

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 1 AUGUST 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 1 AUGUST, 1922.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 3.50 p.m.

TRADE UNIONS (PROPERTY) BILL;
CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

ASSENT.

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

QUESTIONS.

APPOINTMENT OF COST OF JOINT HEALTH BOARD APPOINTED TO DEAL WITH OUTBREAK OF PLAGUE.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. On what date did the Joint Health Board, appointed to deal with the plague outbreak, commence operations

"2. What proportion (if any) of the cost of the operations of the board is borne by the State?

"3. What has been the cost of such operations in the metropolitan area to 30th June last—(a) the State's share; (b) total cost?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*), in the absence of the Home Secretary (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

"1. Tuesday, 6th December, 1921.

"2. (a) The State provided one man to every three men employed by the Board on the rat and disinfecting gangs; (b) services of inspection staff of Health Department in Brisbane; (c) bacteriological examinations.

"3. The cost of such operations in the metropolitan area to 30th June, 1922, was as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
By Board	20,596	16	5
State, since outbreak in September	8,016	3	5
Total	28,612	19	10

FUNCTIONS AND PERSONNEL OF QUEENSLAND MARINE BOARD.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"1. Is it his intention to take such action that will obviate the duplication of duties connected with shipping, so far as the State Marine Board, constituted under the 1876 Act, is concerned?

"2. Have any negotiations regarding control taken place between the Federal and this State Government; if so, what is the position at present?

"3. Who are the representatives constituting such State Marine Board, and what amount was received by each during the financial years 1920-1921, 1921-1922, as members thereof?

"4. Does the person said to be representing the Institute of Marine Engineers receive an allowance, salary, or fee in another Government capacity; if so, in

what capacity, and what amount was received by this person for 1920-1921, 1921-1922, for such duties?

"5. Was any request received asking for more equitable representation on this Marine Board, outside Government members; if so, will he state what the request was, when it was made, and the action taken thereon?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Arrangements were made on the 1st March, 1922, for the performance by the Commonwealth Government officers of the duties of shipping masters as regards intra-State shipping, except at Thursday Island, at which place such duties are still being carried out by a State official. When the Commonwealth Navigation Act is in full operation, the question of the necessity of continuing a State Marine Board will be considered.

"3.—

"Members.	Fees Paid.					
	1920-21.	1921-22.				
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Chairman—the Portmaster	Nil.			Nil.		
Captain W. J. Collin ..	65	0	0	69	6	0
Mr. C. H. Burke ..	52	10	0	44	2	0
Mr. W. R. Wilkie ..	25	4	0	63	0	0
Mr. J. W. Chew ..	72	9	0	61	19	0

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT "JOB CONTROL" AND RE-ESTABLISH PRINCIPLE OF "RIGHT TO WORK."

Mr. VOWLES asked the Premier—

"In view of the numerous cases which are constantly occurring of refusal by unions which have secured preference under awards to allow workers to join such unions upon application, will he take steps to introduce legislation to obviate such tyrannical action and the consequent formation of 'job trusts' and to re-establish the principle of 'the right to work,' which in a democratic State should exist?"

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

"Under existing legislation, the Industrial Arbitration Court has power to deal with such cases, if there be any."

PAPERS.

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

Report by the Under Secretary for Public Lands under the Closer Settlement Acts, 1906-1917.

Thirty-eighth report on the creation, inscription, and issue of stock under the provisions of the Queensland Stock Inscription Act.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

Question—That the Bill be now read a third time (*Mr. Theodore's motion*)—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Pease
" Cooper, W.	" Pollock
" Coyne	" Riordan
" Dash	" Ryan
" Dunstan	" Smith
" Ferricks	" Stopford
" Foley	" Theodore
" Forde	" Weir
" Gilday	" Wellington
" Gillies	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
" Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Forde.

NOES, 29.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Jones, J.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kerr
" Barnes, W. H.	" King
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Brand	" Morgan
" Cattermull	" Nott
" Clayton	" Peterson
" Corser	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Costello	" Roberts, T. R.
" Deacon	" Swayne
" Edwards	" Taylor
" Elphinstone	" Vowles
" Fletcher	" Walker
" Fry	" Warren
" Green	

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

SALARIES BILL.

INITIATION IN CHAIR.

(*Mr. Kirwan, Brisbane, in the chair.*)

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I beg to move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide for the reduction of the salaries of certain officers of the Public Service and of Ministers of the Crown and certain officers of Parliament, and for the reduction of the payment of members of the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): The information we have in regard to this motion is rather meagre. I understand the proposed reduction is 5 per cent. A motion was brought before this Chamber by the hon. member for Townsville recently, impressing upon the House the necessity of putting Parliament, at any rate, in line with public servants whose salaries were being reduced. At that time we raised the question whether public servants who were in receipt of a salary of over £300 per annum and were deprived of the privilege of approaching the Arbitration Court—to which the more fortunate members of the service who were receiving under £300 per annum had access, and from which they received material benefits—would be brought in *holus bolus* or dealt with individually, as in the case of certain men a reduction would be an injustice. Since then I have made some inquiries into the matter, and I find that salaried officers in all branches of the public service, both under £300 and over £300, receive annual increases to their salaries between the specified minimum and maximum salaries for each grade or position.

[*Mr. Vowles.*]

These minimum and maximum salaries are set out in the various public service awards and in the classification of the public service as amended from time to time with the approval of the Governor in Council.

As from 1st July, 1917, all salaries and classifications were brought to the level which was considered to be warranted by the then increase in the cost of living. Since then officers receiving less than £300 per annum have received an aggregate basic wage increase of £50 per annum to meet the increased cost of living, as ordered by the Arbitration Court. Officers receiving over £300, during the same period (owing to the operation of the various Orders in Council), have received basic wage increases ranging from nil to a total of £25.

As from 1st July, 1922, the court has ordered in respect of officers receiving less than £300 per annum

(a) Automatic increases as usual (£10 to £15 per annum);

(b) A reduction of £10 per annum.

The Government in this Bill, in respect of officers receiving over £300 per annum, propose—

(a) No automatic increases (usually £20 to £25 per annum until the maximum salary for the position is reached);

(b) A reduction of 5 per cent.

It is patent to anybody that people who were put on a classification, who were receiving a salary less than the maximum salary, who were going to be deprived of their automatic increases, and who, in addition, are to suffer a reduction of 5 per cent., are being done an injustice. The same condition obtains with respect to those officers receiving over £300 per year, as applied when they had the privilege of the Arbitration Court when the awards were made.

Mr. BRENNAN: How many are there?

Mr. VOWLES: I understand that they represent only about 15 per cent. of the public service, and that this 5 per cent. reduction represents a sum of about £5,000 a year out of a total saving estimated by the Premier to be £230,000 per annum.

Under the award of the Arbitration Court and the Bill respectively, an officer receiving less than £300 per annum last year will this year receive the same salary, or an increase of £5, while an officer on, say, £350 last year, will suffer a reduction of £17 10s.

Mr. BRENNAN: Did you not vote for a reduction of 10 per cent. the other night?

Mr. VOWLES: Not in respect of the people of whom I am now speaking.

Mr. BRENNAN: You voted for a reduction of the salaries of the lower-paid officers.

Mr. VOWLES: I asked for special consideration to be given to those people because they had not received the benefits the other people had received. The increases to the lower-paid officers were given because of the increase in the cost of living, whereas the others' salaries were left standing. Those people who did not receive an increase because of the increased cost of living have been inconvenienced during that time, and now they are going to be attacked and reduced in the same way as those who did receive the increase.

The PREMIER: Those over £300 a year got increases.

Mr. VOWLES: They got some allowances, but not the same proportion as was given to the others. Some of the juniors received an increase of £50 a year, and those juniors, in most cases, are single men, and in some cases single girls without responsibilities.

Mr. BRENNAN: They support their parents.

Mr. VOWLES: A good many do not. A lot of the money is spent on racehorses and bookmakers and at picture shows.

Mr. BRENNAN: That is an insult.

Mr. VOWLES: A tremendous amount of waste money comes into the hands of the junior public servants, as well as into the hands of other junior members of the community. These people have no responsibilities, and those who have families to keep have not received increases in the same proportion as the junior members of the service. The whole thing comes back to basing salaries on what it costs to keep a man, his wife, and three children. If the juniors were compelled to set aside a portion of the money that is given to them, and it was put into a fund bearing interest, to be drawn at a later stage, then there would be some sense in it. In most cases the money is squandered, and the people over £300 per annum have to suffer in consequence, and that is inequitable and unfair. I am given to understand that a great many anomalies will occur under this Bill. I understand that none of the officers in the Department of Public Instruction will be affected.

The PREMIER: None under £300 per annum.

Mr. VOWLES: Will it affect any over £300 per annum?

The PREMIER: Certain officers will be affected.

Mr. VOWLES: Certain officers; but not all. You will find this position arising. If you go into a town where there is a State school and a high school, the salary of the State school teachers, other than the head teacher, will not be affected, but the salary of the head master of the high school will be affected. The high school head master is supposed to have superior qualifications and he has to look after the interests of that school, yet he will be receiving less salary than the State school teachers.

The PREMIER: Where did you get that information?

Mr. VOWLES: The information has been given to me, and I understand it is correct. I understand it will affect police magistrates also. These men have to apply themselves in a different way from the ordinary public servants. They have to qualify and make themselves proficient in technical matters. Clerks of petty sessions have to pass examinations with a view to appointment to the position of police magistrate. All these men are affected, and in many cases they are just on the margin. Professional officers—men who have to qualify for a special occupation—will also be affected. I think there should be some distinction between the reduction in the salaries of these officers and the officers of the ordinary division of the service. These men have to qualify specially for their positions. The motion deals, first of all, with members of this House and with Ministers of the Crown. We have debated that matter already, and we are prepared, individually and collectively, I understand, without any demur to suffer in the same way

as the public servants; and, whilst Ministers of the Crown are prepared also to submit themselves to the 5 per cent. deduction, does it not open up the question of whether Ministers of the Crown are not in receipt of other emoluments apart from their salaries, and whether the time has not now arrived when this House should know what those emoluments are in order that they may be made public, or whether we should make an attack in order to determine what the emoluments shall be for the future? We on this side have for years past been asking for this information, and a motion has been carried by this House that the information should be given, but the Premier has sidetracked it on every occasion. We have never been able to get that information. In order that we may be able to get it, I beg to move the addition after the word "Assembly," in the last line of the motion, of the words—

"and for determining monetary and other allowances to be paid to Ministers of the Crown while travelling (a) within the State, (b) beyond the State."

We have always been told that the information would be forthcoming if we were prepared to ask also what amount of money had been received by Ministers of the Crown under previous Administrations. This House carried it, and, as I have said before, that information should be forthcoming.

Mr. PETERSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: Even if Ministers in the past were lavish towards themselves—if their expenses were higher than those that previous Governments thought necessary—two wrongs do not make a right; and that is no reason why a democratic Government, who are now retrenching, should be lavish to themselves, and should refuse to give to the taxpayers of Queensland any particulars of those very vast sums of money—I am given to understand—which from time to time are received by them. I do not want to be personal, but we know what the cost of the Premier's trip to England was; and we know the cost of Mr. Fihelly's trip to America—for no business purpose whatever. We know in season and out of season, during the recess and on the eve of elections—even in connection with elections in other States—Ministers have toured the country for electioneering purposes and have drawn expenses. We also find they went so far as to give public funds to certain members of their party to go to New South Wales electioneering. We find them going abroad, on every excuse, holidaying, and charging the whole of their expenses up to this State, and taking, in addition, fees for their own personal use. Surely to goodness hon. members of this House and the public are entitled to know what these fees are! You only have to look at the Sydney "Bulletin" to note the different practice followed in Queensland to that followed in New South Wales. In New South Wales a Minister gets a certain allowance per day, out of which he pays the whole of the cost of his trip, while in Queensland it appears that the whole of the cost of the trip, even down to cigarettes, newspapers, and a loaf of bread—(laughter)—are charged up against the Minister's department, and, in addition, the Minister takes from £2 2s. to £3 3s. per day, according to whether he is travelling inside or outside the State.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are quite wrong.

Mr. Vowles.]

Mr. VOWLES: We find Ministers touring the different districts ostensibly in the interests of the department concerned, and charging huge sums in respect of motor-cars and other items which should be paid out of their political funds or out of their own pockets.

Mr. POLLOCK: I wish that was the case so far as I am concerned.

Mr. VOWLES: Not private members, but Ministers. In some cases private members go with them and participate. I think that has happened quite recently.

The PREMIER: It is not correct to say that Ministers tour round during election time and charge their expenses to their departments.

Mr. VOWLES: I call it electioneering, but, perhaps, the hon. gentleman does not. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us the details. That is the best way to talk; let the hon. gentleman put his cards on the table. We have been asking for the information for seven years.

The PREMIER: I am getting the details together. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: You have been seven years over it.

The PREMIER: We gave you the details last year, and you were not satisfied.

Mr. VOWLES: We have never yet got the truth. What we want is the truth, and I am giving the hon. gentleman the opportunity by this amendment either to give us the truth—let him put his cards on the table so that we can see what the expenses are—or for this House, in the future, to determine what amounts are to be paid within and outside the State.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I have no intention of accepting the amendment. The Bill which it is proposed to introduce deals with the salaries of members of Parliament and Ministers and the salaries of certain officers in the public service, and does not deal with or interfere with the travelling allowances or emoluments in addition to the salaries. If the hon. member desires to get a review of Ministers' allowances or expenses, it can be done in a proper way, without seeking to sidetrack the purport of this motion or the intention of this Bill. Apparently the hon. member feels chagrined that this Bill is introduced and will apply to his own salary. (Opposition dissent.) After making a pre-

tence, and putting up one or two [4 p.m.] hon. members on the other side to ask questions appearing to be in favour of a 10 per cent. reduction in members' salaries, they are now apparently chagrined because they are asked to submit to a 5 per cent. reduction.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No! No!

Mr. VOWLES: No; we want you to put your cards on the table.

The PREMIER: The hon. member who has made this wild harangue this afternoon has had no experience of Ministerial office, and apparently knows nothing of the necessity for Ministers travelling round the State. His colleague the hon. member for Albert could have enlightened him as to the necessity for it.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: All my vouchers were always laid on the table.

[*Mr. Vowles.*

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Albert could have enlightened his leader on the necessity of Ministers getting a travelling allowance in addition to their salaries. Ministers surely cannot be expected to travel over a large State like Queensland on the many occasions on which their duties necessitate it and pay the whole cost out of their salaries. If they had to do that, at the end of the year there would be very little left of their salaries. No Ministers either in this or any previous Administration ever paid out of their salaries the whole of their travelling or touring expenses when engaged on public business. Some Ministers are more frugal than others in this respect, and that applies to every Administration. But every Premier has had control of the situation. The Premier, as a rule, in order to have some kind of uniformity, notes a minute on the papers relating to the expenses of Ministers to show the amount they will be entitled to draw. That practice has been pursued by all Administrations in Queensland. These expenses are all subject to the close scrutiny of the Auditor-General. There is no item of expenditure incurred by Ministers when travelling or otherwise that is not subject to the Auditor-General's scrutiny, or to his comment, if he thinks comment is deserving in these cases. The Auditor-General can call attention to anything he likes. He is absolutely divorced from any control by the Government, and is subject only to Parliament.

