

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 24 AUGUST 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 24 AUGUST, 1922.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram. *Marce*) took the chair at 3.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION FEES.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“1. What fees were paid by the owners for the inspection of scaffolding for wooden, brick, or other buildings during the years 1916 to 1920, inclusive; also, for the periods 1st January to 31st July, 1921; 1st August to 31st December, 1921; 1st January to 31st July, 1922?”

“2. What was the reason for increasing such inspection fees from 1st August, 1921, by, approximately, 46 per cent. connected with the erection of wooden buildings, and a large increase in fees connected with brick or other buildings?”

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*) replied—

“1.—

	£	s.	d.
1916	500	11	8
1917	357	15	0
1918	401	14	2
1919	596	15	6
1920	928	11	0
1st January to 31st July, 1921	365	2	6
1st August to 31st December, 1921	292	5	6
1st January to 31st July, 1922	631	4	6

“2. Increased inspection fees for scaffolding were necessary in order to make this branch of the service self-supporting.”

AMOUNT OF LAND TAX DEDUCTED FROM INCOME TAX BY FARMERS.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) asked the Treasurer—

“Of the £19,020 mentioned in the report of the Commissioner of Taxes as having been paid by farmers owning land valued at less than £1,281 during 1921-1922, how much has been allowed in deductions from income tax payable by these farmers?”

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

“The amounts are deductible from incomes earned during the year ended 30th June, 1922. As these incomes have not yet been assessed, the total of the deductions cannot be stated.”

FRANCHISE FOR INDIAN RESIDENTS IN QUEENSLAND.

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

“Referring to the recent visit of Mr. Sastri, and his speech delivered in this Chamber relative to the rights of Indians domiciled in Australia, can he make any statement as to the intentions of the Government regarding the extension of the franchise to Indians resident in this State?”

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

“This is a matter for discussion at a Premiers' conference.”

SILOS AT GATTON COLLEGE.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“Are the silos at Gatton College being regularly used?”

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH, on behalf of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) replied—

“Yes.”

CIVIC RIGHTS TO STATE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LOGAN (*Lockyer*) asked the Chief Secretary—

“1. Is the granting of ‘full’ civic rights to all State employees’ still a plank of the Labour platform?”

“2. Will he kindly explain the meaning of this plank, and to what extent (if any) it has been put into actual operation?”

The PREMIER replied—

“1. Yes.

“2. The plank is self-explanatory and fully operative.”

RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC SERVANTS CONTRIBUTING TO SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Mr. CLAYTON asked the Attorney-General—

“In view of his promise last session that he would give further consideration to the cases of public servants who were contributors to the Superannuation Fund to age seventy, and, having received an assurance that their services would be retained to that age, were, nevertheless, retired at age sixty-five, will he kindly advise what action has since been taken in regard to such cases?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) replied—

“I would refer the hon. member to the statement made by me as to the decision of the Government in this matter, which was published in the newspapers of 12th January, 1922.”

TOOWOONBA LIBERTY FAIR—ALLOCATION OF PROFITS.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) asked the Attorney-General—

“1. Has his attention been drawn to the following statement attributed to Mr. J. S. Collings, State organiser of the Queensland branch of the Australian Labour party, in the ‘Daily Mail’ of 21st December, 1921, relative to a proposal to run the gambling concern known as ‘Liberty Fair’ at Toowoomba in December last:—

All labour at the fair will be voluntary from members of unions and Labour supporters, profits to be shared—15 per cent. to the band, 15 per cent. to the Trades Hall Board, 30 per cent. to the Brisbane ‘Daily Standard,’ and 40 per cent. to the owner of the plant, so as to enable the owner

of the plant to run 'under and over seven' and other games of gambling?

"2. Is the usual allocation of profits derived from 'Liberty Fair' the same as or approximate to the above?"

"3. Does he consider it justifiable that a daily newspaper should have its profits augmented (or its losses lessened) through the granting by him of a permit to conduct gambling concerns amongst the people of this State?"

"4. Who are the owners of the plant used at these so-called 'Liberty Fairs'?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

"1. No.

