

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 1920

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY, 1920.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock p.m.

PORT DUES REVISION ACT AMENDMENT BILL—DAIRY PRODUCE BILL.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of messages conveying His Majesty's assent to these Bills.

QUESTIONS.

CATTLE AND IMPROVEMENTS ON STATE STATIONS.

Mr. SPENCER (*Maranoa*) asked the Minister in Charge of State Enterprises—

"1. What number of bullocks of the age of three years and older have the Government on their stations or elsewhere?

"2. Are these bullocks being supplied to the State butchers' shops, and at what price per head?

"3. What sum has been spent on the State stations for improvements since they have been acquired, viz:—(a) in making provision for water; (b) for ringbarking; (c) for clearing pear; (d) for fencing or building?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*) replied—

"1. 37,150 head—No. 7's and older.

"2. Yes; to butchers' shops and State meatworks as required, at from £9 per head.

"3. (a) Expended £6,000, and present contracts will run to approximately £13,000; (b) practically nothing, experimental work only up to the present; (c) no separate accounts kept—comparatively very little pear on State stations, and managers are held responsible for keeping the stations clean; (d) £13,075."

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—NINTH ALLOTTED DAY.

(Mr. Smith, Mackay, in the chair.)

Question—That £17,538 be granted for "Department of Justice—Chief Office"—stated—

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): During the discussion quite a number of important matters have come up for the consideration of the Committee, one of which is the unsatisfactory condition of the various electorates, so far as the divisions are concerned. I always understood that the policy of the Government and those who are supporting the Government was one that they at least claimed would be fair, equitable, just, right.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member says he approves of that. If he does, he is not carrying out what he believes, or is not assisting to carry out what he believes. I want to ask whether the Government have any intention of adjusting the anomalies that exist, because it is an absolute disgrace that we should find ourselves in the position in which we are to-day. Let me draw your attention to what has been repeated over and over and over again, namely, that there are electorates with one representative and about 2,000 voters, whilst there are other electorates, like my own, which have the same representation and about 12,000 voters. I am perfectly certain that no person in the House can justify that. It is not because the Government have not the necessary means to alter the position, because they have on the statute-book an Act which gives them the power to deal automatically with it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You had that power in 1914.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Perfectly true, but the anomalies that exist to-day are not as they existed in 1914. I am prepared to admit that in 1914 there were discrepancies and anomalies, but they have grown to an extraordinary extent. I am perfectly certain that the number on the roll in the *Bulimba* electorate in 1914 was nothing like the number on the roll to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There was a big excess in 1914.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is not an answer. I am prepared to admit that in 1914 there were more than the quota, but the Minister stands condemned on his own admission, because there is a very much bigger excess to-day. The Minister who interjected admits that there were anomalies, and he admits that there are very much bigger anomalies, and yet there is not the slightest action on the part of the Government. (Interjections.) Why all this noise? Is it that their consciences are pricking them—that they feel they ought to do something which they are afraid to do. Are they afraid that even the Premier might have to seek some fresh fields if they did the just thing? Are the powers behind the Government saying, "Do not do anything, because some of us are going to lose the number of our mess?" Put yourself on this side of the House, Mr. Smith, not knowing, as you do, all the inner circles of the other side and ask yourself how you would view it. You would say, "There is something absolutely rotten in the Govern-

ment when they will not do the just thing by the community." Surely, we have the right to expect that votes shall be equal. Can anyone here say that a constituency with less than 2,000 votes is entitled to the same representation as one with 12,000 votes?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If they cannot turn the blame on to the Commonwealth, they make some other excuse, they never tackle the thing itself, and the result is that the position becomes more and more unsatisfactory. I think the Premier ought to inform the House whether the Government, before they face the electors, have any intention of adjusting the electorates, as they ought to do. Has the Minister in charge of the Estimates to-day any intention of urging upon the Government that something should be done?

HON. J. MULLAN: I am very much amused at you after your party gerrymandered the elections.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member knows that our party never did anything of the kind. (Government dissent.) The truth is coming home to them, and they do not like it, and so they are trying to take something off my time.

Mr. WHITFORD: You had half the cemeteries voting for you.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I want to draw attention to a statement that has been made deliberately by no less a journal than the "Bulletin." (Government laughter.) It has been pointed out by that journal that by some strange means at the last election—I presume it was a coincidence that one does read of sometimes—the number of electors on the State rolls in Queensland was very much greater than it should have been. What is the inference, or, what is more, what are the facts behind it? They are that somehow or other somebody forgot to take off names that should have been taken off.

Mr. RIORDAN: And some of them took off names that should not have been taken off.

HON. W. H. BARNES: There is another member who evidently feels very sore himself. The "Bulletin" distinctly states that the numbers of persons on the rolls were very much in excess of those who should have been on, and it is perfectly certain that these things happen by some strange coincidence. I would like the Minister, who is fresh to Ministerial rank, to get up and make a clean breast of it, tell us all about it. We would really like to know how it was done, and then if any other Government that succeeds did feel inclined to do such a dishonest and improper thing, it would be something to warn them. I hope the hon. gentleman will go fully into these matters, and give us such an explanation as we desire.

HON. J. MULLAN: Such as you desire?

HON. W. H. BARNES: We want at all times just to know what is the truth in this connection. I notice whenever there is a point which touches a Minister it is evaded. We have the same in regard to returns. Somehow or other they are afraid to let the light of day on it. You may depend upon it that these statements which are made by hon. gentlemen occupying the Government benches cannot be proved, and therefore they shelter themselves behind something which is purely a negligible thing. I want to ask the Minister whether, when the ex-Premier

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

went South and conducted a very important campaign—an election which I think the present Government helped to lose very materially by withholding the Financial Statement—I am certain that, because they were afraid to introduce their Financial Statement, it tended to injure the late Premier in connection with his late contest at the Federal ballot—I want to ask how many officers he had with him. I want to know if any of the officers of the State, after the Hon. T. J. Ryan had resigned his portfolio and his seat in this House, assisted in that campaign, and if they were paid for it by the Queensland Government. Will the Minister say I am wrong in making that statement? I challenge the Minister to say that that is not correct.

Hon. J. MULLAN: It is the easiest thing in the world to make wild statements.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I can furnish the Minister with the names of the officers, and I want to ask if they lent their valuable assistance to the Hon. T. J. Ryan while he was carrying on the Federal campaign? If they did, who paid for them? Were they paid by the State of Queensland, which is groaning under wilful financial mismanagement? Will the Minister answer that question when he gets on his feet, because I can assure him that members on this side of the House are going to push the question for all it is worth? Another point I wish to deal with is the question of gambling, and I notice that was quietly thrust on one side when it was introduced. I want to ask if the Minister is aware of the number of permits which have been issued?

Hon. J. MULLAN: I am aware of every one issued and apparently sanctioned by you as treasurer of the Patriotic Association.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I never sanctioned one as treasurer.

Hon. J. MULLAN: There is an application with your name on it.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I never sanctioned one as treasurer, and the hon. gentleman knows that. The hon. gentleman may know that I happened to be, and still am, treasurer of the patriotic funds, and the committee may have applied, but I had nothing whatever to do with them. (Government laughter.) The position is perfectly clear. We find to-day, for the purpose of carrying out propaganda work, that permits are being issued for Liberty Fairs and other places where Ministers are held up for sale. One was sold for 1s, and another was sold for 2s. I am referring to their value to the country, and that is the way they were dealt with.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You would be a "drug" in the market.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I say this gambling evil is undermining the very vitals of this country. And is it not going to stop? I say it should stop. It is a crying disgrace to the community that permits should be given; what for?

Hon. J. MULLAN: Don't be hard on the Opposition. They all applied.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: To help to carry on some of the almost "elect" things which the Minister has to do with. We see little children gambling with the help of the Minister for Justice.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Where did you see that?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Is it not a strange anomaly when a department which calls itself a Department of Justice does that for political purposes? Have we not heard that in connection with some of these permits that have been given and the running of these things that good fat commissions have been paid—I do not say to gentlemen in this House—to people outside this House for the purpose of superintending them? No wonder that there are people in the community who are anxious to continue these things, and a Minister who has any sense of his responsibility should see at once that this kind of thing, even if it is out to help his political "pals," should be at once removed, because it is a menace to the community. I want to ask the Minister: Is his influence going in the direction of assisting the Government to be saved from that kind of thing, and in turn save the country from it? He should be in a position to direct them aright and save them from further humiliation in that particular regard.

I want to say a word also about the fees paid. I have heard over and over again about profiteering. That is the stock word on the other side; but I saw a return the other day, and, if the return was a correct one, the late Premier received I do not know how many thousand pounds for legal work in connection with the Government of this country, and I venture to say the department has never paid such an amount before to any Premier or to any officer of the Government who has had to do with the control of the Government. I want to ask where these gentlemen who talk about profiteering come in? What have they got to say when these big fees are paid? The return tabled the other day shows that the profiteering is on the other side; and, my word, they are making hay while the sun shines! I want to ask the Minister if he can justify the amount of money that is being paid in connection with legal fees in this State?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Can you justify what your Government paid?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Yes, because there was nothing in keeping with what is being done on the other side. I am very pleased to see Ministers are getting angry, because it is an indication that they realise the truth of my criticisms.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The stupidity of them.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I want to ask, even if it is only in view of an election next year, if they are not going to shape their policy somewhat different in the future to what it has been in the past.

I want to ask also how it is that this advertising has been carried on in the way it has been carried on—an advertisement sent South appearing as if the paper had published it off its own bat, and then for it to be discovered afterwards that it was an advertisement paid for by the Government in order to boom them. I want to ask what the reason is. I want to know if that policy is amongst the other policies which have been so disastrous to this country? I am sure the Minister has a good deal to answer when he gets up to reply to the criticisms of this side of the House.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*): The hon. member for Bulimba has argued that there should be a redistribution of seats in this

Mr. Peterson.]

State, and he quoted his own very large electorate containing somewhere in the vicinity of 10,000 voters.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: More than that.

Mr. PETERSON: I stand corrected—over 10,000 voters as against some of the country electorates. If the hon. member's arguments are to be taken as the best in the interests of Queensland, it would simply mean we would wipe out some of the country constituencies. My own seat is not in jeopardy, because Normanby has over the quota, but I could not see my way to support the hon. member, and I cannot see how country members on his own side can see their way to support his argument, because it would mean that you would have more city electorates and more Brisbane influence as against the country.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: There must be a quota in favour of the country.

Mr. PETERSON: The hon. member has quoted justice. Can you get justice when you have a member representing a district which you can almost whistle around, and another member representing 60,000 square miles of country? Can you call it justice and say that that members' electorate should be made larger? Well, I do not get time to read the newspapers, because of the time occupied in trudging round the department in the interests of my constituents, and yet the hon. member says: "Let Peterson's electorate be made bigger. Cut the country electorates out and give more members to the city." The city is already over-represented, in my opinion, and the time has come when both sides of the House should see that there is no such redistribution as is going to cut out country representatives in this Chamber. I hope the Government will not take any notice of that argument, because, after all, the hon. member must realise that if we are to get the best form of government—a Government which is going to represent the interests of the people—then we should have the preponderance in this House of country members over city members. I hope the hon. member will not persist in his argument, and that he will see you have to consider other issues besides the number of electors.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Do you believe the margin is a right one?

Mr. KIRWAN: What about the margin in Victoria?

Mr. PETERSON: In Victoria the town seats are represented by 40,000 constituents, and the country seats from 4,000 to 6,000 constituents. Why was that done? The Labour party down there took up the same attitude that hon. members take up this afternoon, that it is not just; but the National Government there considered the country should receive a larger proportion of representation than the city, and that is why the policy was adopted there. Surely the hon. member does not contend that we should have less country members in this House? Surely he is not going to ask that we should wipe out some of the country seats and give greater representation to the city? The thing is absurd, and I hope the Government will take no notice of him at all, and I hope the country party on that side of the House will not support that argument. The hon. member also referred to the fact that the rolls at the last general election were inflated. I am not prepared to admit that they

were inflated; but, as far as the inference goes, one would be led to believe that some electors voted twice. Speaking for my own

electorate, I can say there were [4 p.m.] only two cases of double voting recorded, and when they were inquired into it was found that they were persons of identically the same christian and surname who were living in the same district. So it can be understood how errors of that description arise. From experience and inquiry, I have found that the same thing has occurred in other electorates. The hon. member must realise that, though there may be an inflated roll—granting that there is—it is not a sine qua non that there was double voting. There is nothing in that argument. I wish now to refer to the actions of the Titles Office in Rockhampton. I hope the Minister will pay particular attention, because the conduct of the Titles Office in Rockhampton is becoming so much of a joke in the Central district. My constituents are continually going to that office with regard to deeds and so on, and I am repeatedly receiving complaints owing to the inordinate delays which occur. My constituents and also solicitors are told that the delay is at the Brisbane office, and when you inquire at the Brisbane office you are informed that the delay takes place at Rockhampton. I think the time is ripe for inquiry to be made into the reason why people who require their title deeds and such like have to put up with such extraordinary delays as are taking place at the present time. Only to-day I have received a most genuine letter on the subject. If the officer there is not capable of seeing that the work is expedited, somebody else should be put in his place.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): The deputy leader of the Opposition made reference to the difference in the number of electors on the rolls for the various electorates. I find that the Cook electorate contains an area of 75,300 square miles, the Chillagoe has 6,340, and the Burke 65,300. In other words, in those three electorates we have nearly one-fourth of the total area of Queensland. According to the 1917 figures, there were on the rolls of those electorates a total of 7,443 electors, or less than the number represented by the hon. member for Bulimba. The point I want to make is: Would it be possible for any one man to represent that area of country as it should be represented? Then we have to ask ourselves another question: Is it not time that the Government—whether it be this or any other Government—saw that we had more population in those parts of Queensland, so that the hon. member for Bulimba would not be given an opportunity to criticise the small number of electors there are on those rolls? The duty of this Government is to help, to the best of their ability, to develop the Cook and the Burke electorates, where there are practically no railways, with a view to getting a greater population in those parts of Queensland. I am not one of those who believe that the country should have over-representation as against the city. The democracies of the world belong to the cities. I know that, from my reading of history; and I am not going to favour the country having over-representation against the democracies which, in many cases, have forced progress upon the country. In various periods of the world's history the country has been forced to adopt radical measures to ensure progress. I am willing to admit that there should be

[Mr. Peterson.

some consideration shown to the country. What do I find in regard to some of the electorates in Brisbane? The Brisbane electorate has an area of $\frac{5}{8}$ square mile, Buranda 1 square mile, Fortitude Valley 1 square mile, Ithaca $1\frac{1}{4}$ square mile, Maree $1\frac{1}{2}$ square mile, Merthyr 1 square mile, Paddington $\frac{3}{4}$ square mile, Windsor $4\frac{1}{4}$ square miles. Those are some of the electorates in Brisbane. In Victoria it is entirely wrong that one portion of the State should require 40,000 electors to return a member to its Legislature while another portion requires only 5,000. What we have to consider in Queensland is the immensity of our State as compared with Victoria. I have travelled over most of those electorates I have mentioned, where the population is very sparse, and they should be given some consideration. I notice on the Estimates there is an amount of £1,000 for travelling expenses for the judges of the Supreme Court. We have had criticism regarding Ministerial motor-cars. What about a little criticism coming from members of the Opposition in reference to the amount of £1,000 set aside for the travelling expenses of the judges of the Supreme Court? I remember having raised this question on more than one occasion. I believe the judges do not even render an account of what their expenses really amount to. If they do, I would like the Minister to say so. Then I come to another item—Court of Industrial Arbitration, associates, two at £250, total £500. I understand that those judges are allowed to appoint their own associates. That is entirely wrong, in my opinion. This party, if they stand for anything, should stand for equal opportunities for all. I remember years ago there was a gentleman who occupied the position of magistrate and warden. Later I watched the career of his son, and I noticed that he became a judge. Later still I watched the career of his sons, and I saw that they became associates to judges. Now, where do the equal opportunities come in? Imagine a working-class child, born and reared on a 16-perch allotment, where the surroundings do not favour the development of the intellectual faculties of that child. What chance has he alongside those I have just referred to? He would have no chance at all. Why should the judge be allowed to appoint his own son to the position of associate because he happens to be his son? Where does the child of the working man come in? We allow these judges to appoint their own associates, and we foot the bill. Is that the only salary those associates receive?

Mr. MACARTNEY: You "foot" the bill; that is all you do.

Mr. COLLINS: We pay up and look cheerful. I have been filling in my income tax return this afternoon, but it is not like that of the hon. member for Toowoong.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I would not be surprised if you returned more now. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: I am asking for equal opportunities for all. We are building up a kind of aristocratic circle. Some of these people ought to get out and do a little of the useful work of the world, and give the children of other people an opportunity of becoming associates. These things ought to go round—not come down from father to son.

Mr. MORGAN: I remember when the present members of the Government were

on this side of the House they continually complained about the enormous amount of money that was being spent by the Government of that day in legal expenses. It will be interesting to give figures in respect to the amount of money paid to barristers and solicitors during different periods by the past Government and the present Government. For the last three years of the late Government the amounts were as follows:—

£ s. d.		
1st July, 1912, to 30th June, 1913	...	4,672 16 9
1st July, 1913, to 30th June, 1914	...	5,011 7 5
1st July, 1914, to 30th June, 1915	...	3,927 16 8
Total	...	£13,612 0 10

The figures for this Government during the last three years have been—

£ s. d.		
1st July, 1916, to 31st June, 1917	...	6,986 9 1
1st July, 1917, to 30th June, 1918	...	6,883 5 9
1st July, 1918, to 30th June, 1919	...	11,724 16 1
Total	...	£25,594 10 11

That shows an increase by this Government of £11,982 10s. 1d.

Mr. PAYNE: They may have had more cases.

Mr. MORGAN: It seems to me to be an extraordinary thing that there should be such an increased amount paid by this Government.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Your legislation was never challenged.

Mr. MORGAN: Possibly this Government made cases owing to the fact that it was a payable thing for some of those who were briefed. Then we have the amounts paid to the late Premier, when acting as Attorney-General. The figures I will quote are only the amounts which have actually been paid. We know there are several sums amounting to thousands of pounds which have not yet been paid, and have not yet been included in the latest return. We know there is an amount of £2,000 which has not yet been paid, which Mr. Ryan at one time said he would not take until after a certain election. According to the return furnished to this House for the year which has just expired, that sum has not yet been paid. It would be interesting to compare Mr. Ryan's fees with those of the Attorney-General in the previous Administration—now Mr. Justice O'Sullivan. Mr. Justice O'Sullivan, while acting as Attorney-General, received the following sums:—

£ s. d.		
1st July, 1912, to 30th June, 1913	...	402 9 0
1st July, 1913, to 30th June, 1914	...	584 13 6
1st July, 1914, to 30th June, 1915	...	663 5 6

That shows a total for the three years of £1,650 9s. During the last three years Mr. Ryan was acting as Attorney-General he received, from 1st July, 1916, to 31st July, 1917, £749 15s.; from the 1st July, 1917, to 30th June, 1918, £849 1s. 6d.; from 1st July, 1918, to 30th June, 1919, £1,170 4s. 6d.; or a total for three years of £2,769 1s. For the

Mr. Morgan.]

total period he was Attorney-General, taking the year from 1st July, 1915, to 30th June, 1916, during which period he received £456 3s., he obtained no less a total than £3,225 4s.

Mr. WHITFORD: He earned every "bob" of it, too.

Mr. MORGAN: And we know that there is at least another £2,000 to add to that, which makes a total of £5,225. This seems an extraordinary amount of money to be paid to him during that period.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He had an invitation from the Imperial Government to go over there.

Mr. MORGAN: We know all about that invitation. Even though the Imperial Government may have reimbursed the Treasury for that expense, still we would just like to know the exact amount of money Mr. Ryan was paid for actions he appeared in owing to the fact that he was Attorney-General for Queensland. Those figures have not yet been provided, but we do know—

Mr. RIGDAN: When did Mr. Feez give you his brief?

