba, who has great experience of the Gulf, has spoken of his experience of years ago, and how many men have made great incomes by going trapping and duffing.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: What is that?

Mr. MAY: The hon. member for Toowoomba is not so ignorant that I have to explain the meaning of that to him. (Laughter.) Let him ask the hon. member for Wide Bay or the hon. member for Cooroola, or the hon. member for Carnarvon. They all know what duffing means. I do not blame them. Had I been in the position myself I would have done it. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Carnarvon was talking about dingoes running into the hollow logs. I suppose we shall have to put on a man to go round and nail up the ends. (Laughter.) That would not be a bad scheme at all.

Mr. FORSYTH: Have you many dingoes in your district?

Mr. MAY: Any amount of them. That is what I am speaking of, that and the district of the hon. member for Gregory, where sheep are taking the place of cattle and dingoes are doing an immense amount of damage.

Mr. MCPHAIL: What are they paying for scalps?

Mr. MAY: A short time ago they were paying only 5s., but they raised it to £1. Had we a good scalp tax and enforced it all over Queensland, not in one particular part—in the sheep districts—we could get rid of the dingo. There is one suggestion that was made by the hon. member for Murrumba that I would like to see carried out. I do not like to take anything from the other side, but it would be a good thing if we could get some clause inserted to include eagle hawks.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): On the whole, the Bill is rather a good one, but there are several clauses in it with which I do not agree. The clause to which I principally object is to the one with regard to not granting exemptions. I do not see that there is anything to be gained in not allowing exemptions when application has to be made to the board and when reasons have to be given.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't forget that 142 exemptions have been granted already, and thirty-eight by one board.

Mr. MOORE: That may be quite necessary in most instances. As far as my experience goes, it is only in the inside country where the exemptions are granted, in which cases the owners do most of the trapping themselves. I know perfectly well that there are foxes and dingoes there, but in cases where the owners are doing their best to destroy the pests, and for special reasons they do not want scalpers working in certain paddocks, they should be able to get exemption if they can give a sufficient reason to the board. They have to satisfy the board that they are doing a fair thing, and that they are endeavouring to exterminate the dingoes and foxes. There has been some talk about shire councils doing the work of these boards. I do not agree with that idea at all, as the shire councils have plenty to do at the

present time without having any more work thrust upon them. Only the other day the shire council of which I am a member had a letter from the Home Department asking how many men were put on for killing mosquitoes. Fancy putting on men in these outside shires to kill mosquitoes! For several years past, at the local authorities' conferences in Brisbane, a proposal has been made that shire councils could better administer these boards; but the proposal has been thrown out by a very large majority in each case, because it was recognised that the shire councils have quite enough to do, and in many cases—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They do not do it.

Mr. MOORE: They would not be able to do this work. For the last three years applications had been received from the North, asking that wild pigs should be declared to be marsupials, as they are very destructive.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Also emus and crows.

Mr. MOORE: Crows are a different thing altogether, because, while in some parts of Queensland, the crow is a tremendous menace, in the sugar districts it is a great benefit.

Mr. FORSYTH: They kill lambs, too.

Mr. MOORE: When you are making a law for the whole of Queensland you cannot put crows in, but wild pigs are only bad in the North, and when the people of the North ask for them to be put in as marsupials, I do not see any reason why they should not be put in, seeing that they are prepared to tax themselves to pay for the destruction of the pigs. In Victoria as well as here, it has been said that foxes should not be brought in because they kill rabbits. I remember many years ago in New Zealand, when the rabbits first became very bad, a large number of ferrets were let loose to kill the rabbits. Soon the ferrets became a great pest, and a lot of weasels were let loose to kill the ferrets, and after that they let loose a lot of stoats to kill the weasels. When it is boiled down, it means that the people who own the property have to kill the last pest. It is best to start at the beginning, and I am very glad to see that foxes have been put in. I certainly think an oversight was made in section 31 as far as the dingo is concerned. It reads—

“The rate for the scalp of a dingo, irrespective of age, shall not be less than 5s.; but the rate fixed for the scalp of a fox need not be the same as the rate fixed for the scalp of any other dingo.”

It should certainly be the same.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It was the intention to make it the same.

Mr. MOORE: Foxes breed very rapidly in Queensland, and far quicker than in colder countries. I know of an instance where one fox had thirteen young ones in the one litter, and you can, therefore, understand how rapidly they breed. Consequently, it will mean a very large expense if the same rate is to be paid for foxes as for dingoes. To a large extent it is on vacant Crown lands where they breed, and where they are most difficult to get at, and therefore the Government should not alter the section which says that one-fourth should be paid by the Crown. There is another matter that I would like

Mr. Moore.]

to call attention to, and which has been omitted from this Bill. I would very much like to see a balance-sheet of the various marsupial boards published in some paper in the district where the board has its being. At the present time no balance-sheet has to be published, and a great deal of dissatisfaction arises because many of the people who pay the levy think that the administration expenses are too high in proportion to the amount expended on scalps. When the local authorities have to publish a balance-sheet, I do not see why these boards should not publish a balance-sheet, so that everybody can see how the money is expended. This has been asked for several times, and it is only a reasonable thing, as the expense would not be very great. Then, with regard to the question where more money is collected than is required in the year, I do not think it should be compulsory for the board to have to make a levy if they do not need the money. Under the Local Authorities Act a shire council need not levy a rate if the money is not required, and in this connection the Governor in Council has full power. If he thinks, for the reasons put before him that an assessment in any year is not required, then it is quite competent for him to say that it need not be put on, and there is no necessity to make a hard-and-fast rule that the assessment must be made. Surely, whatever Government is in power, if it is proved to them that a board has collected more money than is required in a certain year, and it is pointed out that there is sufficient money in hand to carry them on for the year, they should be competent to say that no levy need be made for that year. The board in whose area I happen to live at the present time has not had to make a levy this year because so few scalps have had to be paid for. In a case like that it is only reasonable that the Minister should be able to grant permission to not make a levy. It is no use raising money unless it is intended that any money left over shall go into the consolidated revenue. I do not suppose that is intended.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That will not be done.

Mr. MOORE: Then, what is the sense of making a hard-and-fast rule such as this, when it is in the interests of the board and in the interests of the Minister to be able to give relief from assessment for twelve months when the money is not required, and it might often happen that such will be the case.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The point will be considered.

Mr. MOORE: I am pleased the Minister is going to be reasonable. This afternoon apparently, the Secretary for Railways was going to be very reasonable over this Bill,

and I thought he might have prevailed [8 p.m.] vailed on the Secretary for Agriculture to accept some more amendments. I trust the hon. gentleman will accept other amendments, especially one dealing with exemptions. Even though he hedges exemptions about with safeguards, there is no question that exemptions should be granted in some cases. I am in accord with any Bill that is likely to do away with pests like the dingo and the fox. I have had experience here and also in Victoria of the great damage done by those pests, and, if the Bill is likely to deal with them, and deal

with them quickly, it is going to be a public benefit. There are one or two safeguards that I think should be put in to afford protection in cases where protection is required.

Mr. BOOKER (*Wide Bay*): One cannot get away from the gravity and importance of this Bill so far as the stockowners in South-western Queensland are concerned. On account of the ravages of this pest, men have had to sell sheep stations because they could not carry on in that part of the country. But the question I am going to raise is that there should be a benefited area. I quite understand that the men in the south-west are suffering very seriously from the dingo, but the men on the coast and the tableland men are suffering seriously from ticks, and I am quite satisfied from my own experience that the yearly payments of the cattle-owner, whether he owns ten head or whether he owns 10,000 head, are a very heavy drain upon his resources. If a man runs a cattle property effectively in the tick-infested area, it is necessary for him to dip almost every three, four, or five weeks throughout the best part of the year. This involves a very heavy charge upon his resources, not only because of the constant dipping, but because of the increased cost of the mixture, the cost of labour, and the damage done to cattle, because there is serious damage done to the cattle, more particularly to breeding cows when in calf.

Periodically there are outbreaks of tick fever. During the last few days, I regret to say that redwater has developed in some places in a very bad form, even in herds that have been inoculated twice.

The Western men—both cattle and sheep men—suffer from this one pest that we are dealing with just now. We recognise the blowfly is a more serious pest in some of the western districts than it is on the coast; but, notwithstanding that the cattlemen in the west suffer from none of these other disabilities, the Bill provides that the man on the coast who already carries a very heavy annual burden, shall bear the further burden of a tax for the benefit of people in a certain district. In common justice to the settlers on the coast, the Minister should take that into consideration, and define the area in the south-west which will be benefited by the passage of the Bill, and not ask men who are already carrying a bigger burden than these south-western men, to pay this additional tax. It is double-banking one section of the community in the interests of another section. I speak feelingly, because I know what my burden is in keeping my herd and my property clean, which I am doing largely in the interests of closer settlement later on. That is a burden that the man on the coast has to carry, but which the western man has not to carry, and the former will be burdened equally with the latter with respect to the assessment to be made under this Bill. I would emphasise another very important point which was raised by the hon. member for Murrumba. To give free access to anyone anywhere is altogether unjust. As the hon. member said, there are men who are welcome on any holding, but there are others who are not welcome on any holding, and the owner of a holding should have some protection from men who are a menace to his business.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Would you restrict the office of trapper to university graduates?

[*Mr. Moore.*]

Mr. BOOKER: That kind of interjection is not worthy of the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Surely the boards may be trusted to select respectable men? They are not all fools.

Mr. BOOKER: I am dealing with the Bill in the fairest way possible, and I do not want interjections of that nature. There are university graduates who are just as big larrikins as other people, and there are Ministers of the Crown who are just as big larrikins as other people.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not here.

Mr. BOOKER: It is unjust for the Crown to give the prerogative to any person to go on to another man's holding just as he likes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Crown does not do that; the board does it.

Mr. BOOKER: Ever since the original Act was passed, the practice has been for the boards to give or to refuse permits, and that practice has worked admirably well in the interests of everybody concerned, even of the trappers and shooters themselves. I know trappers and shooters who resent certain men going on to the holdings that they are shooting over. As a matter of fact, the pastoralists and the selector prefer to deal with the whole question themselves, and many stockowners have a grave objection to allowing men to go on to their properties. This is a matter that concerns myself. I discharged two men, and those men deliberately got permits to come and interfere with my stock. That kind of thing prevails, and the men referred to do not happen to be either university professors or Cabinet Ministers. Human nature is a peculiar thing even in Cabinet Ministers; and, when a man is prepared to do a thing like that, he will do it, and the result is that his previous employer suffers through having discharged him. I have had that experience, and there is no question that it is not just or right for a man who is known to be an objectionable character to have the right to go on to any man's holding for any specified purpose, more particularly a specific purpose like this, where great damage can be done. With the exception of probably those two points, I can quite understand the Bill is absolutely necessary; but, if the Minister deals with the question justly and equitably, he will take some little notice of what I have said on those two points.

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

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

POSTPONEMENT OF ORDER.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the consideration of Order No. 3—Legislative Council's amendments in Land Act Amendment Bill—be postponed until after the consideration of Order No. 7.”

Mr. STEVENS (*Rosewood*): I merely rise to say that I think the Premier might have given the House some reason why he is asking for this alteration in the business-sheet.

The PREMIER: I told your leader.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I may say that the Premier consulted me in regard to this matter, and we will raise no objection to it.

The PREMIER: The leader of the party is the proper party to consult.

Question put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS—PROPOSED FREE CONFERENCE.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg to move—

“That Order No. 4—Consideration of Legislative Council's amendments in Industrial Arbitration Bill—be postponed until to-morrow.”

The necessity for the postponement has arisen because it is proposed to hold a free conference between the two Houses to-morrow.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I understood we were going to discuss this measure. I understood from the Premier that we might postpone Order No. 3—Land Act Amendment Bill—for the purpose of assisting the Government in disposing of two or three other matters on the business-paper.

The PREMIER: I understood I mentioned the free conference.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. gentleman said that it was possible that a free conference would take place, but I asked if he was going straight on with the business as arranged on the paper.

The PREMIER: The Minister will at once move that a free conference be held.

HON. J. TOLMIE: It might be necessary for us to discuss the measure. We arrange our business in accordance with the sheet handed to us in the morning, and I thought we were going on with the discussion of this matter.

The PREMIER: The necessity for postponing this Order arose after I spoke to the leader of the Opposition. After seeing the representative of the Government in the Legislative Council a decision was come to with regard to moving for the postponement of this Order, as it is desirable that a free conference shall be held. The Minister will move for that directly. That may do away with a lot of discussion that might otherwise take place on this Order. I understood that the leader of the Opposition was prepared to go down to No. 7 on the business-sheet.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: No, No. 6.

The PREMIER: Well, it was understood that we would go a certain distance with No. 7—the Constitution Act Amendment Bill. I am prepared to confer with the hon. gentleman later.

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: With the consent of the House, I would like to move a resolution.

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Secretary for Public Works be allowed to move a resolution without notice?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg to move that the following message be forwarded to the Legislative Council:—

"The Legislative Assembly having received the Legislative Council's message of date 7th November, intimating that they insist on certain of their amendments in the Industrial Arbitration Bill, to which the Legislative Assembly have disagreed, request a free conference with the Legislative Council, with a view to arriving at a mutual agreement with respect to the said amendments.

"The Legislative Assembly have appointed the Hon. E. G. Theodore and Mr. J. T. Gilday to be the managers to represent them at such conference."

In support of the motion I may say that representations were made to the Government by certain hon. members in another place when it was suggested that some of the difficulties now outstanding might be overcome if a free conference took place. I see no reason why we should decline to meet hon. members from another place, and consequently I move accordingly. I think the conference will take place to-morrow evening.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I have no objection at all to the free conference being held if the Minister thinks that some satisfactory arrangement might be come to in connection with it. I have seen a number of free conferences in my time, and although they generally help to do good, I know that conferences have been held with the object of trying to bridge over a difficulty, and they have been dealt with from a parliamentary point of view.

Mr. PETERSON: You have got representation in another place.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Don't forget that at the last free conference on the taxation proposals the Minister was the only one present from this House.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I am only speaking of the free conferences with which I have been associated. If hon. members are going to endeavour to work it on strict party lines, we might as well thrash it out in the House. The practice hitherto has been to appoint managers selected from both sides of the House. The object in view has always been to disarm criticism as much as possible and try to arrive at some amicable arrangement, but, if the Government desires to restrict it to party lines, they can do so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is not a question of strict party lines, but of the Government's views being represented. There is no representative of this party represented by the Council on the conference.