"2 to 4. See answer to No. 1."

ROYALTY ON GRAVEL TAKEN FROM BRISBANE RIVER.

Mr. VOWLES asked the Treasurer—

"1. What royalty per yard is charged for gravel taken from the Brisbane River, and what rebate (if any) is allowed to the Water and Sewerage Board and local authorities?"

"2. What is the date of the imposition of such a charge?"

"3. What revenue was derived from this source during last financial year?"

The TREASURER replied—

"1. Ninepence per cubic yard. A rebate of 6d. per cubic yard is allowed to the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and local authorities.

"2. 1st July, 1922.

"3. Nil. See answer to No. 2."

PAK-A-PU AND "GOLDEN CASKET" TICKETS.

Mr. VOWLES asked the Attorney-General—

"Will he explain to this House the precise difference, from a moral point of view, between the sale by a Chinese named Charlie Lung of a ticket in a pak-a-pu lottery (for which he was yesterday fined £20), and the sale by the Queensland Government (or by the authority of the Queensland Government) of tickets in the 'Golden Casket' lottery?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

"It is to be greatly regretted that the question of the leader of the Opposition shows, on his part, a most callous disregard of the sufferings of the sick and the afflicted in our hospitals, which humane institutions are materially assisted financially in their good work by the proceeds of the 'Golden Casket.' It is lamentable, too, that the leader of the Opposition sees fit to descend to such mean and vindictive tactics as to compare the action of this Government in permitting the conduct of the 'Golden Casket' to those gambling dens of which, by his question, he seems personally to have such accurate knowledge. In view of the honourable member's hostility to the 'Golden Casket' Art Union, it is interesting to note that a W. Vowles, Dalby, was the winner of the first prize (a tea and coffee service) in an art union which was drawn on 30th June, 1922, in aid of the funds of the

Inglewood Memorial Hospital. The people of Queensland may rest assured that the Government will continue its policy of assisting the hospitals of the State in the care of the sick and the suffering in spite of the bitter hostility and inhumanity displayed by the honourable member in his question."

(Loud laughter.)

ALLEGED CANDIDATURE OF MR. CATTERMULL FOR APPOINTMENT TO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*), without notice, asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"In view of the denial of Mr. Cattermull, the hon. member for Musgrave, that he was a candidate for the Legislative Council, does he (the Minister) still adhere to his statement that the hon. member was a candidate?"

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

"Yes. I have received the following letter from Mr. Lewis McDonald, secretary of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour party:—

24th August, 1922.

Hon. W. Forgan Smith, M.L.A.,
Minister for Works,
Brisbane.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your request for information this morning regarding the nomination of Mr. H. A. Cattermull for appointment to the Legislative Council in 1917, I beg to inform you that I have looked up the records of the executive, which disclose the following:—

In a letter dated 4th October, 1917, the secretary of the parliamentary Labour party, Mr. G. P. Barber, forwarded to my executive list of the names of persons who had been nominated by members of the parliamentary Labour party as candidates for appointment to the Legislative Council. Among the names submitted appears that of Mr. H. A. Cattermull, nominated by Mr. T. G. Arnfield, ex-member for Musgrave, and three (3) others. When the nominations were placed before the Q.C.E. on the following day, 5th October, 1917, the nomination of Mr. H. A. Cattermull failed to receive the endorsement of the Q.C.E."

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*), without notice, asked the hon. member for Musgrave—

"Was he aware that his name had been submitted as a Labour candidate for appointment to the Legislative Council of Queensland?"

Mr. CATTERMULL (*Musgrave*) replied—

"No. (Government laughter.) I was not aware that my name was being submitted, but I do know that I was made a member of the W.P.O. in Bundaberg by the late member for Musgrave, who paid my dues for three years in advance without my consent."

(Government laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

RENAMING OF ELECTORATES BILL.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*), without notice, asked the Attorney-General—

“Is it still his determination to introduce this session a Renaming of Electorates Bill?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

“Yes, it is my intention.”

PAPER.