Mr. MORGAN: The figures go to show that, as far as legal expenses are concerned, the sum total for three years paid by this Government equals £25,594 as against the sum total for three years paid by a previous Government—and not picking out any particular years either—of £13,672, or an increase of £11,982. These figures speak for themselves, and I think there is room for retrenchment. The figures have only to be made known throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, and the Government will be condemned on the enormous increase. And in every instance money has been practically wasted because, as far as the Mooraberrie cattle case is concerned, Mr. Ryan brought that case upon himself. There was no reason why he should have seized the cattle belonging to Mrs. Duncan. It is all very well to say that the pastoralists and others were behind Mrs. Duncan—

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: So they were.

Mr. MORGAN: But it was caused owing to the fact that Mr. Ryan seized the cattle belonging to Mrs. Duncan when he did not seize Mr. Kidman's cattle which had been taken across the border and sent to South Australia, the same as Mrs. Duncan's cattle had, at that particular time. But he seized the cattle belonging to a poor, unfortunate widow woman who was struggling for a living upon the land. (Government dissent and interjections.)

Hon. J. MULLAN: Who fought the case on behalf of the poor widow?

Mr. MORGAN: More credit and more power to those who assisted her. She deserved every assistance, and would get it from every right-thinking man or woman. And notwithstanding that the case was virtually won by the decision of the Privy Council, even prominent Labour supporters such as the late Senator Stewart, in a letter to the Press, stated that the decision should never have been given in that direction, and that had the Privy Council known the conditions that operated it would have given its decision in a different direction. And I feel sure that had those who were assisting Mrs. Duncan—if there was anybody assisting her—sent from Queensland a local barrister

to fight the case the same as the Government sent Mr. Ryan, the decision would have been reversed. Our own High Court judges knew the conditions that operated and gave their decision in favour of Mrs. Duncan.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Their decision was wrong.

Mr. MORGAN: And the Government had to take it to the Privy Council in order to secure a decision, still it was recognised by prominent Labourites that that decision was a wrong one. And I do not care where you go throughout Queensland, you will find Labour supporters telling you that they recognise that the Government blundered in respect to that case, and that Mrs. Duncan had no right to be prosecuted.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Do you think the Privy Council was wrong in its decision?

Mr. MORGAN: I do, honestly. (Loud Government laughter.) And I say that four out of every five people in Queensland who studied the case think the same. I only used that case to illustrate how easy it is for an Attorney-General, who is receiving a salary, to make a case in order to benefit himself and increase his banking account (Government interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: If you read my speeches made in this House when previous Governments were in power you will find that when Mr. Justice O'Sullivan received an amount—although the largest amount he received was £663 for one year—that I objected to it. I said that the Attorney-General has no right to be briefed by the Crown. If he gets £1,000 a year as Attorney-General—which Mr. Justice O'Sullivan was getting—he has no right to be paid in respect to cases such as these. I believe the system in vogue in Great Britain to-day is that an Attorney-General is not allowed to appear and is not paid in such cases.

Mr. KIRWAN: He only gets about £6,000 a year.

Mr. MORGAN: That does not matter. It is the principle I object to. The Attorney-General has no right to institute a case and then brief himself. Is it right that an Attorney-General should draw his salary and receive from the Crown such an amount? The time has come, in my opinion, when the Attorney-General has no right whatever to be able to institute a case or bring about a prosecution and then appear on behalf of the Crown in order to earn fees and emoluments for himself.

Mr. GUNN (Carnarvon): I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for Bulimba in connection with the way that the voting power is distributed in Queensland. I remember well when the Labour party were in opposition—before the Denham Government brought in the Redistribution Bill—they were particularly anxious to get redistribution. At that time the grazing areas were not so much represented by Labour members as they are now. They were represented by what they used to call "old Tories"—(laughter)—and at that time the Labour party used to say they only represented trees and animals—bandicoots, anything you like—except people. The Labour members who represented the city and suburban electorates represented flesh and blood, and argued on the lines that it was quite right to have a redistribution. Now,

[Mr. Morgan.]

Government members are arguing just the opposite, and say the country electorates ought to be represented far more fully than the city. What was good some years ago is quite wrong now. I cannot understand the position that Labour supporters are taking up. I heard the hon. member for Bowen advocating equal opportunities for all. That is not equal opportunities for all; it is unequal opportunities. Take, for instance, my own electorate of Carnarvon. In that electorate there were 4,204 voted at the last election.

Mr. WHITFORD: What is the area?

Mr. GUNN: Then we have the Cook electorate. I suppose it is a bigger electorate than mine. There were 2,765 people voted there.

Mr. H. J. RYAN: You are wrong.

Mr. GUNN: I am quoting from the general elections of 1918 compared with those of 1915. I said the people who voted, not those who were on the roll. I do not see that the people in the Cook electorate should have twice the electoral power that the people in Carnarvon have. Now, this is an anomaly. I notice that at the 1918 election there were 425,316 people on the roll and out of that number only 340,275 voted, leaving 85,041 who did not vote. Yet there was no action taken. Nobody was prosecuted for not voting, although the Act says that it is compulsory voting. Where are those 85,041 people? I think a great number of them were myths. I heard it said there was 14,000 more on the electoral rolls than there were adults in Queensland.

Mr. WEIR: Just as well for you, too.

Mr. GUNN: Of those that did vote, it works out this way: 4,726 per electorate of those who voted, at £300 per annum, equals 1s. 3d. per head, or at £500 per annum equals 2s. 1d. per head! I think it would be a good idea if we paid members of Parliament for what they did—equal representation for all. Pay them at so much per head. If the Government of the day had a redistribution of seats, they would take fine care that everybody turned out to vote. As to the difficulty of representing a country electorate as against a town electorate. I represent a country electorate, and I do not have to go to every little bit of a function that is held in the electorate, because it is too far away. The city member is called upon to open schools and attend other functions. I would far sooner represent a country electorate than a city electorate. Carrying the argument of payment per head, I would like to point out—I have a little table worked out here—how it would work out. We will take the member for Bulimba. In his electorate 9,871 persons voted. At £300 he ought to get £616, or at £500 he should get £1,028. Mr. Theodore, Chillagoe; in his electorate 1,417 voted. At £300 he would get £88; at £500 he would get £147. (Laughter.) Take Mr. Petrie, Toombul electorate; 7,320 voted there. He would get £457 or £762. Take Mr. Riordan, Burke; 1,665 voted there. He would get £104 or £173. Gilday, Ithaca, with 5,576 voters would get £348 or £580. Winstanley, Queenton, with 2,386 voters would get £149 or £248. Warren, Murrumbidgee, with 6,301 voters; he would get £393 or £656. Armfield, Musgrave, with 3,362 voters would get £210 or £350. Now, cannot you see the inequality of the thing? Then

see the inconsistency of using the argument, "Why didn't you do it when you were in power?" We did it. We brought in a Redistribution Bill, and if you had put us in power again the electorates would have been cut up long ago. What does the Government trouble about the country electorates? They only trouble about keeping in power;

[4.30 p.m.] they boast about having a great majority; but the difference in votes between their majority and ours is a mere nothing. But the majority of members is a great difference. The Nationalists, or Liberals, do not have fair representation in this House. We are represented by a small number, whereas we should have nearly half the number of members in the House. Proportional representation is far better than what we have, but the next best thing is a proper redistribution of seats. We subdivided Queensland into quotas of 4,700, but, of course, some electorates increase at a greater rate than others, and the longer it goes on the worse it gets. The position has become worse since the present Government have been in power. There are several other things on which I would like to speak, but I will wait until the vote goes through.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowoomba*): I think the arguments put forward by hon. members on this side of the House in favour of a redistribution of seats are well-founded. We have not had a redistribution for many years, and, consequently, many and great changes have taken place, but it is not necessary to labour that; it has been argued many times before in this House. Comparing our rolls with the Federal rolls, there is no doubt that they are not in the position that they ought to be in. There is an idea abroad—and, I think, with some justification—that there are from 70,000 to 100,000 names on the Queensland roll that have no right to be there. Hon. members opposite are responsible for this state of affairs, and there ought to be no trouble in correcting it. The result is that there is considerable danger of double voting, and I know that there has been double voting.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Very few cases.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I know of cases where there has been double voting, but the benefit of that goes to the other side. I heard of a man travelling in a train who was finding some fault with the Government. One man in the carriage said, "You voted for Macartney." He said, "No, I voted twice in Brisbane and once in Beenleigh, and voted for Ryan every time." I think it is only fair that names on the roll which are not entitled to be there should be taken off, and then everybody will have a fair show. I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Normanby respecting the delays in the Titles Office. Considerable changes have taken place in the department lately, with the result that the delays have very much increased. It takes about a month now to get a title that could be got formerly in a week at most, and sometimes in a few days. It is well known that a man who requires to make a search could do so on paying a fee, but now the Titles Office make searches themselves, and very often the search is based on erroneous calculations, and a fee is charged all the same. This seems to be characteristic of the public service, which is getting back into a state of inefficiency instead of making progress. The complaint made by the hon. member is one that the Minister should give serious consideration to.

Mr. Macartney.]

HON. J. MULLAN (*Flinders*): A few matters have been mentioned that I ought to reply to before the vote goes through, and I shall deal with them in the order in which they were submitted. The retirement of certain returning officers was referred to by the member for Oxley and by another hon. member. I have made inquiries and find that no man was irregularly or wrongly retired. There is justification for every retirement that was made. They were due to old age, death, transfer, and other reasons which, perhaps, it would not be in the interests of returning officers to state. Now, I would like to refer to the question of electoral inequality. This matter has been referred to by half a dozen members on the Opposition side, and one member was particularly unfortunate in his reference to it, in that he picked four mining electorates for comment. We all know that mining electorates, more than any other, are subject to fluctuations, and although they are below the quota to-day something might arise that they will be above the quota in a very short time, and we cannot continually be changing the quota to suit the occasion. The hon. member referred also to one vote one value. Now, suppose you divide the seventy-two electorates into seventy-two equal parts numerically, do you mean to say that 1,000 votes in the far West or the far North would have the same value as 1,000 votes in Brisbane? They would not. My experience is the other way about. Anyhow, fancy the hon. member speaking of inequality, when we have the standing disgrace of the Senate, where there is one Labour member to thirty-five Liberals!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Shame!

HON. J. MULLAN: Now, one member said the other evening, and it was repeated by the hon. member for Toowoong this afternoon, that there were 70,000 to 100,000 electors on the rolls to-day that should not be on. The hon. member for Oxley stated that 89,000 people had been enrolled between 1915 and 1918. I want to tell the hon. member for Oxley that he is out only 50,000. (Hear, hear!) He wanted to know how the difference between the 1915 and the 1918 rolls arose. In the first place, soldiers' names, including those soldiers under twenty-one years of age whose names were put on the rolls, together with some duplications that were subsequently justified, represented 22,000 votes, reducing the hon. member for Oxley's 89,000 to 67,000. The Commonwealth electoral roll in 1915 showed 363,298 voters on the roll. The State rolls for the same year showed 335,195 voters. As a matter of fact, the State enrolments in that year was 23,000 less than the Commonwealth. In 1915 to 1918 the Commonwealth roll was increased by 26,000 votes. If you add that 26,000 votes to the 28,000 votes already accounted for it will explain away 54,000 of the 89,000 votes referred to by the hon. member for Oxley. The other 13,000 to make up the 67,000 votes is accounted for by the Chief Electoral Officer stating that the Commonwealth system is to immediately strike a man's name off the roll when he leaves the district, whereas the State system is to leave that man's name on the roll until his name appears on another roll. I have now shown that the hon. member for Oxley was only out over 50,000 in his calculations, and these figures can be verified by referring to the electoral rolls.

MR. CARTER: There is no system so perfect as the Queensland system.

[*Hon. J. Mullan.*]

HON. J. MULLAN: The next matter to which reference was made—

MR. FRY: What about motor-cars?

HON. J. MULLAN: Surely you got all you wanted about motor-cars the other night from the Minister for Works! I now want to say a word about those fees paid to barristers and solicitors, and the burning curiosity on the part of hon. members opposite to know in what way the money was expended. The hon. member for Toowoong went so far as to say—

"I do not know of any time in the history of the Administration of Queensland in which fees have been so freely drawn."

And I do not know of any Administration in the history of Queensland except the Labour party where legislation has been so viciously attacked by the other side. We know—and the hon. member who has made this attack knows—that a definite policy has been adopted by the Opposition to fight the legislation of this party and to try and alter the verdict of this party and the verdict of the country by appealing to the courts.

MR. MACARTNEY: You know the Opposition has nothing to do with it.

HON. J. MULLAN: I know the Opposition is part and parcel of it. Can the hon. member dissociate himself from the movement in the country to attack and to fight Labour legislation? Why, it was only the other day in this House that I pointed to a plot created—

MR. MACARTNEY: You read a stolen document that had nothing to do with it.

HON. J. MULLAN: I can assure the hon. member that the document was not stolen, because we have any number of friends who have access to the star chamber of our friends opposite.

MR. MACARTNEY: I should say so.

HON. J. MULLAN: And they bring us all the documents we require. Again, we have the famous document: "My dear Macartney," (Government laughter.) Did we steal that?

MR. MACARTNEY: Yes.

HON. J. MULLAN: As a matter of fact, that document was carelessly dropped on the street by the hon. member himself, and he knows it.

MR. MACARTNEY: It was not; it was stolen—

HON. J. MULLAN: It was not stolen. We know the history of it.

MR. MACARTNEY: And used by thieves. I congratulate you on the company you keep.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: How did you get home that night? (Laughter.)

HON. J. MULLAN: If the hon. member is as pleased with his company as I am with mine, then we are mutually satisfied. The hon. member disowned any connection with the policy of fighting Labour legislation. Will he disown this as part of a policy of this great party formed last year to fight Labour? Here is one of the planks of the platform—

"(1) Testing the legality of any Act, proclamation, regulation, or order of the Federal or Queensland Parliament, or of any rule or by-law of any corporation in either case of common application."

What does that mean?

MR. MACARTNEY: What is that?

HON. J. MULLAN: That is the platform of the Employers' Federation.

MR. MACARTNEY: What has this party to do with it? (Government laughter.)

HON. J. MULLAN: If the hon. member thinks that the electors of Queensland are so simple as to dissociate himself or his party from the Employers' Federation, well, he is simpler than I take him for.

MR. MACARTNEY: I have never been a member of an employers' federation in my life.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. member knows quite well that they support his party.

MR. MACARTNEY: They support the party with common sense.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister knows his statement is absolutely incorrect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. member knows quite well—and nobody knows it better than he—that no Government in Queensland has ever had its legislation so consistently challenged as our legislation has been challenged in the courts of the land by the Opposition and by people who support them.

MR. MACARTNEY: On your own seeking.

HON. J. MULLAN: No, because in nearly every case the courts of the land have upheld us. The hon. member for Murilla referred to the Mooraberrie case. Did not the courts of the land support us there?

MR. MORGAN: No.

HON. J. MULLAN: The courts of the land said we did right. Would the hon. member have us do wrong in order to evade legal responsibility? That is the logic of the hon. member's argument. We have carried out the policy of the Labour party. Take the State Insurance Office. If the supporters of hon. members opposite had had their way we would not have had in existence the most successful insurance office that we have to-day. And it would be impossible for the Workers' Compensation Act to be administered in the generous way in which it is administered to-day if we did not have a monopoly. We all know that, and if hon. members opposite had had their way we would not have had that monopoly; and then when we beat them in this House, they followed us outside, and took us from court to court, and took us to the highest court in the land. No wonder we had high legal expenses. They have been forced on us. The hon. member can laugh, but the action of his party—

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I must request hon. members to cease making disorderly interjections while the Minister is replying.

HON. J. MULLAN: By the action of this party in standing to its legislation, and in going into the courts and defending its legislation, we have saved the State of Queensland millions of pounds. (Opposition laughter.) Yes, and I will show you. Take the "Eastern" case. £60,000 was the claim against the Government, and that was saved to Queensland. Then take the action of the insurance companies in connection with workers' compensation. Imagine the

hundreds of thousands of pounds we have saved the workers of Queensland by giving them the benefits which they have received, and which they could not otherwise have obtained. Then take the meat case or the Mooraberrie case, or whatever you like to call it. It is estimated that had we lost that case the claims upon us would have amounted to £3,000,000.

MR. ELPHINSTONE: Through your own wrongdoing.

HON. J. MULLAN: We were not doing wrong, because the courts of the land agreed with us.

MR. MACARTNEY: Is that a Queensland case?

HON. J. MULLAN: They went into the courts and fought the Government, and they attacked us for having done what we did. The Imperial Government stood behind us in that matter.

MR. MACARTNEY: You have never disclosed the fees in that case.

HON. J. MULLAN: They will be disclosed in due course. Then take the Brisbane Gas Company. We had litigation with them in defence of the country's interests, and, as a matter of fact, "the fly in the ointment" with the hon. member is that Mr. Ryan was able to so successfully represent his party and to successfully fight and defeat all opposition in the court.

MR. ELPHINSTONE: Why didn't you keep him?

MR. MACARTNEY: He filled his pockets well, anyhow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

HON. J. MULLAN: Those are petty observations coming from a member of the legal profession. He might be honest enough to recognise the merits of the late Attorney-General as a barrister, more particularly as he himself was concerned in many of the cases which Mr. Ryan won. Although Mr. Ryan last year received £4,000 odd in fees, the fees recovered in connection with the cases which he conducted amounted to £5,300, or £1,300 more than he was paid.

MR. MACARTNEY: That does not sound very honest.

HON. J. MULLAN: Of course, it is not satisfactory to the hon. member. The Government has been quite justified in its policy of defending its administration and its legislation; and in defending its administration and legislation it had to bring to its aid some of the best legal talent in the country, and now hon. members opposite take exception to us doing that.

MR. MACARTNEY: Not at all.

HON. J. MULLAN: That is their obvious objection, and I know of no other reason for objecting to the fees paid to solicitors and barristers.

MR. MACARTNEY: We are objecting to you making use of office to fill your pockets.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. member has been in this House for a long time, and he must admit that he, while a member of a very reputable firm of solicitors in this city—

MR. MACARTNEY: I am not.

Hon. J. Mullan.]

HON. J. MULLAN: You were until recently, and during that period I never heard, until recently, the hon. member disassociate himself with the firm when he was a member of this Parliament or a Minister of the Crown, nor did he object to earn fees as a solicitor and take his fees as a member of Parliament.

MR. MACARTNEY: As a member of Parliament, I have never drawn a shilling from the Government.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. member misunderstands my point. The Government may not have thought fit to engage him.

MR. MACARTNEY: I did not, and would not.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. member had no objection to following his private practice as a solicitor and raking in thousands a year while he at the same time carried on the business of the Government. Mr. Ryan, as a barrister, charged for work performed in his own profession, while at the same time he led the Government.

MR. MACARTNEY: He marked and paid his own fees.

HON. J. MULLAN: I am informed that Mr. Ryan received no fees that were not taxed, and the hon. member ought to know that. All Mr. Ryan's fees have been taxed by a reputable officer of the Crown. (Interruption.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Toowong to cease making disorderly interjections while the Minister is speaking.

MR. MACARTNEY: I ask the Hon. Minister not to be personal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

HON. J. MULLAN: I have no desire to be personal, but if the hon. member persistently interjects, he must have answers to his interjections.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. gentleman to pay less attention to interjections.

HON. J. MULLAN: I think I have said sufficient on that point to justify the policy of the Government in defending its administration and legislation, even though it meant the spending of thousands of pounds and going into the courts if necessary.

MR. MACARTNEY: You did not tell us whether that £1,530 was yet drawn.