HON. J. TOLMIE: If the Government want to make it strictly party, they have the majority and they can carry it.

Mr. BERTRAM: You have the majority in another place.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I am not talking about another place now. We will have time to talk about the other place some other time.

Question put and passed.

[*Hon. E. G. Theodore.*]

FISH SUPPLY BILL.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

(*Mr. Bertram, Muree, in the chair.*)

The TREASURER: The Council have made two amendments in clause 5 in relation to the inclusion of oysters in connection with the business of fish supply. The matter was fully discussed when the Bill was before the Assembly on the last occasion. Certain hon. members on the Opposition side had a suspicion that the Government might not do a fair thing and just thing in dealing with oysters, and the Council, acting on such suggestion, have moved to eliminate every mention of oysters in the Bill. That was a most unwise thing, because if the Government entered on the business of getting, preparing, storing, supplying, and distributing fish, they should also have the power to do the same with regard to oysters. The Government were providing very expensive equipment in regard to markets and cold stores, and there was no reason why they should not also have the control of oysters. He understood one of the chief objections was that the Government might interfere with the people now established in the oyster industry. There was no intention whatever to interfere with those people.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The intention might arise at any time.

The TREASURER: The intentions of the present Government would not arise in that direction, and if the hon. gentleman thought they might arise under the next Government, they would be postponed to such a distance that it was hardly worth while considering the matter in connection with this measure. (Government laughter.) The only possibility to establish the business was under the section from which the words "oyster banks in sections" were omitted in another place, and which read "to purchase, take, contract for the use of, or otherwise provide lands, oyster banks, and sections," &c. If hon. members really thought the Government intended to interfere with present licensees, he did not mind accepting the amendment cutting out those words, but, with regard to the first amendment, it was really essential to have power to gather and sell oysters, or purchase them from the people at present raising them. They were not going to interfere with the present licensees or their grounds, but there were oysters growing on the retaining walls in the Brisbane River which the present Inspector of Fisheries said could be used by taking the spat and culture from them and made a very profitable sideline of the business. There was no intention whatever to interfere with private enterprise. That would be encouraged, because it was a very profitable business, and a highly valuable business to Queensland. There was any amount of space, quite apart from the grounds used by private licensees, that might be used by the Government or anyone else. He moved that the Committee disagree to the Council's amendment in line 29 of clause 5.

* HON. J. TOLMIE: He thought the hon. member for Wide Bay was going to speak first, because he was particularly interested in this matter, and better able to speak on it than anybody in the House; but he was not ready. He thought hon. members in another place were wise in limiting the action of the Government in regard

to the measure. There was no reason why oysters should be included in the Bill. As a matter of fact, he did not think the Bill was going to be operated. The Government were not in a position to go on with the works they said were essential for the Bill and the fisheries. He gathered from the objection to the omission of the words "and oysters" that they provided for the sale and distribution of fish and oysters, and that the Government intended to enter into that as one of the Government enterprises—enter into competition with the cafés. He for one was not in sympathy with Government enterprise of that kind. He thought they were cutting into the private enterprise of the State to an unnecessary extent. They would see the absolute condition of wholesale ruin they were causing.

The TREASURER interjected.

HON. J. TOLMIE: When the Minister was speaking he (Mr. Tolmie) listened to what he had to say, but now the Minister wanted to make his speech for him. He hoped the hon. gentleman would show some sympathy to him, and give him an opportunity to speak his own piece. He was not in sympathy with the proposal, because he saw the thin end of the wedge for the introduction of further Government enterprise, and public enterprise under the Labour Governments had always been failures, and had reduced States almost to a condition of ruin. They found that was the general condition in New South Wales and Western Australia, and they saw the sad commentary on Labour enterprise in Western Australia which appeared in the metropolitan papers to-day, and if those things were to be continued in Queensland, it would be destructive of the interests of the people.

MR. DUNSTAN: Did you not favour the fish supply?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No; he did not believe in the Dago business at all, and he believed that Government enterprise cutting into the Dago business was getting about as low down as they could. He said the Government enterprises they had already were cutting into the enterprises carried on by the people. What was the result? People were going out of business, and the Government were not in a position to continue the same business as those other people. If those people were prepared to invest their money, and give employment, and they now found it expedient to withdraw, the result was going to be disastrous to the working men of Queensland. They knew the disasters at the present time. They knew the Government was not in a position to keep its industries going; it could not keep its own works and enterprises going to the extent they should, and the object of the Government should be, not to do as they were doing—cutting out those people engaged in the industry—but to give encouragement to people to invest their capital and give employment to others. The Minister in charge of the measure said he did not want to establish a monopoly, but had they not tried to establish monopolies in other directions? Wherever they could, they tried to do so, and the result had been loss of employment to the people, and he was desirous of seeing as full employment as could be found at as high a rate of wages as could be paid. That was the policy he had always believed in—finding work for the people—

and when the present Government took it over, by reason of the policy we had adopted by encouraging private enterprise in every possible direction, the State was in a condition of great prosperity. But since that the

Government had in half a score of [8.30 p.m.] ways competed against private enterprise, with the view of driving out the man who was providing capital for carrying on such enterprises and finding employment for the people. Here, again, the Government wanted to cut in in the same direction, and it would be very unwise to give them the slightest encouragement. The Upper House were wise in the attitude they had assumed on this matter, and they should be supported by every right thinking member of the House who was desirous of seeing employment given to the people.

MR. VOWLES: It seemed to him that the argument of the leader of the Opposition was a sound one. They should not be too keen in encouraging the Government to go into speculative businesses, as everything they had gone into lately had been a failure. If the words which the Council proposed to omit were retained, the Government would have the right to go into the oyster business and to deal in all the by-products of the trade. They might even engage in the pearl-shell business, as the by-product of the oyster had a very close relation to the pearl-shell. A suggestion had been made that, because there was a certain deposit of oysters in the Brisbane River they should allow those words to remain in the clause. What had that deposit of oysters to do with the Bill? If those words were retained, the Government would have the right, not merely to take spat from the Brisbane River, but to engage in the preparation, storage, sale, supply, and distribution of oysters.

The TREASURER: The reason those words were inserted was that we might be able to handle oysters in the fish market.

MR. VOWLES: He thought the hon. gentleman had spoken of taking the spat of the oysters.

The TREASURER: Without those words we could not even take oysters into the market and put them into cold storage.

MR. VOWLES: If those words were retained, the Government would be able to go into the oyster business; but if, as the Minister said, he was prepared to agree to the omission of the words "oyster banks and sections" later on, that would show that the Government were not going in for the business of oyster raising, except so far as the Brisbane River was concerned. There was no reason at all why the Government should want to go into the oyster business, and he thought the Committee would do well to accept the amendment.

MR. FORSYTH: He thought it would be better to omit the words referred to in the amendment. Some years ago some of the oyster people in Brisbane did very well; they got large prices for their oysters, and they had a good market for them, and they were sending them South. But the market had gone down since that, and the retail price had jumped up from 1s. to 1s. 6d., which had killed the business. He was not interested in oysters, but he knew some people who were in the business, and they informed him that they were losing money now because they had had a great deal of trouble owing to the oysters being affected with disease. A lot of people who had gone to

Mr. Forsyth.]

the expense of buying thousands of bags of oysters in order to lay them on beds had lost a considerable amount of money, and it would be unwise for the Government to interfere with their business. The people who were accustomed to the oyster business should have a chance of recouping the losses they had sustained. The Government were getting thousands of pounds a year from the oyster beds, and yet they, as landlords, now wanted to interfere in the oyster business carried on by the lessees.

The TREASURER: Don't you think we should help the oyster fishermen?

Mr. FORSYTH: In what way could the hon. gentleman help them?

The TREASURER: By storing their oysters.

Mr. FORSYTH: Could they not store them as well as the Government?

The TREASURER: We will have depôts in different places.

Mr. FORSYTH: Where would the hon. gentleman have the cold storage—up the country? The hon. gentleman knew very well that the oyster-men could get cold storage for their oysters.

The TREASURER: They cannot get cold storage here.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes, they could. In any case, he thought it was better that the Government should remain out of the business. It was apparent that a huge amount of money would have to be expended in connection with this proposal. They knew the losses that had already occurred in New South Wales, and the report in connection with Western Australia was enough to frighten any Government from going into a venture of this sort. They had been losing money hand over fist there. Although this business meant the expenditure of a lot of money, yet the Government said they were hard up and could not afford to make advances to local authorities for necessary works. This was not the time to go in for this undertaking.

The TREASURER: I thought you wanted the Government to encourage production?

Mr. FORSYTH: He was not so sanguine as the hon. gentleman appeared to be that the fish business would be a success. It was not so in New South Wales, where the trawlers were laid up.

The TREASURER: No, you are wrong. They went out one day last week. (Laughter.)

Mr. FORSYTH: There seemed to be a strike. The master of one of the trawlers wanted an extra £1 a month, and the other employees wanted increases. He gave the New South Wales Government credit for desiring to do something which would benefit the people, but the last eight months there had been a loss of £8,000. The Government should refrain from going into a business like this when they saw the risks attached to it, as the people's money could be spent in a much better way. The hon. gentleman knew that he was getting thousands of pounds a year in rent from the oyster lessees at the present time.

The TREASURER: Who is going to interfere with them?

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman would very likely interfere with them. Those people who had been in the oyster business

[*Mr. Forsyth.*

so long knew the business much better than the hon. gentleman. It would be far better for the Government to leave these things alone. The hon. gentleman would find before long that many of the speculations which the Government had gone in for would cause the loss of a great deal of money. There was no monopoly in this business.

The TREASURER: That is precisely why I want to assist these people.

Mr. FORSYTH: There were people in his electorate engaged in the oyster industry, and they were losing money owing to an oyster disease. In Maroochy River and at Bribie they had a lot of disease. Some of the oyster lessees had spent thousands of pounds in bringing spat from Maryborough and other parts of Queensland and laying them upon the beds, and the disease in some cases had destroyed the whole lot. Apart from the disease, sometimes when a flood came the beds were covered over with mud and the oysters all died out. While the Government might have an honest intention of trying to provide cheaper fish—as there was not a good supply of fish, especially in the summer—he believed the undertaking would be very costly. It would be better to stick to the fishing business and leave the oysters alone.

Mr. PETRIE: The Government had erected coldstores at Wynnum, and gone in for the establishment of a market in South Brisbane. Personally, he agreed with the Minister that the oysters should be retained in the Bill. The fishing industry had never been a success as far as private enterprise was concerned, and it meant a large sum of money to carry on the industry. Clause 5 provided for the establishment of markets, depôts, shops, factories, preserving and refrigerating works, canneries, and other suitable works, and so on. The Government were providing a cold storage depôt at Wynnum. Fishermen in the hot weather stood a chance of losing their fish, and wanted to be as near as possible to a cold store.

The TREASURER: That is what we are providing them with.

Mr. PETRIE: He thought it would be better if the Government did that in the meantime, and postponed the further extension of the industry. On the second reading they were told there were lots of ways in which the industry might be extended. Mr. Ogilvie had made some suggestions with regard to the dugong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PETRIE: They had been rather scarce. He thought the Government would be very unwise if they went in for shops and trawlers and oyster boats for some considerable time to come.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are dealing with an amendment by the Legislative Council deleting the words "and oysters."

Mr. PETRIE: It referred to oysters and boats and the Chairman had allowed previous speakers to refer to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is making a second reading speech, and I ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Chamber.

Mr. PETRIE: Of course, he bowed to the Chairman's ruling. He was rather in favour of the retention of the words because if it were the intention of the Government to open fish shops he did not see why they should not be allowed to sell oysters. A good many men were engaged in the oyster fishery who might be glad to have some place where they could stow their oysters in cold storage. From the Southport end of Moreton Bay to Brisbane there was nothing else but oyster beds, but they were subject to the interference not only by the grub and worm, but also by the stingaree.

Mr. BOOKER: And the oyster fish, too.

Mr. PETRIE: Just so. They were surrounded with wire-netting to prevent those enemies from getting into the oysters, but there were plenty of banks available if the people could take them up, but he did not think there was a rush, because although they might make a fair amount of money at some times, still they had lost at other times, probably more than they had made. He supported the Minister in his disagreement to the amendment, but he would like him to adhere to his promise to accept the deletion of the words "and oyster banks and sections."

Mr. SWAYNE: He thought all country members should join in making a stand against the continual incursion of the Government on the realms of business. This was a new departure, at which the Council very praiseworthy tried to draw the line. He supposed it meant that oyster shops would have to be established, not only in Brisbane but in every town along the coast. The Government had supporters all along the North Coast, and he was quite sure their members would unite in urging the Government to establish shops there. Would it not be better to use the thousands of pounds it would cost on other works? He happened to wait on the Minister for Railways that day in regard to a small tramway proposal that would, if carried out, add thousands of tons of cane yearly to the freight carried on the main line, and he did not suppose his case was at all singular, but they could not get their most urgent wants attended to, because no money was available. As showing how the towns were dependent on the country, he would quote a sentence from the Government publication known as the "Queensland Industrial Gazette"—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. SWAYNE: He was arguing that instead of putting the money into oyster shops it would be much better if they put it into other things, such as railways and tram-lines in the farming districts. He thought he was justified in asking all country members to join in calling a halt.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: He would like to ask the Minister whether he did not think it was just as well to go slow in the establishment of oyster shops?

The TREASURER: Where is the proposal to establish oyster shops? You have been listening to the last member who spoke, who knows nothing about it.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: Then the hon. member gave him that assurance?

The TREASURER: There is absolutely no intention to establish oyster shops.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: They all knew what had been going on in New South Wales. At the railway station that morning

he had seen forty cases of fish addressed to a firm in Sydney. If the fish business in New South Wales had been a success would there be any necessity to send down that fish?

The TREASURER: They have only three trawlers and they were trying to get thirty-four.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: Every one of the trawlers in New South Wales at the present time were hung up.

The TREASURER: The hon. member is wrong. They are out now. They went out only last week when I was in Sydney.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG said his information came from a better source than that of the Minister.