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

Second annual report of the Public Service Commissioner for the year ended 29th June, 1922.

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS' INSURANCE BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): I beg to move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to make provision for the insurance of unemployed workers, and for other ancillary purposes.”

The leader of the Opposition called “Not formal” to this motion, probably with a view to getting some information as to the scheme of the Bill. The Bill is an insurance measure whereby workers in certain industries, trades, and callings will be enabled to insure themselves against periods of unemployment. All workers functioning under awards of the Arbitration Court will be subject to this insurance scheme. The fund will be contributed to by employers, employees, and the State in the proportion of one-third each. The fund will be administered by an unemployed council, comprising the Secretary for Public Works, the Director of Labour, the Registrar of Friendly Societies, a representative of the various unions affected, and of the Employers' Federation. There are other provisions in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman will remember that last year I ruled that this is not the stage for discussing any measure.

Mr. VOWLES: We had two Houses on that occasion, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: With that outline of the Bill I will content myself.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I notice you have stated, Mr. Speaker, that you ruled last session that this is not the stage for discussion. I would like to impress upon you that when you gave that ruling there were two Chambers.

Mr. STOPFORD: The Standing Orders here are the same; we have not altered them.

Mr. VOWLES: If you look at the practice in the past, you will see that debate has been allowed. You made a definite ruling, and we stood by it. We did not question it, because we had so many opportunities of considering Bills, more particularly on their return from the other Chamber, when they had been amended. I think that ruling should be reviewed, in order that we might be allowed to have a reasonable amount of debate at this stage. It is a very desirable

thing that the Minister should give a certain amount of information, as the Minister was doing.

The PREMIER: You will get more information in Committee.

Mr. VOWLES: In this case it was particularly interesting, because I have in my memory what took place during other sessions of Parliament when similar measures were before this House. If I remember rightly, an amendment based on an alternative scheme, which was proposed to this House, was rejected.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Do you propose to oppose this Bill?

Mr. VOWLES: I want to see it. It is astonishing to find the Government coming forward now with something they threw out before. I do not wish to take advantage of the position in which I find myself. I will wait and see what really is in the Bill, and criticise it in the right manner.

Question put and passed.

SALARIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I have already spoken on the introduction of this Bill, and it is not necessary to speak at any great length on the second reading. The Bill is practically self-explanatory. Following on the decision of the Arbitration Court to reduce the wages and salaries of public servants, the Government have decided to reduce by means of this measure the salaries of those public servants in receipt of upwards of £300 per annum. That reduction has been made as general as possible, and will include members of Parliament, Ministers of the Crown, and other officers.

Mr. MORGAN: Will the hon. gentleman explain why it does not include Supreme Court and Land Court judges?

The PREMIER: There are certain anomalies that are bound to arise in any general measure providing for an all-round reduction, and these are being carefully gone into with a view to avoiding any such anomalies. For instance, there are some officers who, through no fault of their own, have not yet reached the minimum of the classification for their grade, and in those cases the Public Service Commissioner will make a suitable recommendation, and if any reduction is recommended, will suggest what reduction shall apply in such cases. The same thing applies to officers under £300 per annum, but they are not dealt with under this Bill. The anomalies, although they cannot be set out in the Bill, will be carefully gone into, and provision is made in the Bill to cover anomalies of that kind. The Bill will apply to those officers whose salaries are appropriated by Act of Parliament, and to those officers who hold office under contract with the Crown, if those officers agree to such reduction. That applies to the cases mentioned by the hon. member for Murilla. There is quite a long list of those officers, which will be found in the Estimates; for instance, the salaries of Ministers, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Chairman of Committees, the Auditor-General, the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner for Trade, the Medical Superintendent of

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

Hospitals for insane, the General Manager of the Sugar-mills, the Superintendent of State Coal Mines, the General Manager of the Chillagoe Smelting Works, the Public Service Commissioner, and the judges are fixed either by contract or by statute, and will be affected only so far as those officers concerned agree to have their salaries affected. In effect, the salaries of the whole of those officers, with the exception of the Supreme Court judges and Land Court judges, will be reduced in conformity with their own agreement.