Mr. MORGAN: Why were the figures not given to Parliament?

The PREMIER: I told the hon. member that I would get the information and have it available when the Estimates came on. The hon. member keeps asking questions and getting information every year, and, because he does not know how to ask questions or to use information when he gets it, it is futile to continue answering those questions. I heard the hon. member for Normanby give a loud "Hear, hear!" when the leader of the Opposition asked for details of Ministers' expenses, and applaud the hon. member when he expressed his opinion that these expenses should be seriously curtailed; but I want to remind the House that the hon. member for Normanby, in common with other hon. members of the Opposition, has taken advantage of the opportunity to accompany Ministers and has had his expenses paid.

Mr. PETERSON: That is not true. On the last occasion I paid my own expenses.

The PREMIER: I do not intend to allow this motion to be sidetracked on the flimsy pretext of the leader of the Opposition that he wants information which can be secured in the proper way.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): We have been treated to an example of viciousness which I do not think this House has seen since I have been a member. The Premier, by a torrent of words, has endeavoured to deflect the castigation which should rest on his own shoulders. With regard to the reduction of salaries of members of Parliament, this party, being of opinion that an example should come from Parliament itself in the matter of reduction of salaries, honestly proposed a 10 per cent. reduction.

The PREMIER: Honestly proposed!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The Premier, seeing that we were stealing a march on the

Government and placing them in an invidious position, forestalled us by proposing a 5 per cent. reduction, which, in our opinion, is not sufficient. We think it should be 10 per cent. We contend that, if the taxpayer of Queensland is to be harassed in the way that he is—if he is to be asked personal, inquisitive, and impertinent questions regarding the sources of his income, so that every taxable penny shall be brought into the coffers of the Government—the taxpayer is entitled to know where the money goes that is expended so lavishly by Ministers on the other side of the House. The mere fact of this information not being given during the last four or five years—as it has not been given to my personal knowledge, although persistently asked for session after session—is evidence that Ministers have some reason of their own for not disclosing the information. The look on the faces of the eight or nine gentlemen facing us when the leader of the Opposition was pointing his dart at them was evidence that those gentlemen knew that the dart was striking home. We want this information for the sake of the taxpayer, who has to pay for these jaunts which are indulged in. It is the taxpayer who is asked to foot these bills, and why should he not be given an opportunity of knowing what the expenditure is? The Premier, in his vicious desire to drag the hon. member for Normanby into his clutches in this regard, admitted that the rank and file of the party, when accompanying the Ministers, also had their expenses paid.

The PREMIER: Members on both sides of the House.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: We want to know what expenditure is being incurred, and why we are being denied information regarding it session after session. It is a matter which is becoming a public scandal. If the Premier is sincere in his desire to be fair and to disclose the position, he cannot help agreeing to this amendment. It is no good trying to sidetrack the motion by a vicious attack on members on this side. We have been too long in this business to be circumvented by it, and we know that we have touched a vulnerable point. We want this information for the benefit of the taxpayers, who have every right to know where their money is going.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I am pleased that the leader of the Opposition has moved his amendment, and I will give it my support. The Premier, in his attack on the leader of the Opposition, and also in reference to the questions I have asked on numerous occasions, has not been fair. In 1919, I asked the Premier a question regarding the amount of money which Ministers drew in respect of travelling allowances. I asked the question in 1920, and again in 1921, when the following resolution was carried unanimously by the House—

“That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing the amount paid or incurred by the State in respect of the travelling expenses of each individual member of the Ministry during the years ended 30th June, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921.”

That resolution was carried with a view to getting the travelling expenses for the last six years of the Liberal Administration and

the first six years of the Labour Administration. The resolution, as amended by hon. members opposite, was carried unanimously. Notwithstanding the fact that that resolution was carried in September, 1921, the Premier has not given us the information I asked for. I asked a question the other day in regard to the expenses of Ministers, and I was told that the information would be supplied as early as possible. Last session I asked the Premier to let us know the amount of money allowed to Ministers during the Federal campaign in connection with the Maranoa by-election. The reply of the hon. gentleman was that the information would be obtained. Perhaps the information was obtained, but it has not yet been disclosed to this House. That is purely and simply evasion. The information may be in the possession of the Premier, but we have not got it. When a resolution is carried unanimously by this House, or even when it is carried by a majority, the Premier should respect that resolution and supply the information to the House. What is he afraid of? If the present Government can show that their travelling expenses are not as great as the expenses of Ministers prior to 1915, then why do they not disclose the information? I have always contended that, no matter what Government is in power, this question should be asked every year, because we have a right to get this information. It is just the same as the information which is asked for in connection with the fees paid by the Crown to barristers and solicitors. A question is asked and a return is tabled every year giving that information. The taxpayers have a right to get this information, and we have a right to know exactly what sums have been received by Ministers in the way of travelling expenses. I do not object to Ministers receiving an allowance when they are travelling round the country. No one expects them to travel at their own expense, but they should only receive out-of-pocket expenses. I do not think that Ministers should make money out of their tours round the country. We know, as a matter of fact, that Ministers make a large amount of money out of their travelling expenses.

The PREMIER: Do you think that Ministers are in pocket at present after travelling round the country?

Mr. MORGAN: I do. I understand that the Premier put £1,000 in his banking account as a result of his trip to England.

The PREMIER: That is absurd.

Mr. MORGAN: I will read the figures from the Auditor-General's report. It says in the Auditor-General's report for 1921 that the total expenditure in connection with the Premier's visit to England in 1920 amounted to £4,043 11s. 3d. All the details of expenses are given here, and anyone reading these figures will see that the Premier put £1,000 into the bank.

The PREMIER: That is absolute dirt.

Mr. MORGAN: I will give the items in connection with the Premier's trip from the Auditor-General's report. The first is “Steamer fares £1,100 10s. 10d., and railway fares £219 16s. 10d.” That includes the Premier's railway fares as well as those of the other members of his party. Then there is “Hotel accommodation, £749 17s. 7d.; Cables, telegrams, car hire, and sundries, £965 11s.” That includes all the Premier's

Mr. Morgan.]

car hire. Then here is the last item, "Travelling allowances, £1,007 15s." What were the "travelling allowances" when all the expenses were paid? The steamer fares were paid, the railway fares were paid, and also the hotel accommodation. All the items are shown separately. There are separate items for "cables, car hire, and sundries"—whatever "sundries" may mean. Everything that the Premier wanted in connection with that particular trip was paid for, yet he received travelling allowances amounting to £1,007.

Mr. HARTLEY: It does not say that the reception of guests was paid for.

Mr. MORGAN: I would like to know what "sundries" were. Sundries would include the reception of guests. And, in addition, all the time the Premier was in England he drew his salary as Premier as well.

Mr. BRENNAN: Do you object to him spending his own salary?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not object to that at all; nor do I object to the items for steamer fares, railway fares, and hotel accommodation, but I cannot understand the £1,007 for travelling allowances when all the expenses were paid.

The PREMIER: Do you think that you could live for two months in London in 1920 on nothing?

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman did not live on nothing. A large amount of money was paid.

The PREMIER: You are misrepresenting it.

Mr. MORGAN: I think the Premier was very lavish in his expenditure. I think he was well in pocket after his tour to England.

The PREMIER: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. MORGAN: In connection with this Bill, I want to know why the judges are not included. I asked a question about the judges twelve months ago. Knowing the state of the country at that time, I asked the Premier to consider the advisableness of reducing all salaries in the public service, from the highest to the lowest, right down to the man receiving £210 a year. I stated that all salaries should be reduced, including those of the Supreme Court judges. I suggested that we should reduce those getting over £1,000 a year by 20 per cent., right down to those who are just getting a living wage. The Premier said there was no necessity for it. There was just as much necessity for it twelve months ago as there is to-day. I want to know why the judges are not being taken into consideration. It is only right and proper that the judges should be brought within the scope of this Bill the same as anyone else, and I hope to be able to bring them within the scope of the Bill before it is passed by this House. Why are the Supreme Court judges not to be included? If anyone opposite will propose to include the Supreme Court judges, it will receive the unanimous support of members on this side of the House. I consider that the Supreme Court judge has just as much right to have his salary reduced as the man receiving the lowest wage.

Mr. POLLOCK: Would that not be called repudiation?

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member may say it is repudiation. We increased our own salaries, so it is no more repudiation to reduce them than to increase them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am asking you if you do not think it is repudiation?

Mr. MORGAN: Does the hon. member think the judges' salaries should be reduced?

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes.

Mr. MORGAN: Well he has the power to push the Premier. I am surprised that he does not push his leader, and make him reduce the judges' salaries. This is only a milk-and-water sort of a reduction.

The PREMIER: What reduction of members do you suggest?

Mr. MORGAN: We ought to reduce the members of this House to fifty-two.

The PREMIER: What reduction in salaries?

Mr. MORGAN: Ten per cent.

The PREMIER: Will you move an amendment to that effect?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not know that I will move an amendment. That is a party question.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Will you make the reduction 20 per cent. for a member who has a business?

Mr. MORGAN: A man in receipt of £1,000 and over should have his salary reduced 20 per cent., those getting £500 should be reduced 15 per cent., and those under £500 should be reduced 10 per cent. That was the question I asked last year, and it should be taken into consideration now. I think that we should have the fullest information regarding the expenditure generally. Surely, there can be no objection to the Premier placing this information on the table of the House. We should have a statement in respect to the cost of all Ministerial trips. The Premier said just now that all the accounts were subject to audit by the Auditor-General. Does he audit all the accounts in connection with the trips made by the Premier?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. MORGAN: Then why does it not appear in the Auditor-General's report? It is an extraordinary thing that the expense of the Premier's visit to England appear in the Auditor-General's report—that was a right and proper thing to do, because we have a right to be supplied with that information—but the report makes no reference to the other trips of the Premier and other Ministers. If the Premier makes a Northern tour or a Western tour, we should have all the information in connection with those tours.

The PREMIER: If you come into my office to-morrow morning, I will show you the whole of my vouchers.

Mr. MORGAN: Why did you not respond to the motion I moved?

The PREMIER: Give me time.

Mr. MORGAN: The Premier does not intend to give us this information. I have asked for the information and for a comparison to be made with the expenses of Liberal Ministers for five or six years. It looks suspicious when we do not get the information, and people outside are talking about the amounts the different Ministers get in this connection. If the Premier thinks that the expenses paid to Liberal

Ministers were greater than to Labour Ministers, why is he afraid to table the information? In justice to the people, the Premier has a right to disclose this information. Our auditors fully and methodically examine all the accounts in connection with Government departments, and it is the same in connection with the local authorities; and, just as the information is given in connection with the local authorities because the ratepayers are entitled to the information, so also are we entitled to this information in connection with Government departments. Why should the same principle not apply to the taxpayers of Queensland? I hope the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition will be carried, and I hope we will get the support of the Nationalist party and the Labour party.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): It is very regrettable indeed that we should be considering this afternoon the necessity for the introduction of a Bill to carry out the objects which the Premier has indicated. It is just another case of chickens coming home to roost—another case of the Government reaping what they have been sowing for quite a number of years. No one is to blame more than Ministers themselves for the introduction into the discussion of Ministerial allowances and their disbursement. All that this House wants, and all that it is entitled to, is that a full account of disbursements by Ministers shall be tabled, or be available to Parliament, and that no expenditure shall be permitted by Ministers in any direction whatever on electioneering propaganda. That is not a fair thing to this House or to the people.

The PREMIER: Why place that disability on Ministers? We incur responsibilities in connection with elections.

Mr. TAYLOR: When elections come round, Ministers should be prepared, the same as private members, to pay their own expenses.

The PREMIER: They do.

Mr. TAYLOR: Private members are not allowed to draw anything for their expenses during an election period, and why should Ministers? If the statement the Premier made this afternoon in regard to one hon. member is correct, I think it is highly improper. I think he said that the expenses of one hon. member had been paid on a trip he took with Ministers.

Mr. POLLOCK: So were yours when we went to Charleville. There were six of us, including three of you, and you all had your expenses paid.

Mr. TAYLOR: No. I take it that the Premier referred to monetary allowances.

The PREMIER: Oh, no. I said the cost of the trip.

Mr. TAYLOR: I know that, when we have travelled with Ministers, we have had our "tucker bill" paid.

The PREMIER: That comes under Ministers' expenses; you must remember that.

Mr. TAYLOR: When questions are asked, if Ministers have nothing to hide, they should not be afraid of putting all their cards on the table, and letting the people know what the cost of their trips has been. If one goes back a few years and makes a comparison—even admitting the higher cost now—one finds that Ministers nowadays travel with a retinue. That should not be. Minis-

ters do not require a whole army of secretaries and attendants to help them label their luggage.

The PREMIER: What retinue do you refer to? I take fewer officers and attendants than any of my predecessors.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not prepared to accept the Premier's statement with regard to that. If the Premier's expenses compare favourably with those of Mr. Denham on the occasion when he managed to secure the renewal of large loans falling due, and when Mr. Kidston took a trip to England, I shall be quite prepared to say no more.

The PREMIER: I can show you that they took more officers than I took.

Mr. TAYLOR: Ministers should be as careful in the expenditure and in the rendering of accounts with respect to public money as in the expenditure of their own money—or, rather, more careful, because they are responsible for every penny they spend. I am not standing up to advocate that the Premier should travel as a mendicant when he goes abroad; and I have stated in the House on a previous occasion that the wives of Ministers should have their expenses paid when they have to attend certain functions, because they have to carry out quite a lot of important duties in assisting their husbands in doing the work of their offices.

The PREMIER: If we did that there would be a tremendous uproar from that side of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not believe it. And then, when the House rises at half-past 10, you find downstairs half a dozen motor-cars for the party on the other side.

The PREMIER: Don't forget that your Administration initiated that idea. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: That is the only thing in which you copied them.

Mr. TAYLOR: Even if they did it, that is no reason why the present Administration should do it.

The PREMIER: You were supporting them.

Mr. TAYLOR: This is a retrenchment Bill, and it is only right and fair, if we are going to retrench public servants, that retrenchment should start with Ministers themselves. When the House has sat late, I know that a few of us have had to find the money ourselves for a motor-car to take us home. If it is right for Ministers to incur these expenses, I think there is ample justification for private members incurring them; but I do not believe that the expenditure should be incurred at all, particularly when we are passing through such troublous and strenuous times. As I said at the outset of my remarks, the Government are simply reaping what they have sown. They have been reckless in the administration of public funds in so many directions that they now find it necessary to come on those least able to bear a reduction, and endeavour by that means to make up the deficiencies which should never have been incurred.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I am going to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, because I realise that, though Ministers ought to have their expenses paid in proper cases, there are many occasions when they are not justified. Take that aeroplane arrangement before the last election.

Mr. Moore.]

We have never got the information as to who paid for that. We heard the story that an attempt had been made on the Premier's life by a man who put a screw-wrench or something of that kind into the machinery. We have a right to know about all these things. Again, when Ministers go down South, interfering in the elections in other States and in Federal elections as they do, there is no earthly reason why the people of Queensland should have to pay the expense. The Premier said that, when a private member travelled with a Minister, he had his expenses paid. I remember a case where that was not done. When we arrived at the terminus of the line we found that there were two motor-cars waiting for the members of the Minister's party, but none for anybody else; and we were told, "Are you not coming? If you are, you had better get your own car."