HON. J. MULLAN: For the information of the hon. member, I think it has been drawn. The hon. member for Aubigny, the hon. member for Bulimba, the hon. member for Pittsworth, and the hon. member for Murilla brought under my notice what they describe as the vicious practice of

[5 p.m.] gambling which they said had been encouraged by this Government. I do not think this Government has gone out of its way to encourage gambling any more than any other Government. I do not know why these gentlemen get these faddy ideas about objecting to art unions and that sort of thing. They object to art unions, drawings, and other gambling ventures. The hon. member for Murilla is interested in land. Why should selectors be permitted to draw for selections by lot? The hon. gentleman does not object to getting a selection by lot. Not one hon. gentleman

objects to a bit of gambling such as is condemned by the sanctimonious member for Bulimba, the respectable gambling on the stock exchange which results, perhaps, in the ruining of homes.

MR. KIRWAN: They do worse than that; they gamble in people's food.

HON. J. MULLAN: Yes, they gamble in foodstuffs. Not one of them last year objected to the Prime Minister offering to adopt the voluntary ballot system for recruits. They went on the platforms and supported it. It comes with particularly bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite—especially from the hon. member for Bulimba—to object to gambling by this Government, because I have here nearly a dozen applications for permission to gamble, such as by the "spinning jenny," "Get Rich Wallingford," and all those forms. I find that the treasurer of this body, whose name is inscribed on all letters received, is the Hon. W. H. Barnes.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It had nothing whatever to do with me.

HON. J. MULLAN: He may protest as much as he likes. As a matter of fact, until the war started, a policy of simple forms of gambling had been adopted by all parties. When the war broke out, the organisation of which the hon. gentleman was and is the treasurer wrote to this Government again and again, and asked for permission to run special schemes such as "Get Rich Wallingford," "spinning jenny," and other forms of gambling. Not only did they do that, but on one occasion they wrote asking that the Government give them a monopoly of it. (Loud Government laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: Not me. I challenge you to read a letter from me. You have not got one.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman knows I have here letters on which his name is inscribed as the treasurer. Does the hon. gentleman wish to disown the association with which he is connected?

HON. W. H. BARNES: You cannot read any letter from me.

HON. J. MULLAN: Did not the hon. gentleman condone this wrong? Did the hon. gentleman go into the association and condemn this practice? Did he come here and protest against the Government granting his own organisation those permits?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I voted against it every time.

HON. J. MULLAN: The fact remains that I have letter after letter from the various patriotic branches, and from the head body of which the hon. gentleman is the treasurer, asking permission to gamble. Time after time the Government, in a spirit of generosity, in order to allow the hon. gentleman (the treasurer) to rake in the shakels, gave them this privilege. Then he comes into the House and tries to stab the Government in the back by condemning the actions which he condoned. I have here a letter from the Queensland Band Association applying for permission to gamble, and I notice on it the name of E. H. Macartney, M.L.A. Why does he associate himself with this body and condone their action in applying to this Government for a permit, and then come along to this House and condemn the action of the Government? That is hardly straightforward.

[Hon. J. Mullan.]

ward. I could connect nearly every member on the opposite side with an application for permission to gamble. In addition to the dozen I have mentioned, I have another letter from the hon. member for Bulimba.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Not from me. I deny that.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman's name is on it as honorary treasurer.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Tell me who signed it.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman allowed them to use his name, and now he abuses the privilege by coming in here and attacking the Government. Then we have the hon. member for Oxley. This gentleman on several occasions has lectured the Government on the vicious practice of gambling. I find the hon. gentleman asked for a permit to run gambling devices on France's Day. He also sought permission for a returned soldier for the Exhibition grounds. How can the hon. gentleman blow hot and cold—come along one day and ask permission from the Government to run one of these gambling machines, and then come along on the following day and attack the Government for granting the permit? I find the hon. member for Burnett asked for permission to run a spinning jenny. Then we have the hon. member for Murilla coming along and asking for permission to gamble. (Government laughter.)

MR. MORGAN: Tell us when and where.

HON. J. MULLAN: Here is a letter which our department sent to the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: Read the application. It is absolutely unfair to mention my name if you do not.

At ten minutes past 5 o'clock p.m.,

MR. KIRWAN, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman need not think he can sneak out of his responsibilities by going in the back door of the Justice Department and asking for a permit, not having the courage to put his name to it.

MR. MORGAN: Read it out. I am not ashamed of anything I do.

HON. J. MULLAN: This letter is addressed to "Godfrey Morgan, Esq., M.L.A.," and says—

"With reference to your call at this office on the 13th instant relative to an application made by the Dawson Jockey Club, Taroom, for permission to conduct raffles and side-shows on 12th and 13th September next, I desire to inform you that a list of side-shows has now been submitted by the secretary of the Dawson Jockey Club.

"I enclose herewith copy of the Under Secretary's letter forwarded to Mr. Gatehouse to-day."

MR. MORGAN: Is a side-show a gambling device?

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman asked for raffles, too. There is no good his trying to back out of it. Let him stand up to it.

MR. MORGAN: There is no backing out.

HON. J. MULLAN: It is no good the hon. gentleman coming into this House and

attacking the Government for something he has asked the Government to do. That is not honest or honourable.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That raffle was in aid of the hospital. (Government laughter.)

HON. J. MULLAN: Now the hon. gentleman climbs down and says it was for a laudable purpose. We have been most generous to the Opposition in having granted all their reasonable requests in this regard. We have not discriminated between Opposition members and Government members, but have treated them all alike when they have come along with a reasonable proposition. Then we have the member for Nundah coming along and asking the Government to give permission to run a guessing competition as to the weight of a fat pig. (Government laughter.)

MR. MORGAN: Is that gambling?

HON. J. MULLAN: Of course, it is gambling. The hon. gentleman must have thought it was gambling. Had he not thought so, he would not have asked the Justice Department for a permit.

MR. MORGAN: We have to get a permit, unfortunately.

HON. J. MULLAN: Now, I am reluctantly compelled to refer to one or two more applications coming from a gentleman who, for the last two or three months, has been incessantly nagging at the Government and asking question after question in relation to gambling. That is the hon. member for East Toowoomba.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

HON. J. MULLAN: I regret to have to refer to the matter, but the hon. gentleman has forced it upon me by his incessant attacks upon the Government. I find that the hon. member for East Toowoomba applied to this Government for permission to dispose, by gambling, of a house and land—one of the most vicious forms. In fact, that is one of the forms we could not, and did not, permit.

MR. CARTER: A scandalous thing.

HON. J. MULLAN: Then I find the hon. gentleman asking for permission to hold a raffle for a pug dog in connection with a school. The tickets were sold to little kiddies. This is the hon. gentleman who condemned the Labour party for allowing kiddies to go down to the Liberty Fair—a thing they never did. I think I have said sufficient on gambling to show the downright hypocrisy of the hon. members opposite making such a cry—a political cry—about it. It is no use hon. gentlemen attacking the Government for gambling one day and next day asking for permits for gambling. They should stand on their grounds, and say, "We condemn gambling, and we will ask for no more permits." I claim that this Government has never exceeded in any way what it regards as the proper limits.

HON. W. H. BARNES interjected.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman, as a matter of fact, is not opposed to gambling. It is the Liberty Fair he is opposed to, because it is run by the Labour party. If it were run by some of those people with whom he is associated, we would hear nothing about it. But they can go to the corporations and other big vested interests and get their money for political work,

Hon. J. Mullan.]

while they object to the Labour party getting a few pence by this method, which is perfectly honest and open; and if the people don't want it, they don't gamble. I cannot understand a man who objects to a person taking a shilling in a raffle, at the same time going down and gambling or investing £1,000 on the stock exchange, which is a worse form of gambling. I hope, therefore, that we will hear very little more from gentlemen on the other side about gambling.

There are a few other matters I would like to refer to. The hon. member for Toowong referred to the fact that an increase of £100 was being paid to the Under Secretary for Justice. I would remind him that the responsibilities of this office have enormously increased—in fact, doubled—during the last few years. This has been caused by the establishment of the Curator's Office, the Advertising Branch, State Government Insurance utility, and the bringing under our administration of the Electoral Department. These have amply justified the action of the Government in increasing that gentleman's salary. The hon. gentleman also objected to an increase of £100 to the Crown Solicitor. As a matter of fact, the Crown Solicitor is being paid nothing like the salary that is paid for the same office in the other States.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He is the lowest-paid Crown Solicitor in the Commonwealth.

HON. J. MULLAN: As my hon. friend interjects, he is the lowest-paid Crown Solicitor in the Commonwealth, and we consider he richly earned the increase which we gave him. The Crown Solicitor in Victoria receives £1,600 a year.

MR. MORGAN: There is six times the population there.

HON. J. MULLAN: That would not alter the importance of an opinion which he had to give. The decision given by the Crown Solicitor in Victoria may involve no more than the decision of the Crown Solicitor here. So there is nothing in that argument. In nearly every other State the salary of the Crown Solicitor is £300, £400, and £500 more than the salary we are paying to our Crown Solicitor.

The hon. member for Bulimba asked a question with regard to certain officers of our department going South. Whatever officers of our department went South recently, went on Queensland Government business and were paid by the Queensland Government for their work.

MR. GRAY: You will all be going South next election.

HON. J. MULLAN: I hope the hon. gentleman goes North. With regard to the complaint made by the member for Normanby, and which was also referred to by the member for Toowong, regarding delays in the Titles Office, all I have to say is that, so far, I have had no complaints brought under my notice. But if there is one thing more than another which I desire to see in all departments, it is that the work shall be done most expeditiously and efficiently, and if the hon. gentleman—or any other hon. member—will bring under my notice any case of delay in any subdepartment, I will have it immediately inquired into. This particular case will have my immediate attention.

I think I have replied to everything hon. members have referred to. If there is any-

[Hon. J. Mullan.]

thing which I have inadvertently overlooked I shall be glad to answer it at a later stage.

MR. MORGAN: Before this vote goes through I would like to reply to the remarks made by the Minister in respect to gambling. I wish to state that regarding the ordinary side-shows which the Minister puts upon the same par as gambling—

HON. J. MULLAN: You asked for a permit for raffles.

MR. MORGAN: I want the Minister to go further and ask the officer in charge whom I interviewed with a view to getting permission to run the side-shows and a raffle, which I did in response to a letter, if I did not distinctly tell him that, if it was against the law in any shape or form, I did not want him to issue the permits on my recommendation. The Minister simply and purely made use of the letter sent to me by the officials of the department.

HON. J. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman called at the office.

MR. MORGAN: If the Minister consults the officer of the department, if he is truthful he must bear out the fact that I did not desire that the law should be broken in any shape or form.

HON. J. MULLAN: None of the other gentlemen did either.

MR. MORGAN: But what do we find? At the last Taroom show there were two or three great big healthy men, who were known to be connected with gambling devices generally, conducting the different gambling devices which are prohibited according to law. There were five or six other men generally known as spiclers—who travel round with spinning jennies, "under and over 7," and numerous other gambling devices—whom the police went along to and stopped from gambling. One of the men produced a permit signed by the Commissioner of Police.

HON. J. MULLAN: Are you sure it was signed by the Commissioner?

MR. MORGAN: The sergeant at Taroom will bear me out. I asked him specially to look at that permit, and it was signed by the Commissioner. I asked him to go back and make sure because I did not think the Commissioner would issue a permit of that description. He went back and asked the men to produce the permit again, which they did, and the sergeant said, "Yes, it is signed by the Commissioner of Police."

HON. J. MULLAN: What game was being played?

MR. MORGAN: The game known as "Yankee Sweat" was being played.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The Commissioner had no authority to issue that permit.

MR. MORGAN: I did not think he had, and I want the matter gone further into. Not only did they play on the racecourse and playground, but they also played at night in front of the hotel in the main street. This happened last May. The rest of the spiclers who were debarred from playing went to the policeman and asked why was this man allowed to play not only on the showground but in the main streets, and the police were powerless because the man had a permit.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I will have that matter looked into. Why didn't you mention it on the Police Estimates?

Mr. MORGAN: This permit was inspected two or three times.

The HOME SECRETARY: What was the game?

Mr. MORGAN: It was that game where they have a wheel in a number of colours. You throw the dart, and if it goes on to the colours—

Hon. J. MULLAN: Is it a stationary wheel?

Mr. MORGAN: The wheel would be moving. There are a number of colours, and you put the money on the colour you are backing. The same thing applies with regard to numbers from one to six. You put your money on a number. That game was in progress in Taroom, and the police tried to prevent it, but were debarred from doing so.

Mr. RIORDAN: Who debarred them?

Mr. MORGAN: The permit which this individual had debarred them. Sergeant Cameron saw the permit, which was signed by the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. RIORDAN: Why didn't Sergeant Cameron, if he knew his duty, test that? It is an illegal game, and Sergeant Cameron deserves sacking.

Mr. MORGAN: I want the Minister to go into it. You talk about an illegal game—

Mr. RIORDAN: It is an illegal game and you know it, and so does Sergeant Cameron.

Mr. MORGAN: Can my hon. friends tell me if "under and over seven" is an illegal game?

Mr. RIORDAN: It all depends who is playing it.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is illegal if he is not given a permit.

Mr. MORGAN: This game was illegal in Taroom, but if the men were given a permit the police could not interfere. "Under and over seven" and numerous other games have been played in Albert Square and the Domain in Brisbane—all these games which are illegal according to the Act—and the very moment the Home Secretary issues a permit they become legal.

Mr. RIORDAN: Why do you object when these things have been taking place for many years? Your Government never stopped it.

Mr. MORGAN: It is no use talking about our Government. Our Government issued permits for raffles or art unions in aid of charitable institutions, but never allowed gambling to be played in the streets in the presence of women and children. In Toowoomba, and every other place where the Liberty Fair has been conducted, you see a big table or platform and a woman with a baby in one arm putting a shilling on one of the numbers from one to six. You see people in many cases putting as much as £1 on these games. I have seen as much as £5 staked by one man in Market Square. But it is not the amount that matters. One shilling is just as great an offence from that point of view as £5 would be. The games were illegal. Because I asked for a permit for a side show or a horse to be raffled in aid of a hospital or some other charitable institution, the Minister tried to point out that that was gambling. With regard to guessing the weight of a beast, everybody knows that that is absolutely a game of skill. I would take the hon. member and let him guess the weight of a fat bullock, and I venture to say he would not come within 2 cwt.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Nonsense! A child might guess the correct weight.

Mr. CARTER: I have known good cattle men to guess the weight of a beast and a novice to win.

Mr. MORGAN: That was owing to the fact that he used the brains of a good judge.

Mr. RIORDAN: He did not use any brains at all.

Mr. MORGAN: Still, it is a recognised fact that a guessing competition is a game of skill and not chance, and I doubt whether it would be necessary to get a permit for that.

Mr. WEIR: If it is not illegal, why did you get a permit?

Mr. MORGAN: Because the persons who wanted to conduct the raffle wanted to be on the right side. They did not want to be prosecuted. In respect to these matters the Minister introduced a lot of trivial stuff.

When it came to real gambling, [5.30 p.m.] you could not get in any gambling den in Australia more gambling devices than those played by the different people who are running Liberty Fair. It is almost impossible in many of these gambling devices for a man to win. I am not saying it is impossible for an individual to win, but it is an impossibility for the runner of the game to lose. The man who is running the game always wins. It is no use the Minister trying to hide the fact by reading a few letters, or having interviews with members in connection with the different departments. It will do him no good as far as I am concerned. If I go to the Justice Department again I will always have everything in black and white, but I defy the official in connection with the matter that I was connected with, to state that I applied for a permit for something that was illegal.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Minister, when speaking this afternoon, made reference to my association with the Queensland Patriotic Fund, and whilst he was on his feet I challenged him, and I challenge him now, to produce any letter signed by me asking to be allowed to run anything contrary to the law for gambling. I again challenge the hon. member, and I say distinctly that he cannot produce any document with my name on it making a request for any gambling function.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I have your name here.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: When I was Treasurer of this State, a patriotic fund was started; and Sir Robert Philp asked me if I would act as treasurer of the fund. I agreed to do so, but I have never at any time been a party to making an application personally for any gambling in connection with that fund. When an application for gambling was suggested at any meeting my vote was always against it, and I challenge the Hon. the Minister to say differently. The Minister cannot, at any particular time, point to my ever having asked for any permission to gamble in connection with the Queensland Patriotic Fund, and yet he comes here in his sneaking way and tries to associate my name with gambling, when he knows it is absolutely false.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Why do these people use your name?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: If the Minister will only cast his eye down that paper he will see the names of several men there, besides my own, and I think the Minister has descended to what would be called the

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

lowest backdoor, gutter business that any man could descend to.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The hon. member is getting angry, now.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: No, I am not getting angry, but I will say again that I challenge the Minister to say that I was ever connected with any permit for gambling in connection with the Queensland Patriotic Fund while I was treasurer.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask hon. members to stop these disorderly interjections. The hon. member has only five minutes.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I challenge the Minister to produce any document bearing my name in connection with gambling of the Queensland Patriotic Fund.

Mr. RIORDAN: Your name appears on every application that has been received. You condoned the offence.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Why does not the Minister produce the written application?

Hon. J. MULLAN: Will the hon. member deny that he was treasurer of that fund?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I want to say over and over and over again that I was treasurer of that patriotic fund—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already asked hon. members to desist from making these repeated interjections, and I hope they will obey my call.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I can only say again that the Minister, for political purposes, has laid charges against me which he knows are untrue, and yet he continues them, which is just in keeping with his usual tactics.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): The Chairman told the House that the hon. member for Bulimba had only five minutes to debate. I would also like to have five minutes on this matter. The name of the hon. member for Bulimba appears on the application for gambling permits, but he puts me in mind of two men who were garrotting a man, one of whom had knocked his man down and was going through his pockets, while the other one was holding his legs. A policeman arrived on the scene, and was about to arrest the two men, when the man holding the legs said, "Don't arrest me, I am only holding his legs. I am not stealing from him." The hon. member is in the same position. If his conscience is as clear as he would lead this House to believe, he would dissociate himself with anything of that kind altogether. The hon. member gambles in the foodstuffs for children, and I was going to say that he gambled in cement, but it is the hon. member for Oxley who is a giant gambler in that respect. The hon. member for Carnarvon is also a giant gambler, and it is gamblers like him who make it necessary for workers to pay big prices for their food.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You gamble in misleading the workers.

Mr. WEIR: I say that the hon. members would gamble in the hides of the youngsters if they could. I say it is absurd. If they had any shame in them they would not talk or complain about the police issuing permits. I am hoping to see the day when the police, as the guardians of the interests of the people, will deal stringently with all

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

forms of gambling, particularly food gambling, which is the cause of our present society.

Ned Kelly was a far more honourable man than the existing food gamblers, as he was "sport" enough to risk clashing with the police, whereas the present-day food gamblers have seen to it that the police protect their interests and assist in the process of extorting blood money from the workers of to-day through the Petty Debts Courts.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): I would like to ask the Minister if, prior to his acceptance of office, his department issued an Order in Council stating that the Government had decided that in future none of these permits were to be issued, alleging as a reason that now the war is over we should get down to the ordinary routine of business, and no applications for gambling should be granted. He would like to relate an incident that happened in his own electorate.

At forty minutes past 5 o'clock p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. ROBERTS: I inquired as to an application for a permit for a game of hoop-la to be played at a function in aid of the Brodribb Home, in Toowoomba, and I got a reply from the department refusing the application on the grounds that it was a game of chance. Is there any honesty in the Minister this afternoon? What has changed him since the election, as I notice that he is now issuing permits broadcast. Will he deny that within the last few months four men were granted permits to run hoop-las and spinning wheels in Queensland? Will he also deny that these games were played under the eyes of the police at Stanthorpe? Will he also deny that these games were played at Crow's Nest last Monday week? What is the Minister doing? What is the Home Secretary doing when these things are going on right in front of the police? In the face of these things I want to know if there is any honesty in the man who sits as Minister for Justice in the excuses that he has hurled across the House this afternoon? It stands to the discredit of an hon. Minister of the Crown that these things are going on every day of the week. With regard to the matter of the little pug dog that was mentioned, I am not ashamed of having passed that application to the Minister for the time being. I remember the conversation I had with the Hon. T. J. Ryan respecting the permit for the art union for the house and land, and I am not ashamed of it, and I do not wish to dissociate myself from it.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Why do you condemn me?