Mr. FLETCHER: Was the question referred to those officers?

The PREMIER: The question was referred to those officers. I do not know that there is anything more that I can explain in connection with the Bill. Any detail matters which occur to hon. members can be raised in Committee, and I will fully explain them.

Mr. FLETCHER: Were the Supreme Court and the Land Court judges the only officers who declined to agree to a reduction?

The PREMIER: I do not say that they have declined. The question was referred to all concerned, and those I have mentioned have agreed to accept a reduction.

Mr. SIZER: Have the Arbitration Court judges declined?

The PREMIER: No. I move—

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

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I have dealt with this matter on another occasion, and I pointed out to this House that, in my opinion, the fact of a Government having to reduce its estimated deficit in the way they are doing by attacking public servants' salaries is very regrettable. As far as hon. members in this Chamber are concerned, we are quite in agreement to make the sacrifice which is necessary, but we claim that the fact that the Government are attacking only one branch of the public service now is a very grave admission that the Arbitration Act has been defective because anybody who knows the history of the public service and the Arbitration Court will know that there has been a tremendous lot of chopping and changing about. I propose to give the amount of the salary subjected to the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court from time to time, showing how on the eve of an election the amount was increased and after an election the amount was reduced. What is good for one member of the public service is equally good for another. We claim that the junior members of the public service with less responsibilities have, during recent years, received more benefits as a result of Arbitration Court increases than those men in receipt of over £300 per annum who were entitled to automatic increases.

Mr. COLLINS: The bottom dog should be lifted up.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not agree with that at all, generally speaking. There are cases where responsibility has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Is business run by the bottom dog?

Mr. VOWLES: I know one case in the public service to-day where a man who is a superior officer will, as a result of the 5 per cent. reduction, receive less salary than his subordinate. I know that to be a fact. The junior officer is actually receiving, as a

result of this juggling with the salaries of public servants, more money than his superior officer.

Mr. BRENNAN: What rank or position does that superior officer hold?

Mr. VOWLES: The position of acting sergeant. This junior is getting more than his superior officer.

The PREMIER: The superior officer gets a 5 per cent. reduction—that may be an anomaly that will be rectified.

Mr. VOWLES: There are other anomalies of the same kind, and that bears out the contention put before this Chamber that these cases should be dealt with, not en bloc, but on their individual merits.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Payment by results.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. gentleman talks about payment by results. I think he ought to be getting four Ministers' salaries to-day; he votes for them.

The PREMIER: You do not agree with the hon. member for Oxley.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not agree with him as far as that is concerned.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: We are allowed to have divisions of opinion over here.

Mr. POLLOCK: You certainly have divisions.

Mr. VOWLES: The contention right through has been that the public servants should be excluded from this measure, and that some provision should be made under the Arbitration Act which would give them an opportunity of placing their cases before an impartial tribunal and having them decided upon their merits. I previously gave figures with regard to the classification of the public servants, and I propose to give them again. The 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. The 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.

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

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. 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. I quoted these figures before on an earlier stage of the Bill, and they have not been contradicted in any direction, or criticised by the Minister in charge of the Bill. The number of officers in the service receiving salaries over £300 is estimated at approximately 15 per cent. I understand that the amount of deduction in these cases is very small, and does not amount to more than £15,000 all told, as far as these classified officers are concerned. I ask the Government, if they have any respect for their honour, whether it is a fair thing for them to sacrifice principle for the sake of that small amount of revenue, and to tear up agreements which have been made, more particularly with police magistrates—who I propose to refer to at a later stage—and place us in the same position as “Kaiser Bill,” when he tore up the scrap of paper in respect to Belgium? As far as police magistrates are concerned, they formed an association of their own, and when they formed it, it was possible to get access to the Arbitration Court, but, as the result of an alteration in the jurisdiction of the court, they were put out of court. Although their application to the court was made previous to the jurisdiction being altered, it was ultimately found that the court, without an agreement being entered into by all parties concerned, could give them no redress. Now the

result of that was that an agreement [4 p.m.] was entered into and it is published in “Government Gazette,” 292, volume cxvi. This is what it set out in the “Gazette” dated 23rd June, 1921—

“POLICE MAGISTRATES AND WARDENS.