The PREMIER: What Minister was that?

Mr. MOORE: The late Mr. Adamson, when he was Secretary for Railways.

The PREMIER interjected.

Mr. MOORE: I have been on only one trip, and I take strong exception to the Premier's innuendo.

The PREMIER: And I take strong exception to your innuendo that any Minister could be so mean?

Mr. MOORE: We did pay. I am quite prepared to stand up to any statement I make in this House, and I am not going to be contradicted nor allow assertions to be made that I am not telling the truth, because I am. I know perfectly well what I am talking about. The Premier made a statement, and I am quite prepared to give my own contradiction of it. Because we ask for a limitation of the extraordinary expenditure of Ministers when electioneering, we have all sorts of aspersions and innuendoes cast on members on this side. We are perfectly justified in asking to be given a fair statement of Ministerial expenses. By accident, there was published in a Northern paper a statement of the Attorney-General's expenses.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Oh, no!

Mr. MOORE: Did they not have detectives going round the North endeavouring to find out from the man who published it where he obtained his information from? Were not public servants victimised because of the leakage?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is not true.

Mr. MOORE: We know there was victimisation because of the exposure of the way in which Ministers were throwing away public money. I do not want to be cheseparing.

When Ministers travel on official [4.30 p.m.] business, either in their own State or elsewhere, they should be given a proper allowance. If there is nothing to hide, the Premier should put the statement on the table, and we would then know exactly where we stand. To keep on asking for a return and having it put off year after year arouses suspicion in the mind of the people and in my mind, especially when we have a statement published showing that public money is not being expended in the way in which it ought to be expended.

The PREMIER: You are very suspicious.

Mr. MOORE: We have grounds for suspicion. When something comes out here and

[Mr. Moore.

there, quite by accident, it adds to the suspicion. The Premier will be well advised to accept this amendment and let us have the details of this travelling expenditure both inside and outside the State.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): This amendment has been rendered necessary by the attitude of the Government in absolutely refusing from time to time to give information to members on this side of the House. What the hon. member for Murilla said is perfectly correct—that year after year we sought to get information in connection with certain expenditure, and that information has not been forthcoming. No one knows better than the Premier that that is the position; he has sidetracked it again and again. This afternoon, by interjection, the hon. gentleman told the hon. member for Murilla that we were going to get it. I would like to ask when we are going to get it. At one period, because the Government had a big majority, they simply snapped their fingers at members of the Opposition when hon. members asked a question. We have no right to tolerate such an action. One supporter of the Government, who probably knows exactly what is happening in caucus, has told us that they are doing it now. We know they are. What has been the reason for keeping it back? From time to time we have had statements made by hon. members sitting on the opposite side that the expenditure of ex-Ministers was very great indeed. The hon. member for Murilla has said that, if that is so, the Government should put those expenses side by side with the expenses of the present Administration and let us know where we are. The Premier is afraid to do it; he is going to do again what he can to block the giving of this information and to keep the public in the dark.

The PREMIER: If I put it on the table, it would show, at any rate, that you drew a monetary allowance in addition to being paid your hotel expenses.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I challenge the hon. gentleman, as I have previously challenged him, to do it; he knows he dare not do it. This amendment has been prompted by the fact that again and again we have had information withheld from us. Take up the business-sheet for this session and look at the replies which have been given to questions. In many cases they have been so sidetracked by the Government that members on this side have come to realise that they are not able to get any information. The Government have simply floated members representing important constituencies; representing, too, the people. Is it not a reasonable conclusion, when a question is being sidetracked, that the hon. gentleman is afraid to give the answer? I do not like being personal; but what do we know of some happenings? Might I remind the House of what took place in Townsville in connection with a trip of the Attorney-General? A small sum was spent in connection with the necessities of life, and a big bill at some entertainment for spirits, etc., etc.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Albert, you mean? (Government laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am speaking of the present Attorney-General.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What was the total amount of my bill?

HON. W. H. BARNES: This amendment is brought in because the public servant is

being squeezed, and is having imposed upon him a reduction which should not be put upon him, and in the face of a promise that there would be no reduction. Yet we have the Premier, in his suave way, saying, "Later on I will give it back to you"—thinking we shall be foolish enough to accept his statement. I would like every hon. member to demand that this information be given. If it is not given, surely the public outside will be able to realise that the Premier is not sincere; and they will be the best judges of the matter. I shall be sorry for some members who, because they are supporting this action of the Government, will find later on that the number of their mess is missing.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): In supporting the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, I do not wish to say that Ministers should not have a fair travelling allowance. I do not think any member of the Opposition will say that Ministers of the Crown, particularly the Premier, should not receive sufficient expenses to enable them to fulfil the duties of their office. But, when we are considering a reduction of salaries and wages of Government servants throughout the State, we should get down to a business footing and decide that this House shall have some details of the expenditure incurred by Ministers in the various departments. We think the time has come when we should do away with the old system, whether it is considered bad for the Government or whether it is not, and be given some idea of what is available for each Minister to spend. Prompting us in this direction are many things which have occurred very recently. There is not only the incident of the Attorney-General, who had a certain amount of money appropriated towards expenses for himself whilst he was away. Without referring to "Johnny's Jazz," or any such thing—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: Quite so, Sir: I will not refer to it. But I must refer to the fact that, whilst the Minister received an amount for expenses, he also drew a voucher for whisky, beer, bread, steak, and newspapers. (Laughter.) If the cost of newspapers is not defrayed out of his ordinary expense allowance, surely he must be double-banking in some way! We know the trouble that there was at the time that the copy of the voucher was published. The General Manager of the Railway Department at Townsville put a detective on the track of the person who was bad enough to take a copy of the voucher, and he went round and tried to squash the matter at once. He was careful to keep track of the voucher that got out so that what was going on in the department did not also get out.

The PREMIER: You remember when you were sitting behind the Liberal Administration in which the hon. member for Albert was Home Secretary, he spent money on 10 gallons of rum. (Laughter.)

Mr. CORSER: He provided that rum because most of the hon. members he came in contact with were Labour members.

The PREMIER: And 150 boxes of cigars.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: And vouchers were given for every item.

Mr. CORSER: Part of that liquor was given as a feast at the mission stations visited by the then Home Secretary. (Loud laughter.) The hon. gentlemen left spirits at

the hospitals and other institutions at the different places he visited for the sick. All these things have been charged to him as his own personal expenses. He has already made an explanation with regard to these items, and there is nothing for me to clear up. Whenever this House sits late, Government members go home in motor-cars.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is not so.

Mr. CORSER: Any Government member who requires a car can get it, but Opposition members have to walk home. All these expenses are debited against one department or another. The Government have wiped out State cars, but now they hire cars, and we have four or five motor-cars here perhaps four nights a week, and at a cost of £2 per car, it makes a total cost of £10 a night, or £40 a week. There is no bigger offender in that respect than the Secretary for Agriculture. He is always in a car. He looks all right in a car. We want to know to what department this expenditure is debited. If Ministers are so lax in connection with expenditure for one thing and another, and put it all down under the heading of "incidental expenses," it is not a fair thing to us, and it is not fair to themselves, if they only knew it.

The PREMIER: Why do you not raise these questions on the Estimates?

Mr. CORSER: Because we are unable to get an answer. We want an answer now, and, if the Premier is good enough to give it, well and good. During the election campaign certain expense is going on. Is that debited to the personal expenses of the Ministers? We know that in one of the country electorates cars were paid for by voucher. Those cars were supposed to be doing work in connection with one of the departments; but they were going round the district conveying Government members who were electioneering. If the Government are going to keep in power in that way, then we have a right to demand that there shall be some limit, and the House has a right to know just what amount of money is appropriated for such purposes. We are not anxious to curtail the expenses of the Premier so that he will not be able to live as a Premier or visit the whole State as a Premier. I think there should be some limit, and I think the hon. member for Bowen will agree with me in that. I think, when he sits in a motor-car and rides home and sees hon. members of the Opposition walking, that he will agree that there is something wrong. He looks well in a car.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member forgets the number of years that I was in Opposition when Government members passed me by in their cars.

Mr. CORSER: When Mr. Kidston was Premier only three cars were in use, and he was criticised by hon. members of the Labour party for riding in a car; but now we find that the Labour party are the party who drive in cars whilst members of the Opposition have to go home per boot. I think the leader of the Opposition is quite right in asking that there should be some limit, or that the fixation of the amount of expenses should be placed on some business footing, and that the present conditions should not be allowed to continue.

Hon. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): The Premier was good enough to refer to myself this afternoon in connection with the expenses incurred

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

by me on my different trips as Home Secretary. This reference has been made on different occasions, and during last session I asked a series of questions and elicited certain answers, which conclusively proved that every item of my expenditure was attested by voucher, showing the last ounce of coal used on the Government steamer "Otter," and the last ounce of liquor consumed on that trip.

The PREMIER: Is the hon. member for Burnett in order in saying that you took spirits to the missions? (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: No.

Mr. CORSER: I meant to the Government institutions.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I feel certain that members of the missions participated with those who visited the steamer. I did not hold myself responsible for those who visited the steamer. On every occasion when I was requested by hon. members of the then Opposition side of the House to table the amount of expenditure during any trip, immediately the whole of the vouchers were placed on the table, so that it was possible for every member to ascertain the expenditure that had been incurred. Every item was represented by a voucher. As Home Secretary, I considered it my duty to offer facilities to members of local authorities to visit different portions of the State, and their expenses were paid by the Home Department. I afforded an opportunity to members of the then Opposition to visit the different institutions, and also made available to them opportunities equal to those which were afforded to Government members of the day, to enable them to visit any institution in any portion of Queensland which I visited, and in which they were interested, considering, as I did, that all hon. members would be interested in the different institutions under the administration of the department which I controlled. The point really is this: Why do Ministers of the present Labour Government refuse to table their vouchers? I elicited by that series of questions which I put to the Home Secretary—who I regret is not here this afternoon: I regret to hear of his continued illness, and trust that he may soon recover and be again in his place in this Chamber—(Hear, hear!)—I elicited from him that on no occasion did I draw one farthing for my own personal expenditure; the whole of the expenditure was actually incurred in connection with the trip I undertook. The expenses were incurred for myself and Mrs. Appel, who accompanied me, officers of the department and members of Parliament who accompanied me—as I have said, drawn from both sides of the House—and never on one occasion did I draw one farthing of public money by way of personal expenses.

Mr. BRENNAN: I suppose you spent some of your own money as well?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I always did. I considered that I was entitled, as had been the custom, to the expenses occasioned by my trip, which was taken officially. It was no particular pleasure to me, because the time which was occupied on the tour I could have very well occupied in following out my own forms of leisure which exist to-day. I never was compelled to take advantage of Government tours. I have always been enabled to take any pleasure tour at my own expense, and I am able to do so to-day.

Mr. COLLINS: Lucky man!

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am able to do so because I devoted my time when I was young to acquiring a competence, which enabled me, when I occupied the position of a Minister, to refrain from drawing public money over and above the amount which was expended in connection with the trip.

Mr. COLLINS: Tell that story to the marines; they may believe you—I do not.

HON. J. G. APPEL: It is these heavy expenses that have led to a reduction in the salaries of a large number of members of this community who can ill afford to have those reductions made. It is our duty in this respect to set an example. It is absolutely necessary and essential on many occasions that a Minister should visit different portions of the State for the purpose of supervising matters in connection with his department, and to gain a knowledge of those matters which his department administers, and in regard to which he should have personal information; and any expenditure incurred in connection with these visits he is entitled to, just as hon. members are entitled, if they desire it, to have the vouchers for that expenditure laid on the table. A Minister is paid a certain salary, which may or may not be sufficient. That is a question entirely for this House. A Minister is paid his salary, and he accepts that salary knowing that he will have to incur certain expenditure outside of what might be termed legitimate expenses in touring; but he is not entitled, without the assent of this House, to increase that salary by drawing a daily allowance in excess of the expenses incurred.

The PREMIER: Ministers at present draw no more daily allowance than members of your Cabinet drew.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The allowance of £2 2s. per day within the State was supposed to cover hotel bills and all expenditure, with the exception, perhaps, of the cost of conveyances.

The PREMIER: We follow the rule laid down by Mr. Denham in regard to expenses.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Then why not put the vouchers on the table?

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to table the vouchers, but I am prepared to table the information.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The information which was tabled at the request of the hon. member for Murilla is not correct, because the Premier not only had his expenses paid, but he drew, in addition, £3 3s. a day.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is wrong, and he ought to know that he is wrong.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member for Murilla obtained certain figures which showed that every item of expenditure in connection with the hon. gentleman's trip had been paid, and that in addition, the hon. gentleman drew £1,007 in cash. If the hon. gentleman will take the number of days that he was absent, he will find that that amount runs out at three guineas a day in addition to the whole of his expenditure.

The PREMIER: You know that, notwithstanding the very high cost of travelling in 1920, I took my trip to England with the officers I had to take at very little more than the cost of your trip to North Queensland.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Why not put the vouchers on the table? The amount shown as expended on my trip included the cost of every pound of coal which was used; it

included the total cost of the "Otter," which was left behind for four weeks to enable the children of Northern Queensland to have the pleasure trips which were given to the school children in the south of Queensland; it included the cost of taking the executive of the Local Authorities' Association to different centres of Queensland; and vouchers were placed on the table of this House for every item of expenditure, and not one farthing did I draw for personal expenses. The hon. gentleman well knows that I had to expend a considerable amount of money out of my own pocket in connection with such trips. But that is not the point. The position is this: In view of the failure on the part of Ministers to table the items of their expenditure, as was always done by the members of previous Administrations, and in view of the necessity for economy, we are asking that some limit should now be placed on Ministers' travelling allowances. That seems an absolutely reasonable proposition. There is one little matter I must mention—though it seems a miserable thing. On any occasion when I, as Minister, was detained late at night, and a cab or motor car was provided for me, I was the only member of the Government in that motor car or that cab, and the balance of the seating accommodation was taken up by members of the then Opposition, whom I took to their respective homes before I got to my own home. On no occasion has any member on this side of the House been offered similar accommodation by a member of the present Administration. It has been stated that no such convenience was ever provided by the previous Administration; all I can say is that provision was made for the then Opposition.

THE PREMIER: No. The hon. member himself was generous enough to take a member or two of the Opposition, but he was the exception in his team at that time.

[5 p.m.]

HON. J. G. APPEL: On different occasions cars were provided for members of the then Opposition.

THE PREMIER: No.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yes; and calls were made by the "Whip" upon Ministers, who provided out of their salaries the funds necessary to pay for those cars for that purpose.

THE PREMIER: I can assure the hon. member that during the six years I was in Opposition I never had any such offer made to me.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I never had to make the offer. When I came down to the car or cab it was full. (Laughter.)

THE PREMIER: If the leader of the Opposition desires it, I am quite willing to make provision for getting the Opposition members home at night.