The TREASURER: I saw the trawlers go out a week to-day.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: At any rate, they had been hung up for a long time, and they had not been a success. If, as the Minister said, they had developed the fisheries in finding out fishing grounds, the money had been well spent.

The TREASURER: They are doing necessary experimental work.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: He was in favour of experimental work being done, even if it was going to cost a little money, but, with the experience of New [9 p.m.] South Wales, the Minister should watch things very carefully. As far as embarking in the oyster business was concerned, it would be more advisable if the Minister's attention were turned to safeguarding the oyster banks and in preventing the oyster being destroyed ruthlessly, as it was at present.

Mr. BOOKER: It would be a very wise thing for the Treasurer to accept the amendment and not touch the oyster business until such times as his officers were satisfied that the industry could be carried on profitably without interfering with the men who had put large sums of money into the industry, a great deal of which had been lost. Mr. Appel, of Maryborough, who was closely associated with the Labour party, had spent a large sum of money in developing the oyster banks in Wide Bay, and it would have been interesting for the Treasurer to have had an interview with Mr. Appel to see whether it was a safe proposition for the State to involve itself in any large sum of money in the business. If the Treasurer would instruct the Commissioner for Fisheries to carry out experimental work for a term of three years—

The TREASURER: We cannot carry out experimental work unless this provision is in.

Mr. BOOKER: If the Treasurer would allow the matter to remain in abeyance for a term of three years—as it would take three years before there were any specific results—he could then come to the House and say, "Here I have the facts that it is good business." There was a vast area in Hervey's Bay and Wide Bay which was so lightly covered with spat that it was unprofitable for anyone to take it up as it was, and the Government should appoint a most capable man and give him certain powers to carry out experiments on those areas. All along the foreshores of the bay there was a considerable amount of spat, and the beds could be laid down in the most practicable and best condition, and in three years' time the

Mr. Booker.]

department would have ample data to show whether the scheme was a profitable one or not. If it was a good scheme, then he was with the Treasurer; but if it proved to be a bad scheme, then he was against the proposal altogether. If the Treasurer did that, he could come to Parliament—and the people of Queensland who had to find the money—with some concrete proposal. His own opinion was that if the Treasurer selected the right man, and gave him the necessary powers and the money, it would turn out a good scheme in that district. As the hon. member for Lockyer said, it was a deplorable fact that they were exporting from Wide Bay and Hervey's Bay thousands of bags of culture per annum, and only a percentage of that culture finally reached the oyster plates in the oyster shops. That was one of the greatest disasters in connection with the industry. After the war, if Australia was to develop as they all hoped it would, and there was an influx of people to Australia, it would not be 1s. or 1s. 6d. a plate that they would have to pay for oysters, but considerably more, for the reason that the oyster beds were limited. Oyster fattening in Moreton Bay was an unprofitable business. The output was limited, and the general methods were such that there was a great deal of destruction in the oysters drawn from Hervey Bay and Wide Bay. It was "up to the Government" to carry out experimental work in such a way as not to involve the expenditure of a large sum of money. The Treasurer ought to know from his officers that the oyster business was very precarious, and that it meant a large expenditure. The hon. member for Toombul had referred to the enemies of the oyster both in Moreton Bay and Hervey Bay. No oyster proposition in the latter bay could be carried on profitably without a large expenditure in fencing the banks with poles to protect oysters from the oyster fish. He had known banks in splendid condition, and in a week a shoal of oyster fish had wiped out the entire beds. That was a common occurrence. If the Treasurer went into the business under present conditions, he could not hope to sell his oysters at a higher price than the present suppliers. There was no question about the hon. gentleman commandeering the oysters, as he had given them his word that he would not interfere with licensees. But who knew who would be Treasurer twelve months hence? In a few months the present Treasurer might be Premier. The leases were only annual, and what was to stop the next Treasurer from doing what the Crown had done in connection with cattle—commandeer them—to satisfy a certain section of the people, who said, "We want cheap oysters with our dear stout," and they were going to get them, if the present Government continued in power. Lord help the unfortunate lessee who had involved himself in a large expenditure in preparing his banks and carrying on his work. He would have very little protection unless they accepted the amendment of the Council. The Treasurer should confine himself to experimental work, and when he had some data to put before Parliament he could easily amend the Act, and the people could back him up if the proposition was a good one, or turn it down if it was a bad one. Under present conditions it was a bad proposition, and the men who were engaged in the industry were the best judges of that.

[Mr. Booker.

Question—That the Council's amendment in clause 5, line 29, be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. McLachlan
" Barber	" McMinn
" Collins	" McPhail
" Cooper	" O'Sullivan
" Coyne	" Payne
" Dunstan	" Peterson
" Eihelly	" Petrie
" Foley	" Pollock
" Gilday	" Ryan, D.
" Gleeson	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hardacre	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hartley, H. L.	" Smith
" Hartley, W.	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Wellington
" Jones, T. L.	" Wilson
" Kirwan	" Winstanley
" Land	

Tellers: Mr. Petrie and Mr. Pollock.

NOES, 18.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
" Barnes	" Moore
" Bell	" Morgan
" Booker	" Roberts
" Bridges	" Stevens
" Forsyth	" Swayne
" Grayson	" Tolmie
" Gunn	" Vowles
" Hodge	" Walker

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The TREASURER: The Legislative Council had omitted the words "oyster banks and sections" on lines 34 and 35. He moved the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

On clause 16—"Regulations."

The TREASURER: The Council had inserted a new paragraph dealing with the regulations. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had disagreed to one amendment in the Bill, and agreed to the other amendments. The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council with the following message:—

"Mr. President,

"The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's Amendments in the Fish Supply Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

"Disagree to the amendment in clause 5, page 3, line 29—

"Because it is necessary to include in the Bill the authority to deal with oysters in connection with the business of marketing and distribution of fish, and

"Agree to the other amendments in the Bill."

"W. McCORMACK,

"Speaker.

"Legislative Assembly Chamber,
"Brisbane, 22nd November, 1916."

QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK BILL.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

(Mr. Bertram, Mace, in the chair.)

On clauses 2—"Definitions"—

The TREASURER: The Council had omitted the words "and Orders in Council"

from lines 48 and 49. The amendment was not of great importance and he moved that it be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

On clause 5—"Appointment, etc., of commissioner"—

The TREASURER: The Council had inserted the following paragraph after line 32:—

"No person shall be appointed to or hold the position of commissioner unless he has had not less than ten years' recent banking experience in one of the ordinary trading banks in Australia, and at some time during that period has been in receipt of a salary of not less than eight hundred pounds per annum."

This was an important amendment and one which he could not agree to. It was placing a very unfair and unjust restriction on the Government in the selection of the person who was to fill the position of commissioner of the bank. There could be no reason for such a restriction. It was a most unreasonable amendment, and it prevented the Government from appointing any person at present in the employ of the State to the position. They could not appoint anyone in England or New Zealand to the position, because it was limited to a banker in Australia. He was credibly informed that it would restrict the choice to eight or nine persons in Australia of those who would be willing to accept such an appointment.

Mr. FORSYTH: I think that I could get seven or eight satisfactory men myself.

The TREASURER: He did not think that the Government should be restricted in the appointment. They could not promote the deputy commissioner of the bank no matter what good service he gave. The amendment was most unjust, unwise, ill-considered, and unfair and should not be tolerated for one moment. Another place was under a great misconception with regard to the intentions of the Government. He moved—That the amendment be disagreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE pointed out that the Government went outside the State to appoint a recent commissioner. The hon. member talked with great vehemence about restriction, yet the Government proposed a measure which operated in the direction of restriction in Parliament. It was desirable that a man appointed to the position of commissioner should have plenty of experience, because he would not only have to deal with the savings of the people, but with the Agricultural Bank, which had already advanced a sum of over £1,000,000. He would also have to deal with the Workers' Dwellings Boards, which also had advanced over £1,000,000. It was, therefore, essential that they should get somebody to take charge of the bank who had banking experience. And inasmuch as the banker would have to deal with people who carried on the ordinary avocations of life, they should have a man who was accustomed to deal with such people. If, as was indicated by the Treasurer, the intention [9.30 p.m.] was to appoint a public servant who was accustomed to move in a groove in connection with administration, then such a person would not be a success in dealing with people outside the limits of his present environment. A banker who had charge of a bank of issue must be a man of very varied experience, and must have an insight into human nature, and have

had experience in dealing with the general public to a considerable extent. They had also to take into consideration the fact that he should be a man who was thoroughly in touch with banking business. With all due deference to the public servants of the State, he did not know that many of them had had experience of general banking business, and the person who had to discharge the duties of commissioner of the bank should have the qualifications possessed by bank managers in ordinary trading banks. That was all the amendment asked for, and it was a very proper thing that the Government should appoint such a man.

The PREMIER: It was hardly necessary for him to rise and assure the leader of the Opposition that they would see that the man who was appointed, whoever he might be, possessed the necessary qualifications. He principally rose to assure the leader of the Opposition and hon. members who seemed to have some misapprehension, some misgiving, or the point, that it was not the intention of the Government to appoint any member of Parliament—any member of either the Council or the Assembly—to the position. He was speaking now of the Bill as the Treasurer desired it to go through.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is, the Bill as it is now.

The PREMIER: Yes. Of course, it was understood that if a member of Parliament were appointed, he would have to relinquish his position in Parliament. The little fine distinctions that the hon. member for Murrumbidgee was making had evidently arisen out of a caucus of the Liberal party, at which they decided to ask certain questions of the Chief Secretary—questions which were evidently manufactured by the legal talent on that side and distributed among the lay members. But he wished to assure the leader of the Opposition, and his friends in the other place, that there was no intention of appointing anyone who at present held a seat in either House of Parliament to the position of commissioner, and that the Government would take care that the person appointed possessed the qualifications referred to by the leader of the Opposition, namely, that he was a man who had a general knowledge of banking and possessed all the qualifications necessary to fill the position.

Mr. FORSYTH: He was not aware of questions having been framed in a Liberal caucus in connection with this matter. With regard to members of Parliament being ineligible, if the hon. gentleman would look at subclause (4) of clause 5, he would see that no member of the Executive, or of either House of Parliament, could be appointed to the position. The appointment would be for seven years, and the commissioner would have absolute power under the Bill. The Council had inserted an amendment which practically meant that the person appointed to the position of commissioner should be competent to fill that position. When the matter was discussed in Committee he moved that the salary should be £800 a year, and the reason he did that was because of certain rumours he had heard. When those rumours had reached a certain point, he stated that he thought the man appointed should be a first-class man, and he did not care if the Government paid him £1,500 or £2,000 a year, because he would be head of the Government

Mr. Forsyth.]

Savings Bank, of the Agricultural Bank, and of the business done under the Workers' Dwellings Act, which represented millions of money. There were about £12,000,000 in the Savings Bank to the credit of about 200,000 depositors, and the commissioner would have absolute control over those moneys. He would be outside Parliament, he would have autocratic powers, and they could not touch him. Therefore, the commissioner should be a man of special ability. A man who had not got banking experience would not be competent for the work. He did not know why the Upper House had inserted this amendment, and he had never asked anyone for the reason, but he would ask the Premier if he would appoint anyone to the position of commissioner who had less than ten years' banking experience? Some men who had had twenty years' experience would not be competent to fill the position, and there were very few who had had less than ten years' banking experience who would be competent. This was one of the best positions they could offer to anyone in Queensland, and it was a position in which a man could lose an enormous amount of money if he was not careful. Therefore, the matter of the salary was a mere bagatelle in view of the enormous responsibility involved. The appointment should be restricted to someone who had got at least ten years' banking experience. The Treasurer appeared to think it was undesirable to confine the position to someone in Australia. Why should they go to New Zealand? If they could get a man in Australia it would be better, and he thought there were plenty of suitable men in Australia who had had ten years' experience.

The TREASURER: Why should we go down South?

Mr. FORSYTH: They need not necessarily go down South.

The TREASURER: Who would accept the position in Queensland? Mr. Ralston would not accept it.

Mr. FORSYTH: He knew plenty of men who would be competent, both here and in Sydney, and men who had had ten and twenty years' experience. If they could get a local man, by all means give him the appointment; but, if not, there was no reason why they should not go all over Australia. They were giving the commissioner autocratic powers under the Bill; his position would be just the same as that of a judge. There had been no trouble in getting a manager for the Commonwealth Bank, who got £800 a year.

The TREASURER: He does not, and therefore he would not be qualified for this under the amendment.

Mr. FORSYTH: He could mention three or four men in one bank to-day who were getting more than £1,000 a year. Take the manager, the secretary, or the chief inspector of the Queensland National Bank; those men were getting more than £800 a year. Did the hon. gentleman mean to tell him that the manager of the Commercial Bank of Sydney was not getting more than £1,000 a year?

The TREASURER: Do you think he would take this position?

Mr. FORSYTH: If he was only getting £1,000 a year, he might take £1,500 a year. He could give the hon. gentleman half a

[Mr. Forsyth.

dozen cases of men who would be suitable for the position. The hon. gentleman's statement with regard to there being only two or three men in Queensland with £800 a year fell to the ground. In the Bank of New South Wales, in Sydney, there were men getting over £800 a year, and with more than ten years' experience.

Question—That the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 5 be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
" Barber	" McLauchlan
" Carter	" McMinn
" Collins	" McPhail
" Cooper	" O'Sullivan
" Coyne	" Fayne
" Dunstan	" Peterson
" Fihelly	" Pollock
" Foley	" Ryan, D.
" Gilday	" Ryan, H. J.
" Gledson	" Ryan, T. J.
" Harlaere	" Smith
" Hartley, H. L.	" Stopford
" Hartley, W.	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Wellington
" Huxham	" Wilson
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. O'Sullivan and Mr. D. Ryan.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
" Barnes	" Morgan
" Bell	" Pettie
" Booker	" Stevens
" Bridges	" Swayne
" Forsyth	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Wowie
" Hodge	" Walker
" Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Stevens and Mr Swayne.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On the motion of the TREASURER, the Council's amendments in line 43, clause 5, and in clauses 8 and 34, were agreed to.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had disagreed to one of the Council's amendments, and had agreed to all the other amendments. The report was adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, with the following message:—

" Mr. PRESIDENT,—

" The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's amendments in the Queensland Government Savings Bank Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

Disagree to the amendment in clause 5, page 3, after line 32—

Because the amendment would have the effect of unduly restricting the choice of selection for the appointment of commissioner. No person at present in the Government service would be eligible, and subsequent to the first appointment, no deputy commissioner or other officer of the bank could qualify for appointment to the higher position; and

Agree to all other amendments in the Bill.