Mr. ROBERTS: I do not condemn you. I condemn the method in which you allow permits. It has been laid down as a policy, not only by this Government, but by previous Governments, that no lottery should be allowed, and the reason can be quite understood. I did not want the hon. member, or the late Attorney-General, Mr. Ryan, to explain the reason to me, because I understood it. In reference to the permit for an art union of a house and land, I may explain that a certain number of working men in Toowoomba were prepared to stand by an unfortunate man who had been ill for two years, and had got into financial difficulty in connection with his house, which he was

buying on the term system. These men had financed him for some months, and it occurred to them that if they got permission to run this art union they would be able to give their friend his home free. They undertook to supervise the art union, and to guarantee the sale of so many tickets, and no more.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You should have known that that was against the law.

MR. ROBERTS: We knew it was against the law.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Still you asked for a permit?

MR. ROBERTS: I am only stating the object of the art union. Can you compare an art union of that kind with what we saw a few weeks ago down in the Domain? I challenge the Minister to deny that these permits have been issued within the last three or four weeks for these men to go through Queensland robbing the unwary and the unthinking, and for no ultimate gain, only political. It is a scandal to see the games that are being played, and to see how men are being rifled of their hard-earned wages.

MR. RIORDAN (Burke): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat would make any hon. member smile when he speaks of gambling. In 1907 the hon. member went to Rockhampton and gambled at the convention there with the Labour party's platform. He said any member who went back on the platform drawn up by that convention would be a rat, and the first man who ratted on the platform was the hon. member for East Toowoomba. That is gambling in one of its most vile forms—gambling against the people of Queensland. The hon. member got up and made a tirade against this Government, but the Minister clearly showed that the hon. member for East Toowoomba made application for a permit for gambling. He may call it side shows, he may call it "under and over seven," or he may call it "over and above seven"; if that is not gambling in the estimation of the hon. member, why was it necessary for him to make application to the Department of Justice for permission to conduct a sweep? The hon. member for Murilla said the Commissioner of Police had granted permits for gambling. I do not think the Commissioner of Police is that much of a fool as to go outside the Department of Justice and give gambling permits to any individual. I do not think for one moment that the present Commissioner of Police has any inclination towards the gambling section of the community, any more than I have. I do not stand for street gambling, but gambling has been going on so long as I can remember. Prior to 1915, the Labour party was not in power, and at that time poker machines were in vogue in lolly shops and in booze shops or hotels, which hon. members opposite are always crying out should be closed at 6 o'clock. Hon. members opposite never did anything to suppress the gambling devices that were in vogue during their term of office, and yet they come along to-day and accuse this Government of granting permits to gamble. It is a good thing that the Government has taken some control in this matter, because at one time it was not necessary to get a permit. In the far Northern parts of Queensland games of chance were played

which are not played to-day. I remember having to get out early in life to earn a crust, and in those little places in the North I have seen gambling carried on in its vilest form, and in front of children on their way home from school. I have seen a dice stuck up and boys shooting at it, to see the biggest number they could hit up. That is not permitted to-day, and when hon. members opposite come here and condemn gambling, it is only drivel on their part. When the hon. member for East Toowoomba makes application for a permit for gambling, which he knows is absolutely against the law, and then comes here and blames an official, I am of the opinion that that hon. member is prepared to prostitute his conscience. The hon. member spoke about the Minister adopting a back door method, but I do not think it possible to get lower than the method adopted by the hon. member for East Toowoomba.

MR. GUNN: I do not pretend to know much about gambling, but if gambling is against the law it should be prohibited. It seems to me that some people can gamble through Liberty Fair or some other institution while other people are not allowed to do so.

MR. HARTLEY: You want to shut up the Roma Street Markets.

MR. GUNN: Life is a gamble from beginning to end, but when the dice is loaded, as it were, it is a hurtful undertaking. It is a vice, because you do not get a fair deal when you go in for "under and over seven" or "Yankee sweat," or any of the other devices carried on at Liberty Fairs. If they were fair, and you got good value for your money, I would not say anything. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the present Opposition applied for a permit to run a Liberty Fair, do you think they would get it? No fear. But the other side can run Liberty Fairs whenever they like. There are plenty of poor returned soldiers, and if they were to commence playing "under and over seven" in the streets they would be immediately put in gaol, but if you go across the street you can see the same game being played under a permit. I do not think that is right.

MR. HARTLEY: You can go to the Queensland Club and play poker whenever you like.

MR. GUNN: I suppose you go somewhere else and play poker. I do not believe in gambling, whether it is connected with the church, charitable institutions, or anything else. It is either right or wrong. It cannot be right for a charitable institution and wrong for somebody else, and I think the Government would be well advised if they put the whole system down altogether. They are not getting any kudos for sanctioning the running of Liberty Fairs as they are doing. Everybody knows that the profits from these Liberty Fairs are used to keep the funds of the Labour party up to what they require. Suppose the other side were to run Liberty Fairs to keep their funds replenished, what an outcry there would be from the Labour party. There would be a howl from one end of Queensland to the other. When I was a youngster, if a man wanted to dispose of a saddle, he used to have a raffle, and I do not know that it did a great deal of harm, but at the present time a raffle is illegal. A raffle was far less hurtful than playing "under and over seven" or "Yankee sweat." The hon.

Mr. Gunn.

member for Burke referred to the hon. member for East Toowoomba, and said that hon. member gambled when he left the Labour party, but I have yet to learn that you have to get a permit to leave the Labour party. We have had the example lately of one hon. member at any rate who was able to leave the Labour party without a permit.

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

Question put and passed.

ADVERTISING OFFICE.

HON. J. MULLAN: I beg to move—
"That £5,633 be granted for 'Advertising Office.'"

This represents an increase of £398. The salaries show a decrease of £2, a clerk at £150 being transferred and a new clerk appointed at a lower salary. Opportunity has been taken to increase the salaries of the manager and other officers. The vote for contingencies has also been increased by £400. This vote represents the advertising services for all departments of the public service, including railways.

(Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.)

MR. FRY: I notice that the manager has an increase of £50. Has any saving been made in this office since the appointment of the new manager? There are several kinds of advertising, and the class adopted depends to a great extent upon the man who controls the office. There may be advertising of an indifferent nature which, if indulged in, will not produce the results which good advertising produces. I consider that a good advertising man is one who, by telling the truth about the State, can attract desirable persons from other parts of the world to settle in our country, and to develop it. We can get any number of immigrants from various parts of the world, but as long as they settle in cities to compete against the already great number of unemployed, there is going to be trouble. With the opportunities we have, advertising should be directed towards the settlement and development of our primary and secondary industries. If we get men who are well skilled, we are going to develop the State in the right direction. If that is the result of the money which has been spent in advertising, it will have been well spent.

MR. GUNN: The advertising, I know, has been brought under a manager; and I dare say he is carrying out his duties to the best of his ability. But I think he must get instructions as to his advertising. There is the Tourist Bureau, for instance, which issues very excellent pamphlets. But I do not think it is necessary to advertise in the local papers. If it is, all the papers ought to get the advertisements. I called for a return some time ago, and this was one of the advertisements—

"Queensland wants millions of new settlers to develop her magnificent resources."

HON. J. MULLAN: That is under another vote altogether.

MR. GUNN: It is the advertising vote we are on, and this is an advertisement which was inserted. It must have been sanctioned by the advertising department. It goes on to say—

"Millions of acres of fertile land available for selection. Most liberal land laws in the Commonwealth. The wonderland of the southern hemisphere."

[Mr. Gunn.]

MR. KIRWAN: Hear, hear! So it is.

MR. GUNN: That is not the heading the Intelligence and Tourist Bureau put on it. That was put on by whoever inserted the advertisement. I do not mind the "Standard" having a fair share of advertising, but it gets £600 for inserting that advertisement or a similar one every other week. The "Courier," the "Mail," and the "Telegraph" do not get any. But the "Woodcutter"—whatever that is—gets some, and some other twopenny halfpenny papers whose names I cannot remember also get a bit. If it is for the sake of advertising the Tourist Bureau, surely it ought to be advertised as much in the "Courier" as in the "Woodcutter" or some other periodical.

HON. J. MULLAN: The advertisements to which the hon. gentleman refers do not come under this department at all. This department has been organised to advertise the Government departments, and deal with Government advertisements. It also, of course, includes the advertising of the State Insurance Office, Savings Bank, State enterprises, etc.; but it does not deal, so far, in advertising of the nature mentioned by the hon. gentleman. The member for Kurilpa wanted to know in what way this department had been an advantage to the State, or, in other words, if it could be shown that we had saved money. Taking the three years prior to the establishment of the Advertising Department, and comparing them with the three years since its establishment, we find the net saving has been £16,000. That is to say, over £5,000 odd per annum has been saved by the creation of this new department which does all the Government advertising.

MR. FRY: You are getting a cheap man at the price, at that rate.

MR. MACARTNEY: That is rather a tall statement for the Minister to make without giving the Committee something of the history of the advertising of the State. He tells us now that there are two Government advertising departments, and that this department saved £16,000. Unless we know what both departments have done, we cannot say whether there has been any saving at all. Apparently some functions are transferred to a special department which is not in the hon. gentleman's department. I do not know whether electoral registration comes under the hon. gentleman or not.

HON. J. MULLAN: Yes, it does.

MR. MACARTNEY: I think it is time we knew what advertising was meant for. Is it meant to subsidise newspapers, or to be really of advantage to the State in bringing under the notice of the public the possibilities of the State?

HON. J. MULLAN: Those figures show a saving of money on the methods we have adopted.

MR. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman makes a glib statement about a saving of money. We have to take the whole of the advertising before we can get at the net result. It is no use the hon. gentleman making a statement of that sort, because anybody who knows what has been going on in Queensland for the last three or four years, and has been watching the advertisements appearing in certain papers from day to day, must come to the conclusion that a great deal more money is being spent in advertising now than was spent in days gone by.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Those figures prove otherwise.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am sorry to say that we have to come to the conclusion that not only is it advertising in the nature of political propaganda but in the nature of a subsidy to newspapers. The other evening I asked the hon. gentleman a question—and he did not respond—as to what is the justification for what we understood to be an advertisement which appeared in the "Standard," running into two columns. He disclaimed any knowledge of it. He said he would have inquiries made, but he has not answered the question yet.

Hon. J. MULLAN: That kind of advertising does not concern this department.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is just like the motor-cars. When asked about the motor-cars the Ministers said, "Oh, we have nothing to do with the motor-cars." We are forced to ask each Minister for the information which we should be able to get from one department. Anybody would imagine that all the advertising of the Government came under this vote.

Mr. KIRWAN: Didn't you see the vote for the Chief Secretary's Office, and discuss it the other night? I am only correcting you, and you should not need correcting. You are old enough now to know the vote under the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The position I take up is, why the need for hiding expenditure? Under what various votes is money in connection with advertising going to be found? Is it hidden up in "incidentals" and "contingencies"? The way this Government have of dipping their hands into the public Treasury for the purposes of propaganda, and expenses in connection with propaganda and in connection with motor-cars, and hiding it under different votes, is not a system to be encouraged.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): We were told, when this Advertising Department was established, that it was going to undertake the duties and responsibilities of the whole advertising of the State. Since then, from year to year, we find that the Chief Secretary's determination to hold some power in that direction has been retained. We find that he has been determined, in the interest of party propaganda, to hold a power that is not his due since the establishment of this office. I understand, also, that in some particulars the Railway Department are loth to give over the whole power of advertising and create a monopoly in this direction, and, like the Chief Secretary's Office, are determined to do some in their own interests. We notice, also, that during the election campaign this office was used in a way which, instead of being in its interest, was to its detriment, and it assisted in the propaganda in connection with the Labour party. I do not think any Advertising Department was ever meant for party politics, and when we support the creation and carrying on of a branch department like the State advertising, we certainly do not want it to be responsible for the setting out of the whole advertising of the Labour party during a State election. I think members must admit that if we were to do such a thing there would be an outcry from one end of the year to the other, and this vote would never go through.

Mr. COLLINS: You made a statement; now prove it.

Mr. CORSER: It is for the Minister to disprove it. Hon. members know perfectly well that it was availed of during election time.

Mr. KIRWAN: Absolutely untrue.

Mr. RIORDAN: You show us where.

Mr. CORSER: It is for the Minister to disprove it, and it is not correct to use a department in that direction. We were told that the bulk of the advertising was to come under this heading, and from year to year we were encouraged in our belief that this was to come about. It seems extraordinary that for party propaganda purposes the Chief Secretary should be allowed to control certain funds. I say it is wrong, and if you cannot trust your own manager of this department with regard to some of the advertising that goes through the Chief Secretary's Department, it shows that some political work is going on, which does not look too good.

Mr. COLLINS: Low ideas can only emanate from low minds.

Mr. CORSER: We are here to say what we think, and if that "Standard" advertisement is not politically worked, I say I do not know what term it comes under. You have a manager of this branch, and if there are certain works the Chief Secretary has to do that you cannot trust him with, it does not look too good. You have secretaries and a staff there capable of carrying out all the duties and, as the Minister claims, saving us many thousands of pounds in a year. I cannot see why the work of advertising for the whole State could not be straightforward enough for this gentleman to see and know what is going on. From time to time we find it very hard to gather certain information with regard to advertising. It is claimed to be advertising, whereas it is party propaganda. Who compiles certain little pamphlets, and who edits them? We have great difficulty in getting this information, and it seems to be withheld, not only from us, but also from this Advertising Branch. I would like to see the whole thing under one heading. Give the Advertising Department its due and the control of the whole of the funds expended, and give to the staff the credit of its administration. I hope the Government will wipe out this Tourists' Bureau as a separate branch and amalgamate the whole thing in one. There may be some reason, but I do not see any good reason why that cannot come about. It has been an improvement as far as railway advertising goes, and I think it would be a good thing for the State if we had some responsible head. We would then know what is being done. At present, we do not know what is being done by the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: In connection with this particular vote, these words are used: "Advertising generally for all departments in the public service." The natural inference one would draw from these words is that the whole of the advertising which is done by the Government comes under this particular department. But we now discover that there is included in the Chief Secretary's vote, under the heading of "Miscellaneous," the sum of £5,000.

Hon. J. MULLAN: You cannot say it is covered up; it is there very clearly for you to see.

Mr. Elphinstone.]

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is evidently put there, just as that £40,000 for returned soldiers is put there, for the purpose of having a fund at the disposal of the Chief Secretary. We know quite well the use it is put to at the present time. It is surprising to me, seeing that we have selected a gentleman who is quite competent to control the affairs of the advertising of the State, that the whole of the advertising is not put under his jurisdiction. He is a man of experience, whom we thought sufficiently well of to send across to America last year to get all the latest information regarding advertising, and in the advertising and the methods which he has displayed he has shown quite clearly that he has benefited by that trip. But, possibly, he is a gentleman who would not be quite prepared to administer the sum of £5,000 if it had certain instructions surrounding it, and therefore, for the purpose of keeping it under the hand of the Minister himself, without exposing the uses to which it is to be put, it is scheduled under a different vote altogether. I must once more say, in my opinion, the general advertising—what we might call the business advertising of the State—shows a very considerable improvement; but, in my judgment, there is room for extension even yet. There are vast spaces on our railway stations and in our railway carriages that could yet be used for advertising. Those hon. members who have travelled round the world know that in other parts every corner which is available for advertising purposes is used to make revenue. I cannot see why the big spaces along the railway lines, on railway carriages, and on the hoardings at railway stations should not be better used for the purposes of revenue. In my judgment, the State, and the Railway Department in particular, can secure considerable revenue from that source. We know that advertising is the essence of business, and I do not see why the Railway Department should not take advantage of all the opportunities for advertising which it has at its disposal. I would ask the Minister to see that this section of advertising receives greater attention. We not only want to see what is spent on advertising, but we want to be able to point our finger to what we can get in revenue from advertising, and if the State is going to run enterprises in competition with other businesses the sooner it adopts business principles and gets the greatest possible benefit from advertising, the quicker will those enterprises become payable.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I just wish to say a word in reply to the remarks which have been passed on the vote. This Government is the only Government which has ever attempted to properly organise advertising. Until this Government came along, each department, in a questionable way, did its own advertising, and there was duplication and confusion everywhere.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: In the last contract the previous Government gave the papers for advertising the Savings Bank they spent £800.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: When did you discover that mare's nest?

Hon. J. MULLAN: A certain number of Under Secretaries met, and appointed one of their number as chairman. He was six months in office as chairman, and when another

[Mr. Elphinstone.

man succeeded him there was probably a change of policy. Since we came into power we have created a new department, and have saved £5,000 a year by the methods we have adopted. Some exception was taken to the fact that all the advertising does not come under one head, but in time there is no doubt that the whole of the advertising of the State will be under one department.

Question put and passed.

COURT OF INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I move that £3,000 be granted for "Court of Industrial Arbitration." The only increase in the vote is in respect of contingencies, which are increased by £100.

Question put and passed.

COURTS OF PETTY SESSIONS.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I move that £40,591 be granted for "Courts of Petty Sessions." It will be observed that salaries have increased by £1,431, and contingencies by £940, or a total of £2,371. As in other departments, well-merited increases have been granted pursuant to agreement and under the classification. The contingencies have been increased by £940, representing an amount of £390 to meet the increased cost of living under the recent general officers' agreement.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Are we to understand that the officers in this vote have their salaries fixed by an outside authority? Is it the result of Mr. Story's classification?

Hon. J. MULLAN: Mr. Story's classification.

Mr. MACARTNEY: All the officers?

Hon. J. MULLAN: They all come under the classification.

Mr. MACARTNEY: They may all come under the classification, but what I want to know is as to what part the Government had in connection with the increases. I notice in going through the list, that the salaries, taking into account the responsible work done, are remarkably small, and the increases seem to be confined to certain districts. For instance, I notice that Cairns and Innisfail receive consideration which is not extended to Bowen, and in other directions the same peculiarity appears. The salary of the police magistrate at Bowen, which was £340 last year, is £340 this year, while the salary of the police magistrate at Cairns, which was £350 last year, is £385 this year. It seems to me that, if as the Government say this is all the result of the classification, they are playing no part at all in fixing the salaries—the whole of the responsibility of the Government in connection with administration appears to be disappearing altogether. We are told that it is the result of the Arbitration Court, and also of Mr. Story's classification. The Government are carrying the nominal responsibility, and doing no work. The responsibility of the Ministry is being farmed out. What is the position of Ministers going to be if they leave everything to the Arbitration Court? They have practically passed over the finances to the Arbitration Court. Apparently they have no control over the finances of the State in regard to the increments to public servants. It is really hard to understand what the posi-

tion is. I do not know who the police magistrate at Bowen is.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The police magistrate at Bowen died last year, but there has been no change with regard to the emoluments.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It seems to me that the man who was getting £340 a year as police magistrate at one of the principal ports in Queensland was not getting enough.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: It seems to me that there is a distinction which ought not to exist. I, personally, take the view that a man should be paid for the work he does. I think that each office ought to have a certain value.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is exactly what Mr. Story was appointed to do.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What puzzles me is that Cairns, which is represented by the Home Secretary, is apparently of very much more importance than Bowen.

The HOME SECRETARY: Surely, you know the difference between the work at Cairns and Bowen. It is a different position altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Quite as great as the difference between Cairns and Brisbane.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Innisfail is not by any means so important as Cairns, yet the police magistrate at Innisfail, who got £340 last year, will get £370 this year. Will the hon. gentleman suggest that Bowen is a less responsible position than Innisfail?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know. I can assure you that I have nothing to do with classifying the positions.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman can defend himself when I make an accusation.