“This agreement, made in pursuance of the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916, this fourteenth day of June, 1921, between the Honourable Edward Granville Theodore, Chief Secretary of the State of Queensland, for and on behalf of the Government of Queensland, of the one part, and the Police Magistrates and Wardens’ Associations of Queensland (an industrial union registered under the said Act), of the other part. Whereas the members of the said association are employed by the Government of Queensland: And whereas the conditions of employment of and remuneration to be received by the members of the said association are determined by an award of the Court of Industrial Arbitration dated the fourteenth day of August, 1920: And whereas the said association has made a claim on the said Government for an alteration in the conditions of employment of such members, and in consequence of such claim the parties

hereto have agreed that the conditions of such employment and remuneration be as in manner hereinafter appears:

“Now this agreement witnesseth that it is hereby agreed between the parties hereto as follows:—

“1. The provisions of the said award (No. 303 of 1920 of the Court of Industrial Arbitration of Queensland, in so far as it refers or relates to the classification and salaries of members of the said association, are, for the purpose of this agreement, deemed to be inoperative as from and including the first day of July, 1921.

“2. From and including the first day of July, 1921, and notwithstanding anything in the Public Service Acts, 1896 to 1920, or regulations thereunder contained, the remuneration and conditions of employment of members of the said association shall be on the scale and subject to the terms, provisions, and stipulations set out in the schedule hereto.

“3. Save in so far as the remuneration and the conditions of employment are affected by the provisions of this agreement, conditions of employment of members of the said association shall be the same in all respects as prescribed by said Acts and regulations thereunder, so far as such Acts and regulations are applicable to such members.

“4. This agreement shall take effect and have the force of law throughout the State of Queensland as from and including the first day of July, 1921, and shall remain in force for a period of twelve months from the date thereof.”

Then there is a schedule giving the scale of minimum and maximum salaries and increases in salaries during the year ending 30th June, 1922. I will not read all the details of the salaries. That is signed by Mr. H. L. Archdall, Chief Police Magistrate, Brisbane, and Mr. W. Harris, Police Magistrate, Brisbane, and also by the present Premier, Mr. Theodore. That agreement has been registered under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act. I ask the Premier what right has he to attack an agreement which he has consented to? What right has he to introduce repudiation in connection with this Bill? It is impossible for the Opposition to agree to anything in the nature of repudiation. We cannot be a party to repudiating the terms of that contract as disclosed in that agreement, which was solemnly entered into by the Premier and those public servants that I have referred to. Until such time as that agreement expires, we, as members of this Chamber, should not interfere with the functions of the court, and we should allow the existing conditions to stand. I would like to point out to the Premier that during the time I have been in this House I have constantly heard reference made to the conditions which obtained in 1902. At that time there was a severe drought in Queensland. It was the most severe drought ever experienced in Queensland, either before or since. Hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Government side, and the members of their party at that time, criticised Sir Robert Philp for reducing the salaries of the public servants at that time. They charged the old Liberal party, which was associated with

Mr. Vowles.]

Sir Robert Philp, with reducing the wages of public servants when they had no right to do so, and with dropping their automatic increases. These were the catcalls and cries that came from the members of the Labour party, and they gave them as reasons why there should be a change of Government. I know that many public servants recorded their votes in favour of the present Labour Government on the thorough understanding that, no matter what happened, they were all right in the future so far as the Labour Government were concerned, as that Government would not resort to retrenchment. What happened? We know that the Government have reduced the salaries of public servants. With reference to the special retrenchment from 1902 to 1905. I have the figures here which show what happened at that time. The retrenchment in the public service under the Special Retrenchment Act of 1902 and the Special Retrenchment Act of 1904, operated from 1st August, 1902, to 30th June, 1905—two years and eleven months. The reductions made were as follows:—