" W. McCORMACK,

" Speaker.

" Legislative Assembly Chamber,

" Brisbane, 22nd November, 1916."

CONSTITUTION ACT OF 1867 AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The PREMIER: I rise to move the second reading of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which has been very considerably discussed on the preliminary stages, both in the House and in Committee. It is because it is a Bill which is so far-reaching in its consequences and strikes so fundamentally at the privileges which have been enjoyed by the representatives of certain interests in the past that that discussion has been so extensive. During that discussion I think the main principles of the Bill have been fairly well thrashed out, but as the Bill is so important I think it perhaps desirable that I should refer to them again.

This is a Bill which is intended to disqualify certain representatives of monopoly and alien companies from holding seats in Parliament. Monopoly companies and alien companies are defined in the Bill. A monopoly company means—

“Any corporation declared by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly—

“To be a company in possession or partial possession of a monopoly within Queensland for the production, distribution, transport, or exchange of goods or commodities to the detriment of the public interests; or

“To be associated with any trust or combine for the purpose of securing a monopoly or partial monopoly in Queensland of the production, distribution, transport, or exchange of goods or commodities to the detriment of the public interests.”

“‘Alien company’ means any corporation declared by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly to be so composed or to be of such a class or character that the capital shares or stock of the same, or the beneficial interest in such shares or stocks or in the dividends or profits of such company, is or are wholly or substantially held or enjoyed by alien persons or by corporations which are incorporated according to the laws of a country other than His Majesty’s Dominions, and whether or not such last-mentioned corporations are or are not registered under the Foreign Companies Act of 1895 or any Act amending or in substitution for that Act.”

Any director, attorney under power of attorney, or solicitor for such monopoly company or alien company will be deprived of the privilege of holding a seat in either House of Parliament, and he will be also subject, in the case of presuming to sit in either House while subject to

[10 p.m.] such disqualification, to a penalty not exceeding £500 per day. I

think every member of the House will admit that Parliament is the chief trustee of the public welfare, and Parliament must attend to the interests of the whole community, and must not subordinate those interests to the interests of any section of the community. Now, the whole history of Parliament in the British dominions has shown that Parliaments have always possessed a laudable zeal in fulfilling their functions. In the very early days we find that it was the powers of the Crown that had to be checked. We

find at another period that it was the powers of the nobility that had to be checked. Coming down to 1782, when the Rockingham Act was passed, it was enacted that a member of Parliament shall have no commercial relations with the Government. It had been for centuries a recognised rule that no member might vote on a motion in which he had a direct special interest of a pecuniary kind, and this enactment disqualified persons who had any commercial relations with the Government. That Act was supported by Burke, who uses these somewhat striking words—

“It is treading in the footsteps of their ancestors, whose uniform and invincible rule it was to disqualify persons from sitting in that House who were in such a predicament that they could not be disposed to be otherwise than under improper influence.”

We have a similar provision in our Constitution Act of 1867, section 6, a measure which was passed at a time when we had not this great development of the formation of joint stock companies and of trusts and combines. That Act contains this provision—

“Any person who shall directly or indirectly himself or by any person whatsoever in trust for him or for his use or benefit, or on his account, undertake, execute, hold, or enjoy in the whole or in part any contract or agreement for or on account of the public service, shall be incapable of being summoned or elected or of sitting or voting as a member of the Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly during the time he shall execute, hold, or enjoy any such contract or any part or share thereof, or any benefit or emolument arising from the same.

“And if any person being a member of such Council or Assembly shall enter into any such contract or agreement, or having entered into it, shall continue to hold it, his seat shall be declared by the said Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly, as the case may require, to be void, and thereupon the same shall become and be void accordingly.”

In other words it disqualified contractors with the Government; contractors having contracts to supply anything for or on account of the public service. It did not matter how small the amount of goods to be supplied, he is disqualified from holding a seat in Parliament. Why is it? Would anyone suggest that because a person happens to have a contract, however small, for the supply of goods to the public service, that he is thereby not honest? Would anyone suggest that? I do not think they would. But the line must be drawn somewhere. Parliament, in its wisdom, has said that persons who come within that category shall be disqualified from having a seat in Parliament. They say that Parliament cannot enter into the intentions or motives of persons. It is not competent for us to say, “Mr. A may have a contract to sell a certain amount of goods on account of the public service, but who would doubt his honesty? Who would suggest that he would do anything wrong; that his motives would be improper or that his intentions would be improper? And Mr. B is such a person that we may presume from his upbringing and from his environment and from our experience of him that he will be improperly influenced, and will not so conduct himself as a member of Parliament

as to serve public interests." We do not enter into investigations of that sort. But Parliament came down as far back as 1867, and further back, as I pointed out in the Rockingham Act and even further back still; the invariable practice was that no one having a pecuniary interest in any particular matter should have the right to take part in a decision on that matter. The line is drawn hard and fast—that any person who might possibly on account of the relations which exist in the case of a contract—that no person who might possibly be influenced thereby shall have a right to a seat in Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: That is all right as far as shareholders are concerned, but not in regard to solicitors.

The PREMIER: How much more, with the modern development we have with these large corporations and combinations of capital, how much more necessary is it that the paid agents of such combinations of capital and alien companies should be deprived of a seat in Parliament without questioning the integrity of anyone who may hold those positions? I say we are not called upon to investigate; what I am asking the House to do is to say that persons who hold such positions have an interest which is different from the interests of the whole community. They have a duty to the corporation they represent or to the monopoly company they represent, and they have a duty to the people. Does it not come exactly within the words of Burke that I referred to a little while ago where he said—

"The uniform and invincible rule was to disqualify persons from sitting in that House who were in such a predicament that they could not be disposed to be otherwise than under improper influence."

The director of a monopoly company must either be prepared to do his duty to his company or not. If he does his duty to his company, then he necessarily neglects the interests of the whole community, because there is no man bold enough to get up in this House and say that the interests of a monopoly company are not antagonistic to the interests of the community as a whole.

Mr. MORGAN: Why should that follow?

The PREMIER: There are some things that are so obvious as not to require argument, and this is one of them.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That is only begging the question.

The PREMIER: And in war time these great combinations of capital—these monopoly and alien companies—get a greater opportunity of expanding their operations than they do in time of peace. It is a remarkable thing that, when the American civil war was drawing to a close, the great martyr, President Lincoln, used these words, which, I venture to say, were prophetic—

"Yes, we may all congratulate ourselves that this cruel war is nearing its close. It has cost a vast amount of treasure and blood. The best blood of the flower of American youth has been freely offered upon our country's altar that the nation might live. It has been indeed a trying hour for the Republic; but I see, in the near future, a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era

of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavour to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the Republic is destroyed. I feel, at this moment, more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war. God grant my suspicions may be groundless."

That prophecy has been fulfilled.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: Only partially.

The PREMIER: And why "only partially"? Because, under the American Constitution, rigid as it is, there have been some means of bringing in legislation that would to some extent prevent the expansion of the operations of these monopolies. But with all that, the home of trusts, combines, and monopolies is the United States of America. It is from there that they have set out to come here and that they have set out to go to other parts of the world. We know that at the present time in the United States of America there is a law which prevents contributions by such combinations of capital to the funds of political parties.

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: They do it, all the same.

The PREMIER: I am hopeful that by another measure we may be able to prevent the funds of such corporations from being used to support any political party.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You would not apply that to the tobacco trust.

The PREMIER: There is ample reason for thinking that there is a necessity to have an amendment of the law on the lines I have suggested, because it is within the memory of every hon. member and of the people of Queensland that a document was mislaid by someone and that it got into hands that it was not intended for, and that it referred to a certain subsidy. That subsidy has never been explained to the people of Queensland or to the members of this House.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You know that that is not honest.

The PREMIER: I do not know at the present moment where that subsidy was supposed to come from.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You do know.

The PREMIER: No one would be more pleased than I to hear an explanation as to the source of that subsidy. It has never been explained yet.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You know that Mr. Justice Street gave the answer to the lies that were told on that occasion.

The PREMIER: Interjections will not supply an answer. I have simply stated that the people of Queensland and the members of this House are anxious to hear where that subsidy came from.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is in "Hansard."

The PREMIER: Well, if it is in "Hansard," I ask hon. members opposite who contributed that money to the Liberal funds?

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Not the tobacco trust. Not the publican trust.

The PREMIER: There is no answer.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is in "Hansard."

The PREMIER: Well, I have not seen it in "Hansard."

Mr. MACARTNEY: You do not want to see it. It does not suit you to see it.

{Hon. T. J. Ryan.

The PREMIER: I challenge the hon. member to explain now where that money came from. He talks about a royal commission. Are hon. members opposite prepared to have a royal commission to inquire into where that subsidy came from?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

Mr. MACARTNEY: We have had one already on the subject.

Mr. MORGAN: We will have a royal commission into the beer trust.

The PREMIER: However, I do not want to be drawn away from the immediate purpose of this Bill. (Hear, hear!) We know that, although the power has been taken away from the nobility and from the Crown as it existed in earlier times, that desire to rule still remains. The greed of rule is something that lives, and, when an attempt is made to destroy it in one body, it passes into another. And in these latter days it has passed perhaps into the most insidious and the most dangerous body of all—into these great monopoly companies and corporations. It is our purpose, at all events, to see that the direct representatives of such companies are deprived of the right to a seat in Parliament. The description of these paid representatives are set out in the Bill. For the benefit of hon. members, I would point out that the definition of "solicitor" includes a barrister practising as a solicitor, or a barrister holding a general retainer for any such monopoly company or alien company.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Why should it be limited to a general retainer?

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to have the definition made as drastic as possible; but the remarkable thing is that hon. members opposite have taken varying attitudes upon this matter since the Bill was introduced. First of all they said that this proposal was suddenly decided upon by the Premier on account of certain spleen.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: That is so.

The PREMIER: Although, while leader of the Opposition, he referred to the necessity for such a measure; although within recent months he has on more than one public occasion referred to the necessity for the introduction of such a measure; and although there is no measure that has been introduced into this House since we have been a Government that has had the more unanimous support of the party sitting behind me in this House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: That was the first attitude. The second attitude was this. "It is not the Premier at all who is doing this. It is the Industrial Workers of the World." (Loud Government laughter.) "It is the Trades Hall that is doing this." "He is being shoved into doing it." "He is being driven by some members in the corner, by some of the younger members of the party." That was the next attitude. Then the next attitude was. "Why don't you disqualify the shareholders and make the thing more drastic?" "Why don't you come down with a measure which will wipe out such combines and monopolies. Why don't you do all these things?" Mr. Speaker, why did we not do anything except introduce the Bill that we are doing? Do hon. members opposite think that they can persuade the people of Queensland that they really desire to curb the powers of monopolies and aliens? Do they

seriously think by taking these varying attitudes and shifting from one attitude to another that they are deceiving anybody? There is only one thing they are consistent in, and that is in their opposition to this Bill.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: What can we expect when we attack the vital interests of such combinations of capital as this? You would not expect them to say, "Oh yes. It is aimed right at us. It is going to hit us." No. They say it is going to hit someone else, so that they can divert public attention so far as they can from the real purpose of the measure. But the way in which hon. member after hon. member rose on the opposite side shows that we are striking at the very foundation of the party on the other side. (Opposition laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Striking at the foundation of the reputation of the Premier.

The PREMIER: Hon. members opposite are very much concerned about the reputation of the Premier. No matter what may be said by the other side, nothing is going to deter the Premier from going on with the measure he has undertaken.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I am satisfied that the people of Queensland have a real cause to be afraid of the monopoly companies in Australia. They have real cause to be afraid. They are afraid because of the brazen manner in which hon. members opposite rise and defend these monopolies while endeavouring to mislead the public as to the real issue. They admit that the Bill will hit members on that side of the House.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Only one member.

The PREMIER: If it were true, does it make any difference to the people of Queensland, to public opinion, as to what the situation is? The facts remain and they cannot get it out of the minds of the people of Queensland—no matter what dust they may try to throw in the eyes of the people, my reputation will stand in the eyes of the people—(Hear, hear!)—and they will see that I am not actuated by such motives. The bald fact remains that hon. members opposite admit that it is aimed at members who hold seats on their side of the House.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: One member.

The PREMIER: And in the Legislative Council, and the Opposition are prepared to defend them.

Hon. J. TOLMIE and the other OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: We will stand or fall by him.

The PREMIER: Things are coming to a sorry pass in these enlightened days when a democratic people are asked to allow, and in fact, to put a mark of respectability to it, that paid representatives of such corporations as this shall have seats in the halls of Parliament and in the counsels of State dealing with the interests of the people. Things are coming to a sorry pass when any man can defend that position.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: When a man can prostitute his position.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that when you and I and all of us have passed away, perhaps when we are lying in

Hon. T. J. Ryan.]

the constituency of the hon. member for Toowoong, it is measures such as this that will stand as a monument to the Parliament that passed them, and it will stand as a beacon light to guide the ship of State through the dangerous waters into which it is getting with these combines and monopolies.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. D. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I hope that the Premier is going to consent to the adjournment of the debate.

The PREMIER: Why?

HON. J. TOLMIE: We have already endeavoured to meet the hon. gentleman in the transaction of business to-day. The hon. gentleman was desirous of postponing the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments in the Land Bill because the Secretary for Lands was not in his place. I endeavoured to meet him in that. I helped to carry out other business on the business-paper. The hon. gentleman arranged the business for to-day last night, and it was published in the Orders for to-day, and we came here prepared to go on with business in accordance with that announcement.

The PREMIER: Did you prepare for this Bill?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No. This Bill was not presented to us until this morning.

The PREMIER: You have been discussing it for days.