The HOME SECRETARY: The previous man got £450.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am not picking out Cairns particularly. I see that the police magistrate at Ipswich has been granted an increase from £480 to £490. Brisbane, of course, has a greater number of

[7.30 p.m.] police magistrates to do the work; but the point I wish to make is this: I find that the pay given to these men—who, in most cases, are old servants of the State and men who are doing responsible judicial work—is less than that given to many young men in the service, and less than youngsters are getting under industrial awards in some cases. I would like the hon. member to tell us the reason for these differences.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): In connection with the magistrates of various centres, I would like to say that the figures with regard to Bowen are somewhat misleading. The police magistrate of Bowen also does the work at Ayr and Proserpine—in fact, it embraces the whole of the electorate, which has over 7,000 electors. Mr. Short was the police magistrate at Bowen, but he died last year, and there is an acting police magistrate there at the present time, and I would like to know from the Minister whether the police magistrate at Innisfail, who is down for £370, takes in the whole of the Herbert electorate?

Mr. ROBERTS: I notice that the clerk of petty sessions in Toowoomba is getting an increase of £30. I think this is quite justified, but what I am most concerned about is that the assistant clerk, who is often called upon to act for the clerk himself, does not get any increase. I understand that this is the final vote, but I trust that the Minister will give this matter consideration.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: There is another matter I would like to refer to. There seems to be some anomalies as far as the clerk of petty sessions at Bowen is concerned. In 1918-19 the amount appropriated for the clerk during that year was £140, but I notice now that during this year it is £120.

Hon. J. MULLAN: He probably is a junior.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Hon. Minister tells us it may be a junior. I was wondering whether the policy of the Government is to cut down the lower paid men.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I notice also that in connection with Bundaberg, dealing with the clerks again, the number is the same for the years 1918-19, 1919-20, and yet the amount is reduced by £25. In other words, during 1918-19 the sum of £355 was provided for three clerks, but during 1919-20 only £330 was provided. I wonder what the explanation of the Minister is. The Government do such funny things that I was wondering what was the reason of these anomalies. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Toowoomba told us about Bowen. I understand that the police magistrate at Bowen died last year, for which I feel very sorry. The comparison I want to make is that in 1918-19 the appropriation for the police magistrate at Ingham was £320; for 1919-20, £350. I suppose the reason for that is that the Government think that Ingham is growing beyond Bowen, and the police magistrate at that place is worth £10 more than the police magistrate at Bowen. The Minister may be able to explain this matter, but I hope he will not explain it away the same as he has explained some other things away earlier in the afternoon. I notice that the hon. member for Bowen is very much disturbed. Another town which I would like to refer to is Mackay. I have been in Mackay, and it is a very fine town; the sooner the railway is completed to that place the better. However, that is not what I wish to refer to. There are these anomalies—Ingham, £350; Bowen, £340; Mackay, £300. I do not like making comparisons in this House, but I would like to know what order these towns come in, and I was wondering if these appropriations will appeal to the electors of the North. It is extraordinary that these anomalies should exist, and I appeal to the Minister to explain the reason for them.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I stated earlier in the afternoon that the Government took all the responsibility in connection with these matters. Mr. Story made a classification, and set out a maximum and a minimum. Those places mentioned by the hon. member are stated here. For instance, the following towns from £475 to £600:—Charters Towers, Cloncurry, Gympie, Maryborough, etc. Then you have in Division 2, £425 to £550, Bundaberg, Cairns, Herberton, Mackay, and Warwick. Division 3 includes Charleville,

Hon. J. Mullan.]

Gladstone, Hughenden, etc., and they run from £380 to £500. The division £340 to £450 covers other towns, including Ingham, Townsville, Bowen, and the places mentioned by the hon. member.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Where does Mackay come in?

Hon. J. MULLAN: Mackay comes in Division 2, carrying a salary of £450 to £550.

Mr. COLLINS: I have been wondering why the electorate of Herbert requires £720 per annum to be spent on two police magistrates, when there is a less number of persons on the electoral roll of the whole of the Herbert electorate than either Cairns or Bowen. Cairns has a police magistrate who receives £335, and Bowen a police magistrate who draws £340. I have been in all these places, and nobody can convince me that Ingham requires a police magistrate and Innisfail one also. There are no rowdy people round Ingham. I want to know why the police magistrate at Innisfail should receive more than the police magistrate at Ingham, who receives £350, and why the police magistrate at Ingham should receive more than the police magistrate at Bowen, because I am satisfied that they do less work, notwithstanding Mr. Story's classification. He is not the Alpha and Omega of this Government. When we see these discrepancies it is our duty to point them out. I notice that at Ingham they have an acting clerk of petty sessions at £230, whilst at Bowen the clerk of petty sessions receives £230. Of course, I see that at Bowen there is another clerk at £120. At Innisfail, however, I find there is a police magistrate at £370, an acting clerk of petty sessions at £170, and a clerk at £65.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: There is something wrong in the State of Denmark.

Mr. COLLINS: Of course, there is; and I want to know why it has been perpetrated.

Mr. FRY: I take it that the hon. member for Bowen has a just grievance. He has gone to no end of trouble to show that he has facts to support him, and I think the Minister should take notice of his representations.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I would point out to the hon. member that he cannot judge of the business transactions of any place from the mere number of persons on the roll. For instance, there is a clerk of petty sessions office at Ingham and another at Innisfail, but he may also remember that there is one at Ayr. He may also remember that most of the Bowen electorate is easily accessible, except the outlying districts, where there is not much population; whereas it is not so easy to get to Ingham, although the railway, when the Minister for Railways gets it in order, will certainly make things a bit easier. Then, again, it was not this Government who created these offices.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Blame the other fellow again.

Hon. J. MULLAN: We are not trying to throw the blame on members opposite. If the offices were not wanted, we would have wiped them out.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I do not know whether the hon. member for Bowen has all this time been telling fairy tales about this wonderful place. We have been hearing for

[Hon. J. Mullan.]

years past that it was almost the only place in Queensland—that it was going to be the biggest place in Queensland; yet now we are told by a responsible Minister that it does not count.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: As one who has resided for some time in the electorate of the hon. member for Bowen, I can support his contention. (Laughter.) This is no joke. I have come to think that hon. members opposite are not so travelled in Queensland as they would lead us to believe. There are three important centres in the Bowen electorate—Ayr, Proserpine, and Bowen itself; and as one who was intimately acquainted with the late police magistrate, I can vouch that his time was incessantly occupied with his duties. This is a district which, largely with the help of the hon. member for Bowen, is assuming a very important position, and it should be recognised as occupying a more important prospective position than the salary of the police magistrate would lead us to imagine. Another factor is that, judging by questions which the hon. member for Bowen has been asking, it would seem as if his electorate were becoming a harbour of refuge for all these yellow races and yellow perils, and therefore it is important that the police magistrate should be a man competent to deal with any situation that should arise.

Question put and passed.

DISTRICT COURTS.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I move—That £9,079 be granted for "District Courts." This amount represents an increase of £830, including an increase in salaries of £330, and in contingencies of £500. The increase of £330 in the salaries of the Crown prosecutors is explained by the resumption of duty of an officer after twelve months' leave. By the recent classification the registrar at Brisbane, Mr. Carvosso, receives an increase to £495, and the clerk also receives an increase. There is an increase of £500 in allowances to witnesses and jurors, a decrease of £50 in the item for bailiffs, for service of jury summonses, and an increase of £50 in the amount required for fees to acting District Court judges and Crown prosecutors.

Question put and passed.

ELECTORAL REGISTRATION.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I move—That £17,428 be granted for "Electoral Registration." This represents a decrease of £3,613 on last year's vote. There is a decrease of £113 for salaries, owing to the resignation of a clerk. Certain increases will be paid to officers in the branch under classification. For example, the salary of the Principal Electoral Officer will be £400, and that of senior clerk and deputy principal electoral officer £320. There is a decrease in the contingencies vote of £3,500.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I would like some explanation of the details of the sum set down for contingencies. The item reads—

"Postage, telegrams, railway fares and freights, printing, stationery, expenses of elections, including referendum on question of the abolition of the Legislative Council, and incidental expenses."

Last year the vote was £6,500, and this year it is £15,000. In another paragraph it is stated that £12,000 was asked for as an appropriation for 1918-1919 for "Expenses of referendum to be taken under the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908, on the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council, including expenses in connection with placing the issues thereon fully before the electors in the State and on active service abroad." Will the Minister tell us how it is that the amount asked for this year is £15,000, also what amount was spent from the £12,000 voted last year? I think the hon. gentleman ought to inform the Committee whether the whole of that £12,000 was spent, or, if not, how much of it was spent? I should like further to ask what are the intentions of the Government with regard to the Legislative Council? Last year it was apparently worth £12,000 to do a certain thing, but this year, according to the Estimates, it is worth £15,000 to get rid of the Legislative Council, or rather to seek to educate the people up to getting rid of the Council. I have a very vivid recollection of what happened on a previous occasion when an attempt was made to get rid of the Council. What do the Government propose to do now in connection with that matter? Last year we voted members £200 each to tell the people what they thought about the Council, but I do not know that very much eventuated in that particular direction. What do the Government propose to do with the vote now before the Committee? Do they propose that there shall be some propaganda work gone on with when the House adjourns, and the Minister for Railways is in full charge, and the Premier on his way to the old country, where he may possibly be knighted? Will any part of the sum now asked for be required for by-elections? I presume we will shortly be having a fight in the Herbert electorate, and the Minister ought to be able to tell us whether any portion of this sum will be used for the purpose of defraying the expenses of that election.

Mr. FRY: I think we can assume that there is not going to be an election this year, and that there is not going to be any propaganda work in connection with the abolition of the Upper House, so that it is desirable that we should be given some information regarding the item for postage, telegrams, railway fares, printing, stationery, and expenses of elections, including the referendum on the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council, and incidental expenses. I would also ask the Minister to inform the Committee what is the reason for the difference in the salaries paid to the electoral registrars at Brisbane, South Brisbane, and Toowoong. The electoral registrar at Brisbane receives £270 per annum, the registrar at South Brisbane £250, and the registrar at Toowoong £240. As far as I can see, the work done by those three gentlemen is very much the same.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The increases this year are not on the Estimates at all. That remark applies to all the Estimates. The old salaries are given, and the increases on those salaries are made according to Mr. Story's classification.

HON. J. MULLAN: In reply to the hon. member for Kurilpa, I may say that the electoral registrar for Brisbane now receives £300 per annum, the electoral registrar for

South Brisbane £275 per annum, and the electoral registrar for Toowoong £250 per annum.

Mr. FRY: The Minister might tell us what is the reason for having the three different amounts for officers who do the same work?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not the same work—similar work. We must have some seniority.

HON. J. MULLAN: The increases to those officers are given to them in the order of their seniority. The hon. member for Bulimba wants details of the expenditure of the item of £12,000 voted on last year's Estimates. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Government did not spend one penny of that £12,000, as there was no fight or contest last year.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Will it be expended this year, and added to the other amount?

HON. J. MULLAN: No; it is not included in the vote. The sum of £6,500 was voted last year for "postage, telegrams, railway freights and fares, printing, stationery,

[8 p.m.] expenses of elections, including referendum on question of the abolition of the Legislative Council, and incidental expenses." The item for this year is £15,000. I would point out that the £6,500 was not put down for the referendum on the abolition of the Legislative Council. It is down, as the hon. member can see, for contingencies, such as postages, telegrams, etc., in addition to referendum.

Mr. FRY: I asked the Minister the reason for the additional £8,500 this year as against last year. As I pointed out, there is no chance of an election this year, and, apparently, there is not likely to be a referendum on the abolition of the Legislative Council.

HON. J. MULLAN: If there is no contest, there will be no expense.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Then you are inflating the Estimates.

HON. J. MULLAN: No.

Mr. CORSER: I am sorry that the vote is not much larger in the expectation of an election and of a referendum on the abolition of the Legislative Council. I was afraid we would soon be faced with the possibility of a contest.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is your fear.

Mr. CORSER: No; that has been my hope, and I sincerely trust we might have the opportunity to see which course the Government prefer to take. The course open to them to take might not be permitted by a certain section. I would be very much encouraged if I thought that at the back of the minds of the Government this increase meant that they were anticipating action in that direction. If there is one thing more than another that strikes me in connection with this vote, it is the work of the Electoral Office in cleansing the rolls. We know that there are 70,000 more individuals on the rolls in Queensland than there are individuals in the State.

Mr. KIRWAN: Wrong.

Mr. CORSER: This information should be proved to be incorrect if it is not in accordance with fact. One can see in the Press right throughout Australia at the present time—the "Auckland Sun" and the Sydney

Mr. Corser.]

"Bulletin" are criticising the unfairness of the Queensland Government in regard to the Opposition in connection with roll-stuffing. The Electoral Office, unfortunately, is controlled by the bosses of the front bench. These men are shackled together to-day to do the bidding of the individuals who control them from above. They are driven as the convicts were some time ago to do just what their bosses tell them, and they have to keep a roll that is acceptable to their dictators. It is about time the people of Queensland understood the true position, and it is about time that the Electoral Office had an opportunity of cleansing the rolls and the Electoral Act so broadened as to make possible a fair appeal to the people when it comes about. If there was an appeal on the abolition of the Legislative Council, even with 70,000 extra on the roll, we know that the Government would not feel too safe. I sincerely hope that these chained individuals will sooner or later realise the position, and that they will give us a chance to get at them through the ballot-box. That is all we ask for.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We gave you a good chance at the last elections.

Mr. CORSER: The rolls were then inflated to the extent of 60,000, and yet the Government only got a majority of 25,000. To show the way this whole system has been organised, with 25,000 of a majority, they secured two seats for every one.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Ours is the cleanest roll in Australia to-day.

Mr. CORSER: Your estimation of a clean roll is one that allows your supporters to get on four rolls.

Hon. J. MULLAN: We can show a clean form for every supporter on the roll.

Mr. CORSER: A railway worker could go to five different electorates in six months, and if he does not put on his form which roll he was previously on, he can get on the roll for each electorate, and there is no power under the Electoral Act for anybody to take one individual off the roll. I suggest that one name should not be on two rolls at once.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Are you suggesting that they vote twice?

Mr. CORSER: I suggest that under your system of placing them on the roll they can vote four or five times. I know railway men in my own electorate were given a holiday on the Friday previous to the election to come to Brisbane; and in Brisbane there is an electoral booth for every electorate in the State.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I suppose all these individuals went from booth to booth and voted for each electorate?

Mr. CORSER: As long as a man is on the roll he can vote, and so long as he does not say for which electorate he was last enrolled he can get on another roll.

The HOME SECRETARY: You got an increased majority last time.

Mr. CORSER: I know; but that was the result of hard work and of the confidence of the electors.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: One of your members of Parliament for years had twelve votes and exercised them.

Mr. CORSER: Fancy the Minister knowing that and keeping it up his sleeve so

[Mr. Corser.

long! Hon. members opposite know that roll-stuffing is going on, and they know there are more electors on the rolls than there are individuals in the State.

Hon. J. MULLAN: That is not true.

Mr. CORSER: You cannot disprove it, and you won't give us an opportunity to prove the rotten state of the rolls. Compare our roll with the Federal electoral roll, and can anybody say that it is a clean roll?

The HOME SECRETARY: What is the difference in the enrolment? Give us the number.

Mr. CORSER: At the time of the last State election it was something like 32,000.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Rot!

The HOME SECRETARY: What is the difference now?

Mr. CORSER: There probably would be a greater difference now if the Government gave us an opportunity of having an election. During last State election we had a certain system instigated by the Government and supposed to be carried out by the electoral registrars for securing the proxy votes of soldiers. All last session I asked the cost of this system and the answer was put off from time to time.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Upper House threw out the Bill giving the soldiers a vote.

Mr. CORSER: The Upper House threw out no Bill. When the Electoral Act was going through the Principal Electoral Registrar was deprived of the opportunity of giving a vote to the soldiers. I moved an amendment to provide it. Just as the elections came on the Electoral Registrar was empowered to do certain things, and he issued proxy votes by cable, the cost of which was never made known to this House. We know that of some 40,000 votes which should have come in only about 10,000 were received, including those who had returned to Australia, showing how hard they tried to deprive the soldiers of their votes.

Mr. KIRWAN: Your crowd never gave the soldiers overseas a vote at the last Federal election.

Mr. CORSER: We voted to give the soldiers two votes. In 1915, when the hon. gentleman came into office, they took out the machinery which the Denham Government had placed in the Act providing for a vote.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No, the machinery is there yet.

Mr. CORSER: Amendments were moved to provide certain machinery, and hon. gentlemen would not agree to them, saying the war was over. Continually they were asked to make provision, and on every occasion they turned it down. A few weeks before an election they threatened they were going to do a lot of things, and they cabled away under a ridiculous system a form of electoral ballot-paper that could not be availed of by practically 25 per cent. of the soldiers. I would like to know from the Minister in charge what the cost of that system was. He would like to have some reason why they preferred it as against an honest system which was in vogue the previous year, when the Liberals secured the vote of a large percentage of the soldiers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you suggest there was some dishonest collusion between the Agent-General's Office and the Electoral Office here?

Mr. CORSER: I say hon. gentlemen will do anything for electoral purposes in their own interests.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Explain how it could be done.

Mr. CORSER: They had five years in which to receive the proxies of soldiers according to the old Act, and for the first three years they were in office they did nothing. They could have kept the Act where it was, held the proxies given in 1915, and had the whole of the machinery ready for an election at any time. They wiped out everything.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you know that your Holman Government in New South Wales did not give them a vote at all?

Mr. CORSER: It is not my Holman Government. Holman came from the front benches of the Labour party. These chained men opposite will be Holmans, or they will attempt to be, when they throw off their shackles. I hope the Minister is going to give us some information.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I would like to know what is being done at present in regard to the enrolment of electors—if the police have received any instructions to see that the rolls are up to date, or are likely to receive them. In most districts throughout the State a good few people are moving about, and it has been the practice with previous Governments at certain periods of the year to undertake the duty of putting people on the roll who are entitled to be there, and of taking off those who are not entitled to be on. The duty of every Government is to see that the rolls are kept up to date, and that those who are entitled to vote are placed on the roll. There is another question I would like to raise before I sit down. The "Observer" to-night states that the Herbert election is to take place on 10th April. I do not know whether the Minister can signify that that is correct information.

Hon. J. MULLAN: It comes from the Speaker, does it not?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I assume it is perfectly correct. It is not likely that a responsible paper would publish a statement like that unless it were true. This is exactly 10th February, and it would seem that two months are to be allowed for the filling of this vacancy. There has been a good deal of delay in issuing the writ. Why is it that two months are allowed before the election takes place?

Hon. J. MULLAN: We cannot say what time is allowed until we see the writ.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Is this period allowed so as to give plenty of time for the Government to move about after the adjournment of the House takes place? In connection with the general election, I think the time which the Government took for the whole State was about six weeks. What is the reason that a longer time is taken in this instance? Is it that the Government are afraid of losing another seat and want to put forward every effort to get things right?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Have you heard about the cyclone?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: They may have a memory of what happened in the Maranoa, and are particularly anxious to see that that kind of thing is obviated.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I am quite sure we would not satisfy the hon. gentleman whether we had a quick or a slow election. If we took about six months he would say we were sparring for wind, and if we took as many weeks he would say we were hurrying the election on. As to the specific date of the election, the hon. gentleman recognises that the Speaker alone determines what the date is to be. Until he announces the date I am not going to discuss the matter. I presume it will be necessary this year, as on former occasions, to take some special steps to see that everybody is on the roll.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Are you going to do it, or are you not? Give it to us straight out from the shoulder.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The policy of the Government will be disclosed in due course. One of the things this Government stands for is to give every eligible person in this State an opportunity of being on a roll, and of casting his vote however he pleases. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not object to that. With regard to the comment of the hon. member for Burnett regarding the inflation of the roll, I believe that the Queensland roll to-day is the cleanest in Australia.