MR. VOWLES: We can walk.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I think it is a pity that this discussion has arisen. What objection can the Premier have to limiting the travelling expenses and allowances of Ministers, as the necessity for economy has arisen?

THE PREMIER: There is at the present time a very drastic limitation on Ministers' expenses.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I never had any difficulty in having the vouchers in connection with any trip by me laid on the table.

They were ready, and, when the question was asked, they were tabled. Every item of expenditure was shown by the vouchers. What objection has the hon. member to the tabling of the vouchers for the travelling expenses of himself and his Ministers? I remember that, when I first became a Minister, a question was asked, and I saw Mr. Kidston, the then Premier, and said, "This is a very awkward question." He said, "Answer the question, and answer all questions, truthfully, as long as you are in the House"; and that course was invariably followed by every member of that Administration. What do we find now? When Ministers are asked for the items of their expenditure, they say, "We will table the vouchers of a previous Minister." My vouchers were tabled years ago.

THE PREMIER: What was the suggestion you were making to Mr. Kidston when he had to tell you to answer the question truthfully?

HON. J. G. APPEL: It was a question which had arisen in the term of my predecessor, which might have told against the department.

THE PREMIER: And you were not going to answer it?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I was not, without instruction. I wanted advice as a new Minister—(Government laughter)—as to whether the question should be answered or not, and Mr. Kidston's reply was, "Answer it truthfully." I do not know how Mr. Kidston would have managed with the hon. gentleman, because, unfortunately, we now seldom get a truthful answer to any question asked in this House. Hon. members know that, and the public realise it. I appeal again to the leader of the Government to consider whether, in view of the fact that we are having to inflict hardship on a large number of employees in the State, who are ill able to bear this reduction at the present time, he cannot see his way to accept the amendment. He would thereby create a considerable amount of confidence in the minds of those who will have to suffer much more than we, as members of Parliament, are likely to suffer. If we are to start with reductions in the salaries and wages of public servants and employees of this State, we should set a shining and bright example by not only reducing our salaries, but likewise the travelling allowances of Ministers, especially in view of the fact that over and above the actual amount expended in travelling, there have been so great personal allowances drawn in addition, which have practically become a public scandal.

MR. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): I think this amendment is necessary for two reasons. One reason is that we should have the details of the expenditure, so that we can find whether it is reasonable. Last session a trip which the hon. member for Albert had up North in the "Otter" was spoken of as equal in cost to the Premier's trip to London; but, when we go into the details of the trip, we find that the hon. member for Albert was even charged with the painting of the ship. (Laughter.)

THE PREMIER: Painting the town, you mean. (Laughter.)

MR. BEBBINGTON: It was very seldom that the school children up North had the privilege of a trip in the "Otter," like the Brisbane children had, and, because the

Mr. Bebbington.]

boat was used up North in giving the children trips, the expenditure was increased.

The PREMIER: Do you excuse the hon. member for Albert for having ten gallons of rum on the trip? (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I think we should have details of the expenditure on these trips.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: At Hunter's farewell they had as much grog as we had on the whole of the trip.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The taxpayers are looking for some relief, and the amendment will give a measure of relief. We do not mind Ministers having the expenses to which they are entitled, nor to a member going with the Minister on a tour in his electorate, but we say that the people should know what expenses are incurred. I think it is time to have the whole question of members' salaries reviewed. I do not think we are paid on the right principle. It is wrong to pay a man who lives in Brisbane the same salary as a member for a distant electorate.

Mr. COLLINS: You should propose a reduction of 25 per cent. in the case of a member who follows two or three occupations.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that there is an amendment before the Committee, by which it is proposed to add, after the word "Assembly," the words—

"and for determining monetary and other allowances to be paid to Ministers of the Crown while travelling, (a) within the State, (b) beyond the State."

I hope the hon. member will discuss the amendment, because, if he now discusses the motion, there will be nothing to prevent him, when the amendment is disposed of, from debating the motion again.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I think the amendment is necessary in the taxpayers' interests. It is only right that the public who are paying for these things should know just how their money is spent.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I have a few words to say regarding the departmental allowances to Ministers. I well remember the discussion which took place in the House last session, when I endeavoured to get from the Ministers some information as to the expenditure upon State motor-cars by various Ministers and their departments. Notwithstanding the strenuous and earnest efforts made to obtain this information, the question was side-tracked by the Government. I contend that the expenses of Ministers should not be above what is considered to be a fair amount, and they should only be drawn when strictly applied to their official duties. In 1916, before I was in the House, the Government were asked to give information regarding the motor-cars. The answer was given that the information would be obtained, but that information has not yet been communicated to the House. We have never received any information concerning the motor-cars used by the Government. I well remember that members of this House, who now form the party sitting behind the Government, chided Mr. Kidston for buying two motor-cars, yet quite recently this Government had forty-nine motor-cars in use, and we can get no information about them. We would like to know something about the motor-cars to see if they are part of the extra expenses of the Min-

isters. We would like to make a comparison between the amounts paid to present Ministers and Ministers who were ex-Labour members, such as Mr. Kidston, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Kerr. This information would be enlightening to us. I well remember, when the hon. gentlemen I have mentioned left the Labour party, they used to walk to their homes, and if they did not walk they would take a penny tram. Under the regime of this Government we find motor-cars waiting outside the House to take Ministers home, and we also find cars at the disposal of members on the Government side, whilst members of the Opposition who live in the same district, and almost in the same street, are never invited to participate. In fact, members of the Opposition are rushed by in the street, and there is a sort of contemptuous smile on the part of hon. members opposite as they pass. The capitalists are on the Government side of the House. There are no capitalists on the Opposition side. The people who used to cry out against the capitalists of the past to-day emulate the capitalists in an aggravated form. I was delighted and interested to hear the hon. member for Albert refer to the instruction given by Mr. Kidston to his Ministers. Mr. Kidston told his Ministers that if a question were asked in the House, it should be answered truthfully. What a blessing it would be to this House if the present Government accepted a little of that advice! It would be all right if we got 75 per cent. of the truth, but at the present time the information we get from Ministers is probably not more than 20 per cent. true. There are no means of finding how the departments are run or where the extra expenses go to, because Ministers refuse to give the information to the House. This House is composed of the people's representatives, and we should know something about the Government expenditure. We are entitled to all the information about the Ministerial allowances. We should know what vouchers they submit for their expenses, including the vouchers that they submit to the departments "under the cushion."

Mr. BRENNAN: Does not the Auditor-General find them out?

Mr. FRY: I recognise that the Auditor-General is a servant of the Government.

The PREMIER: No; he is a servant of Parliament.

Mr. FRY: I consider that every officer in the public service depends on the Government, and he knows that he will lose his job if he says anything against the Government. We know that he has to take the word of the Government; so it is no use talking about the Auditor-General being an officer of Parliament. If the Government had taken the advice tendered to them by the Opposition, they would be in a better position than they are in to-day, and they would not have the present entanglement so far as their own supporters are concerned. The whole of the present trouble with the supporters of the Government has been brought about by the evil way the big majority was used in bludgeoning the Opposition. The Opposition have as much interest in this country as the most earnest man on the Government side.

The PREMIER: Nonsense!

Mr. FRY: The country should be run on proper lines. Unfortunately, we have a party

[*Mr. Bebbington.*]

machine, and it is a machine without intelligence to control it.

Mr. BRENNAN: Don't you consider the Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament?

Mr. FRY: I have stated in this Chamber that not only the Auditor-General but the Commissioner for Railways and other members of the public service are supposed to come under the direct control of Parliament; but now that we only have one Chamber, they come directly under the control of the Government of the day, and they have no chance to review any of their actions.

Mr. COLLINS: That is a reflection on the Auditor-General.

Mr. FRY: It is not a reflection upon the Auditor-General. He comes under the direct control of the Government the way Parliament is constituted to-day.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—
“That the question be now put.”

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

AYES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
“ Bertram	“ Jones, A. J.
“ Brennan	“ Land
“ Bulcock	“ Lacombe
“ Collins	“ Mullan
“ Conroy	“ Payne
“ Cooper, F. A.	“ Pease
“ Cooper, W.	“ Pollock
“ Coyne	“ Riordan
“ Dash	“ Ryan
“ Dunstan	“ Smith
“ Ferricks	“ Stopford
“ Foley	“ Theodore
“ Forde	“ Weir
“ Gilday	“ Wellington
“ Gillies	“ Wilson
“ Hartley	“ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Pease and Mr. Riordan.

NOES, 33.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
“ Barnes, G. P.	“ Logan
“ Barnes, W. H.	“ Macgregor
“ Bebbington	“ Maxwell
“ Brand	“ Moore
“ Cattermull	“ Morgan
“ Clayton	“ Nott
“ Corser	“ Peterson
“ Costello	“ Roberts, J. H. C.
“ Deacon	“ Roberts, T. R.
“ Edwards	“ Sizer
“ Elphinstone	“ Swayne
“ Fletcher	“ Taylor
“ Fry	“ Vowles
“ Green	“ Walker
“ Jones, J.	“ Warren
“ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Nott.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be added (*Mr. Vowles's amendment*) be so added—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
“ Barnes, G. P.	“ Logan
“ Barnes, W. H.	“ Macgregor
“ Bebbington	“ Maxwell
“ Brand	“ Moore
“ Cattermull	“ Morgan
“ Clayton	“ Nott
“ Corser	“ Peterson
“ Costello	“ Roberts, J. H. C.
“ Deacon	“ Roberts, T. R.
“ Edwards	“ Sizer
“ Elphinstone	“ Swayne
“ Fletcher	“ Taylor
“ Fry	“ Vowles
“ Green	“ Walker
“ Jones, J.	“ Warren
“ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Deacon and Mr. Sizer.

NOES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
“ Bertram	“ Jones, A. J.
“ Brennan	“ Land
“ Bulcock	“ Lacombe
“ Collins	“ Mullan
“ Conroy	“ Payne
“ Cooper, F. A.	“ Pease
“ Cooper, W.	“ Pollock
“ Coyne	“ Riordan
“ Dash	“ Ryan
“ Dunstan	“ Smith
“ Ferricks	“ Stopford
“ Foley	“ Theodore
“ Forde	“ Weir
“ Gilday	“ Wellington
“ Gillies	“ Wilson
“ Hartley	“ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Forde.

Resolved in the negative.

Original question stated.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) rising to speak.

The PREMIER: I move—
“That the question be now put.”

(Opposition hoots.)

Mr. KERR: If the Premier wishes to know my amendment, it is to provide annual increments for those receiving over £300.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member wishes, I will give him an opportunity to speak on the second reading. (Government laughter.)

Question—That the question be now put (*Mr. Theodore's motion*)—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
“ Bertram	“ Jones, A. J.
“ Brennan	“ Land
“ Bulcock	“ Lacombe
“ Collins	“ Mullan
“ Conroy	“ Payne
“ Cooper, F. A.	“ Pease
“ Cooper, W.	“ Pollock
“ Coyne	“ Riordan
“ Dash	“ Ryan
“ Dunstan	“ Smith
“ Ferricks	“ Stopford
“ Foley	“ Theodore
“ Forde	“ Weir
“ Gilday	“ Wellington
“ Gillies	“ Wilson
“ Hartley	“ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Dash and Mr. Ferricks.

NOES, 33.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
“ Barnes, G. P.	“ Logan
“ Barnes, W. H.	“ Macgregor
“ Bebbington	“ Maxwell
“ Brand	“ Moore
“ Cattermull	“ Morgan
“ Clayton	“ Nott
“ Corser	“ Peterson
“ Costello	“ Roberts, J. H. C.
“ Deacon	“ Roberts, T. R.
“ Edwards	“ Sizer
“ Elphinstone	“ Swayne
“ Fletcher	“ Taylor
“ Fry	“ Vowles
“ Green	“ Walker
“ Jones, J.	“ Warren
“ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Costello and Mr. King.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[5.30 p.m.]

Question—That the resolution (*Mr. Theodore*) be agreed to—put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution.

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I beg to move—

“That the resolution be agreed to by the House.”

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I would like, Mr. Speaker, to draw your attention to the fact

Mr. Kerr.]

that, while in Committee a few minutes ago, I rose to move an amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. KERR: It was this—

“That due provision be made for annual increments to be paid—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. KERR: It seems to me that our privileges are being taken away, especially in Committee. Time and again, you, Mr. Speaker, have been good enough to suggest—or the Premier has suggested, through you—to hon. members that they would have every scope in Committee of bringing forward matters that concern a Bill. I waited for a chance to move this particular amendment; I did not speak on the previous amendment or on the original motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out, for the information of hon. members, that I am not cognisant of what happens in Committee. The hon. member may give reasons why the resolution should not be agreed to.

Mr. KERR: That is so. If you will give me an opportunity, I intend to show why the resolution should not be agreed to. One phase of the question is that, once the resolution leaves the Committee stage, the Bill cannot be widened in scope. That is the reason why I desired to move an amendment at that stage. Public servants are going to lose, in addition to the amount by which they are being reduced, certain annual increments. I was prompted, in Committee, to extend the scope of the resolution to enable provision to be made in the Bill for the payment of the annual increments or classification increases provided for in the awards and in staff regulations, such as the staff regulations of the Railway Department. If the scope of the Bill is not widened to give protection to those who are in receipt of over £300 per annum—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. KERR: If the scope of the Bill is not now widened, but the resolution remains as it is on the business-paper, we shall have lost our opportunity for extending its provisions, and shall not be able to do anything at the second reading or Committee stage. With some of these men it will mean an amount equal to what would be necessary for the payment of interest and redemption on a home—from £45 up to £100 per annum. For instance, the first year the loss through the stoppage of the annual increment will be, say, £20 plus 5 per cent. reduction, then the second year it will amount to £40 plus the 5 per cent., and the third year £60 plus the reduction, increasing annually by £20 until the maximum of the class is reached. Thus in three years, such an officer will have lost £120 in addition to the 5 per cent. reduction.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: That is the seriousness of it. I do not know that you, Mr. Speaker, can do anything in the matter; but I am bringing it before your attention. I do not think the House should agree to this resolution. Another reason why the resolution should not be agreed to is that the Premier, as leader of the Government, gave a direct promise to representatives of the unions that the classification increases would be granted.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that the resolution is one dealing with the salaries of members of Parliament, Ministers, and others exclusively—not with the public ser-

[Mr. Kerr.

vants to whom the hon. gentleman now is referring.

Mr. KERR: That is so, but my point is that the “gag” was put on me in Committee before I had an opportunity of speaking. The question was not even stated.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is now discussing something that happened in Committee.

Mr. KERR: That is so.

The SPEAKER: He will not be in order in doing it.

Mr. KERR: I do not think you quite follow me, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so. I am not discussing something that happened in Committee; this never came into Committee. There was a resolution before the Committee, and I am entitled—

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall ask the hon. member to resume his seat if he continually disobeys my call to order.