HON. J. TOLMIE: We met the hon. gentleman in regard to the postponing of the third Order, and then he took us by surprise with regard to the fourth Order, but we met the hon. gentleman in that. Then when we went on to the next Order we understood that when the discussion was closed that the House would adjourn. The Government whip informed the Opposition whip, Mr. Bridges, that if we finished the discussion on that measure we would adjourn. The hon. member for Murrumba was speaking, and I asked him to resume his seat in order to let the measure pass. I also asked the hon. member for Dalby not to speak, in order that the Premier might adjourn the debate on this motion. I did everything possible for him to get through the business. I ask what kind of conduct is this? Is it the kind of conduct that ought to be expected in this Chamber? Are we to come to the conclusion that the word of the Government does not stand for anything? If we had gone on discussing the other matters in the ordinary way, it would have taken until 11 o'clock at night. If the hon. gentleman had said at an earlier hour that he proposed to have an all-night sitting, we would have prepared accordingly, but he did not do that.

The PREMIER: You should have asked me before now.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I had no opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman. I could not get up and ask him when he started to speak. Mr. Speaker called for the next Order, and then I understood when the Premier moved the second reading he would allow the debate to be adjourned. I ask the hon. gentleman to adjourn this motion and go on with some other business if he wishes to sit later to-night.

[*Hon. T. J. Ryan.*]

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition has just made remarks which surprise me, coming from the leader of a party hopeful of getting some consideration in regard to the order of the balance of the business. He contends first of all that the Opposition had come to the House prepared only for business up to a certain point—up to Order No. 6. They were not prepared for this measure. Well, if hon. members opposite were not prepared for this measure, I can say that the Premier came to the House with the full intention that the House should not adjourn until we had finished the second reading of this Bill. A little later I had a conversation with [10.30 p.m.] the leader of the Opposition with regard to the postponement of the Council's amendments in the Land Bill, and the hon. gentleman agreed to have that put further down on the paper. A little later the whip, after consulting with me, went across to the other side, and I think he conferred with the Opposition whip. The instruction from me was that if the business before the Committee was finished in time to allow us to catch our trams, we would adjourn. But the hon. member for Murrumba kept on repeating himself and discussing the question of the managership of the bank, and at the end of his speech the leader of the Opposition called for a division, so that members of the House were deprived of the opportunity of catching their trams. Then it was for me to decide that we should continue with the business, because some other means of sending members home must be arranged for by the Chief Secretary, and arranged irrespective of which side members of the House belonged to. That was my intention, and it was my intention when I rose to move the second reading of this Bill to proceed for a reasonable time, say, till midnight. If the leader of the Opposition would give me credit for being actuated by the best of motives, his chance of getting this debate adjourned would be much better than it is when he gets up and accuses me of improper conduct. That is not the attitude which ought to be taken up in the circumstances.

Mr. VOWLES: You don't want us to go down on our knees to you, do you?

The PREMIER: I do not want you to go down on your knees to me, but I want ordinary courtesy. The Opposition have always found that if they had a reasonable request to make, I was prepared to meet them.

Mr. ROBERTS: You are taking up half an hour now.

The PREMIER: I am going to make a reply to the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for East Toowoomba will not gag me. (Hear, hear!) I am prepared to go on with business, but I am not particular whether it is this business or some other business. I think it is necessary that we should proceed with business till a reasonable hour to-night, seeing that we have lost the opportunity of catching our last trams. If the Opposition are not ready to go on with this Bill, there may be members on this side of the House who desire to speak, and I will give them the opportunity of doing so. If the Opposition are not ready to go on with the debate I will not deprive them of the opportunity of getting ready. They have a good deal to get ready.

Mr. BRIDGES (*Nundah*): With regard to the motion that this debate be now adjourned, I think there is perhaps some misunderstanding. After my conversation with the Government whip, I told the leader of the Opposition what was arranged, and asked other members to refrain from speaking in order that we might get through the business in time for members to catch their trams, and we did finish the business at eight minutes to 10 o'clock.

The PREMIER: No, we didn't.

Mr. BRIDGES: We did. At any rate, it is cutting it very fine when the Premier goes back on an agreement for the sake of a minute or so. I think we did finish in time to catch our trams, but whether or not, seeing that I went round and asked members on this side to refrain from speaking so that we might rise in time to catch our trams, surely, if we were a couple of minutes out, the Premier might have kept faith with us. I have always got on very well with the Government "Whip," who has treated me in a courteous and gentlemanly way, and I believe there has been a little misunderstanding in this matter. Certainly he went over to the Premier, and when he came back he said to me, "Get Mr. Forsyth down, and we will go home."

Mr. WELLINGTON: Did you get him down?

Mr. BRIDGES: I admit that we did not get him down quite as quickly as we expected. (Laughter.) But I do not think it was a fair thing or a courteous thing for the Premier to go back on the agreement.

The PREMIER: The Premier went back on no agreement.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): From what the leader of the Opposition has said, and from what the whip of that party has said, members of the Opposition are solely to blame for the position in which they find themselves. I told the Opposition "Whip" in the first instance that we were going to put this Bill through to-night. Then I came back and consulted the Premier, and he said that if we got through the business we were then dealing with by ten minutes to 10 o'clock we would adjourn. I told that to the Opposition "Whip." When the hon. member for Murrumbidgee sat down it was eight minutes to 10 o'clock, and to the surprise of the "Whip" himself, as well as other members on that side of the House, the leader of the Opposition called for a division. It was then impossible for members to get their trams at 10 o'clock. By the taking of that division everybody lost his tram, and the Government thought we might just as well sit here as walk home. If anyone is responsible for the present position, it is the leader of the Opposition himself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: The hon. member for Murrumbidgee.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 15.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
" Barnes	" Morgan
" Bell	" Petrie
" Bocker	" Roberts
" Bridges	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Vowles
" Gunn	" Walker
" Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Roberts.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Laad
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bertram	" McMinn
" Carter	" McPhail
" Collins	" O'Sullivan
" Cooper	" Payne
" Coyne	" Peterson
" Dunstan	" Pollock
" Fihelly	" Ryan, D.
" Feley	" Ryan, H. J.
" Gilday	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hardacre	" Smith
" Hartley, H. L.	" Stopford
" Hartley, W.	" Theodore
" Hurter	" Wellington
" Huxham	" Wilson
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. McMinn and Mr. Peterson.

Resolved in the negative.

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

HON. J. TOLMIE: Mr. Speaker—

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Bowen wishes to speak, I understand.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member for Bowen remained in his seat. I asked him if he was going to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to point out to the leader of the Opposition that he has already spoken. The motion for the adjournment of the debate was moved by the hon. member for Lockyer and seconded by the leader of the Opposition. I thought that an arrangement had been made, but no arrangement has been made, and the Standing Orders are very distinct on the point that when a member has moved or seconded the motion for the adjournment of the debate, and the motion has been negatived, he is not entitled to speak afterwards on the main question.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Premier whether I shall now be deprived of my right to speak.

The PREMIER: You won't be deprived of any action of mine. The Standing Orders provide for that.

HON. J. TOLMIE: By your action. It is quite on a par with all your actions this evening.

The PREMIER: Not by my action—the Standing Orders. Do not say something that you will be sorry for.

Mr. VOWLES: I shall give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of speaking before I have finished. (Government laughter.) Speaking on the second reading of the Bill, I may say that I was rather astonished at the temper, if I may so call it, which was displayed by the leader of the Government in introducing it. He went in for a display of heroics, fireworks, and all sorts of pyrotechnic mixtures. He quoted from Burke, from Lincoln, and from other American writers as to what was prophesied would happen as far as the American Constitution was concerned. I little dreamed that we were going to get to this stage of the proceedings to-night, but I took one note. He said that Parliament was the custodian of the public welfare, and must not subordinate its conscience to one section of the community. I think the history of this Parliament shows that the functions of Parliament have been sadly subordinated to one section of the community, instead of being exercised for the whole of the community—not for the people who keep the State going, who supply

Mr. Vowles.]

the sinews of war, and who supply the money for the carrying on of industries and for the payment of wages. It is not to foster those people that the Government have used their endeavours, but to foster another section of the community who are entirely dependent on that other section. Their legislation has been simply to foster the interests of the one party, and to relieve them from any form of taxation in regard to legislation which might affect them in any direction. It has been suggested that the Premier has prostituted his functions as the leader of the Government. It was my intention to refer to that later on, but I will do it now. If you examine any Bills introduced into the Parliament of Queensland you will not find that the leader of a Government has brought in legislation of such a class as this, which has been dubbed by the Opposition as puerile legislation, and legislation striking in the direction of private interests, and which, as soon as it was put before this House, was proclaimed broadcast throughout Queensland by the official organ of the Government, the "Daily Standard," as being legislation introduced for the purpose of putting certain individuals out of Parliament. As far as this Chamber is concerned, it is one individual, the hon. member for Toowong. What greater indictment could the Premier and his Government have against them than their official organ in Queensland, the "Daily Standard," turning round as soon as the Bill was introduced, and stating that the sole object and the only business in the measure was the victimisation of one individual who was sitting in this House, who has been and still is a thorn in the side of the Premier and his Government, and who they would like to get out of the way so that their path might be cleared? I feel that I can say that as a party we will not consent to legislation such as this. Although we are weak in numbers we will be strong in our protests, and we will stand up to a man to denounce the individual who has introduced this dirty legislation, and protest as far as we can, and do everything in our power to prevent the sacred statute-books of Queensland from being besmirched by legislation such as this being put upon them. Look at the Premier now! Look at the sad look on him. (Government laughter.) He knows as a professional man that he has prostituted his profession. He has prostituted it to-night as the leader of his party and as a responsible person in the Government. He is a man who is taking advantage of his position in order to gratify his personal feelings.

The PREMIER: You know more about prostituting than I do.

Mr. VOWLES: Do I? I know a little bit about the hon. gentleman's professional career, but there is no prostituting about it so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: The public will laugh at you.

Mr. VOWLES: I stand up and I will pick him to pieces when he cannot pick me to pieces.

The PREMIER: The elephant talking to the mouse going in to the ark.

Mr. VOWLES: That is all very well. If the hon. member had a clean record it would be all right, but he has not.

Mr. MORGAN: That is so.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

[*Mr. Vowles.*

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member brings this on himself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in accusing the Premier of having an unclean record?

Mr. VOWLES: A professional record, I said.

The PREMIER: That is worse still.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order, and I ask him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. VOWLES: It is unfortunately the truth, but I have to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Allow me to finish. I would ask members on my right to refrain from interjecting, because members speaking will reply to them, and that is how personalities come into the debate. I hope that hon. members speaking on this question will refrain from personalities, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. VOWLES: Of course, I withdraw, as it is the parliamentary custom to do so. Before I conclude I shall move an amendment that this Bill be read a second time this day six months, and that will give the leader of the Opposition an opportunity to speak, of which he was deprived through the tactics of the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member was deprived of his right to speak by the Standing Orders.

Mr. VOWLES: By parliamentary procedure.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: By the course of the Premier, a deliberate breaking of faith.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VOWLES: This thing has been worn pretty threadbare. This Bill, according to the Premier, is an attempt to clean up Parliament, to put certain persons in such a position that they will not be able to sit in this House or the other Chamber if they represent certain interests. What is the definition of solicitors in the Bill? The Premier, I might say, suggested that we had had this Bill a very considerable time, but members of this House, as you know, only got it when they came to the House this morning at about 10 o'clock, and we have had no time to go into it. Fortunately it is a small measure, and the principles and also some of the definition clauses have been foreshadowed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have debated it twice already.

Mr. VOWLES: I have and I am going to debate it again, whatever the hon. member may say, because I saw him urging his leader not to give way and do the correct thing. When members on this side urged that the arrangement should be carried out the hon. member who interjects was the very one who was urging on the Premier not to give way.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not true.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: It is.

Mr. VOWLES: I believe my own eyes in preference to the "truth."

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I rise to a point of order. I want to know whether a member's word or denial of a statement is to be accepted.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will accept the statement of the Secretary for Public Lands.

Mr. VOWLES: Unfortunately, I am bound to. I do it. It is parliamentary procedure, and I do it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Premier denies it as well as I do, and so what is the good of going on?

Mr. VOWLES: I am accustomed to believe my own eyes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the hon. member that he should discuss the Bill.

Mr. VOWLES: I shall, but if they interject I am going to reply to them, and if there is any breach of parliamentary procedure I say that the example should be set by the Premier and his deputy. The definition of solicitor is as follows:—

“A solicitor of the Supreme Court, and a barrister practising as such solicitor, and a barrister holding a general retainer for any monopoly company or alien company.”

What should the principle, so far as a barrister is concerned, be that he must be a man holding a general retainer? I say that he should be placed on exactly the same position as a solicitor, who is paid from time to time by fees, not as a general retainer, but for the work he does as the recognised solicitor of the company. Unless a barrister holds a general retainer he does not come within the scope of the Bill. He may receive his brief on each occasion, all the nice fat fees that come to him—the Premier may be placed in that position when he is sitting over here and we are opposite—he may give advice on any subject, but so long as he has not a general retainer he is not affected. I say, why this discrimination? And why should discrimination be made between a solicitor and an accountant, the auditor who goes through the company's accounts, has access to private papers, the man who advises so far as the commercial side of the business is concerned? Why should a director, who is simply the business head of the concern, and a solicitor, be included while others are excluded? It seems to me to be unfair. You might just as well say that the doctor who prescribes, and the chemist who makes up the prescription for the manager of the company, should not have the right to sit in this House. Why discriminate between the different professions? I go to the trouble of pointing this

out to show that if you make a solicitor ineligible, simply by reason of the fact that he is a member of that profession, it lends a good deal of colour to the stories that are going about—that this Bill is not introduced bona fide in the interests of the public, but for the purpose of hitting at an individual. That is why I am opposed to it. It is not getting at me as a member of the profession. As I said before, there is only one member of this Chamber who it can hit, and we know who that member is. It is the member for Toowong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He must enjoy being made a martyr.

Mr. VOWLES: I know the hon. member and I know he does not mind. He knows that this class of tactics is simply worthy of the source from which it comes. He knows very well that there is a certain section over

there who would like to do him an injustice if they could. They have told us very plainly that they are making this tilt at him, although they know it will not be a success. They are attempting to throw a certain amount of mud, hoping some of it will stick, but his character will stand all the criticism that the public want. Hon. members opposite would like to get rid of him, and they want to be able to go to the country and give them something to talk of. They want to talk about getting rid of Mr. Macartney.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is out of order in referring to any member of this House by name.