	From 1st Aug., 1902, to 30th Sept., 1904.	From 1st Oct., 1904, to 30th June, 1905.
Salaries exceeding £450 per annum..	15	7½
£301 to £450 ..	12½	6½
£151 to £300 ..	10	5
£101 to £150 ..	7½	3½

The full salaries were restored as from the 1st July, 1905. Here is another matter which we never heard the hon. gentleman mention. In justice to the Governments of the past, their actions stand in contradistinction to the attitude adopted by those in office to-day. It was laid down that the public servants who had reductions made in their salaries were allowed a reduction from their taxable income of the amount taken off their salaries. There are very few of the public servants know that. The amount of salary reduced was allowed as a reduction in every case from the taxable income. That meant that if it reduced the taxable income to £150 the public servant would be exempt from taxation altogether. These were concessions given under previous Governments which are not given to-day. Section 25 of the Special Retrenchment Act of 1902 and section 7 of the Act of 1904 make provision for that. In the year 1904-05 there was a surplus of £13,955. As the finances were being put right, the much maligned Governments of those days started to give benefits to the public servants, and started to make refunds.

Mr. HARTLEY: The public servants were on a starvation wage at that time.

Mr. VOWLES: They were just as well off as they are to-day. For the financial year 1904-05, there was a surplus of £13,955, and this was distributed pro rata amongst the public servants whose salaries had been reduced under the 1904 Act. It was distributed at the rate of 8s. in the £1. Section 8 of the Special Retrenchment Act of 1904 made provision for this. If you make a comparison of the figures you will find that they give most alarming results. Under the Bill now before the House officers receiv-

ing over £300 per annum incur the following losses—

	Annual Increase.	Reduction of 5 per cent.	Total.	Loss per cent.
Salary (say) £370	£ 20	£ 17½	£ 37½	10·7
Salary (say) £450	25	22½	47½	10·5
Salary (say) £550	25	27½	52½	9·6

The purchasing power of money, according to "Knibbs," was represented in 1904 by 14s. 8d., as compared with 28s. 7d. in 1922.

So that a person with a salary of £250 in 1904 now requires a salary of £490 to meet the same responsibilities. The loss of increment on a salary of £490 is £25, which with the 5 per cent. reduction of £24 10s. proposed in the Bill makes a total of £49 10s. That is equal to 19·6 per cent. of the salary of £250 for the same position in 1904; that is, taking into consideration the earning power of the sovereign.

The question of automatic increases, I submit, bears on the principles under discussion. Mr. Story's classification scheme, accepted by the Government and the unions, provides for automatic annual increases between the minimum and maximum salaries for each classification. Clause 6 of the report reads ("Parliamentary Papers," 1919-20, volume 1, page 64)—

"In the operation of the suggested scheme, I have assumed that the following provisions will be adopted:—

(a) That the scale of increases for classified positions will be—

Less than £300 per annum—increments of £15 per annum.

£300, but less than £400—increments of £20 per annum.

£400, but less than £600—increments of £25 per annum."

If the automatic increases are to be stopped in addition to the reduction of 5 per cent., it must be assumed that it is now intended that the whole classification scheme, as well as the agreements, is to be repudiated. If so, public servants receiving over £300 per annum will lose, over a period of, say, three years, a very large amount, as shown by the following particulars:—

	1922-3 Increment.	Reduction.	1923-4 Increment.	1924-5 Increment.	Total.
Salary (say) £320	£ 20	£ 16	£ 56	£ 76	£ 168
Salary (say) £400	25	20	70	95	210
Salary (say) £460	25	23	73	98	219

As I said at the beginning, there has been a good deal of juggling in connection with increases and the application of the Act to public servants. First of all, I shall deal with the embargoes on the public servants in respect of the Arbitration Court. By an Order in Council dated 12th July, 1917, the jurisdiction of the court was limited to cases where the salaries did not exceed

[Mr. Vowles.