Mr. KERR: I had no opportunity of moving the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): I support the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Enoggera. I was waiting until that hon. member had moved his amendment, as I wished to speak to the question which then would have been before the Committee. By virtue of the fact that an important phase—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER: I think I am entitled to move an amendment in order that this resolution may be referred back to the Committee so that we shall have an opportunity of discussing the phase which has now been raised.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Kirwan
„ Bulcock	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Conroy	„ Mullan
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Payne
„ Cooper, W.	„ Pease
„ Coyne	„ Pollock
„ Dash	„ Riordan
„ Dunstan	„ Ryan
„ Ferricks	„ Smith
„ Foley	„ Stopford
„ Forde	„ Theodore
„ Gilday	„ Weir
„ Gillies	„ Wellington
„ Hartley	„ Wilson
„ Huxham	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 33.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Brand	„ Moore
„ Cattermull	„ Morgan
„ Clayton	„ Nott
„ Corser	„ Peterson
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Peterson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original question put and passed.

FIRST READING.

The PREMIER presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

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

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION BILL.

COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Kirwan, Brisbane, in the chair.)

Clause 1—“Short title and commencement of Act”—put and passed.

Clause 2—“Interpretation”—put and passed.

Clause 3—“Application of Act”—put and passed.

Clause 4—“Board of Agricultural Education”—

Mr. KING (Logan): I beg to move the omission, in line 32, of the word “three,” with a view to inserting the word “two.” I am moving the amendment with the object of having a local authorities’ representative on the Board. I do not wish to deplete the number of representatives on the board, but I consider that the local authorities should have one representative and that two other representatives can be appointed by the Governor in Council. This is a new phase in the educational system in Queensland, and the Bill provides that the local authorities, under certain conditions, may come under its operation, and, that being the case, I think there should be a local authorities’ representative on the Board. We do not know how long the Board will be in existence. We know that its functions will come to an end on the appointment of a Superintendent of Agricultural Education; but, so long as it is in existence, and so long as local authorities are going to be liable or responsible, then they should have a representative on the Board.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is purely voluntary.

Mr. KING: I have not the slightest doubt the Secretary for Public Instruction is honest in what he asserts; but, as it is very questionable whether the local authorities will be liable or not, I intend to move a further amendment to remove all doubts as to their responsibilities. Local authorities are being asked to take part in this new educational system.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They are not being asked to do it.

Mr. KING: I hope to be able to show the hon. gentleman that the local authorities are in a very serious position, and they will very likely be brought under the scheme whether they like it or not. The hon. gentleman assures me that that will not be the case; but I do not think he is altogether right there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is the opinion of the parliamentary draftsman.

Mr. KING: I do not intend for a moment to pit my opinion against that of the parliamentary draftsman, but I hope to be able at least to show some grounds for the doubts I have. This amendment does not mean that

local authorities will be approached individually; but, as we have a Local Authorities’ Association in Queensland incorporated by Act of Parliament, I intend at a later stage to move an amendment to the effect that the Association be asked to appoint a representative to the Board of Agricultural Education. I hope the Minister will accept my amendment, which I have very great pleasure in moving.

Mr. TAYLOR (Windsor): A new system of education is being introduced, and certain responsibilities are likely to be thrust on the local authorities if the Bill becomes law, and it is only right that they should have representation on the board. It is not asked that every local authority should nominate the person they desire to be appointed to the board, but that the local authorities’ representative shall be appointed by the Local Authorities’ Association. I take it that the object of the Minister is to get the best board it is possible to get. If a recommendation is made by the board on which the local authorities are not represented, the Governor in Council has power to say they shall do certain things and undertake certain responsibilities. That is fairly clear and definite, and for these reasons I hope the Minister will see his way clear to accept this amendment, and other amendments that will be moved by the hon. member for Logan.

Mr. FRY (Kurilpa): I cannot see that there can be any real objection to the amendment, because the Local Authorities’ Association is, after all, a body which has more weight now than previously, on account of adult franchise in the election of local authorities’ representatives. The question of whether the Governor in Council shall nominate two or three members to the Board is not one of vital moment to the Government. If it is of vital moment, what is the reason? So far as I can see, the Government could be represented by two members just as well as by three, unless there is some sinister motive.

Mr. MOORE (Aubigny): Personally, I do not see that there is any occasion for the local authorities to be mentioned in the Bill at all; but, if they are going to have anything to do with this educational system, they should certainly be represented on the Board of Agricultural Education. I am against them coming in at all, as there is ample provision made for other organisations to ask for what education they require, and for them to guarantee the amount of money required, without bringing the local authorities into the matter at all, and my experience is that the local authorities have plenty to do to carry out the duties the Government have already thrust upon them. I have no doubt it would be an advantage to make the local authorities in some way responsible, and if they are to be held responsible they should certainly be represented on the Board. This Board may not last very long. This is an extraordinary Bill which provides that the Board can be wiped out at any time, and a Superintendent of Agricultural Education appointed in its place. I cannot understand what the reason of that provision is—whether it is that the Board is to be established just to get agricultural education started, and then for the Superintendent of Agricultural Education to carry it on or not. If the local authorities in a

Mr. Moore.]

particular district are satisfied that there is a demand for agricultural education in the district, and they go to the Government and say, "We consider it should be provided," the Government evidently are going to take more notice of them than if the request came from a progress association or some other such body, because they recognise there is a certain amount of responsibility attaching to the local authorities. In such cases the local authorities will be called upon to levy a special rate to procure the amount required, and it is only right that they should have a representative who can put their views before the Board. This may save a good deal of ill-feeling afterwards. It is all very fine to talk about levying special rates, but anybody who has had anything to do with local authorities knows the difficulties that have to be contended with. After all, the Board is going to consider the whole question of instituting this educational system, and it must be to the advantage of the Board to have some body which is vitally interested in collecting the special rate afterwards to put their side of the case forward. When the question of appointing the Main Roads Board was being discussed, it was said that there was nothing to prevent the Governor in Council from appointing a local authorities' representative to that Board, and there is nothing in the Bill to say that the Governor in Council shall not appoint a member of a local authority on the Board of Agricultural Education, but it should be made quite clear. Responsibility, after all, should carry some sort of representation.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*): I shall support the amendment. I do not see why local authorities should be brought under the measure at all; but, if they are made responsible in any respect whatever for the cost of a school, it is only a fair thing that, while the Board lasts, the local authorities should have representation thereon. Therefore, I think that the amendment is just and

[7 p.m.] fair. Personally, I consider the provision for this Board—and in fact, the whole of the provisions of the Bill—to be cumbersome. I cannot see why the Board is required at all, or why the scheme cannot be administered by the Department of Public Instruction, which would save a certain amount of expense. Why cannot our secondary schools be utilised in carrying on such education as this?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is what we intend to do. The high schools will be utilised.

Mr. GREEN: I remember when I went to a university college twenty years ago there were agricultural plots for the education of the scholars, and they were also instructed in carpentry and saddlery work. It appears to me that the great expense which will be entailed under this scheme would be avoided if our secondary schools were utilised as they should be.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Bill provides for that.

Mr. GREEN: I am glad to hear the Minister say that the Bill provides that these institutions shall be utilised. I cannot understand why local authorities should be brought in at all. The ratepayers have the right to petition for the establishment of an agricultural school. It appears to me that, if a local authority is forced into this by a certain

percentage of the ratepayers, the next thing it will have to do will be to impose a special rate in that area.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to restrict the hon. member in discussing the constitution of the Board of Agricultural Education, but he will certainly not be in order in discussing the clause in connection with the principles he is now dealing with. I hope the hon. member will keep to the amendment, which provides that one of the members of the Board shall be a member of a local authority.

Mr. GREEN: I am trying to show that the local authority should have one member on that Board if they are going to have this responsibility in connection with the working of the Board. I think the Minister should give the amendment some consideration. If he has decided that the local authorities must accept the responsibility in connection with the financing of the Board, then they ought to have direct representation. I hope that at a later stage the Minister will be prepared to leave the local authorities out of it altogether.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murrilla*): I certainly object to the local authorities having anything to do with this matter at all. Clause 9 is the most important clause in the Bill, as it provides for applications for the establishment of schools or classes, and, if the local authority makes application, then the local authority must find one-third of the cost. I hope the Committee will decide to delete that portion of the clause relating to local authorities and place the whole of the responsibility on the Government, the same as it is now in respect to State schools, high schools, and technical colleges. If the Minister will give us some indication that he intends to omit that part of the Bill, then there is no need for this amendment at all. I am quite satisfied that the hon. member for Logan will not press his amendment if the Minister will indicate that he intends to leave the local authorities out of it altogether.

Mr. KING: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I will deal with that clause when we come to it.

Mr. MORGAN: I just want to make my position clear. I want to delete the clause which says that the local authority must find one-third of the cost; but, if it is to be retained, then I think the local authorities should have representation on the Board, and I will support the amendment. I think it was the Labour Government that abolished the one-fifth contribution towards the cost of erecting schools which previously local residents had to pay.

Mr. WALKER: The Kidston Government.

Mr. MORGAN: I well remember that, when it was suggested in this Chamber that the one-fifth contribution should be wiped out, it was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question under discussion is to omit the word "three" and substitute the word "two," to give the local authorities representation on the Board. The hon. member will be quite in order in discussing the matter he is now referring to when we come to clause 9, which deals with the liability of the local authorities; but I cannot permit him to discuss that subject while we are dealing with the amendment now before the Committee.

[*Mr. Moore.*]

Mr. MORGAN: I quite agree that your ruling is right; but if the Secretary for Public Instruction will indicate that he intends to remove that one-third limitation we need not press this amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I am not going to indicate anything.

Mr. MORGAN: I am against the local authorities being asked to find one-third of the cost; but if they have to find that share of the cost then they want to be represented.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I rise to support the amendment. It is not reasonable to ask the local authorities to find one-third of the cost and not give them any representation on the Board. For all they know, their money will be wasted, and they should have some say in the control of it. I hope the Minister will consider the amendment.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I was hoping that the Minister would reply as a matter of courtesy, and give the Committee some indication as to what he is going to do.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I cannot do it at this stage. The Chairman has already ruled it out of order.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister can give us an idea, and help us along step by step. He can give us an idea whether at a later period he is going to do something to relieve the local authorities of some financial responsibility.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Chairman would rule me out of order—I cannot go beyond that. (Opposition laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am perfectly certain that you, Mr. Kirwan, are anxious to expedite the passage of the Bill, and that, if the hon. member wants to give any information that will help, your generous nature will allow him to do so. Seeing that information is not forthcoming, I want to say that it does seem to be perfectly plain that, if other parties are brought under the Bill, they should have some representation. The amendment merely asks that, in view of something that may be done later on, there should be a representative of the local authorities on the Board. I should have thought that the Minister would like the conference which is meeting to-morrow to think that he had shown some desire to assist a body who, he has said again and again, play an important part in the life of Queensland. I am perfectly certain that, if the hon. member were free to do so, he would accept the amendment, and, if he has any doubt—as has been suggested by the hon. member for Logan—perhaps he will appeal to his chief, who I do not imagine for one moment would turn it down. I think that the Minister ought to get up and say something on the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*): I cannot accept the amendment, because it really cuts at the foundation of the Bill. It is essential that the Board of Agricultural Education should consist of men of expert knowledge, and if hon. members on the other side think otherwise, they make a great mistake. The representatives to be appointed by the Government will certainly be men of expert knowledge—probably one from the Department of Agriculture and another from

the Technical College, as suggested by the hon. member for Townsville, and that will not be in any sense detrimental to the people who are benefiting by the education the board will control. I cannot imagine that the presence of a representative of the local authorities on the Board is going to help the measure.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: They would appoint an expert.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I think the Government will appoint a better one.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I doubt if the Government can.

Mr. MOORE: Will not the Council of Agriculture appoint two members? Why should not the local authorities have the same opportunity?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Simply because it is only now that I have heard it suggested for the first time that the Local Authorities' Association have any interest in education.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Will you tell them that to-morrow? (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I shall not be there to-morrow; but if I were I would speak just as frankly as I do now, and they would not be any the worse for it.

Mr. KING: It has never been a function of local government to deal with education.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You want to bring them in now. I cannot accept the amendment, because I want this Bill to be as perfect as I can make it, so that the young people who will take advantage of the education provided will get the very best expert knowledge that can be afforded. I recognise that the hon. member for Townsville put his finger on the spot when he said that technical colleges, high schools, and such institutions, should be capable of handling this subject. I maintain that they can. There is no reason why, in connection with such institutions, we should not have experimental plots, where young people can be taught the germination of seeds and allied subjects.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): One would imagine, hearing the remarks of the Minister, that the Board of Agricultural Education will have the final decision in matters pertaining to this scheme. The functions of the Board will be mainly advisory. They have to co-operate and report; the Governor in Council will have the final say in everything. All that is being asked in this amendment is that the constitution of the Board shall be different to that suggested in the Bill; that, as the Governor in Council and the Council of Agriculture are to be represented, there should also be a representative of the local authorities, because of the fact that local authorities will have to subscribe certain funds.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They will not be forced to do so.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know so much about that. The more I read the Bill, the more satisfied I am that they will.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Vowles.]

Mr. VOWLES: That interjection of the Minister threw me off the track.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman knows sufficient of parliamentary usage to know that he is not in order in replying to interjections.

Mr. VOWLES: The Minister tells us that there is no responsibility on the part of the local authorities. I say that there is a responsibility, and that it is covered up.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Are you certain?

Mr. VOWLES: I am. If the local authorities are to be called upon to find money under certain conditions, they should have some representation. It is suggested that a representative from the local authorities would not be suitable for the purposes of this scheme.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Who suggested that?

Mr. VOWLES: The Minister did. It is a very sad reflection on the intelligence of the personnel of the local authorities of Queensland. Here you have a Council of Agriculture, to be created from one section only—the producers—having sufficient intelligence, according to the Minister, to do all that is necessary for the purposes of this scheme, and they are to be given two representatives. Yet the persons who are representative of the whole of the ratepayers in the area are said to be lacking in that intelligence! That is a bit too thin. I had hoped that, when the Minister had it pointed out to him, the local authorities would not be included in the scheme. If what he says is correct, it will not be necessary for them to have a representative on the Board; but if, as I believe is the case under the Bill as it stands, they are to be responsible under certain conditions, seeing that they have an association, that association should be accorded the courtesy of having a representative on the Board to look after their interests.

Mr. MACGREGOR (*Merthyr*): I agree with the leader of the Opposition that the explanation given by the Minister is very unsatisfactory. It seems to me that the amendment embodies a recommendation that he should readily accept. He was inclined to speak rather slightly of the possibility of local authorities assisting at all in the matter of education; but I notice from one of the clauses that one of the functions of the board is—

“To co-operate with local authorities in the establishment of agricultural schools and classes, and, generally, in the promoting of agricultural education.”

How can the hon. gentleman, then, speak slightly of the bodies with which the Board has to co-operate? It seems to me that the whole of his argument fails, and has no real substance in it. In judging whether a member of the Local Authorities' Association should be joined in the composition of this Board, one has to look at the functions of the Board. The Bill says the Board shall co-operate with local authorities, and also that it has—

“To make, or cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports having reference to the establishment and administration of agricultural schools and classes.”