Mr. CORSER: I suppose if we were returned on it, you would call it the blackest.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I submitted figures to show that there was no inflation whatever of the Queensland roll, as was generally supposed, and as was indicated, I think, by the hon. member for Oxley on Friday evening. The card system we have adopted now has reduced to a minimum the possibility of duplicating. The statements made by the hon. gentleman will not bear investigation. A man may go on two or three rolls, but when the claim is submitted to head office and compared and checked—which, I am told by the Electoral Officer, is done—if he is on two rolls his name will be deleted from one—I presume the former.

Mr. CORSER: Would you like us to show you names on two rolls? You say they cannot be on two rolls.

Hon. J. MULLAN: They may have been on two in the past, before this card system was adopted.

Mr. CORSER: You have done your work; you have them on the roll now.

Hon. J. MULLAN: At the time the hon. gentleman speaks of the card system had not been brought up to date.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was stopped.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I am not aware of its having been stopped. It takes some time to inaugurate a system, but the system is now complete, and the roll is one of the cleanest in Australia.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The Minister said this roll was one of the cleanest in Australia, and the card system was inaugurated with the object of making it so. May I ask the Minister why it is that they do not insist upon the provision of the age of the elector being given, and which would greatly help the Chief Electoral Officer in keeping the roll pure?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You know what the objection is. Ladies object to give their age.

Mr. Elphinstone.]

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: This is a most wonderful Government. If there is a way of wriggling out of a thing, by jove, they will wriggle.

Mr. KIRWAN: They cannot wriggle like the Opposition.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The position is this—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you think the age is vital?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I do not say it is vital, but it is of great assistance, and I will show you how. If you go and see the card system—which I have done; the Chief Electoral Officer has shown me how the thing works—you will find perhaps 100 or more cards in the name of "John Smith." The birthplace of this man, or these various men, will assist in identifying them, but if you also insist upon the date of birth being given it assists very materially in identification.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: If you follow that to a logical conclusion you will have finger-prints.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No. The point is this: I said provision is made in the Act for the age being given. Why do you not ask for it? The Chief Electoral Officer would be able to make his roll more pure if that were insisted upon. But for some reason it is not. Why not? I cannot think for one moment that the Government are so susceptible to the weaknesses of feminine nature that they are not going to insist upon it. The member for Brisbane may do so, but they are not all ladies' men. I do think that the date of birth should be insisted upon, because I am quite certain it will assist the Chief Electoral Officer in purifying his roll.

The HOME SECRETARY: Tell us how the age would assist?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Didn't you hear when I explained it? If you go to the Chief Electoral Officer's room and refer to the cards, you will find perhaps fifty or 100 cards in the name of "John Smith" or "John Brown."

The HOME SECRETARY: All over twenty-one. That is the only qualification needed.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That may be so, but on the card which the man is supposed to fill in, he has to give the place of birth, and there is also provision in the Act for date of birth. You do not insist on that—in fact, it is cut out altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Supposing, for the sake of argument, you establish your point. Does that make for any greater security as compared, say, with his height and the colour of his eyes?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That argument does not take us any further. I am quite prepared to admit that if you ask a man's height, colour of his hair, finger prints, and so forth, you could carry on to practically finality so as to avoid a name being in the roll twice. But that is not asked for. The regulations state explicitly that place of birth and date of birth shall be given. For some reason, best known to these mysterious gentlemen opposite, the date of birth has been cut out, is not insisted upon, and—although I quite admit that it does not go completely to

eradicate the possibility of duplication—it goes a long way towards it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Much ado about nothing.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You may consider it so. We on this side are desirous to see the roll as pure as we can make it. If it is not your desire to see the roll pure, wipe it out.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about all legal documents. Is not the signature the only thing that counts?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If there is any argument in these interjections of hon. members opposite, why is it provided for in the regulations that date of birth shall be given?

Hon. J. MULLAN: It is not provided for, I tell you.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Those two things are provided for.

Hon. J. MULLAN: You are wrong.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I have been there and found out that they are provided for.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Have you been there recently?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You may have altered it since your term of office—probably you have, it is quite possible—but I have been there within six months.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I do not think so.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I tell you I have, and that was told to me. My only object in raising this, is so that we shall have as pure a roll as we can get, and if the Minister in charge of the department is as sincere as I am, he will assist us to have all these regulations complied with as quickly as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You do not want a roll; you want a book of ages.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I listened to the remarks made by the member for Bulimba in which he tried to extract from the Minister some statement as to the expenditure in connection with this vote last year; and, as far as I understand, the Minister's reply was that no part of this money voted for the expenses of the referendum was spent during the financial year. I happen to have the Treasurer's tables, and it is very easy just to arrive at what was spent. The vote for "salaries" is £2,541. The vote for "Postages and Telegrams" was £5,500. The hon. gentleman will see, by adding the two together, that the whole vote, outside that which was intended for the Referendum, amounted to £9,041. The referendum vote was £12,000 in addition, which would total £21,041.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Not a penny of that £12,000 was spent.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman may say so, but I want him to explain something else. The Treasurer's table says that on that electoral registration vote there was spent, during the last financial year, not the sum of £9,041 only, but the sum of £14,125, so that the expenditure was upwards of £5,000.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The figures you are talking about now is the money appropriated last year.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am talking about the money that was appropriated last year.

Hon. J. MULLAN: You want to see if that was exceeded.

[Mr. Elphinstone.]

Mr. MACARTNEY: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that no part of the £12,000 was spent.

Hon. J. MULLAN: This is the amount of money that was appropriated last year. That was exceeded by the difference between the amount voted and £14,125.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Then out of the £12,000 that was voted for the referendum £5,041 was spent?

Hon. J. MULLAN: The exact amount that the vote was exceeded by was £4,400; but it has nothing to do with the £12,000. That sum was voted for a specific purpose.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Tell us how it was spent.

Hon. J. MULLAN: It was spent *pro rata*, as the other vote was.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Contingencies! (Laughter.)

Hon. J. MULLAN: Exactly; it was made up of contingencies.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I think the hon. gentleman might give a little more information. It is quite clear that a certain amount was voted in addition to the £12,000, and it is equally clear that £5,000 [8.30 p.m.] over that amount was spent.

Presumably, the excess amount comes out of the £12,000. Why it was spent is a matter only within the knowledge of the Minister. I would now like to refer to the delay in the issue of the writ for the Herbert electorate. I understand the date of the election has now been fixed for two months hence. I see one Minister shakes his head.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The date has not been fixed.

Mr. FRY: The official organ says it has.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out that the issue of the writ is entirely a matter for the Speaker.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Well, here is the statement that appears in this afternoon's "Observer"—

"The writ for the Herbert election (due to the retirement of the Hon. W. Lennon) will be issued on 21st February. The date of nomination is 13th March, polling 10th April, and return of the writ 1st May."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is speculation.

Mr. MACARTNEY: How the "Observer" got the information I do not know. I was under the impression that it was the "Daily Standard" that made the statement. It is rather a remarkable thing that such a long period has been allowed to go by before the date of the election was fixed. We know that it is the duty of the Speaker to issue the writ after the resignation of a member, and we know that the practice in the past has been to issue the writ a day or two after the seat has been declared vacant.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Conditions are very disturbed in the North. (Laughter.)

Mr. MACARTNEY: It seems to me that the Government have adopted a policy of attempting to jerrymander elections. The last general election was brought on in the

midst of the wet season, after only four or five weeks' notice.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not so.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is so. No one knows it better than I do. That was the position at the general election. Here we have a vacancy for the Herbert, and for two or three weeks we have seen the hon. member for Logan asking the Government in vain to give him something like a fair show so that he may give the electors of the Logan an opportunity of testing their view regarding his coming to this side of the House. The hon. member has made a perfectly fair request. He has asked for a fair field and no favour, so that he may tender his resignation and meet the challenge of Ministers to test the feeling of the electors. It is a matter of some satisfaction to hear the Minister say that the rolls are clean. I wish I could believe him. If I could, I would have very little to say on this vote. I have in my hand a list of removals from the Townsville roll. There were about 100 names on the list, and it would be rather interesting reading if the Minister would look over it, and see the length of time that people remained on the Townsville roll after they had actually left the district. They have not left the State, and apparently the instructions to the electoral registrars say that they are not to take objection to names on the rolls unless evidence is produced that the persons objected to have actually left the State. That does not conduce to clean rolls. It is rather remarkable to find on that roll persons who were actually on other rolls in the State at the time. There is evidence that some of these people were on the Mundingburra roll, on the Mackay roll, and other rolls. There is one case of a man who had lived in Sydney for fully six years, and yet his name was retained on the Townsville roll for the whole of that period. Another left the district four years ago, and is now at Kuridala, which, I believe, is a mining township in the Minister's electorate. Another person has lived at Charters Towers for the past four years.

Hon. J. MULLAN: What is the date of that roll?

Mr. MACARTNEY: This is since the last general election.

Mr. HARTLEY: An agent of the National party compiled that list.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It does not matter who compiled it if it is true. The list can be verified by a reference to the electoral registrar at Townsville. Then, two other persons left fully six years ago, and are now in Sydney.

Mr. STOFFORD: What are you quoting from?

Mr. MACARTNEY: The list is perfectly correct.

Mr. STOFFORD: I want proof of that.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the hon. member will see me afterwards, I will supply him with proof. Another person left Townsville two years ago. Another left for Cloncurry ten months ago. Another left fully three years ago, and is now in Brisbane. If any hon. member disputes the accuracy of this list, all he has to do is to make inquiry from the Townsville electoral registrar, when he can see the names expunged from the roll and the decisions of the magistrate against each

Mr. Macartney.]

name. That shows that the rolls at the time this list was compiled were not by any means clean, whatever the Minister may say with regard to the position at the present moment.

Hon. J. MULLAN: That list is eighteen months old. I am dealing with the present situation.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That may be so, but the impression is abroad, and there is justification for the belief, that for many years past there have been thousands and thousands of people on the rolls of this State who had no right to be there.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true. Prove that by quoting the number of persons over the age of twenty-one years in this State.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am inclined to think that the hon. member's suggestion that a good many people on the roll are under the age of twenty-one years is probably correct. I believe there is a good deal of colour for the statement that has been made in that respect. As soon as we can get some official statement, without any reserve whatever, from the responsible officials at the head of the Electoral Department that the rolls are clean throughout Queensland, it will be more satisfactory to the people. The hon. gentleman must see that his predecessor and himself have surrounded the management of this department with mystery and juggling, and they must, therefore, expect that the people are doubtful about the statements which Ministers make. It would be a great deal better if the Minister would be a little more frank and explicit, and would tend to shorten very much the proceedings of the Chamber.

Mr. ROBERTS: I would like to support the remarks of the hon. member for Toowoong. I would point out to the Minister that, prior to the last election, at East Toowoomba there were upwards of 1,200 names on the roll of persons whom I was quite satisfied were not in the electorate. Immediately after the election, upwards of 500 names were advertised as those of persons having left the district, and which would be removed by the electoral officer. If the East Toowoomba electoral roll is a criterion of the State, it is evident that a large number of people are not qualified to vote for the electorate in connection with which their names appear on the roll.

Mr. FRY: I wish to tell the Minister that it has come under my notice that quite a number of people who are on the present rolls do not reside in the electorate for which they are enrolled. I know of a firm in Brisbane who sent out a number of circulars to the people appearing on the electoral roll, and fully one-tenth of the circulars were returned within the first fortnight. That shows that there is a big floating population, or that the rolls are not up to date.

Hon. J. MULLAN: What roll did you send out the letters on?

Mr. FRY: The roll was not issued more than about eight weeks ago. I would draw the Minister's attention to the necessity of having all the means at his disposal brought into operation to check the rolls, so that when the elections come on the rolls may be as clean as possible. The Minister knows the statements which were made about the rolls being stuffed, and as guardian and responsible head of the department, he should see that the rolls are as clean as possible.

{Mr. Macartney.

Mr. CORSER: I would like to know whether, during the by-elections, the Principal Electoral Registrar, or the returning officers, have the selection of the presiding officers at the various booths. In the past it was always left to the department or the Electoral Office to deal with the whole of the elections; but, unfortunately, at the last State election the system was changed, and the presiding officers had to be temperamentally fitted, I understand, before they could sit. I understand that the names were submitted to the Trades Hall, and that unless the labour organisations indicated that the presiding officer was suitable from their point of view, he did not receive endorsement.

Mr. WHITFORD: I remember some of your presiding officers being scrutineers also.

Mr. CORSER: Just previous to the last election, twenty-six returning officers were not acceptable to the Labour organisations, and they were removed. That is not the state of affairs which should exist at the State elections, where we want fairness and honesty; and I ask the Minister whether that state of affairs is going to obtain at the by-elections?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Are you attacking the integrity of the men who were presiding officers last time?

Mr. CORSER: When the hon. gentleman's department is under consideration, we will tackle him.

Hon. J. MULLAN: This is the third time the question has been discussed on this vote.

Mr. CORSER: I am asking the question, and if the Minister replies to it it will be all right.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It so happens that, during the last general election, I had charge of the Electoral Department. I do not think it would be right if we were to allow innuendoes and insinuations made here to-night—by irresponsible members mostly—to pass unchallenged. We have heard from the hon. member for Burnett some strange, weird stories about a conspiracy between the Agent-General and the electoral officers with regard to soldiers' votes; such an impossible thing!

Mr. CORSER: He was never mentioned.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Well, he was the returning officer—the man in charge of the whole of the machinery in England. The votes were cabled out here, and there was no possibility of manipulation, no possibility of trickery.

Mr. CORSER: No, because you did not give them the possibility or anything else—you did not give the soldiers a vote.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The integrity of our Government cannot be successfully attacked. The principal officers of the Electoral Department can be questioned anywhere. A Royal Commission could be appointed to inquire into the whole proceedings, and it would be found that no interference took place, except the ordinary Ministerial administration—the Ministerial actions that go to make for efficiency.

Mr. CORSER: The electoral office did not administer the soldiers' vote. It was done by the Government Printing Office.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is entirely incorrect. We will take the stalking horse of duplicate voting. It is well known that nearly every returning

officer was appointed by a Liberal Administration—an Administration opposed to us. The returning officers make a return of duplicate voting immediately after the results are known. They give them to each candidate affected. Here is the result: In the electoral district of Albert there were fifteen cases; in the electoral district of Aubigny there were four. It cannot be expected that in the heat and rush and worry of election day the clerks can go right through and make no clerical mistakes—it is obvious that they will do that, and that explains most of any errors there may be in the list. But there was no justification for saying, or any documentary or other evidence to establish, that there was any duplication or trickery or manipulation, and it is a most ungenerous and improper insinuation to make. Yet it is made continuously. It was made down South, and if it so happens that there were on the roll more names than were justified in being there, nevertheless our machinery was of such an exact nature, was so efficient, that there was absolutely no duplication in voting. It is with amusement that we listen to the pious exhortation of members opposite in regard to double voting. We know they manufactured and traded upon it for years and years. I know a man in the Upper House to-day who for some time had twenty votes. I know one man—a very prominent man up there—who exercised eighteen votes for twelve years. Those were the days when they had votes for sheep, votes for rabbits, votes for corner allotments. We brought in a clean roll. The police do the collecting, and the officials in the office, uninterfered with by Ministers or higher public servants, carry on the process until the names are in print.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You did not introduce one man one vote?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Certainly. I will recite the history of it to the hon. member. The Morgan-Kidston Government wiped out plural voting, and the hon. member hotly opposed them. (Dis-sent.) Subsequently, they became enveloped in the fold of it and coalesced.

Mr. CORSER: Long before that it was wiped out.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You are on the wrong history altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I wish the hon. member would subside—we have had some intelligent interjections. Furthermore, the measure introduced by the Morgan Administration allowed a man to vote where he lived, or in the electorate in which he had his office, whichever he preferred, and the hon. member for Brisbane, on the first occasion, had a hard run in consequence.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: The Philp Government did not have plural voting.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Philp Government had plural voting, and the Morgan Government abolished it.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: No.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member for Bulimba has a habit of sitting back and ejaculating "No," but I am prepared to establish the fact. I say that the Morgan Government abolished plural voting, but they allowed a man to have his

vote where he lived in a fashionable suburb, or at his office in town, and that provision was operated to the disadvantage of the democratic party—the Labour party. I do not want to read the whole of this table, but I trust it will go into "Hansard," because we want things in "Hansard."

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Read it. We have too many things going into "Hansard" without being read.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Very well. It is the complete return of all duplications in voting, and it puts to rout for all time any suggestion of improper practices. It is on page 2854 of "Hansard" for 1913—

Albert ...	15	Mackay ...	1
Aubigny ...	4	Maranoa ...	10
Balonne ...	5	Maryborough ...	0
Barcoo ...	12	Merthyr ...	9
Bowen ...	6	Mirani ...	11
Bremer ...	4	Mount Morgan ...	0
Bulimba ...	12	Mundingburra ...	14
Burke ...	2	Murilla ...	14
Burrum ...	8	Murrumba ...	2
Cairns ...	5	Musgrave ...	0
Carnarvon ...	3	Nanango ...	19
Chillagoe ...	0	Normanby ...	2
Cook ...	7	Nundah ...	9
Cooroora ...	3	Paddington ...	6
Cunningham ...	5	Pittsworth ...	3
Drayton ...	0	Port Curtis ...	0
Eacham ...	1	Rockhampton ...	4
East Toowoomba ...	7	South Brisbane ...	4
Fassifern ...	5	Stanley ...	4
Flinders ...	26	Toombul ...	2
Fortitude Valley ...	6	Toowong ...	2
Gregory ...	0	Toowoomba ...	4
Herbert ...	6	Townsville ...	9
Ithaca ...	5	Warrego ...	6
Kennedy ...	3	Warwick ...	3
Kurilpa ...	7	Wide Bay ...	6
Leichhardt ...	0	Windsor ...	4
Lockyer ...	1		
Logan ...	9	Total ...	315

The hon. member for Oxley made a point of identification and said that everything rested upon the basis of ascertaining the age of the individual. That is really not worthy of consideration; no genuine identification could be established on it. A person could give any age. The electoral officer will tell you that very few women give their correct ages. Therefore that disappears as an argument. If you want something for the purpose of identification, have fingerprints, or photographs. By every possible practicable means we cover the facts concerning the individual, and we secure the purity of the roll. Identification could, of course, be carried to fantastic limits; we have made it simple.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Asking for a person's age is certainly a reasonable method of identification.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No, because what check have you on the correctness of the reply or not?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is the same in everything.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You might take the colour of their eyes, or nip a bit out of their ears.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If it were a piece of their tongues, I would not object.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Government would be very pleased to

Hon. J. A. Fihelly.]

apply that here. It is to be deplored that the Opposition have sought occasion on practically every vote to criticise the administration of the Electoral Department. I myself have had the fullest knowledge of the office and the machinery, and I can assure hon. members that those men in the head office who have been controlling matters, and who have had complete supervision over the rolls, in direct arrangement with the police, have done nothing to sully the reputation of any public servant. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The extra £8,500 for incidentals seems a very big margin, seeing that we are going through a very bad season. It is certain sure that the majority of the soldiers at the last election had little opportunity to vote, whoever was to blame. There is no doubt that had it not been for the hon. member for Burnett and the interest he took in the soldiers, the matter would have been allowed to lapse. Everybody knows that nothing was done until he went to the Electoral Office and made inquiries. So far as he could find out, nothing had been done, and then he inquired here, and the Minister said that so-and-so had been done.

Mr. CORSER: They issued regulations after they had contradicted my statement.