Mr. VOWLES: To get rid of a solicitor of this Chamber, and they simply put in alien company at the end as a blind. They want to be able to turn round later and say when this thing is thrown out by another place that they are the friends of alien companies or that they are the friends of monopolies. We know who are the friends of the alien. We know who have been bringing in legislation during the last couple of weeks, and when we attempted to bring in amendments aimed at a certain class of aliens they refused to accept same. This is like every other bit of legislation that is brought in by the present Government. They bring in something that is desirable and they deliberately attach to it something that is undesirable.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What part of this Bill is desirable?

Mr. VOWLES: Alien companies, if it is necessary. It will not have a safe passage. Look at what happened to the amendment of the Lands Bill as far as soldiers were concerned. The Minister was asked to bring in legislation in regard to that important matter, and also he knows the wishes of the prickly-pear selectors. What happens? Although the Minister in charge of the Bill knew it was highly desirable—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VOWLES: I am simply connecting one with another. There is an analogy. He connected something which is undesirable and he connected legislation which he knew could not possibly go through; legislation which had been thrown out previously, for what purpose? So that he could go before the people and tell them that the Upper House had thrown out this legislation, but the people in the country knew his little game. They knew it never was his intention.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. member is out of order.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are stating—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS continued interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to answer my call to order, and to take notice when I ask him to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. VOWLES: I will let that go. I am glad you gave him the rebuff you did.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You deserved it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. VOWLES: You deserved it, and very often deserve it. I was saying it was the tactics of this Government to tack on some-

Mr. Vowles.]

thing that is undesirable to something that is desirable, and instead of allowing the desirable portion to become law they deliberately set out to wreck it, and I understand they are doing it for a purpose. As regards what constitutes a monopoly company; this is a principle that I for one will never consent to. The Government, or as I said last night the executive authority, which is practically the same thing—the Trades Hall executive have the power to decide that the Government have to come to a certain resolution that any company is not run in public interests and it becomes a monopoly. There is no concurrence by the Upper House. There is no right of appeal, and any company that they like, for their own purpose, can be made a monopoly company. It simply says—

“A monopoly company means any corporation declared by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly—

“To be a company in possession or partial possession of a monopoly within Queensland for the production, distribution, transport, or exchange of goods or commodities to the detriment of the public interests.”

All the Government have to do is to bring in a resolution that any company at all in Queensland is a monopoly within the meaning of that clause, and any person who happens to be a director or any person who happens to be a solicitor or if immediately becomes debarred from a seat in Parliament, or, for the time being, from becoming a candidate for Parliament. The penalty for remaining a member under these conditions is no less than £500 a day, which may be sued for by any person at all, and you may be perfectly certain, if a case arose, you would find a man of straw—those electioneering gentlemen who are attached particularly to the party opposite—would come forward, or would probably be brought forward, to sue for that sum, a man you could not get costs against if he was unsuccessful, and the only remedy that I can see is if the Government were gracious enough under clause 8 to submit the matter to the elections tribunal if any reasonable doubts arose. No Government should arrogate to themselves or seek such enormous powers as they are asked to be given to them in this measure. If it is necessary to define what is a monopoly company from time to time it should be defined on the same principle that was agreed to the other evening—the same as regulations are agreed to in this House, and should be assented to by both Houses of Parliament. As long as we have the other Chamber—as long as it is part of the Constitution of Queensland—they should certainly not be ignored, and certainly not in a case such as this. I have got no sympathy for alien companies. If a company was a genuine alien company I would be very pleased to see it removed from the register, and I would like to see its assets confiscated, if necessary. But if you are going to penalise a company because its shareholders live outside Australia and do not live in Great Britain, you are putting in the hands of the Government too great a power and a power which they should not have an opportunity of exercising. We know the name of one company has been hurled at us across the Chamber, that is the meat company down the river, but that company came here and was established with the consent of the Commonwealth of Australia. They have expended huge sums of money

[Mr. Vowles.

in this State, and it happens that an hon. member of this Chamber is the solicitor to the company. As a result the Government are tilting at that institution. I do not know what the game of the Government is, but I know they would like to put this company out of action. I know they would like to secure the works of this company under their Meatworks Bill, and to pauperise the company and force them to sell at a big loss, so that they themselves would get the benefit of the expenditure by the company of something like £500,000. That company finds employment for some hundreds of people, but those people are to be thrown out of employment, and the company is to be driven out of Queensland simply because members opposite presume to believe that it is an alien company. I wonder what the future of Queensland is to be when the whole of our legislation and the whole of the administration of the Government is in the direction of retarding the progress of those who are creating new industries, and indeed crippling those who are developing existing industries.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the Bill. The Bill does not propose to cripple industries; it proposes to prevent representatives of certain companies from being members of Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: Exactly; but the Government cannot do that in this particular case until they declare the American Meat Company to be an alien company.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS interjected.

Mr. VOWLES: There goes the gramophone again.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the word “gramophone” as applied to a member of the House.

Mr. VOWLES: I will, with apologies to the gramophone.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word unreservedly.

Mr. VOWLES: Is “gramophone” unparliamentary?

The SPEAKER: In my opinion it is. I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. VOWLES: I withdraw, if that is your opinion, but it certainly is not my opinion. When you interrupted me I was pointing out that there is a certain institution here which it is desired to declare to be an alien company. I do not want to labour the matter, as I have been over the ground on two previous occasions, but I must say that I cannot see any merits in the Bill, and consider that it would have been far better if it had remained unprinted. I am very sorry that the Premier has thought fit to introduce it; he is belittling himself as a professional man; he is not reflecting any credit on his own party; he is not raising the prestige of Parliament by doing it; and he is not doing it in a bonâ fide spirit.

The PREMIER: That is what the trusts always say when you bring in legislation affecting them.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not think the hon. gentleman can say that I am connected with a trust. I have never had anything to do with a trust as a solicitor—bad luck—though I believe the hon. gentleman has had

some fat fees from them. I think he knew something about the tobacco trust and the beer trust before the last election.

The PREMIER: All dirt—worthy of the member for Dalby, worthy of the source from which it comes.

The SPEAKER: Order! order! I ask the hon. member to keep to the question.

Mr. VOWLES: I would ask the Premier to withdraw that. He said something about the dirty member for Dalby.

The PREMIER: No—dirt.

Mr. VOWLES: I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word "dirt."

The SPEAKER: The remark was not addressed to the hon. member.

Mr. VOWLES: I am glad to hear it. I move, by way of amendment, the omission of the word "now," with a view to adding to the motion the words "this day six months."

Mr. MORGAN: I have very much pleasure in seconding the amendment so ably moved by the hon. member for Dalby. I feel sure that the people of Queensland will agree with the hon. member that at least six months should elapse before the Bill is read a second time in this Chamber. We are dealing with one of the most important matters that Parliament could deal with—an alteration of the Constitution. Before any alteration is made in the Constitution it should be dealt with by both Houses of Parliament, and it should also be submitted to the people of Queensland for their approval. The people of Queensland have not had an opportunity of thoroughly realising what the contents of this Bill really are. It has been more or less discussed during the last few days here and in some of the metropolitan papers, which have discussed the motives which, in their opinion, animated the Premier in introducing the Bill. In this connection, I would like to quote from last Saturday's "Daily Mail":—

"Mr. TOLMIE repeated that he believed the measure—to disqualify certain lawyers from seats in the Queensland Parliament—was aimed at individuals sitting on the Opposition side of the House, not because of high public grounds, but because of personal reasons.

"Here is the head of a Government who would probably not deny that he has been paid considerable sums of money by the Government since the war was on. He has been paid during the last twelve months £1,300 a year as Premier, and close upon £500 for briefs. That, mark you, was from the Government. In addition, he charged the Government £1,800 for a trip to England, which the Government paid. Not bad remuneration for a Labour member, was it? And in addition to this dual Government pay, and this trip to England handsomely furnished by the Government, there was private time devoted to private clients, and handsomely paid for, too."

Even the Premier will not deny that. During the period he occupied in his trip he also represented private clients, and I suppose the £1,800 he received from the State for expenses on that trip—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member connect his remarks with the question before the Chamber?

Mr. MORGAN: I will continue to read the statements in this paper, criticising this Bill. It goes on—

"Has Mr. T. J. Ryan given two sons to the fighting line?" No.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. gentleman must quote matters relevant to the subject now under discussion.

Mr. MORGAN: I think if you will wait a little while you will see that I am quoting matters that deal with the Bill. I will connect my remarks with the Bill as I go along. It says—

"Has he helped the war in any way? He has helped by endeavouring to stop compulsory reinforcements being sent."

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: If you will only allow me to continue, you will see that it is relevant.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must select matter that is relevant to the subject under discussion. I cannot allow him to read the whole article.

Mr. MORGAN: I am entitled to give reasons why the Bill should be postponed for six months. I am not dealing with the original question now. I am dealing with the amendment that the consideration of the Bill be postponed for six months. The paper says further—

"Has Mr. Ryan ever moved any resolution to prevent the authors of sentiments such as these from sitting in Parliament?"

This is in reference to certain sentiments of disloyalty uttered by a colleague of the Premier. I might point out that this Bill does not provide for preventing disloyal subjects from occupying a seat in Parliament. The Bill disfranchises certain persons, but does not disfranchise disloyal persons who may be uttering disloyal sentiments so far as the King and the British Empire are concerned. In my opinion we would be doing more to protect the interests of Queensland and the British Empire in general if we also included in this Bill something that would disqualify persons who were guilty of disloyal statements as were recently uttered by the Assistant Minister for Justice. The "Mail" continues—

"This move to exclude men from Parliament because they have advised certain corporations that are carrying on a lawful business does seem to the public a vindictive move; and nothing the Premier can say will make it seem otherwise. It should never have been brought on. It is not fair, reasonable, patriotic, or decent to start a campaign of this sort, aimed at men in their business capacity when there is no reproof at all, but veiled encouragement for those who openly flout the cause for which so many are dying and so many more are likely to die."

Those are the concluding remarks of the criticism published in last Saturday's "Daily Mail," and when the people of Queensland read those remarks they will agree with every word appearing there. The people of Queensland do not desire a Bill of this description to be brought into the House at this moment. We should endeavour to bring in legislation that will cause as little friction as possible during the present time. We are

Mr. Morgan.]

now engaged in a war greater than has ever been known in the history of the world, and it is a time when every one of us should endeavour to be as united as possible. We should endeavour to stand shoulder to shoulder—Government with Opposition—with one aim and object in view, to bring about the successful termination of the war and the downfall of the enemies of the British nation. That is what we should be doing at the present moment instead of discussing Bills of this description, which will only cause friction, embitter members one with the other, and make us divided as a State so far as our general politics and views are concerned. This is not the time for party strife. This is not the time when the Premier should show his spleen by introducing a Bill of this kind.

Mr. KIRWAN: You have been slinging mud for a fortnight.

Mr. MORGAN: No. The mud has been slung by members over there, and we are endeavouring to return some of it with the view of protecting ourselves from some of the charges made by the Premier in respect of this party and certain members of this House. The hon. gentleman tried to throw some mud in regard to a certain subsidy.

The PREMIER: It has never been explained. I challenge you to explain it.

Mr. MORGAN: The Premier has never explained the amount of money his party have received from the liquor party and the tobacco trust.

The PREMIER: None. None whatever.

Mr. MORGAN: That is absolutely incorrect. Is the Premier prepared to have a royal commission appointed to inquire into the subsidy paid by the liquor party to some of its members?

The PREMIER: We have documentary evidence against you.

Mr. MORGAN: It has been said that £2,000 was handed to certain individuals sitting on the Government benches by the liquor party in order to fight the campaign and in order to secure that particular party a definite promise, we understand, was given by the present Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: The promise was given that if they were returned to power—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in imputing motives.

Mr. MORGAN: I admit that I am out of order, but when you allow the Premier to talk about the £2,000 subsidy, I maintain that I can do the same.

The SPEAKER: The Chief Secretary did not impute motives to anybody in regard to that subsidy.

Mr. MORGAN: I did not attribute any motives to anybody either. I only asked where that subsidy came from? We know that certain bodies combined together and organised a fighting fund for the Labour party, and they got certain definite promises. They were promised that if the Labour party got into power they would get certain things transacted for them, and the Government would not interfere in a certain direction with the business of these people. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent members of Parliament from receiving fees

[Mr. Morgan.

and subsidies practically amounting to the price of their support and vote in order to bring about a certain result in [11.30 p.m.] Parliament and in order to prevent certain things from being transacted in Parliament. It is a well-known fact that certain organisations in Queensland were successful in getting a definite promise that certain legislation would not be introduced during a specified time. That is absolute corruption, and we see that the promise is being kept religiously by those who have power to keep the promise. Money was used in that particular instance for the corrupt purpose of stopping certain legislation being introduced into Parliament. If that is so, then it is time we had a more comprehensive measure than that now before the House. The Opposition have treated this measure with as much contempt as it is possible to treat any measure, and have drawn the attention of the people of Queensland to the fact that the Premier is capable of introducing such a low-down measure for a certain purpose.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "low-down."

Mr. MORGAN: In accordance with your wish I withdraw the word "low-down," but that is the word which is generally used in places where people congregate and discuss this measure.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will use parliamentary language, and not language which he hears when travelling about the country.

Mr. MORGAN: If I do not use parliamentary language you have the right to call me to order. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment that the second reading be adjourned for six months, and I do so as a protest against the Bill.

At thirty-five minutes past 11 o'clock,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Bertram) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I am going to try to give reasons why this measure should not be read a second time this day six months. This is one of the measures which should be passed as quickly as possible, if we are to keep the political life of the State free from corruption. Listening to members on the other side of the House, one would really think that we were innocent in regard to combines and trusts—that those things did not exist in Queensland or in the Commonwealth. I am astonished at members opposite not being acquainted with the history of political life in other countries. While we may not have reached the high form of development that has been reached in Great Britain and the United States in connection with this matter, we are on the way towards reaching a similar development. If this State is to avoid travelling the same painful road as those countries have travelled, and workers are not to be prevented from getting seats in Parliament, we should have a measure of this kind on our statute-book. It is owing to the fact that a similar measure was not passed by the Parliaments of Great Britain and the United States that the working classes have been prevented from taking possession of the Parliaments of those countries. We all know the power which money possesses, and we should seek to block that power. This Bill is a step in that direction.