It seems to me that the investigations and

[*Mr. Vowles.*

inquiries that they are to make will be made largely amongst the local authorities, and the local authorities will have a good deal to do with the site and the housing of these bodies, and, naturally, they will give the best of their information to the Board. What better representative could you have on the Board than a member of the Local Authorities' Association? The members of the Local Authorities' Association are chosen on a democratic vote by the different towns and shires, and it is only proposed to have one of those members as a representative on the Board. That member of the Local Authorities' Association will be in touch throughout the year with his executive, and will be able to place before the Board all the ideas of the local authorities as to site, housing, and equipment. Three of the members will be appointed by the Governor in Council, two by the Senate of the University of Queensland, and two by the Council of Agriculture, “or such other similar body as the Governor in Council may determine.” Why should there not be one member appointed by the Local Authorities' Association? It seems to me that the explanation given by the Secretary for Public Instruction is unsatisfactory, and that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Logan, which I strongly support, should be readily accepted by him.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): The explanation given by the Minister is unsatisfactory, and I am at a loss to understand his objection to the amendment. If he can point out that the substitution of the word “two” for the word “three,” enabling one representative to be appointed by the Local Authorities' Association, is going to interfere with the Government on the Board, we can quite understand his objection; but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Merthyr, we find that the local authorities are mentioned in four or five clauses in the Bill. They are to be responsible for a certain amount of money, and they also have power, if they so wish, to build schools solely with their own funds. The Minister considers them good enough to do all those things, yet he does not consider that they have sufficient intelligence, or that they are sufficiently educated on agricultural matters, to be an acquisition to the Board of Agricultural Education. As has been pointed out, the members of the local authorities are representative of the whole of the people of Queensland, and they are elected members of local authorities on the adult suffrage, and surely, considering the functions of the Board, they have the right of representation. The Minister spoke about getting the best experts possible. We hope he will get the best experts possible; but there is no guarantee that the two members to be appointed by the Council of Agriculture will be the best experts possible, any more than there is any guarantee that the one who may be appointed by the Local Authorities' Association will not be the best expert possible, and for that reason I do hope that the Minister will give consideration to what is a fair request. He said that the amendment practically meant the destruction of the Bill, but I cannot follow that line of argument.

Mr. BRENNAN: Take Toowoomba, for example. How many aldermen on that council would be fit to sit as a representative on the Board of Agricultural Education?

Mr. TAYLOR: This amendment, and further amendments to be proposed by the

hon. member for Logan, set out that the representative shall be an appointee of the Local Authorities' Association, and not of any particular local authority. It does not mean that Toowoomba or any other district will appoint the representative, but he will be appointed by the combined representatives on the Local Authorities' Association. What danger is there in it? I hope the Minister will accept what I consider is a most reasonable amendment, and one that will make the Bill very much better than it is at the present time.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister. There are sitting in this Committee some very capable men who are associated with the Local Authorities' Association. I am sure the hon. member for Aubigny will forgive me for making the suggestion; but could we get a more suitable man than that hon. member? That hon. member has been President of the Local Authorities' Association on more than one occasion. While in that position he carried out his duties in a most admirable way, and I am sure every member of that Association would say the same. Would it not be a good thing to get a man with commercial experience, farming experience, and a knowledge of the world generally such as the hon. member for Aubigny possesses? Have the Government party in caucus said that an amendment like this is to be refused? If they have, I know we are striking up against a stone wall, but if they have not, I appeal to the generosity of the Secretary for Public Instruction.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. member for Logan did not send his amendment to caucus.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for giving us that information. It is very apparent that an amendment like this, unless it gets a certain brand, has no chance.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I fail to see how the Minister can hold the contention that the giving of representation to the local authorities is going to destroy the foundation of the Bill, unless it is that the Bill is introduced on political grounds and the Government want control of the Board, in order that it may carry out their behests. The Local Authorities' Association is composed of men who are appointed on the adult franchise, and yet we are told that, by giving them representation on a Board of this description, we are going to destroy the foundation of the Bill. What sort of "tommy rot" is that? The contention cannot be sustained, and for that reason I am more justified than I was before in supporting the amendment.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS (*Pittsworth*): One cannot help being surprised at the Minister giving as a reason for retaining the provision for the appointment of three members to the Board by the Governor in Council that they would be appointed from the Department of Agriculture, and probably would consist of better experts than could be found amongst members of local authorities. I do not consider that the Department of Agriculture has an expert who can be compared to men such as Mr. C. E. McDougall, of Lyndhurst, or Mr. Jonas Holmes, of Pittsworth. These men have been

breeding cattle for years past, and to-day they stand pre-eminent.

Mr. STOPFORD interjected.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I do not think they have ever bred anything up there like the hon. member for Mount Morgan.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will recollect that I have previously given a ruling that personal reflections are entirely unparliamentary, and I hope he will not continue that line of debate.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I never passed any personal reflection on the hon. member for Mount Morgan. I think that, if the Secretary for Public Instruction could get men of the calibre of Mr. C. E. McDougall, or Mr. Jonas Holmes, or some of the expert breeders we have in the cattle industry in Queensland to-day, he would have a man on the Board who would give far [7.30 p.m.] better and probably sounder advice than he could obtain elsewhere. I think the Minister will agree with me that the local authorities carry big responsibilities on their shoulders. I do not think they are at all anxious to have thrown on them further responsibilities in connection with agricultural education; but if they are to be asked to carry a burden under this Bill, it is only a fair thing that they should have representation on the Board. I hope the Minister will fully consider the amendment before he decides to turn it down. I think the Minister will admit that there are men who are taking a very keen interest in local government work from whom he would be very pleased to get advice in regard to rural education. I think his statement is not altogether correct when he says that the sole reason why he will not accept the amendment is because he is anxious to appoint to the board three agricultural experts from the Department of Agriculture.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Or from elsewhere. The Bill does not say we are to get them from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: If the Minister will not accept the amendment, I hope that he will give the local authorities a representative. I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): The Minister has cast a very serious reflection on the local authorities of Queensland. He says that we are not fit to appoint a capable man to this Board, and yet the clause states—

“and two members shall be appointed by the Council of Agriculture or such other similar body as the Governor in Council may determine.”

We may have the Farmers' Alliance asked to appoint a member to the Board of Agricultural Education. Why should the local authorities of Queensland not be just as capable of nominating a man to sit on the Board as the Council of Agriculture or the Farmers' Alliance? We place responsibility upon local authorities under this Bill in regard to the collection of money. We ask the Board to co-operate with the local authorities and advise on certain matters in connection with education, and yet we say that the very men who are going to co-operate with the Board and give advice with regard to agricultural

Mr. Moore.]

education are not to be represented on the board. The contention of the Minister will not stand water. If the Council of Agriculture are to be allowed to appoint two members, the local authorities, who have to shoulder more responsibilities than the Council—because the Council do not take any responsibility at all, they simply appoint two members—should have the right to appoint a member. I think the local authorities will be quite as capable of appointing a good man as the experts of the Department of Agriculture. The Government have an opportunity, if the board is unsuccessful, of wiping it out.

Mr. BRENNAN interjected.

Mr. MOORE: There are more members of local authorities who represent agriculture than there are on the Council of Agriculture, and they come from all over Queensland. They have to accept responsibilities under the Bill, and in some cases to collect money.

Mr. BRENNAN: In one case the producers elect, and in the other case all the people elect.

Mr. MOORE: Do you object to the people electing?

Mr. BRENNAN: No.

Mr. MOORE: It is the producers' business. The Council of Agriculture are entitled to elect two members, who will probably come out of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BRENNAN: Who appoints the Council of Agriculture?

Mr. MOORE: The Premier and the Secretary for Agriculture.

Mr. BRENNAN: Until such time as an election takes place.

Mr. MOORE: I do not think that even the hon. member for Toowoomba will say that there is not any amount of agricultural knowledge among the local authorities throughout Queensland.

Mr. BRENNAN: There is some; but the other is purely agricultural.

Mr. MOORE: The Council of Agriculture will appoint two members of the Board, but the Council has no responsibility under the Bill, while the responsibility of the local authorities is recognised throughout the measure. The Board of Agriculture has to confer with the various local authorities throughout Queensland as to the advisability of building schools in certain areas.

Mr. BRENNAN: It is voluntary.

Mr. MOORE: The question of raising the rate is not voluntary, the local authorities have to contribute under certain specified provisions. It is only right that the local authorities should have power to appoint one member to the Board. If the hon. member for Toowoomba was sitting on this side, he would be one of the greatest advocates for it; but, because he is tied to the Government, he objects to it. The local authorities would not appoint a man who was unsuitable for the position.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I think that this amendment is a very important one. The proposal in the Bill is a new departure. The local authorities are going to be forced to do something by Parliament, but are to have no representation in the matter. We are told that it is not compulsory, but purely voluntary, and we recognise that. But we

know that the Government are short of funds, and if an agricultural school is required, the Government will hang on until the local authorities are compelled to build the required school.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out for the information of hon. members that the amendment before the Committee deals with the question of representation on the Board. The clause provides for three Government representatives, and the amendment of the hon. member for Logan provides that one of these shall be a representative of the local authorities. I hope that the hon. member will keep to the question before the Committee.

Mr. KERR: I am leading up to that by showing that local authorities are going to have certain responsibilities put upon them, and they should therefore have representation on the Board. The principle I am dealing with applies to the Council of Agriculture. The same thing applies to the Government themselves in connection with another Bill which is likely to come before the House, under which, because they are financially concerned in the transaction, they seek to have the representation of two members. If it is right for the Government to do that in one case, why not do it in this?

Mr. BRENNAN: Do you object to that provision in the Brisbane Tramway Trust Bill.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member will hear all about that in due course. If we are going to spend the people's money, the people should have representation, which they are not given under the Bill as it stands. My argument is that, if they get a representative from the Local Authorities' Association, everything will be quite all right and the ratepayers will have representation. I listened very carefully, because I think the arguments from this side of the House have been such that they should have been accepted by the Minister. The hon. gentleman says that the Government must have experts to make it a success. Hon. members on this side want to make it a success, and it will not militate against its success if a representative is appointed from the Local Authorities' Association. The Council of Agriculture, consisting of farmers and country people, will send two representatives, and the local authorities' representative will in all probability be a man from the country, so that there is nothing to militate against the success of the Board by appointing him as a member of the Board. He will be an expert, because he will understand what is required. The ratepayers have got to pay, and some consideration should be given to them. I would like to ask what rural knowledge the two University Senators will have, and what knowledge they will have of the Local Authorities Act. They will not have such a great knowledge as a member of the Local Authorities' Association. Then, again, what great knowledge have the Council of Agriculture got of the Local Authorities Act? Looking at it from every point of view, the Minister should accept the amendment. We are opposed to the local authorities being brought into the scheme at all; but if they do come in, they should have representation. If we decide to give the local authorities representation now, and then at a later stage the Minister accepts an amendment to obliterate the local authorities from this Bill, we can easily recommit it and amend it again, and no harm will be

[*Mr. Moore.*

done. That is the position in a nutshell. If we have a representative from the Local Authorities' Association, he will understand all the problems that will come before the Board, and his assistance will be of material benefit. He may also know a good deal about rural education. The Minister must know that what we are saying has a good deal to recommend it.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*), who was received with Opposition cheers and laughter, said: Here we have a lot of "pot plant farmers" on the other side telling us what to do in connection with agricultural education.

Mr. MOORE: They call you a "street farmer."

Mr. KERR: I have more farmers in my electorate than you have in Toowoomba.

Mr. BRENNAN: The only farming seen by some of the hon. members who have spoken to-night is in the Brisbane Botanic Gardens. The hon. member for Logan moved an amendment to an important clause in this Bill asking that the local authorities shall have representation on the Board. When we come to the discussion of the Brisbane Tramway Trust Bill hon. members opposite will raise some opposition to the local authorities having representation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRENNAN: For the sake of analogy we might as well say that, because the farmers are going to use the trams, they should be represented on the proposed Tramway Board. We have got a Council of Agriculture, which is to be elected by the producers, who are the people most interested in farming. This is a question which affects my electorate, because Toowoomba is the centre of the agricultural districts of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like hon. gentlemen on my left to respond to my call to order. I take it for granted that this is an important Bill, and the hon. member for Toowoomba is desirous of dealing with this in a serious manner, so I hope this levity will cease.

Mr. BRENNAN: Thank you, Mr. Kirwan. They ought to listen, when the position is being put to them by a member who understands farming. If we take the City Council of Toowoomba, we can just imagine any hon. member on the other side discussing the question of agricultural education with any one of the aldermen.

Mr. KERR: You are parochial.

Mr. BRENNAN: No. I am advocating that the representatives must come from the Council of Agriculture, because they will be elected by the people who produce. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): The Minister should accept the amendment, because it is perfectly fair and reasonable. The Minister has heard the reasons given by members on this side in favour of the amendment, and I do not think that the Committee has been treated to a single valuable and legitimate reason against it. The Minister stated that in the Local Authorities' Association you could not find an expert capable of taking his seat on such a Board as this.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I did not say that.

Mr. KING: I do not want to misconstrue what the hon. gentleman said, but that is what I gathered from his remarks.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I said the hon. member for Aubigny.

Mr. KING: The Minister on more than one occasion has had the privilege of addressing the delegates to the Local Authorities' Conference. The conference comprises 165 local authorities out of a possible 170, so it will be readily seen that it is a pretty influential body of representatives of local government in Queensland. The Minister will have an opportunity of addressing those delegates, and I do not think he will have the temerity to get up and say that there is not an expert in their ranks qualified to sit on this Board. He would be a brave man to get up and say that. The annual conference of local authorities starts to-morrow in Brisbane, and it would be a very simple thing for the conference to select its member if we knew the Minister would agree to this amendment, or the conference could delegate to its executive such an appointment. The hon. member for Bulimba, in speaking to the amendment, referred to the hon. member for Aubigny. The hon. member for Aubigny has been actively associated with the Local Authorities' Association for a considerable number of years, and I had it in my mind that the Local Authorities Conference would select the hon. member for Aubigny as its representative on the Board. If they did, then he would be a very worthy representative indeed. He would satisfy the local authorities, and there would not be the slightest demur to his appointment. This amendment does not in any way alter the principles of the Bill. It simply seeks to give representation on the Board to the local authorities, who are vitally interested and will be called upon to pay part of the cost.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They will not be called upon to pay anything.

Mr. KING: I beg to differ. It appears to be voluntary; but we can argue that out later on. It is necessary to have local authority representation on the Board, because the Bill provides in one of its clauses how the money is to be raised—by special rates, by precept, or otherwise—and it is just as well to have on the Board a man who understands those matters. I appeal to the Minister in all seriousness and earnestness to accept the amendment.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (*Mr. King's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Larcombe
" Collins	" Mullan
" Conroy	" Payne
" Cooper, F. A.	" Pease
" Cooper, W.	" Pollock
" Coyne	" Riordan
" Dash	" Ryan
" Dunstan	" Smith
" Ferricks	" Stopford
" Foley	" Theodore
" Forde	" Weir
" Gilday	" Wellington
" Gillies	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Riordan and Mr. Weir.

Mr. King.]

NOES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Cattermull	„ Nott
„ Clayton	„ Peterson
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the negative. (Opposition cheers.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Resign!

Mr. SIZER: Now put on the "gag."

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HARTLEY: Cheering because there was a lot of sick men on our side!

Mr. PETERSON: Put the "gag" on now.

Question—That the word proposed to be inserted (*Mr. King's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Cattermull	„ Nott
„ Clayton	„ Peterson
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Deacon.