Mr. GILLIES: Do you think the Minister was going to do that when he had two sons at the front?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He was not Minister then. We know who was Assistant Minister for Justice then, and he had not two sons at the front.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have three children at home, and that is more than you have got. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am not saying that he was to blame, but I am saying that the matter was neglected entirely until the hon. member for Burnett brought it forward in the House. There are many in this House to-night whose sons would not have had an opportunity to vote had it not been for him. Anyhow, the less we say about the matter the better. All the soldiers are back now.

At 9 o'clock p.m.,

Mr. KIRWAN, one of the Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: There is some information which has not been supplied to the Committee in connection with this vote. The Minister promised to furnish details with regard to the expenditure of certain money in connection with electoral registration.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I did not promise to give each item.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Minister has a right to furnish the Committee with full details as far as possible.

Hon. J. MULLAN: Your Government never furnished the details.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: We always had the information, and, personally, I was always most willing to furnish information to the Committee about the department under my control. This department last year exceeded the vote by about £5,000 as compared with the amount appropriated, and I think the Minister should explain to the Committee how that money was spent.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The hon. member for Bulimba is much concerned about the excess

of £4,000 odd in the vote as compared with the amount voted last year. I can assure the hon. gentleman that £4,100 is exceeded by one item alone, an item which I think the hon. gentleman will approve of, and that is the cost of cabling soldiers' votes. The cost of cabling soldiers' votes was £4,300, and as there were 10,000 effective votes cast I think that expenditure was absolutely justified. The excess in the vote has been caused solely by the efforts of this party to give votes to the men who were at the front.

Mr. CORSER: The Minister claims that there was no interference by the Minister with regard to soldiers' votes.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I did not say I "claimed." I said the fact has not been established.

Mr. CORSER: It was not the Electoral Office, but the Printing Office, which administered that vote, and the Minister ought to know that.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Every cable sent went to the electoral officer.

Mr. CORSER: The Minister thought he had scored a point on a previous occasion by saying that the soldiers' proxy votes were administered by officials of the Printing Office. I had previously tried, and tried repeatedly, to get from the Minister a statement regarding the soldiers' votes, but he declined to give the information.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The reason you could not get the information when you asked for it was that the information was not to hand.

Mr. CORSER: It certainly did not take two years to secure that information.

Hon. J. MULLAN: It took longer than you thought.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman claims that the system adopted by the Government was a cheap system for securing 10,000 votes. We know that there were not 10,000 votes, but that there were only 7,000, and that those 7,000 included men who had returned to Australia. The system followed on that occasion was a rotten one, but even that system was only made possible after certain anomalies and omissions had been pointed out by members on this side of the House.

Mr. WHITFORD: Would you have the effrontery to say that the soldiers would vote against this Government?

Mr. CORSER: No, I would not have the effrontery to say that the soldiers would vote to say that the soldiers would not vote for the Government, and that that was the reason the Government would not give them a vote. Mr. Ryan, in reply to a question I asked, said that my statement was not correct, and that arrangements were being made to give votes to the soldiers. Yet, not many days after that, the "Gazette" contained a notice stating that regulations had been issued making it possible for soldiers to vote under the system provided by Act of Parliament.

Mr. BRENNAN: And your party would not give the soldiers a vote at all.

Mr. CORSER: That statement is not correct. However, I must say that every member of the Opposition, and a great many people in the country, must be dissatisfied with the replies we have received in regard to the administration of the Electoral Office.

Question put and passed.

[Hon. J. A. Fihelly.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

Hon. J. MULLAN: I move—That £1,740 be granted for "Friendly Societies." This amount represents a decrease of £125 on the amount appropriated last year. The contingencies show a decrease of £25, but increases have been granted to the Deputy Registrar of Friendly Societies and other members of the staff.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*): Everybody will recognise the great work that is being done in the State of Queensland and in the other States of the Commonwealth by the friendly societies, and it is because I think sufficient publicity is not given to the reports of the department that I have risen to say a few words on the matter. In reading this very interesting report, I notice that the total membership in Queensland is 53,194; and when we realise that only about 5 per cent. of these members were unfinancial at the time that the report was drawn up, it shows the great amount of thrift that is being displayed by the members associated with these societies. The friendly society movement is doing a great work in this State, and they are ably assisted in the efforts they are putting forth not only by the Registrar of Friendly Societies, but by all the officers connected with the department. This report—although it is a short one—is the most interesting document submitted to Parliament during the year. In looking through the report I notice that the total capital of the societies amounts to £946,531; and, as an evidence of the business ability displayed by members of friendly societies throughout Queensland, I find that 95.4 per cent. of the capital is invested. Of course, one of the great things in connection with friendly society work is to see that the funds are properly invested and interest-earning, and that the investments are such that members generally will benefit by the investments; and that is what is happening so far as friendly societies are concerned. Another interesting paragraph in the report is the comparison between the years 1917 and 1918, and the benefits that have been paid by friendly societies to their members during the year. I find that the total receipts during the year amounted to £172,248, and the disbursements were—

	1917.	1918.
Sick pay	£58,714	£44,330
Mortality benefits	£27,323	£34,759
Medical attendance and medicine ...	£56,951	£50,844

or a total in 1917 of £122,998 as against £139,933 in 1918. The table shows that during the last ten years a sum of £1,101,117 has been distributed to the members and their dependents in connection with friendly society work in the State of Queensland. When we realise that that amount of money has been distributed, and that the money is raised by small subscriptions from the members of the different societies, one must realise the great work that is being done, and I certainly think the Government is doing the proper thing in encouraging the friendly society movement in every way it can. Another phase of the question is the matter of the number of members of friendly societies who did service during the war. A great number went to the front, and a great percentage of those who did go away offered "the supreme sacrifice"; but notwithstanding the fact that

those members and their payments were taken from the society during the term of the war, in nearly all instances—I think in connection with all the societies the members were relieved of their contributions—their benefits were continued in the same way as if they were paying contributions. (Hear, hear!) The societies recognised it was their duty to do that for the men who had gone to the front. There is a paragraph in the report which refers to the amount of money that has been paid in death claims, and it reads as follows:—

"The actual payments for claims at deaths increased by £4,681 in 1915, £3,619 in 1916, £12,117 in 1917, £19,553 in 1918 over 1914. The increases are attributable to the war, as the mortality experienced, excluding military cases, was under expectation. Notwithstanding the abnormal drain on the funeral funds, the stability of the societies as a whole is not seriously affected, as £193,687 was added to capital during the last four years."

This is a very creditable position for the societies to find themselves in after the great strain placed upon them during the war. The Minister, in speaking of the increases that have been given, mentioned that there has been an increase given to the Deputy Registrar. I am very glad to hear that, because I notice this report is signed by the Deputy Registrar, it having been compiled and issued while the Registrar of Friendly Societies was away on six months' leave of absence. I, having a good deal to do with friendly societies in Brisbane, and in Southern Queensland generally, know the great amount of good work that is being done by the Deputy Registrar. Mr. Rendle has told me of the good work the Deputy Registrar is doing, and eulogises his ability in the office of deputy. In the State of Queensland, friendly societies must recognise that the Government are doing a good deal for them, inasmuch as they assist in connection with the interest allowed by the Savings Bank. We get full interest on all deposits, no matter how big the amount may be, and we are relieved from stamp duty in the matter of receipts, and in connection with moneys that are paid in the shape of mortality or funeral payments. The Savings Bank in Queensland has become a bank of issue so far as the friendly societies are concerned, and the societies are now able to draw cheques and operate on their accounts in the same way as with the associated banks. This is a matter that we endeavoured for quite a number of years to have brought about, and I am very glad now to see that it is an accomplished fact. While the Government of Queensland is assisting the friendly society movement in many ways, I must say that we are not getting the assistance from the Commonwealth Government that I think we should get. Just as a case in point, to show that more might be done by the Commonwealth Government, I would point out that when the new postage rates were introduced the Commonwealth Government were asked to allow the friendly societies in Queensland to go on at the old rate of postage, and that some concession might be made in sending printed matter through the post, but we were unsuccessful in securing from the Commonwealth Government that which we thought we were entitled to get. However, we are hoping that the example set by the State Government of Queensland and by the Governments of other States will be

Mr. McLachlan.]

followed by the Commonwealth, and that they will render all assistance possible to the friendly societies. I am pleased to see the nature of the report and to hear what the Minister says about the office.

Mr. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Merthyr certainly opened the debate on this vote in a very comprehensive way. I thought to some extent it was going to be free from party politics, but he finished up not altogether satisfactorily. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as he has seen fit to raise the question, as one who is keenly interested in the friendly societies movement, how much have this Government done for the friendly societies? Might I remind him that the Act under which we operate was passed by a previous Liberal Government, and the concessions of which he speaks were made operative, as far as the Savings Bank is concerned—and that is the latest—by the hon. member for Bulimba when Treasurer.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I did not take credit to myself for that, did I? I said "the State Government of Queensland."

Mr. ROBERTS: Anyone reading the hon. member's remarks to-morrow would assume that he was dealing with something to which this report added significance. There is nothing new in those concessions; they are well known to friendly societies, and have been accepted. Queensland did not give the lead in regard to those things, either. They were given by New South Wales and Victoria long before men like myself could induce the Queensland—even a Liberal—Government to give us similar concessions. I am pleased to know, also, with the hon. member for Merthyr, that we were able at a certain date prior to the advent of this Government to get those privileges for the friendly societies of Queensland. In reference to the gentleman who has signed this report, when Mr. Scott went along to the office he took with him an experience of a number of years in active friendly society work. It must be recognised that, knowing the work of friendly societies, and being a successful secretary of a friendly society in Queensland, he was fitted to grapple with the position satisfactorily. I am pleased to know that in Mr. Rendle and Mr. Scott we have two officers who are very keen in their interest for friendly societies, and particularly keen to see that the things which members pay for are there when necessity arises and they are required. If the hon. member for Merthyr wants to do anything to help friendly societies, there is a field in which he can work in gaining advantages which have been given to friendly societies in another State. I am going to touch on another matter first. One of the things which has saved Queensland friendly societies—perhaps to the detriment of some members of friendly societies—has been the decision of the Attorney-General in Queensland, as against the other States, that soldiers could not be claimants on the sick fund. That is what has put Queensland, just at this moment, in the, perhaps, fortunate position that they have come through four years of war. No reference is made to it in this report. Perhaps it was lost sight of. But, as one who studies the movement, I realise that that has put us in the position in which we find ourselves. In New South Wales a tremendous sum of money has had to be paid from the sick fund, and the same

[Mr. McLachlan.]

thing has occurred in Victoria. I want to quote from the latest report of the friendly societies in Victoria—1917-1918—because, as one who is keenly interested in the movement, I realise that we have not done with the drainage as the result of the war. I have instanced this in places where I have been speaking on different occasions on friendly society work. As no allusion is made to it in this report, and as in New South Wales they are feeling it considerably, it is as well that we get it on record, so that men who read the debate on this vote will be able to give some attention to it. What does the Registrar of Friendly Societies in Victoria say? He says—

"I referred in my report of last year to the effect produced by the war on the sickness and mortality rates at young ages, and to the possibility that members of societies who have been on active service during the present war may for a long time after returning to civil life be subject to higher than normal rates of sickness. While a considerable amount of information is now available in regard to the sums which have been paid by societies in sickness and funeral benefits on account of members on active service, it is impossible to predict the amount by which the total of such payments for the whole period of the war will exceed the expectation according to the standard table used in the valuations. Also, no estimate can be formed at this stage of the extent to which the liabilities of societies will be affected by the future sickness and mortality experience of members who have taken an active part in the war. I have, accordingly, made no provision in the valuations for losses which may occur owing to these causes."

That is supported in New South Wales by actual experience. I was looking through one of the societies' books a few weeks ago, and I find that the applications which have been made for sick pay are remarkable in connection with men who have returned; that is, the short periods which they claim. They claim for a few weeks, go back to work, and unfortunately another attack of illness comes along and they become claimants again. It is an indication that we are going to have a somewhat heavy drain in connection with this matter, and it will appeal to Queensland for the reason that when you look at the registrar's report he points out that, after you take into consideration the contributions the members have made and the claims made against the societies, it only works out to the credit of 2d. per member. That is rather interesting, and it shows that we want to be exceedingly careful. The hon. member for Merthyr rather anticipated my remarks in regard to one thing. I have the New South Wales report of 1919, which really refers to the work of 1918. I propose to read two or three passages, because it is very interesting, and it certainly deals with subvention. I fail to see where this Government have given any new concessions to friendly societies. If there are any, I would be glad to know what they are. I want to show where they can assist the societies, and there is a reason why they should do so.

Mr. McLACHLAN: You also know I advocated subvention when the other Government were in power.

Mr. ROBERTS: I will give the hon. member credit for anything he has done. There

is no party spirit with me in this matter. This is what the Registrar-General in New South Wales says—

"A most important innovation was made in 1908, when, upon my representations, the Subventions to Friendly Societies Act, 1908, now Part VIII, of the Friendly Societies Act, 1912, was passed. Under its provisions the State pays the whole sickness cost for male members aged sixty-five years and over and for female members aged sixty years and over, provided that the amount payable in each case shall not exceed 5s. per week. The State also bears half the cost of sick pay to members under those ages for all sickness after the illness has continued for twelve months, provided such half cost shall not exceed 5s. per week.

"By means of this subvention the societies are relieved of the greater portion of the burden of providing sick pay for their aged members, and are, moreover, enabled to guarantee sick pay during the whole duration of illness."

[9.30 p.m.]

"By another provision aged members have been relieved of the payment of any contributions except those for purely management purposes, as the State pays the contributions which are necessary to provide funeral donation and for medical attendance and medicine for such members, while under the scales of contributions now in force male members' contributions to the sick fund cease at the age of sixty-five, and female members' contributions cease at age sixty."

Then comes this paragraph, to which I wish to direct particular attention—

"The Act has proved a great boon to all societies, and more especially to those having a large proportion of aged members. The claims made by the societies up to the end of 1917, and paid after examination, amounted to £185,455. Of this total, £179,618 was paid before the end of 1918, and the balance was held over until the current year, pending verification of claims."

There is something solid—something done. The report continues—

"In addition to the financial assistance thus afforded, the societies have been relieved of the payment of fees for services rendered by the registrar. Friendly societies have always been exempt from direct taxation, and it appeared to me anomalous that they should be required to pay fees for such services; accordingly, when the matter was referred to me by the Chief Secretary, I recommended the abolition of practically the whole of the fees hitherto payable. My recommendations were adopted."

That is the position in New South Wales, and I was glad to hear the hon. member say that there was a time when the matter was mooted in Queensland, though it is a remarkable thing that it was when there was another Government in power. I do not remember the hon. member having made any attempt since the present Government came into power to get anything further done. There was a time when he was not afraid to ask that a subvention should be granted to Queensland friendly societies. There was a time also when this House

carried a resolution declaring that it was advisable that a subvention should be granted by the Government. If the hon. member for Merthyr is looking after the interests of the members of friendly societies, what has he been doing in caucus since that resolution was carried? Has he not got any influence with the Government, or has he not got sufficient support from friendly society men in the party to help him and take the matter further? What was the good of those men supporting that resolution? Evidently, their object was to burke discussion when they affirmed the principle that it was advisable that a subvention scheme should be applied in Queensland, and then did nothing further when sitting behind the Government. I know that here, as in New South Wales, there are differences of opinion among the members of friendly societies themselves on the subject; but that is not the point with the Government. I venture to say that the Government have not recognised that, and, in any case, they have given no explanation of their inaction. I asked a question some months ago as to what was the position, and I was then told that the matter was under consideration. They could easily have said that, owing to the difference of opinion among the members of friendly societies in Queensland, it was not deemed advisable to give effect to the resolution, and that would have been an end of the matter. There is a special reason why the New South Wales principle should be adopted in Queensland. I stated on another occasion in this Chamber the difference it would make to the friendly societies. I could tell hon. members the position in New South Wales during the last twelve months, and how it has affected their funds during the war period, and what they have been able to do owing to the assistance given them by the Government. This must also be borne in mind: That when a member of a friendly society comes to this State from New South Wales he is not likely to withdraw his clearance from New South Wales. It is to his advantage that he should keep on the books of his society in New South Wales; and that is what is happening in many instances. They are not likely to ask to be transferred to the Queensland societies, because they have something to lose. If some of the States do not get a move on, probably there will be a Commonwealth friendly society movement and a Commonwealth Friendly Societies Act passed, and the benefits will apply to all the States. A movement in that direction is already on foot. Years ago there was a proposal made for the inauguration of a Commonwealth friendly society movement, and when there is such an amount of differentiation between the States the movement is bound to go ahead. If any assistance is given by this Government to the friendly societies, I shall be only too pleased to acknowledge it; but at present I do not know of any such assistance. I am not going to say that the Government are opposed to friendly societies, but I am not going to allow an hon. member on the other side to talk as if all that had been done for friendly societies in Queensland had been done by the present Government. The Act itself and any benefits that have accrued under the Act were all made available before this Government came into office.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I said the State Government—not this Government.

Question put and passed.

Mr. Roberts.]

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £650 be granted for "Parliamentary Draftsman." There is no change in the vote.

Question put and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £1,380 be granted for "Public Service Superannuation Board." This amount represents an increase of £295 on last year's vote, salaries being increased by £270, and contingencies by £25. The increases set down for the clerks are in pursuance of the public service classification scheme.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Before the vote goes through, I would like some explanation from the Minister as to the necessity for increasing the number of clerks this year from three to five. Has the work grown to such an extent that the clerical staff previously provided was not sufficient, or are there any other reasons to account for this increase? The point I wish specially to make—I do not say that it applies specially to this branch of the service, but this is one of the phases of the work of the Government that has to be very closely watched by the Opposition—is that there is a move in many departments in the direction of putting on extra men, and this is one of the things which account for the increased amount of money that has to be provided on the Estimates, not so much by reason of the fact that the departments themselves require more men, but for other reasons. I want to know what the explanation is.

The HOME SECRETARY: What might those "other reasons" be?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister will have an opportunity of saying what other reasons there are himself.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are making the statement.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman knows so well that there is no need for me to repeat what he knows.

The HOME SECRETARY: I know there is something sinister in what you say.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister tries to get very nasty sometimes, but if he has a clear conscience it is all right. I notice that, generally speaking, he has a book in his hand, but somehow or other he cannot concentrate his thoughts upon the book. Other things occupy his mind, and it may be that there are certain workings going on which draw his attention from the book, apparently very interesting.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not getting my relative out of gaol.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is not correct—

The HOME SECRETARY: You are very free in your statements. I will give you one for one.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman is incorrect.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is absolutely true, on the statement of the Attorney-General.

[Hon. J. Mullan.]

HON. W. H. BARNES: I challenge the hon. gentleman to prove it. It has nothing to do with this vote, and I would like the hon. gentleman, after accepting my assurance—and the hon. gentleman has to do that—to accept my word that I have no relative that I got out of gaol.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have to do that, even if it is untrue.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman dare not make that statement outside.

The HOME SECRETARY: One of your Minister friends made it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I challenge the hon. gentleman. We are both wandering; but the Minister, who is always trying to be vindictive, is endeavouring to draw me off the track. He knows a great deal better about some of those happenings in the North, in which he figured, which I need not detail to-night.

The HOME SECRETARY: I never used my position as a Minister to get my relatives out of gaol.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I say that that is a falsehood. The statement is incorrect.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will give you one for one.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I want to know why there has been this increase in this particular vote in such a small department. It may be that the work has grown to such an extent that it is necessary to have an increase.

HON. J. MULLAN: In reply to the hon. gentleman, the reason why the staff has been increased by two clerks is because of the extension of business, and the action was taken by the Government on the representations of the board to that effect.

Mr. FRY: I see that members of the board are paid £1 ls. for attendance at meetings, and it is just as well that we know how many times the board meets. Some of the unemployed would like to attend meetings at the same remuneration.