It disqualifies for membership of either House directors and solicitors of certain companies. The other night I made reference to Africa, because some people seem to think that corruption exists only in the United States. I am going now to quote from a work on "Railway Nationalisation" by Clement Edwards. He says—

"The 250 odd boards of directors, with their incidental appendages, are a luxurious superfluity. In nine cases out of ten the directors are as economically useless as they are socially ornamental. Speaking some years ago, the well-known railway solicitor, Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P., declared that 'As a rule, the average English railway director knew very little about the details of his line. . . . Directors were chosen because of their parliamentary or territorial influence, and even now some of the directorates of the English railways were crowded with titled directors, who knew little of business life and still less of the democratic requirements of the present day.'"

What has taken place in Great Britain in that respect will take place in this State later on, unless we prevent it. I am not so simple as to imagine that gentlemen occupying seats in another place are there to represent the mass of the people. They are there as directors, shareholders, or agents, or solicitors of big companies. I am not going to fall out with any man who may occupy a position in this House at the present time and may be the agent or solicitor for any of those companies. It is the system which has brought that about, and I should be lacking in my duty as a representative of the working classes if I did not try to alter that system and prevent such gentlemen getting seats in this House, to the detriment of the working classes. I know that the same class of persons have been in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and that the influences which placed them there have existed in Queensland for a number of years. I know the effect of money power in Queensland.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Yes, you got it at the last election.

Mr. COLLINS: I did not get it at the last election. I am prepared to let the hon. member look at my banking account if he will let me look at his. He will find mine very small, and I am satisfied he would not change places with me. Mr. Edwards goes on to say—

"Certain shrewd professional gentlemen cast about to see where local agitation against a railway company exists or can be got up, or when rival companies may be played off against each other. They subscribe a certain sum to pay the expenses of surveyors and a Parliamentary contest, on the speculation that, if they get their Act, they will get their money back many times over, either by inducing the public to subscribe the requisite capital, or by getting the company assailed, or some of its rivals, to take them over. Parliament assists this speculation by making the deposit on application for a Bill quite illusory."

And so on. Further on he says—

"Nor must the way in which the railways use their huge voting power in Parliament be forgotten?"

This is in the British Parliament, not in the United States Parliament. I am not one of

those who believe that all the corruption exists in the United States. It is the same capitalistic system in the United States as it is here, but it has reached a higher form of development there. If we had 100,000,000 of people, God knows what would have happened to us the other day. It will take them many years in the United States before they will be able to throw off the shackles of corruption due to trusts and combines. The author goes on to say—

"Nor must the way in which the railways use their huge voting power in Parliament be forgotten. Addressing a half-yearly meeting of shareholders in 1880, the Chairman of the London and North-western Railway said—"As they were aware, Government and Parliament to railway people meant ill-treatment and oppression. They did not look for any good from them. On the contrary, every year they had rather increased the burdens of railway companies. The railway interest had hitherto borne the treatment, and been content with the British grumbler, but sooner or later they would all have to combine, and when they did, no matter what Government was in power, the interests of the share and debenture-holders and people who were depending for their living on railway working, were so powerful that no Government could afford to say they would not attend to them." This threat was certainly no idle exaggeration, for at the time the railway companies had no less than one hundred and fifty-eight salaried servants in Parliament. Of these, fifty-one were members of the House of Lords, and one hundred and seven members of the House of Commons. Nor were the lawyers, architects, contractors, and surveyors, generally dependent upon railways for their living, included in the list of one hundred and fifty-eight."

Mr. CARTER: Disgraceful!

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. Edwards points out that outside of these one hundred and fifty-eight were many more who were in the pay of railway companies, which I suppose could be claimed as monopolies. Then further on he says—

"It merely embraced the salaried directors. And at the present time there are one hundred and forty railway directors in the two Houses. Addressing a meeting of traders, the President of the Board of Trade declared in 1893 that the railway interest in Parliament was so powerful that it was impossible for him, even in his official capacity, to do anything unless the traders and farmers of the country were solidly united at his back."

Hon. members opposite propose that this Bill be read this day six months, knowing that the money power exists here in Queensland. I have felt the money power many a time, when they would not allow me to work although I was willing to work.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Things have changed since those days.

Mr. COLLINS: Things have changed since then. Further on, on page 196, the chairman of the Hull and Barnsley Railway Company, speaking in the House of Commons, is reported to have said—

"Of course that shows what the power of the railway directors is in the House. Well, I am a railway director myself,

Mr. Collins.]

and I am in the House of Commons myself. If it is on any future occasion proposed that the votes of railway directors, or even shareholders, should not be allowed in the House of Commons on matters in which they have a distinct interest, I for one, railway director as I am, shall vote in favour of the proposition."

There was even one honest man amongst them. You can find honest men even amongst railway directors sitting in the House of Commons—

"During the historic discussion upon the State Purchase of Railways, before the Royal Statistical Society in 1873, Mr. D. Chadwick, M.P., said he objected to the proceedings of railway directors who used their immense influence in Parliament to obtain legislative enactments to restrict the amount of damages for loss of life caused by their negligence. Mr. Hamilton said he could not conceive that any amount of Government jobbery would equal the jobbery which had taken place in connection with railways."

Of course, we are well aware that the reason that these men occupy seats in the House of Commons is owing to the fact that while 28,000,000 people in Great Britain, who, under adult suffrage would be entitled to vote, under the present franchise only a little over 8,000,000 can exercise the franchise. Therefore, these railway directors are enabled to sit in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, which is somewhat similar but a little more radical than the Chamber here which we call the Legislative Council. I want to quote a passage with reference to the United States. No one will deny that corruption, like industry, has reached its highest form of development in the United States as a result of the capitalistic system and of combines and trusts brought about since the time of the American Civil War. I am quoting from Bliss's Encyclopaedia on social reform, page 322, which states—

"Considering first State Legislatures, the relation between the city and State political machines is, in most States, so intimate that there is probably little to choose in purity between the city council and the State Legislature. The State Legislature because of its greater prestige undoubtedly attracts a considerably stronger and to a less extent a better class of men, but on the other hand the greater value of the franchise and legislative Bills at the disposal of the Legislature compared with those at the disposal of most city councils undoubtedly works to draw to it much larger corruption funds, a more persistent lobby, and consequently the most daring and effective corruption, politicians, and especially the tools of the most corrupt rings. The corruption of the Legislatures of Missouri, Minnesota, Illinois, Pennsylvania, have been shown in connection with municipal corruption. The corruption of the Legislatures of States largely under the dominance of one or more railroads, like New Hampshire, and California, is notorious. The old joke about the Legislature of Pennsylvania only adjourning when the Pennsylvania railroad has no more use for it to transact has still point. New Jersey has been called "a traitor State" because of its Legislature's notorious subservience to corporate influence. The facts, however,

† *Mr. Collins.*

as to the corruption of State Legislatures have been sufficiently shown in connection with municipal corruption."

I could go on quoting from this and other works, but we do not desire to keep the House at any great length. I am anxious to hear hon. members on the other side get up and give reasons why this Bill should not pass. The speech of the hon. member for Dalby was practically all abuse, and abuse is no argument. And the hon. member for Murilla, who followed him, did not give us any reason why the measure should not be carried.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: He told you the truth.

Mr. COLLINS: I do not call it the truth.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You cannot see yourself as others see you.

Mr. COLLINS: Neither can the leader of the Opposition. At any rate, I am true to what I have believed in for more than twenty years, since I was a young man on the soap-box at the corner of the street. I am on a more important soap-box at the present time, and the hon. member does not like it, because there are others like me and we are going to remain here. At any rate, I know that our chance of remaining here depends on the legislation we pass to block the trust and the combine, and the money power, which controls the Press in this State. On page 325, this work says:—

"And here another important element enters in. Given wealthy corporation seeking franchise or concessions from poorly paid officials with uncertain tenure, he who is dishonest can make money, but he who would make a profession and graft and give it his time and organise politics for it, and put brains into it, can become enormously wealthy, enormously powerful, and almost absolutely secure."

That is what has happened in the United States. The men who have put their brains into it for these big combines become enormously wealthy and they have also exercised an influence over the Legislature detrimental to the mass of the people. We are dealing with the wealthy and taking a little of that which others have gained from the people by exploitation. First they took it from the labourer who produced the wealth, and now we are taking it from them and using it in the interests of the labourer. That is it in a nutshell. That is sound political economy; that is the political economy of the future, whether hon. members like it or not. Further, on the same page, Mr. Bliss says:—

"This is the city or more often the State boss. Everybody knows what Mr. Platt is, yet he sits in the United States Senate representing New York. In St. Louis, Mr. Folk even got Colonel Butler convicted, but he laughed at the indictment, and is still in power in St. Louis. Senator Clark was unseated from the Senate for corruption, but he is now in the Senate. Everybody knows what Mr. Murphy stands for in New York, and men like Michael Kenna, "Bathhouse John," John J. Brennan in Chicago, yet they rule their city or their ward. And this power once developed, the corporation must, if they are to go on under the present system, continue the purchase of legislation and immunity, otherwise these political bosses who have gained their power through corruption by corporations will turn against the

corporations. A banker in California declared that he was no more to blame for giving his quota to purchase legislation from the legislature of California than the traveller who pays over his money to the highwayman who holds him up. An enthusiastic capitalist recently declared that he had given five thousand dollars to help to purchase Indiana and would willingly give five thousand dollars more."

Of course, we all know that on one occasion £2,000 was subscribed to the Liberal funds from some source or other. I am satisfied that this party will be up against the money power at the next election. They are even organising at the present time all they know how. They represent the wealthy classes. They do not represent the working men—I am satisfied that they do not represent them—except a few misguided workmen. There are a few in every electorate, and there must be some in the electorates of hon. members opposite. They need enlightening, and this is one of the means of enlightening them. To accuse us of spleen against hon. members is absurd. Nobody can accuse me of that. I have no desire to do them an injury, but what we have to consider as a Labour party is the public interests, and I take it that this Bill proposes to do that. We want to exclude solicitors, attorneys, and directors of certain companies from seats in this House or the other. I hope the time is not far distant when we shall not have to deal with the other at all. It ought never to have been there, and it is unfortunate that it is there, especially for the Labour party, judging by our legislation that they will not pass. Hon. members have already threatened us with what the other Chamber will do with this Bill, seeing that they control the money power, and that hon. members on the other side of the House are in alliance with the other Chamber. In other words, they simply tell them what to do. I want now to quote from "Industrial Liberty," page 192:—

"When a man has achieved political success, and becomes a United States Senator solely because he has achieved prior success in railway management, we need not look to that man for such legislative or judicial wisdom as comes from the examination of political and economic principles. The prevalence of such principles in his State would have made his success impossible. Nor can we conceive that a man who has learned his lesson from the corporation will feel in any constitutional sense that he is the servant of the people."

And again on the same page:—

"Nor can we expect any assistance in reform from corporation attorneys. By these I particularly mean that large numbers of attorneys employed at large salaries to give their exclusive services to this interest. They naturally seek for authority in form. All their suggestions lie in this direction. Their services are devoted to the promotion of existing corporate methods. Their efficiency is measured by the corporate managers largely by their power to resist reform."

The Bill was a step forward in regard to the control of trusts; and the question of the future was whether the trusts should control the people or the people control the trusts; and the platform of the party could only advance step by step towards that end.

Mr. PETRIE: The Bill had a twofold object. The veneer was so thin that they could see through it very clearly,

[12 p.m.] and there could be no doubt that it was aimed at a certain individual occupying a seat in the Assembly, and at a certain member of the Legislative Council. The Premier had referred to the lobbying that existed in America, but because such things occurred in America, that was no reason for introducing a Bill such as this, because politics in Australia had always been kept clean. The Bill would not redound to the credit of the Premier nor to the credit of the party that supported him.

HON. J. TOLMIE: There were several reasons why the Bill should not be read a second time. The ostensible idea of the Bill was to secure a purification of Parliament, and how did the Premier propose to secure the purification of Parliament? By excluding from Parliament a gentleman who had shown him up in a public fashion to be in a most unenviable position. There was no need for the Bill, as no evidence had been adduced of any member having been approached by a combine to use his position against the best interests of the country, and no evidence of any member having attempted to use his influence in that direction. The Bill was vindictive and spiteful, and was introduced because a certain hon. member had cast a reflection upon the Premier, and because the Premier had no other means of redress against that hon. member he was introducing a Bill to exclude that hon. member from a seat in Parliament.

At 12.30 a.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. GUNN argued that the Bill only represented a bit of spleen directed against the firm of Thynne and Macartney. If any foreign company wanted to corrupt hon. members, they would not go to members of the Opposition, but to the poor union secretaries and the poorer members supporting the Government party.

Mr. BARNES: There was ample proof that the Bill was of the most hasty and vindictive character that had ever been introduced into the Queensland Parliament. The Government had impugned the honour of one of their most respected citizens, which would be an everlasting discredit to the House. The Government should start at the foundation of things, and bring forward proof that the existence of certain large companies had not been in the interests of the people in general. As a matter of fact, there was no company operating in Queensland that was not of considerable benefit to the community, and if any of those companies were closed down it would cause a good deal of hardship to many persons.

Amendment put and negatived.

Original question stated.

Mr. MACARTNEY said it was most unfortunate that he should be called upon to speak at that hour of the morning, when there were no reporters present.

The PREMIER: Move the adjournment of the debate and I will agree to it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Macartney.]

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The SPEAKER: In the absence of the Chairman, I call upon the hon. member for Mundingburra to take the chair.

Mr. FOLEY took the chair accordingly.

On clause 6—"Disqualification for preferential pastoral holdings"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree to the Council's amendments in this clause.

HON. J. TOLMIE supported the Council's amendment, because so sure as the sun would rise in the morning, so sure were the Government going to bring about hard times in Queensland through their land legislation.

Mr. MORGAN pointed out that land settlement in Queensland was not on the up grade, notwithstanding the fact that the drought had broken and grass was more plentiful than ever before.

At twenty minutes past 1 o'clock a.m.,

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

Mr. MORGAN hoped the Chairman would not put the question, as it had only been debated for a few minutes.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN said the matter had been debated at considerable length on a previous occasion.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bertram	" McMinn
" Carter	" McPhail
" Collins	" O'Sullivan
" Cooper	" Payne
" Coyne	" Peterson
" Dunstan	" Pollock
" Fihelly	" Ryan, D.
" Gilday	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hardacre	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hartley, H. L.	" Smith
" Hartley, W.	" Stopford
" Hunter	" Wellington
" Huxham	" Wilson
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Gilday and Mr. H. J. Ryan.