NOES, 34.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
„ Bertram	„ Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Bulcock	„ Larcombe
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Conroy	„ Payne
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Pease
„ Cooper, W.	„ Pollock
„ Coyne	„ Riordan
„ Dash	„ Ryan
„ Dunstan	„ Smith
„ Ferricks	„ Stopford
„ Foley	„ Theodore
„ Forde	„ Wair
„ Gilday	„ Wellington
„ Gillies	„ Wilson
„ Hartley	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Pease.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[8 p.m.]

Clause 4, as amended, put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—“That clause 5, as read, stand part of the Bill.”

Mr. KING (*Logan*): There is a consequential amendment to be made in clause 4.

Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I submit, Mr. Chairman, that you never put clause 4, as amended.

[*Mr. King.*

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry if the hon. gentleman did not hear me, but the clause was put and passed.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I am told I made a mistake; and I say so at once.

The CHAIRMAN: I put the question—“That clause 4, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Quite right.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): There are some consequential amendments that I want to move on clause 4.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot do that now, as the clause has been carried. An hon. member is supposed to be on his feet if he has further amendments to move on a clause.

Clause 5—“*Superseding the Board; Superintendent of Agricultural Education*”—

Mr. VOWLES (*Dabby*): Subclause (2) reads—

“The Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be called the Superintendent of Agricultural Education.”

After the word “may” I move the insertion of the words “on the recommendation of the Board.” We shall have a Board constituted—so we have been told by the Minister—of men who are highly proficient, men who are scientists from his point of view, as well as members of the Council of Agriculture and, now, a member of a local authority. The objects of the Board are—advising, co-operating with local authorities, making reports, issuing bulletins—non-political, I hope—and, generally, to exercise such other powers and perform such other duties for the effectual execution of this Act as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine. After going to all the trouble of appointing this Board, and, after all the wrangling and loss of time we have had in connection with its constitution, we are asked to give to the Governor in Council, for no reason shown at all, power to determine the functions of that Board, and to appoint one individual to carry out those various functions which the Secretary for Public Instruction informs us could not be carried out by a member of the Local Authorities' Association. I think that, before the Board is disbanded, it would have to be a consenting party. Therefore I am proposing that, before the Governor in Council shall do this, it must be done—as in the case of the Council of Agriculture—with the consent of the Board.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I support the leader of the Opposition in this amendment. It seems an extraordinary thing that there should be appointed a Board consisting of experts of all sorts to draw up a scheme of agricultural education; and then for the Governor in Council to appoint an officer, to be called the Superintendent of Agricultural Education, without any recommendation from that Board. The Bill says—

“The Governor in Council shall have the power to fix a date on and after which the powers, duties, and functions of the Board under this Act shall cease.”

I cannot understand what are to be the reasons for doing away with this Board. Surely, if a time arises when the Board no longer has power to give useful advice to the Minister, the Government should say, “The Board is no longer required to carry out this scheme of agricultural education, and we think it would be to the advantage

of the whole scheme to appoint a Superintendent of Agricultural Education. It is a most extraordinary state of affairs for the Governor in Council—apparently for no reason whatever—to knock out this Board and appoint a Superintendent. Under the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act, there is no kicking out of the Board at a moment's notice and the substitution of a Superintendent. That Board has been put there practically for the same purpose—advising, co-operating with local authorities, and making investigations. The main principle in this Bill is the appointment of a Board to give directions, and to see how the money is being expended. Yet in the succeeding clause the Governor in Council is to be given power to cut out the Board at a moment's notice. If the Board is going to be as capable as the Minister thinks, the least he should do is to get a recommendation from the Board before wiping it out and putting in a Superintendent. I ask that favourable consideration be given to the amendment.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): When this Bill was passing through its second reading stage, I asked the Minister to explain under what circumstances this Board would be dispensed with and its duties devolve upon this Superintendent of Agricultural Education. I trust the Minister will take advantage of this opportunity to explain to us why that power is retained. The object of the amendment is to make sure that the Board's powers shall be retained and its existence fortified, so that it cannot disappear in favour of this Superintendent of Agricultural Education.

When the Minister was last on his feet he told us what were to be the powers of the Board, and the use it was going to be, and he also said that three experts taken from the Department of Agriculture would be appointed, which would make this branch of education a big success. If that is to be accomplished, I fail to see under what circumstances the Minister can defend the action of this Board being wiped out with a view to appointing a Superintendent of Agricultural Education, who will be really a vassal of the department, and will have to do exactly what the Minister says shall be done. This is not an obstructive amendment, but an amendment on which we have very great grounds in asking an explanation, and we consider that, if the words proposed to be inserted are so inserted, it will fortify the Board and put it in the position of being a permanent part of this particular portion of our educational system. As I stated the other night, it is a very pleasing innovation in our educational system to see a Board being created to take part in framing our educational curriculum. I hope that the experiment will be adopted in other branches, so that eventually education will pass from the control of any Minister, and come under the direction of a Board fully qualified to give education that consideration which it so badly needs in our State.

Amendment (*Mr. Vowles*) put and negatived.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): The appointment of the Superintendent of Agricultural Education has not so far been discussed, and I think the Committee at this stage ought to know what salary is going to be attached to the office. The other day an appointment was made carrying a salary of £1,500 per annum. I would ask the

Minister whether he has anyone in view just now for the position of Superintendent of Agricultural Education.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No Superintendent will be appointed until the Board is abolished. Can you not read the Bill?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, but I want the hon. gentleman to tell me. It does appear that someone will be appointed some time. I think it is a fair question to ask whether the salary will be £1,000, £1,500, or £2,000 per annum.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That will be decided when the appointment is made.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Surely, we have a right to know what is in the mind of the Government in connection with the salary. The Bill must have been discussed in Cabinet, and some consideration must have been given to the salary to be paid. What class of man is going to be appointed? Is he going to be a professor of some kind? If he is to be a professor, then the salary attaching to the office will be a pretty big one. The general trend of legislation by the Government has been to create fairly big billets carrying fairly good salaries. Will the Minister tell the Committee whether the salary is going to be a high salary or a medium salary?

THE PREMIER: Give notice of the question for next month!

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman would like to close the House up just now.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

Question put; and the Committee divided (*Mr. Gledson, Ipswich*, being carried into the Chamber to take part in the division):—

NOES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Cattermull	„ Nott
„ Clayton	„ Peterson
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Costello and Mr. Clayton.

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
„ Bertram	„ Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Bulcock	„ Larcombe
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Conroy	„ Payne
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Pease
„ Cooper, W.	„ Pollock
„ Coyne	„ Riordan
„ Dash	„ Ryan
„ Dunstan	„ Smith
„ Ferricks	„ Stopford
„ Foley	„ Theodore
„ Forde	„ Weir
„ Gilday	„ Wellington
„ Gillies	„ Wilson
„ Gledson	„ Winstanley
„ Hartley	

Tellers: Mr. Riordan and Mr. Weir.

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

The CHAIRMAN: "Ayes," 35; "Noes," 35. The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the "Ayes." The question is resolved in the affirmative.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Gag!

Question—That clause 5, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Lacombe
" Collins	" Mullan
" Conroy	" Payne
" Cooper, F. A.	" Pease
" Cooper, W.	" Pollock
" Coyne	" Riordan
" Dash	" Ryan
" Dunstan	" Smith
" Ferricks	" Stopford
" Foley	" Theodore
" Forde	" Weir
" Gilday	" Wellington
" Gillies	" Wilson
" Gledson	" Winstanley
" Hartley	

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Bulcock.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macgregor
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Bell	" Moore
" Brand	" Morgan
" Cattermull	" Nott
" Clayton	" Peterson
" Corser	" Petrie
" Costello	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Deacon	" Roberts, T. R.
" Edwards	" Sizer
" Elphinstone	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Jones, J.	" Warren
" Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Deacon and Mr. J. Jones.

The CHAIRMAN: "Ayes" 35; "Noes" 35. The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the "Ayes." The question is resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 6—"Duties of the Board"—

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): The clause provides that the Board shall have power to issue bulletins from time to time dealing with agricultural education and cognate subjects. The time has arrived when Parliament should put some limitation on the class of literature which emanates from Government departments. So far as I can see, the literature issued by the Government at the present time is nothing but propaganda boosting the Government, and it is not in the best interests of Queensland. In my second reading speech I referred to this matter, and said it would be necessary to provide that the Board shall issue non-political bulletins.

Mr. COLLINS: You have a very big imagination.

Mr. VOWLES: Our "Agricultural Journal" has developed into a Government advertising medium. The Premier has thought it necessary to prepare statements which he has had published in Darling Downs periodicals, and we believe the editor of the "Agricultural Journal" has been boosting his scheme. If bulletins are to be issued in that direction, the time has

[*Mr. Vowles.*

arrived when this House should put its foot down, and they should put in a reservation that these bulletins shall be non-political. Therefore, I move—

"That the word 'non-political' be inserted after the word 'issue' on line 1, page 4."

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): The amendment is one that ought to commend itself to the Committee. We know that certain things have been done in every department, that appointments have been made which are absolutely political, and this amendment merely asks that the Board shall issue non-political bulletins. Judging by the very narrow majority which the Government have, it may happen in the very near future that the majority will be on this side, and what a benefit it will be then to have it non-political. (Interruption.) Hon. members will see how very important it is that these bulletins should be non-political. I notice that on a previous occasion to-night the Minister did give an explanation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He is not likely to do it again after what has happened. (Disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Premier moved the "gag," and not we on this side.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You challenged him.

Mr. WARREN: Why should we not challenge him? (Interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I would ask hon. members to respect the chair, if not the occupant of the chair.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The amendment must commend itself to the Committee, and I sincerely trust the Minister will not get annoyed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (pointing to Mr. Gledson): That is one reason.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is not our fault. That is the fault of the leader of the Government. If the leader of the Government chooses to sacrifice his men, that is his business and not ours.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): This is an amendment that could be accepted without sacrificing any principle in the Bill. It appears that the Minister has received his instructions from caucus.

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention to the decoration on the wall of the Chamber (pointing to a card bearing the Red Cross on the wall of the Chamber behind where Mr. Gledson was lying on the back Government bench). (Interruption.) This is a serious matter.

Mr. F. A. COOPER interjected.

Mr. VOWLES: Just now you were shedding crocodile tears.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It was the hon. member for Brenner who did it—the clown of the House!

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister has not intimated whether he will accept the amendment or not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I won't accept it.

Mr. MORGAN: You won't accept any amendments. We have got the Minister in a temper; we now know where he stands, and we know what to do on this side of the House. The Government must recognise that they cannot do what they like in a Chamber of this sort, and, simply because the Premier thinks it is his duty to bring a sick man into the Chamber, we are not going to neglect our duty as an Opposition. (Disorder.) Whoever brought that sick man into the Chamber ought to be ashamed of himself. (Further disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. PETERSON (pointing to the Government benches): You would sacrifice a mate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the hon. member to discuss the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: I intend to discuss the amendment, and I am very pleased to know that the Minister does not intend to give any amendment from this side of the House serious consideration. (Interruption.) Why not let us have a fight with the gloves off? The sooner we have it the better. We have been too lenient. Now that the Premier has exposed his hand, we should fight him with the gloves off.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Uproar.)

Mr. COLLINS (Bowen): I am surprised at hon. members opposite, who have a controlling interest in the various Universities throughout the Commonwealth, wanting to say that in this particular matter politics should be debarred. It is owing to the teaching of hon. members opposite or their professors in the various Universities that we find the world in the damnable state it is in at the present moment. (Disorder.) This

ought to be a lesson to the Secretary for Public Instruction tonight. [3.30 p.m.] We ought to consider whether we should not alter the whole curriculum in our State schools and Universities, by making a sweeping change and stopping the teachings which are being taught in the various institutions mentioned by me—institutions which helped to bring about the great war.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will keep to the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS: The amendment is designed to stop the publication of political literature. I am pointing out that the leader of the Opposition has all the opportunity he requires. He has three or four newspapers in Brisbane preaching his type of political literature at the present time.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not true. They have been against him all the time.

Mr. COLLINS: Hon. members opposite think we are going to use this opportunity, and, if we do use it, we shall only be following in the footsteps of hon. members opposite. Anyone who knows anything about the history of the world knows that it is owing to these gentlemen, from time immemorial, controlling the schools and teaching their particular doctrines that we find the world in the state which it is in at the present moment. I hope that the Minister is not going to accept the amendment. He has no intention of doing what the Opposition say. I think it was Ruskin who said, "Low thoughts can only emanate from low minds." (Uproar.) I expect something like that from hon. members opposite. They have been so accustomed to manipulate the

universal education system that governs this State for their own purposes, that they think everybody else is similar to themselves. I am pleased to hear the Minister say that he does not intend to accept this amendment.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS (Pittsworth): I am surprised to hear that the Minister looks upon the Opposition as being responsible for bringing the hon. member for Ipswich into the Chamber. I say that we are in no way responsible for it. (Disorder.)

The PREMIER: Yes you are.

Mr. STOPFORD interjected.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am going to say that the hon. member for Mount Morgan was responsible for bringing the hon. member for Ipswich into the Chamber. (Interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope that the hon. member will realise that this is a deliberative Assembly. I hope that hon. members will respond to my call to order. If there is any more disorder, I will take the action which I have power to take under the Standing Orders.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I sincerely hope that the Secretary for Public Instruction is not going to take the advice given to him by the hon. member for Bowen. The schools to which the hon. member referred have been responsible for turning out the greatest men that the world has ever seen. I give the Secretary for Public Instruction this much credit, at any rate, that he is sincere in trying to turn out the same class of men in Queensland that have been turned out in other parts of the British Empire. I hope that the Minister is not going to stand by the assertion he made quite recently that he would not accept any amendments in this Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I say I will not accept your amendments.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I think that, with the co-operation of hon. members on this side, the Minister will have a Bill that he, as well as the people of Queensland, will be proud of. I do not consider it wise, as a matter of public policy, for any Minister to say that he is not going to accept any amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is an amendment before the Committee which I clearly and distinctly stated, and I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Bowen wandered all round the country.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member for Bowen did not.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The amendment aims at the issue of non-political bulletins. We know perfectly well that political literature is being distributed throughout the country in all the journals in which the Government have a very great influence. The "Agricultural Journal" contains political writings every week.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why don't you endeavour to stick to the truth?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I try to stick to the truth, and I am not going to be corrected by the Secretary for Agriculture, because he does not know truth when he sees it. (Opposition laughter.) I sincerely hope that neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Department of Public Instruction is going to be used for political purposes from now on. We know very well

Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.]

that the school children in country districts have been used by our friends opposite as a medium for spreading certain literature in the country districts. The hon. member for Toowoomba knows it as well as I do.

Mr. BRENNAN: I know nothing about it.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The time has arrived when we should have stated in Bills exactly what is meant, and what is the intention of Ministers, so that, when they get over here the Ministry which will be formed from this side of the House will know exactly what is expected of them. I hope that the Minister will accept the amendment. I believe that it will go a long way towards encouraging the carrying out of this scheme, and I strongly urge its acceptance.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I also support the amendment. I think it is very regrettable that it should be necessary in this Chamber even to suggest that our bulletins, which are supposed to be issued for the purpose of giving information and which are distributed to the schools, should have reached the stage when we have to put in a Bill the word, "non-political." It is only true, I admit, of Labour Governments.