HON. J. MULLAN: I understand that they meet on an average about once a month. Of course, they meet oftener if required.

Question put and passed.

SHERIFF.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £3,989 be granted for "Sheriff." The amount represents a decrease on last year's vote of £270.

Mr. FRY: I notice that the amount paid to bailiffs in various parts of Queensland is very small, some being paid as low as £40 per annum; and unless a man engages in some other work, he cannot live upon that. I would like to call attention to the fees paid to jurors, and to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to grant an increase of fees and give proper remuneration to those men who are called away from their daily avocation to act as jurors. They have to listen to the evidence in the cases, their powers being taxed to the utmost, and in criminal cases to take the responsibility of saying whether a man is guilty or not guilty of the crime with which he is charged. This affects the man who works for a daily

wage more than a man who receives a yearly salary, as he loses his wages, and it is not a fair thing to ask him to act as juror for such a small remuneration.

HON. J. MULLAN: The present rates of remuneration for jurymen are 10s., 11s., and 12s. a day in the South, Centre, and North, respectively. There seems to be a good deal in what the hon. member says, and I have no doubt that his representations will be considered.

MR. FRY: I am pleased that the Minister has taken the view which he has expressed.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This Government increased the jury fees.

MR. FRY: I am not questioning that. I am only drawing attention to the state of affairs that exists to-day. It does not affect members of Parliament; if it did, we would soon get a decent increase. The poor man is usually called upon to sit on juries, and it is taxing his honour and putting on him a responsibility for which he should be amply paid. At any rate, he should not lose anything by doing something for his country.

MR. ROBERTS: I raised this question last year, when I pointed out that they were not only paid below award rates but that sometimes they went along and found that they were not wanted, because since the evening before the court had adjourned, having finished the last case on the list, and they were not paid at all for that day. Afterwards I got a letter from the Minister for Justice to the effect that they paid all the country men, but that the town men could read the papers before they went to work in the morning and would thus be able to see whether they were required. That is most unsatisfactory. Surely, the Minister does not expect jurors to go out and get a newspaper and depend on it as to their attendance at an important court. I think the Minister will see that a man cannot be expected to take his instructions from a newspaper report. A newspaper has been quoted here this afternoon, and we have been told that someone else only has authority. If a juror did not turn up, and was called before the court, the judge would want to know why he had not attended, and he might not be satisfied with the statement that he had depended on a newspaper. I think that so long as the court is sitting the man should be paid till he is notified by some satisfactory method that he is not required.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister certainly said that the matter would be considered. The fact remains, however, that a living wage of so much per day has been established. I am sure that the Minister will not contend that 10s. is a living wage—that is, if he is going to live up to the principles laid down very frequently by members of this House. I do not think that it is a fair thing that a painter getting 18s. 6d. a day should lose his day's work and then get only 10s.

HON. J. MULLAN: When the hon. member was in office he only got 8s.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The cost of living then was only about half what it is to-day. I am sure, Mr. Kirwan, that, as you are a student of this House, you will have noticed how the Minister, though he is only a junior in the ranks, has got the same complaint

as the other Ministers, and at every opportunity tries to sidetrack and point to what the other fellow did. The fact remains that this Government, at election-time, said that if they were returned the cost of living would come down by 50 per cent., but since they have been in power the cost of living has gone up by more than that, and, like Johnny Walker, is still going strong. Is it fair to reputable men to tell them that they must do something for their country and then add, "Thank you; we will give you about half what you are entitled to"? The Minister has said that he will give the matter consideration—we have heard a good deal of "consideration in due course"—and I hope he will give it favourable consideration, and urge it upon his colleagues, so that justice may be done to those men who serve the country in a capacity which is very necessary in these days when there is a tendency to overlook some of those things that do happen and to give a clean sheet when there should be no clean sheet.

MR. CORSER: I should like to add to the suggestion of the hon. member for Bulimba. I think that "Knibbs"—so often quoted by the Labour party—shows that the cost of living has increased by about 72 or 73 per cent. since they came into office, and I do not think that the Minister has made provision for anything like that. Jurors have to attend under compulsion, and anybody who does anything for the State by compulsion should receive a fair amount for the time he puts in. The Australian resents more than anything else being dictated to by a power he has to obey, and it is hard to be called up and locked up to perspire while other people outside are wondering what the verdict will be. The duty is an unpleasant one, and I hope that the Minister next year will provide for an increase in the vote instead of a decrease. I notice that most of the departments this year show increases. Even in the burial of paupers and the examination of lunatics there were increases, anticipating the results of the Government's actions, and I cannot see why the jurors' charge should be reduced.

[10 p.m.] We have had just as many occasions to carry out the law during the last twelve months as in the past. I cannot see why the appropriation is less this year than it was last year, and I hope the Minister will be reasonable, and give us some idea of the Government's intentions in the matter.

At 10 o'clock p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Question put and passed.

STAMP DUTIES OFFICE.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £5,470 be granted for "Stamp Duties Office." There is an increase of £380 in this vote.

HON. W. H. BARNES: This is another case in which "Contingencies" score. If there is one thing that is more noticeable than another in regard to these Estimates, it is the way in which contingencies score and come out on top. It is a very convenient way of rolling up expenditure to increase the vote for contingencies and incidentals from £1,000 to £1,300, and I hope

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

the Minister will explain how that increase is made up. It may be that the expenditure for last year was greater than the amount voted, and, if so, the Minister should explain that to the Committee. I shall also be very much obliged to the hon. gentleman if he will tell the Committee what rate of commission is paid to Commonwealth officials for the sale of duty stamps.

Hon. J. MULLAN: One and a-half per cent.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I should also like to know if there is reciprocity on the part of the Commonwealth as far as the sale of postage stamps by Queensland Government officials is concerned.

Hon. J. MULLAN: The Commonwealth pay no commission on the sale of postage stamps by Queensland Government officials. The increase in the amount for contingencies is mainly caused by the increased cost of stationery and printing, which are very big items at the present time.

Mr. CORSER: I should like to know if it is necessary that the department should impose a tax in the shape of stamp duty on cream suppliers. At the present time cream suppliers have to provide a duty stamp when they are paid their cheques, and to go through all sorts of formalities which were not required previously. Considering that the payments for cream are really the wages of the man in the country and his family, I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is a correct thing to tax his wages—for this stamp duty really means a tax? An ordinary wages man is not required to affix a stamp duty to the receipt for his wages, and I think the same principle should apply to the wages of a cream supplier. I feel sure that if the Minister for Agriculture had been present when this stamp duty tax was imposed, he would not have allowed it to go through.

Hon. J. MULLAN: What amount would the payment of that duty mean to a prosperous farmer in a year?

Mr. CORSER: Considering that there are no prosperous farmers, your question is a bit of a conundrum.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It would mean 1s. a year.

Mr. CORSER: What would it mean to the ordinary worker? It is an outrageous tax, and cannot be explained by the Minister. If it is such a small thing, why do they descend to such tactics in order to get a penny or two a month out of the farmer? Why unnecessarily hamper him in that regard?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why not wipe out the stamp duty altogether?

Mr. CORSER: Why not extend it to all labour?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What do you suggest?

Mr. CORSER: I suggest that every means of taxing the farmer should not be the policy of the future.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do the farmers' children go to school?

Mr. CORSER: Of course they do, and these actions of the Government are to try and keep them home to earn their bread. But I am going to stop that. Every bit of

taxation makes it harder for those farmers to send their children to school.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did you not complain when the Act was going through?

Mr. CORSER: It is not the Act; it is the administration that we complain about. (Hear, hear!) And why did not the Minister for Agriculture see that that was not brought about? The Minister did not explain what these stampers are, and I see that the inspector has received an increase of £20. I do not know whether this increase has been brought about by Mr. Storey's report or not; but, if so, it is not very much. A matter for inquiry is the item for the "Deputy Commissioner of Stamp Duties." There is one for three months at £370 and for three months at £335, and one for nine months at £380. In 1913 there was £640 voted, while for the present year only £462 is asked. The Minister has not attempted to explain that position, but I would prefer the Minister to explain the injustice that is being done to the farmers.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Ministers and hon. members on the other side complain bitterly about a poll tax, but they do not hesitate to put a poll tax on the farmers. They are the first people who have put this special poll tax on to the small farmers of Queensland. They could not get any land tax, and the farmer had no income, but he was bound to turn over something if he had to live. Even if it cost him more to produce his milk than he got for it, he must pay the tax. This is a poll-tax Government. There is no question about that. In order to extract money from the farmers, they are sending all sorts of threatening letters through the Insurance Department.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Who circulated the poll tax amendment? (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Who circulated that threatening letter through the Insurance Department? They are extracting every possible penny they can from the man on the land. If they had any sympathy for the man on the land at all, after the drought he has gone through during the last six or nine months, they would not impose this tax. Many of the farmers have been paying to the factories more for feed than they received for their milk, and yet they have had to pay this poll tax.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How would they pay stamp duty if they received no cheques?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They have been paying £15 or £20 a ton for chaff—the Minister ought to know that—and they turned that into milk, and received only half back from the factory; and yet he still claims his poll tax. There are many who have not had a single penny income for the last six or nine months, and I guarantee these people have had to pay as much as 10s. or 12s. stamp duty.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Twelve shillings stamp duty?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Threepence a month for nine months, that is 2s. 3d. (Loud laughter.) I put it down at the lowest. The Government follow a man into the bush and claim their 3d., even if the farmer has had to draw money out of the bank to keep his cattle. A more contemptible action

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

on the part of any Government I never saw. Talk about a poll tax! A poll tax is not half as bad as that. I sincerely hope the Minister for Agriculture, if he has any sympathy for the man on the land—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Well, if you have, take off that tax, and prove your sympathy by your actions.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did you say 10s. or 12s.?

Mr. ROBERTS: All documents, irrespective of their value, as far as Southern Queensland is concerned, have to come to Brisbane to be stamped. This is a considerable inconvenience to people in the country, and consideration might be given to the question of whether facilities could not be offered to settlers in the Toowoomba, Maryborough, and Ipswich districts for stamping up to a certain value at the office of the clerk of petty sessions.

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURTS.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £9,886 be granted in respect of "Supreme Courts." This vote shows a reduction of £30. The amount asked for on account of "Contingencies" is considered to be sufficient. Last year we spent on allowances to witnesses a sum of £1,449, and £1,500, it is considered, will be ample for this year.

Mr. GUNN: I would like to ask who is the Attorney-General now? Have we an Attorney-General?

HON. J. MULLAN: The powers are vested in the Minister for Justice.

Mr. CORSER: I would like to have some information as to what is intended to be done with the present judges, and if there is anything in the contention of the late Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not that he knows of.

Mr. CORSER: I thought that, by reason of his convenient political interpretations of many Acts, he would be rather a suitable gentleman to have as Chief Justice at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You do not propose to assassinate the present men, do you?

Mr. CORSER: I wondered what you were going to do with them when you had passed the Judges Retirement Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not dealing with that Bill. That is not the question before the Committee.

Mr. CORSER: We would not like any injustice to be done to gentlemen who have carried the office with dignity and fairness throughout. I think nothing can be said of the Supreme Court other than that it has done honour to the State. We can be proud of the fact that nothing of a political tone can enter it. I hope Queensland will long remain in the glorious position it has occupied in the past with regard to this vote. We hope that the court will be kept clean of the political state of affairs that exists wherever Labour has been in power. In the past it was never questioned, but at the present time it is questionable from the fact

that we know strings are being pulled to try and get their own way in the courts of justice.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you impugn the integrity of the present Chief Justice?

Mr. CORSER: No. I would not follow the arguments of the Minister for Railways in that matter. I hope the Minister is not going to do anything contrary to decency.

Question put and passed.

TITLES.

HON. J. MULLAN: I move—That £13,610 be granted for "Titles." This shows an increase of £974. Salaries have increased by £784 and "Contingencies" by £170. During the year the Registrar (Mr. Mitchell) was retired after a long and successful career. Mr. Bradfield was appointed Registrar on 1st October, 1919. Mr. Gore Jones, Master of Titles, retired after many years of honourable service, and on 1st October, 1919, Mr. MacGinley was appointed as Legal Adviser and Master of Titles at a salary of £475. Other increases have been granted to various officers.

Mr. SIZER: I would like the Minister to inquire into the complaints made by members on both sides of the House with regard to the extraordinary length of time it takes to get titles through the department. I do not know what the cause of the delay is. I would like to ask, also, if the Minister intends to take any notice of the request made to his predecessor to make provision for the registration of land and estate agents. What has brought the question to my mind is the case which is going on in the courts at the present time.

HON. J. MULLAN: There is a great deal in the hon. member's contention that the agents should be registered, and I will give favourable consideration to the matter.

Mr. FRY: I think it will not do any harm to keep on pointing out that the incidents are swelling up. We know it is all coming out of the public purse.

Question put and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STOCK.

CHIEF OFFICE.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I beg to move—That £27,177 be granted for "Chief Office." This shows an increase of £3,671. Chief Office salaries are responsible for £2,811 of that sum, the principal cause being increases to the staff. There are fourteen officers more than there were in 1918-19, and the increased activity in the branches of the Director of Fruit Culture, the Director of Agriculture, and the Pure Seeds has necessitated the appointment of more officers. There have been substantial increases, too, to practically all officers under the classification.

At half-past 10 o'clock p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under Standing Order No. 306, I must now leave the chair, and make my report to the House.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Smith.]

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This is really a Committee Bill. It is designed to remove certain anomalies in the principal Act and to prevent evasions. It will be necessary for me to refer briefly to some of the clauses in order to explain the proposed alterations. Section 4 of the principal Act expresses definitions of "bake-house" and also of "employee." Clause 2 of the Bill proposes to make clear the definition, and to provide that it shall include an hotel. That was the intention of the original section. According to legal authorities, there is some degree of ambiguity on the subject at the present time, and the clause will make the matter quite clear. It is also proposed to delete certain superfluous words regarding the meaning of "clerical worker" in the definition of "employee," and also certain misleading words regarding the meaning of "carter." Section 4 also expresses the definition of "night." It is proposed to repeal that definition. There is no definition of "day," and the present definition of "night" might be misleading, especially in view of recent industrial legislation and industrial awards. Clause 3 proposes to add to section 7 of the principal Act a provision making it an offence to occupy a shop not registered, or a failure to renew registration on or before 31st January in each year. This will simplify and strengthen the present section without making any material alteration. The innovation is proposed as the result of the opinion of the Crown Law Officers. Section 27 deals with the sanitation of factories and workshops. Clause 4 adds a new sub-clause to the section, which provides that the section shall apply to wharves and to buildings thereon, with certain qualifications expressed in the clause. The reason for the alteration is obvious. It is necessary with respect to sanitary and lavatory accommodation for employees taking meals on the wharves. Clause 5 deals with the question of exempted shops. Section 50 sets out the list of exempted shops. Clause 5 seeks to remove tobacconists' shops from the list of exempted shops, but it is now proposed to delete the clause, which was originally inserted as the result of a deputation which waited on the ex-Minister for Public Works, who took it that the representation made to him on the subject was fairly unanimous. But as the result of a subsequent deputation to myself, as Secretary for Public Works, and also to the ex-Minister, who is now Premier, it has been decided for the present to delete the clause.

Mr. FRY: Does that mean that the small tobacconists will be allowed to carry on as at present?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes. Section 52 provides the machinery for taking a poll for the weekly half-holiday in the various districts. Clause 7 proposes to repeal the first nine subsections of the section. The object of the repeal is to make provision for a general Saturday half-holiday. This was attempted in 1916, and a provision to that effect was passed by this House, but it was rejected by the Council, and—rather

than lose the Bill—the Government agreed to the amendment suggested by the Council. It is proposed now to make the Saturday half-holiday general wherever the Act applies. At present each district may choose its own half-holiday, and may alter it once in every three years, but there is a growing tendency in favour of Saturday as a universal half-holiday. At present out of 118 districts seventy-eight observe Saturday, and the tendency of industrial awards is in favour of making that the day on which the weekly half-holiday shall be observed. In many cases the result of the poll conflicts with the industrial awards, and that is unsatisfactory.

Mr. ROBERTS: Do you remember the poll at Bundaberg?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I cannot say that I remember.

Mr. ROBERTS: The State shop practically broke the law there, didn't it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Wherever the Act applies, Saturday will be observed as the weekly half-holiday. Under certain industrial awards the employees have been granted the weekly half-holiday on Saturday, whereas the shops are closed on some other day—say Thursday—and that is unsatisfactory. Section 56 deals with the carters' half-holiday, and provides that they shall have a half-holiday on some working day in each week. That is a disadvantage, and it is proposed to give the carters their half-holiday on the prescribed weekly half-holiday. That is, where Saturday is the day fixed for the half-holiday, they must have their half-holiday on that day and not on some other day in the week. The clause also provides that it shall not be lawful for any occupant of any factory or shop to cart or deliver, or permit any person in his employment to cart or deliver any goods on the weekly half-holiday; or, where any industrial agreement provides a weekly whole holiday for carters, the preceding provision shall apply to the whole of such weekly holiday. It is unlawful, therefore, for the carter himself, or for an occupier, if he is not an employee, to deliver goods upon the prescribed half-holiday. The object is to prevent unfair competition. Notwithstanding that a carter may not be an employee, it is not permissible for him to deliver on the half-holiday. Section 56 of the original Act provides that no occupier of any shop or factory shall employ a carter for a longer period than fifty-three hours per week. Clause 9 of the Bill reduces the hours to forty-eight. The change is made in conformity with the weekly limitation of ordinary working hours, as laid down in section 10 of the Industrial Arbitration Act. It will be unlawful for a carter to work overtime in excess of the working hours prescribed when the Bill comes into operation. Overtime must not be worked after 1 p.m. on the Saturday half-holiday, nor before starting time or closing time named in any award under the Industrial Arbitration Act. It is quite possible that the hours between opening and closing may be twelve, and the hours fixed for working might be eight, and a man would be entitled to four hours overtime. It is not legal for him to work outside the hours I have mentioned.

Mr. FRY: Would this prevent licensed cabmen from carrying parcels after those hours?

[Hon. J. Larcombe.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It all depends; if he is engaged mainly in that work, it might. With regard to carters' hours of employment, it will not be lawful for any occupier of any factory or shop to cart or permit any person to cart on Sundays, with the exception of milk and ice cream. There is the further proviso that, under extraordinary circumstances, the inspector may grant exemption, if he deems it expedient. Such power may be necessary in case of any unforeseen circumstances such as flood, fire, etc. Now, I come to the question of parcel delivery. Section 56 of the original Act provides that, for the purpose of the section, a parcels delivery establishment shall be deemed to be a shop. Clause 9 proposes to add, after "shop," the words—

"Any person engaged in carrying on the business of parcel delivery in connection with any factory or shop, whether he employs carters or not, shall be deemed to be the occupier of a parcel delivery establishment."

The object of this amendment is to prevent the growing tendency for carters to take parcels up to closing time on the day of the half-holiday, and then to deliver them immediately afterwards. That is considered unfair competition. If an employer employing carters is prevented from delivering after the prescribed hour for closing no other contractor should have that privilege. At the present time contractors are in the habit of collecting goods and delivering them immediately after the closing time. That is unfair competition. The contractor who employs labour should comply with the Act. Clause 11 provides—

"After section fifty-nine of the principal Act the following section is inserted:—

"[59A.] The provisions of any industrial award or agreement under the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 shall prevail over anything contained in this Act where any inconsistency exists between such award or agreement and this Act."

I think it is in accord with the principles of law, common sense, and fairness that where an award under a recent Act conflicts with the section of an Act passed many years ago, the more recent Act should prevail.

I have briefly outlined the more important parts of the Bill, and I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

BROOLOO-KENILWORTH (MARY VALLEY) RAILWAY EXTENSION.

PLAN, ETC., RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council intimating that they had approved of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed Brooloo-Kenilworth (Mary Valley) Railway Extension.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 11 o'clock p.m.