NOES, 14.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
" Barnes	" Moore
" Bell	" Morgan
" Booker	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Roberts
" Grayson	" Tolmie
" Gunn	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Moore and Mr. Roberts.

Question—That the Council's amendment in clause 6 be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

Ayes, 33.

Noes, 14.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division in this case was exactly the same as that last recorded.

At 1.30 a.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

On clause 6—"Partnerships"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Council's amendment on

[Hon. J. M. Hunter.

lines 44 to 47 be disagreed to. If the amendment were agreed to, it would encourage dummyming.

Mr. VOWLES supported the Council's amendment, as it was in the interests of the small man, and the residence conditions could be performed by one partner.

Mr. MORGAN also supported the Council's amendment.

At 1.40 a.m.,

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the Committee divided:—

Ayes, 33.

Noes, 14.

This division was the same as the last recorded, except that Mr. Bertram did not vote, and Mr. Foley voted with the "Ayes."

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Council's amendment in lines 44 to 47 be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

The division in this case was exactly the same as the last.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 8—"Amendment of section 43"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Council's amendment be disagreed to. The amendment would deprive the Government of the services of the Land Court in fixing the rental value of Crown leases.

Mr. GUNN argued that if the Government thought fit to repudiate their contracts, they should give some compensation to the lessees.

At five minutes to 2 a.m.,

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the Committee divided:—

Ayes, 33.

Noes, 14.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The division in this case was the same as that last recorded.

2 a.m.

Question—That the Council's amendment in clause 8 be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

The division was the same as on the preceding question.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 10—"Amendment of section 50—Perpetual lease prickly-pear selections"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree with the omission of clause 10, because it is the settled policy of the Government, and has received the endorsement of the electors of Queensland.

Mr. PETRIE moved—That the question be now put.

Question put and passed.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the omission of clause 10—put; and the Committee divided.

Question resolved in the affirmative, the division being the same as previously.

Ayes, 33.

Noes, 14.

On clause 11 (now 10)—“*Restriction on selection by pastoral lessees*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree to the Council's amendments, because the consequence would be that settlement could be restricted thereby.

HON. J. TOLMIE supported the amendment. He could not understand the Government taking up the attitude that the man now on the land was an individual who was dangerous to the wellbeing of the community. The Council's amendment was in the nature of a compromise, but apparently the Government were not prepared to accept any compromise in connection with any of the amendments.

Mr. VOWLES also supported the amendment, which he regarded as an evidence that the Council desired to extend the olive branch to the Government. In some districts the maximum area of 40,000 acres proposed by the Council was less than the maximum now allowed in the pastoral districts of the west. No inducement was offered to people to come to the State and take up outside blocks.

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 31.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ Payne
„ Coyne	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Pollock
„ Foley	„ Peterson
„ Giday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Smith
„ Hartley, W.	„ Stopford
„ Hunter	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Winstanley
„ Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Dunstan and Mr. O'Sullivan.

NOES, 14.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Barnes	„ Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Roberts
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Morgan and Mr. Grayson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the Council's amendments in clause 11 (now 10)—put; and the Committee divided:—

The division was the same as the last, except that Mr. H. J. Ryan voted with the “Ayes,” whilst the Hon. T. J. Ryan did not vote.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 12 (now 11)—“*Amendment of section 54*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree to the Council's amendments, because they do away with the Government policy of providing land for the landless man.”

HON. J. TOLMIE objected to the application of the “gag” before the various amendments had been adequately discussed. The same course had been adopted when the Bill was going through Committee.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the question be now put.

Question put and passed.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the Council's amendments in clause 12 (now 11)—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. McLachlan
„ Barber	„ McMinn
„ Carter	„ McPhail
„ Collins	„ O'Sullivan
„ Cooper	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Giday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
„ Land	

Tellers: Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Smith.

NOES, 12.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 14—“*Amendment of section 55*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree with the omission of clause 14 for the same reason as was given for disagreeing with the omission of clause 10.”

Mr. VOWLES proceeded to discuss the motion, when

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the question be now put.

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihely	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Giday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. McMinn and Mr. Collins.

NOES, 12.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Bridges and Mr. Moore.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the omission of clause 14—put; and the Committee divided:—

The division was the same as in the previous division.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. J. M. Hunter.]

On clause 17 (now 15)—“*Amendment of section 66*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree to the Council’s amendment because the Land Act already provided for this, and it was already being done.”

Mr. MORGAN called attention to the fact that the clause was inserted by the Council, and had never been discussed by this Committee.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the question be now put.

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 33.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O’Sullivan
„ Coyne	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Fihelly	„ Pollock
„ Foley	„ Ryan, D.
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Smith
„ Hartley, W.	„ Stopford
„ Hunter	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Winstanley
„ Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Peterson.

NOES, 12.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Bridges and Mr. Petrie.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the Council’s amendment—put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 31.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O’Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. McLachlan and Mr. H. J. Ryan.

NOES, 12.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Moore and Mr. Petrie.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 25 (now 23)—“*Powers of Minister in war time*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Council’s amendment be disagreed to, because—

“If adopted, it would shorten the selectors’ leases for the terms of their absence and entail an involved and intricate procedure in the department.”

[Hon. J. M. Hunter.

Mr. MORGAN said that the Minister’s refusal to accept the amendment showed that he was not in sympathy with the soldiers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the question be now put.

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 32.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O’Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. H. L. Hartley and Mr. Dunstan.

NOES, 12.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Morgan and Mr. Bridges.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Council’s amendment in clause 25 (now 23) be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O’Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Smith
„ Hartley, W.	„ Stopford
„ Hunter	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Winstanley
„ Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. H. L. Hartley and Mr. Pollock.

NOES, 12.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Bell.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. PETRIE moved—That the Chairman do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Booker	„ Morgan
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Vowles
„ Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Moore.

NOES, 32.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. McPhail and Mr. Peterson.	

Resolved in the negative.

On clause 31—“*Amendment of section 109*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree to the Council's omission of the clause for the reason given for the disagreement with the Council's amendment in clause 8.

HON. J. TOLMIE said the Minister had given no reason for disagreeing with the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the question be now put.

Question put; and the Committee divided

AYES, 32.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. D. Ryan and Mr. Smith.	

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	

Teller: Mr. Moore.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Committee disagree to the Council's omission of clause 31—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 28.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hunter	„ Smith
„ Huxham	„ Stopford
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wellington
„ Kirwan	„ Wilson
„ Land	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Armfield and Mr. O'Sullivan.	

1916—6 H

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Bridges.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 34—“*No land to be auctioned in fee simple after 1st January, 1917*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree with the omission of clause 34 for the reason given for disagreeing with the omission of clause 10.”

At 3.30 a.m.,

Mr. FOLEY relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. VOWLES: This was a very important clause, inasmuch as it prohibited the sale of land by auction after 1st January, 1917, and made the perpetual leasehold system the only tenure under which land could be acquired from the Crown in the future. He supported the retention of the freehold tenure. So far, very little land had been selected as perpetual lease, showing that that tenure was not popular.

At twenty-five minutes to 4 o'clock,

Mr. BRIDGES called attention to the state of the Committee.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I am satisfied that there is a quorum within the precincts of the House.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved—That the Temporary Chairman's ruling be disagreed to. There was no evidence that there was a quorum within the precincts of the House.

Question—That the Temporary Chairman's ruling be disagreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Moore and Mr. Bell.

NOES, 32.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Bertram	„ McMinn
„ Carter	„ McPhail
„ Collins	„ O'Sullivan
„ Cooper	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Fihelly	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Peterson and Mr. D. Ryan.	

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. VOWLES said that no person could acquire more than six allotments, or 3 acres, under perpetual lease in a town. He pointed out further objections to the clause, and claimed that people should have the option of saying whether they would take up land as a freehold or as a perpetual leasehold.

Mr. Vowles.]

Question—That the Committee disagree to the omission of clause 34—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 32.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Bertram	„ McMinn
„ Carter	„ McPhail
„ Collins	„ O'Sullivan
„ Cooper	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Fihelly	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Barber and Mr. O'Sullivan.	

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Gunn and Mr. Vowles.	

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 35—“*Amendment of section 121*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree to the omission of clause 35 for similar reasons to those given for disagreeing to the omission of clause 10.”

Question put; and the Committee divided.

Resolved in the affirmative, the voting being “Ayes,” 31; “Noes,” 11.

On new clause 31, to follow original clause 35—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

“That the Committee disagree to the insertion of the new clause because it is against the settled policy of the Government.”

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. McLachlan
„ Barber	„ McMinn
„ Carter	„ McPhail
„ Collins	„ O'Sullivan
„ Cooper	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
„ Land	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Stopford.	

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Bridges and Mr. Moore.	

Resolved in the affirmative.

[*Hon. J. M. Hunter.*

On clause 38 (now 34)—“*Amendment of section 130*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree with the omission of the words relating to the penalty, because it was necessary to have a penalty to prevent dummying.

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 29.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Winstanley
„ Kirwan	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. McPhail and Mr. Smith.	

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Moore and Mr. Bell.	

On clause 50—“*Amendment of Schedule II*”—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Committee disagree with the Council's amendment omitting the clause for the same reason as given for disagreeing with the amendment in clause 8.

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 30.	
Mr. Armfield	Mr. Land
„ Barber	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ McMinn
„ Collins	„ McPhail
„ Cooper	„ O'Sullivan
„ Dunstan	„ Payne
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, D.
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hunter	„ Smith
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. T. L. Jones and Mr. Winstanley.	

NOES, 11.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Vowles
„ Gunn	
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Bell and Mr. Moore.	

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had disagreed with the Legislative Council's amendments in the Bill. The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council with the following message:—

“Mr. President,—

“The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative

Council's amendments in the Land Act Amendment Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 6, lines 22 to 25—

“Because the object of the clause is to provide land for landless men.

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 6, line 44—

“Because it would encourage dummying.

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 8, page 5, lines 43 to 55 (now 43 to 54), and page 6, lines 1 to 7 (now 1 to 6)—

“Because the object of the clause is to enable the Land Court to fix the true rental value.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 10—

“Because it is the settled policy of the Government.

“Disagree to the amendments in clause 11 (now 10)—

“Because if the amendments were accepted the possibilities of increasing closer settlement would be restricted.

“Disagree to the amendments in clause 12 (now 11)—

“Because they do away with the Government's policy of providing land for landless men.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 14, for the reason given in disagreeing to the omission of clause 10.

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 17 (now 15)—

“Because the Land Act already provides for this, and it is already being done.

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 25 (now 23)—

“Because, if adopted, it would shorten the selectors' leases for the terms of their absence and entail an involved and intricate procedure in the department.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 31, for the reason given in disagreeing to the amendment in clause 8.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 34, for the reason given in disagreeing to the omission of clause 10.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 35, for a similar reason, and for the additional reason that it is found satisfactory.

“Disagree to the insertion of new clause 31—

“Because it is against the settled policy of the Government.

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 38 (now 34)—

“Because in practice it is found necessary to inflict a penalty to prevent dummying.

“Disagree to the omission of clause 50, for the reason given in disagreeing to the amendment in clause 8.

“W. McCORMACK,

“Speaker.

“Legislative Assembly Chamber,

“Brisbane, 22nd November, 1916.”

MONEY LENDERS BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

On clause 3—“*Interpretation*”—

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIDELLY, the Council's amendment was agreed to with slight amendments.

On clause 18—“*Regulations as to registration*”—

HON. J. A. FIDELLY moved—That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. He disagreed with the amendment, but, in order to permit of the measure becoming law, he would accept it.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee agreed to one amendment and disagreed with another amendment. The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council with the following message:—

“Mr. Speaker,—

“The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's amendments in the Money Lenders Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

“Disagree to the amendment in clause 3, page, 2, line 54 (now 51)—

“Because under the definition of trustee in the Trustees and Executors Acts, 1897 to 1906, unless the amendments hereafter mentioned are made, the Act will readily be evaded, as any person could become a trustee; but offer to amend the Legislative Council's amendment as follows:—

On line 52 omit the word ‘under’ and insert the words ‘within the meaning of’ in lieu thereof;

On line 53, after ‘1906,’ insert the words ‘under any will’;

“In which proposed amendments they invite the concurrence of the Legislative Council;

“And agree to the other amendments in the Bill.

“W. McCORMACK,

“Speaker.

“Legislative Assembly Chamber,
“Brisbane, 22nd November, 1916.”

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*): I formally move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

GAS BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S MESSAGE NO. 3.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following message from the Legislative Council:—

“Mr. Speaker,—

“The Legislative Council having had under consideration the Message of the

Hon. W. McCormack.]

Legislative Assembly of date 21st November, relative to the Gas Bill, beg now to intimate that they—

“ Agree to the addition proposed by the Legislative Assembly to paragraph 12 in Schedule III., page 10 (now 14).

“ Do not further insist on their amendment on page 10 (now 15), line 66 (now 24), substituting the figures ‘10’ for the figures ‘7½,’ and do not insist on their disagreement to the substitution therefor of the figures ‘8½’ offered by the Legislative Assembly.

“ Do not further insist on their amendment on page 10 (now 15), line 67 (now 25), substituting ‘ten pounds’ or ‘seven pounds ten shillings,’ and do not insist on their disagreement to the substitution therefor of ‘eight pounds ten shillings’ offered by the Legislative Assembly.

“ Do not insist on their further amendments in the Bill to which the Legislative Assembly have disagreed; and

“ Do not further insist on their other amendments in the Bill to which the Legislative Assembly insist on disagreeing.”

“ W. F. TAYLOR,

“ Presiding Chairman.

“ Legislative Council Chamber,

“ Brisbane, 22nd November, 1916.”

LAND SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MESSAGE FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

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

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

On clause 4—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—That the Legislative Council's amendment, omitting £100 and inserting £50, be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had agreed to the Council's amendment. The report was adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be returned to the Council with the message in the usual form.

LUCINDA POINT TO HALIFAX ROAD BILL.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

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

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIELLY it was agreed to take the message into consideration at the next sitting of the House.

The House adjourned at half-past 4 o'clock a.m.

[*Hon. W. McCormack.*