Mr. FERRICKS: Get out! You had sixty years of it.

Mr. KERR: It only took a few short years in New South Wales to permeate the schools there with socialism, and the same thing is possible here. It is no good saying that the time has now arrived when certain ideas in the minds of hon. members opposite are going to be given out for the good of the country. The hon. member for Bowen has criticised the University, one of the institutions that good men, and the best educated men in this country, have come from.

Mr. COLLINS: They are the same class of people who are running Great Britain at the present time.

Mr. KERR: You have had your say.

Mr. COLLINS: I know the history of my country, at any rate.

Hon. J. G. APPEL (addressing Mr. Kerr): Didn't he tell you he was a Bolshevik?

Mr. KERR: Yes. I have read a lot of the pamphlets issued by the Government, and I have noticed the policy issued through the various schools by the present Government. If they do not write them, at any rate they direct them, and they will direct the policy of the agricultural schools. That is the sort of thing we wish to have some protection against. I might refer particularly to the Governor's Speech in 1920, which was distributed at the expense of the country at a cost of £2,000. That is a cheap way of getting propaganda for electioneering purposes. I think it is most regrettable that it is necessary for us, as an Opposition, to have to insert in any Bill the word "non-political." Our experience has been such that the time is opportune now—and it is getting worse and worse, for the party opposite is split on the matter of Bolshevism and other "isms"—the time is opportune to put in the word "non-political," so that our children will not be subject to politics in the schools, and so that no one can get an opportunity of teaching them wrong principles.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): If ever any evidence were wanted as to why propaganda should be part of any institution under the Government, the conduct to-night of hon.

members opposite is the most striking example that could be given. I think it can be said that they are absolutely dead to every common sense of decency. They are absolutely callous towards the feelings of others. (Opposition dissent and disorder.)

Mr. FLETCHER: That is your own responsibility.

Mr. HARTLEY: Hon. members opposite are absolutely unsympathetic to the condition or welfare of the hon. member who has just been carried into the Chamber when they can use an occasion such as this to attempt to defeat the Government. They are also heedless and inconsiderate to a degree of the feelings of the wife, who for the past week has devotedly nursed him downstairs in a room of this building, and now they compel the Government to expose him to the danger of a relapse, regardless of what she may feel on the matter. I think the exhibition to-night is sufficient to show, not only that this Government should allow political ethics and honour and straightdealing and cleanness to be taught, but that they should go further and see that in all their institutions their officers are of such probity that young scholars will be turned out in such a way that they will be an example to the State. It is all the more necessary and important after the exhibition that hon. members opposite have given to-night.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: The Government were responsible.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think this incident has been discussed sufficiently, and I hope that hon. members will now confine their remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. HARTLEY: I quite agree with you, Mr. Kirwan, and I simply say that the exhibition to-night is sufficient to make the Government keep the clause as it stands. This Government should have the fullest liberty to teach in the schools what they think should be taught for the benefit and honour of the young people who will hereafter rule this State.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I rise to support the amendment, because I think it is absolutely necessary. We have seen how the Government have used their various publications for the circulation of their political propaganda. In the May and June numbers of the "Agricultural Journal" you will find a dozen pages containing the speeches delivered by the Premier with regard to his agricultural policy, and they teem with party politics from end to end.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Government publications are to be made use of in that way, it is time we took a stand and insisted that in the future nothing of the kind shall occur. With your permission, Mr. Kirwan, I want to refer to a certain incident, and I feel quite sure you will give me that permission. A certain incident has been referred to this evening by hon. members on both sides of the House. I want to say that the hon. member for Quantenon, the Government "whip," came to me this afternoon, and asked me if Mr. Petrie, the hon. member for Toombul, was able to come into the House. I told him that Mr. Petrie was in a fit condition to come to the House, but that he had gone out to his son's place, and I had not seen him to-day. He told me that Mr. Gledson was also fit and well enough to come into this Chamber.

[*Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.*]

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah!

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I just want to say that, when the leader of the Nationalist party brought the hon. member for Toombul into the Chamber to-night, he did not bring him in in a decent and honourable way, but he smuggled him in like a Chinese smuggling opium. (Opposition dissent.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust that no other hon. member will discuss this incident. (Hear, hear!) I will name the next member who disobeys my ruling.

Mr. MORGAN: I ask is the hon. member for Mount Morgan in order in referring to the leader of the Nationalist party as having done something dishonourable.

Mr. FORDE: Of course he did something dishonourable.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Murilla should have raised his point of order when the hon. member for Mount Morgan was making his speech.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): Unless this amendment is accepted, this clause is going to aim one of the greatest blows at our national system of education that we have had for a great number of years. There are thousands of people to-day who are getting sick and tired of communism being taught by some of the extreme section. (Government dissent.) There are thousands of parents in Queensland to-day who are beginning to talk about the abolition of our present system of State education owing to what the children are taught in the schools. I mentioned this matter when speaking on the public platform not long ago, and I said that the people are getting tired of having socialism taught in our State schools.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question under discussion now is not what is being taught in the State schools, but what literature should be issued by the Board, and I ask the hon. member to keep to the question.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I want to point out that we do not want the pupils in our agricultural schools taught the same kind of rubbish that is being taught in our State schools. Political bulletins are issued by this Government and distributed, and it will mean the destruction of our State school system, because the parents to-day will not stand it. If these things are going to be taught in our agricultural schools, then we are going to have a big demand for sectional and sectarian schools. Don't make any mistake about that.

Mr. BRENNAN: You're a humbug.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: If you allow this sort of teaching to get into the agricultural schools, there will be a public condemnation of them, and there will be a demand for sectarian schools in preference to our national schools of to-day. Unless you are going to keep politics and communism out of our national educational system, you are going to strike it a death blow.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I understood that this Bill was introduced to give to the people something in the way of agricultural education. We are now getting a suspicion that it has been introduced as political propaganda, or is to be used for political purposes.

Mr. COLLINS: Are you not satisfied with the "Telegraph," the "Courier," the "Daily Mail," and the "Observer" thundering on your behalf every day?

Mr. DEACON: I wish that it was quite clear that this is not a political measure, or introduced for party purposes, and that it is not going to help one side or the other; in fact, that it is going to be some thing which it should be, that is, a measure to provide agricultural education.

Question—That the word proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Vowles's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Cattermull	„ Nott
„ Clayton	„ Peterson
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Peterson and Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
„ Bertram	„ Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Bulecock	„ Larcombe
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Conroy	„ Payne
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Pease
„ Cooper, W.	„ Pollock
„ Coyne	„ Riordan
„ Dash	„ Ryan
„ Dunstan	„ Smith
„ Ferricks	„ Stopford
„ Foley	„ Theodore
„ Forde	„ Weir
„ Gilday	„ Wellington
„ Gillies	„ Wilson
„ Gledson	„ Winstanley
„ Hartley	

Tellers: Mr. Bulecock and Mr. Foley.

The CHAIRMAN: "Aves." 35; "Noes." 35. The voting being equal, I give my casting vote in favour of the "Noes." The question is resolved in the negative.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Thursday, August 10th."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hon. members opposite, through the leader of the Opposition, have shown so little consideration to members of the Government party who are seriously ill that they have declined to extend to them the consideration and courtesy of "pairs." Of course the hon. member is quite within his rights in refusing to do that, but it makes it impossible for the Government to continue business without seriously endangering human life. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. BRAND: You are nothing else but an autocrat.

The PREMIER: Hon. members over there are gabbling about something or other—I do not catch what they are saying—but, whilst the Government have a majority in the constituencies, they are going to continue. They are not going to surrender their position to parties which are in the minority in the constituencies.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are in a minority on the votes.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Nationalist party, apparently with the connivance of the leader of the Opposition, took rather a mean advantage of the Government—

Mr. FLETCHER: That is not true.

The PREMIER: He brought the hon. member for Toombul surreptitiously into this Chamber in order to cause embarrassment to the Government. (Opposition interruption.)

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): I rise to a point of order. I was not brought into this House by anybody. (Government interruption.) My leader knew that I was well enough to come here at any time. (Government interruption.) I can come here when I like, and I will stop here as long as I like.

Mr. TAYLOR: And the Government "whip" knew it. (Government interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust hon. members will restrain themselves. (Interruption.) The hon. member for Toombul, with his long parliamentary experience, knows there is nothing in his point of order. I have allowed the leader of the Government to make a brief speech, and, when he has concluded, I will allow the leader of the Opposition to make a brief speech.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I rise to a point of order. (Government interruption.) I ask if the Premier is in order in stating that I brought the hon. member for Toombul into this Chamber surreptitiously, seeing that I did not bring him in at all. (Government interruption.)

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member for Kurilpa, your "whip," brought him in.

Mr. TAYLOR: As I have already informed the House, I told the "whip" of the Government party that the hon. member for Toombul was well enough to be here. (Uproar.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Windsor is abusing the privileges of the House in making a speech on a point of order. There is nothing in the hon. member's point of order.

The PREMIER: I do not think it has ever happened in the history of parliamentary government in Queensland that a Government has been deliberately refused a "pair" for a man who is in hospital sick, especially a Minister.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Never has such a thing happened within the knowledge of any hon. member in this House. Hon. members on the other side have stooped to that kind of thing, and the Government had to bow to the inevitable; but I am not going to surrender my position because of the disorganised rabble that is in opposition—(Opposition uproar)—especially when that rabble is in the minority. (Uproar.)

Mr. SIZER: We are not as disorganised as you are on that side.

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

The PREMIER: If that disorganised rabble are not in a minority, let them prevent this House from adjourning. (Disorder.)

Mr. SIZER: You did not have a majority in caucus, still you carry on.

The PREMIER: The position is perfectly clear. The rabble—the various sections that constitute the Opposition—cannot take command of this House. (Disorder.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We took command to-night.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If they could, they could prevent this resolution from going through—which they cannot do; they must accept the adjournment of the House until next Thursday week. By that time—it is my hope, at any rate—the hon. members who, unfortunately, are sick at the present time—hon. members on both sides—may be fully recovered. I beg to move the motion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): It is not usual on an occasion of this sort for a debate to take place; but, as certain statements have been made by the Premier, I think it is only reasonable that I should reply to them. In the first place, he has charged us with not having given a "pair" for a Minister who is incapacitated. The functions of the Opposition are to oppose the Government, not to assist it; that is our duty to the country. If things were normal, if we had a Government representing a majority of the people of the State, it would be different. (Disorder.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: When we find a rabble—as they describe us—and they are a rabble—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Government interruption.)

Mr. VOWLES: You have only to look at the papers to-day to find that the unions are calling on the Premier to resign.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Government interruption.)

Mr. VOWLES: The people in the country are calling on them to resign. (Government interruption.) I am charged with having connived with the hon. member for Windsor to bring the hon. member for Toombul surreptitiously into this House. I venture to say that it is more than the two of us could do. (Laughter.) I am informed by the hon. member for Windsor, the leader of the Nationalist party, that to-day he told the Government "whip" that the hon. member for Toombul (Mr. Petrie) was available, and might be in the House at any time.

The PREMIER: Why did you sneak him in?

Mr. VOWLES: And the hon. member was told, in reply, that Mr. Gledson was in a fit state to take his place in the House. In order to bludgeon through business once more, this Government—who recently have had to depend upon the votes of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees to carry through their business—have descended right down to the gutter by taking a man from his sick bed and bringing him in here in order to make political capital out of it; and they try to throw the blame on us. (Disorder.) I want to let the public know that the hon. member for Ipswich was brought into this Chamber, not because we called for a division, but because the Premier wanted to use that force which

he used so frequently during the last session to bludgeon his legislation through.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: All I can say is that we object to the adjournment of the House. We are here to do business; and, if the Government cannot carry on, let the Premier do as any self-respecting Premier would do—resign and get out.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: Not so our friend opposite; he will hang on till the bitter end to the sweets of office and to the fees of which we heard so much this afternoon; and the people we are talking about will keep him there. I propose to vote against this adjournment; and, if it is carried by yourself, Mr. Speaker—as I have no doubt it will be—all I can do is to say I regret it.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I rise to endorse the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. Probably never since its establishment has the Queensland Parliament witnessed a more regrettable scene than that which we have witnessed this evening—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: In which the Premier was the chief actor.

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member for Kurilpa was the chief actor, and you know it.

Mr. TAYLOR: If ever a disgraceful speech has come from a man occupying the position of Premier of Queensland and leading the Government of the State, I think we have heard it to-night. So far from there being a rabble on this side, I would advise the Premier to try and control his own rabble. If there is any rabble in this House, it is sitting on that side behind the Premier; and the Premier knows it. If the hon. gentleman had any courage in him at all, instead of wanting to adjourn the House until Thursday week, he would go to the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: He is not game.

Mr. TAYLOR: We challenge him here to-night to go to the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: He is frightened, and his followers are frightened. He and they know just what would happen to them if they went to the country. (Government interruption.) Instead of going to the country, he moves the adjournment of the House so that he may have a little more breathing time to enable him, perhaps, to get his rabble under control. It seems to me that the rabble have broken away from him now. Once again, with regard to the hon. member for Toombul, I challenge the "whip" of the Government party to contradict one word that I have said. I repeat that the hon. member came to me and asked me what was the condition of the hon. member for Toombul, and I told him that the hon. member was in a fit and proper state to come into this House and vote, and he told me that the hon. member for Ipswich could come in and do the same. (Uproar.) I challenge the Government "whip" to deny that. I am not in the habit of coming into this Chamber and telling lies. I am prepared to stand by every word I say in this Chamber, and, when I have got to resort to subterfuge and lies, I will get out of it. I intend to vote against the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): Before this House adjourns—

The SPEAKER: Order! On such a motion it is not usual for private members to speak. As a matter of propriety, the debate is restricted to the leaders of the respective parties, and it is to be hoped that hon. members will follow that course on the present occasion.

Question—That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Thursday, 10th August, put;—and the House divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Lacombe
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Coyne	" Pollock
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday	" Weir
" Gillies	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
" Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. F. A. Cooper and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macgregor
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Bell	" Moore
" Brand	" Morgan
" Cattermull	" Nott
" Clayton	" Peterson
" Corser	" Petrie
" Costello	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Deacon	" Roberts, T. R.
" Edwards	" Sizer
" Elphinstone	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Jones, J.	" Warren
" Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Bebbington and Mr. Brand.

The SPEAKER: "Ayes," 35; "Noes," 35. The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the "Ayes." The question is resolved in the affirmative.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Question—That the House do now adjourn.—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Lacombe
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Coyne	" Pollock
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday	" Weir
" Gillies	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
" Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Pease and Mr. Riordan.

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

NOES, 35.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macgregor
„ Bebbington	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Cattermull	„ Nott
„ Clayton	„ Peterson
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Costello	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Fletcher	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Green	„ Walker
„ Jones, J.	„ Warren
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. King and Mr. Maxwell.

The SPEAKER: “Ayes,” 35; “Noes,” 35. The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the “Ayes.” The question is resolved in the affirmative.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

The House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.