£300—I think it was £300 or under, but I am not perfectly sure, and, at any rate, that is only a very small item. That Order in Council was rescinded on 14th August, 1920, as from 1st July, 1920. On the 13th February, 1921, the jurisdiction of the court was increased to salaries of £500; but on 15th July, 1921, immediately after an election—to which I have referred before—the jurisdiction of the court was decreased to salaries not exceeding £300. I think I have given sufficient evidence of the proportions of decreases in comparison with the earning power of money in 1902 and of the increases which have been adopted for those persons who are receiving less than £300 per year to show that, while one section of the public servants have been receiving very large benefits, another section have been denied the opportunity of obtaining those benefits, and that it is not now equitable that we should attack that latter section, who had to bear the brunt of the high cost of living without any consideration at all, and call upon them, now that the cost of living is beginning to decline, to make up the deficit for which the maladministration of the Government is responsible. (Hear, hear!)

Then, again, there is an aspect of the matter here to which I would like to refer. Are employers outside—for instance, the Water and Sewerage Board—to be forced to give the proscribed annual increases this year when the Government are not only refusing to pay the increases, which, except for the operation of the Order in Council establishing the embargo, they would be called upon to pay, but are also imposing a 5 per cent. reduction? Men in the banks receiving over £300 per year, men under the local government award, men employed by the Water and Sewerage Board as architects, draftsmen, engineers, and surveyors, are all covered by awards, but men who are working for the Government and doing exactly the same work are going to receive a good deal less for their services. In the first place, they do not receive an award rate, because they are not allowed to go to the court, and, in addition to that, they are to suffer a reduction of 5 per cent. in their salaries, with the loss of automatic increases. Here I should like to give particulars of the awards in the cases I have mentioned—

“BANK OFFICERS’ AWARDS.

“(‘Industrial Gazette,’ volume 5, page 1134.)

Clerks—From £20 (first year) to £370 (fourteenth year), with automatic increases of £15 to £20 per annum.

Accountants (six-handed branches)—Minimum £350.

Managers—

Small branches, £350 to £400 (annual increases of £10).

Six-handed branches, Minimum £500 per annum.”

Those are the salaries which private or joint stock banks are compelled to pay their officers doing the same class of work as Government clerks, accountants, or managers, as the case may be. The officers of those banks receive a higher wage, by reason of the fact that they have access to the court—which the public servants had not—and, in addition to that, they are not going to lose their automatic increases and 5 per cent. of their salaries in addition. Here are the awards

for local authorities, Water and Sewerage Board officers—

“LOCAL AUTHORITIES AGREEMENT.

“(‘Industrial Gazette,’ volume 6, page 348.)

“Local authorities’ clerks—Minimum salaries (according to revenue) ranging from £275 to £600 per annum.

“METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE BOARD AWARD.

“(‘Industrial Gazette,’ volume 5, page 361.)

“Minimum salaries (exclusive of allowances)—

Senior survey draftsman—£375 to £475.

Engineering surveyors—£375 to £475.

Designing draftsmen and engineers—£375 to £475.

Engineering supervisors—£450 to £600.

Engineer for sewerage reticulation—£425 to £525.

Superintendent of water supply—£415 to £515, etc., etc.

“Increments—

Salaries up to £300—£15 per annum.

Salaries in excess of £300—£20 per annum.

“ARCHITECTS, DRAFTSMEN, ENGINEERS, AND SURVEYORS’ AWARD.

“(‘Industrial Gazette,’ volume 5, page 976.)

“Draftsmen—£200 to £375.

“Designing engineers—£375 (minimum).

“Assistant surveyors—£300 to £380.

“Local government engineering assistants—£250 to £350, etc., etc.

“Increments—£20 per annum.”

And our public servants, who are doing precisely the same class of work, have to make up for the maladministration of the Government—instead of receiving increments, they have to suffer a reduction of 5 per cent. in their salaries. There are many cases in the Education Department where anomalies will appear. The award for teachers of non-Governmental secondary schools (‘Industrial Gazette,’ volume 6, page 52) provides that assistant masters shall receive £185 (first year) to £220 (eighteenth year), with increments of from £10 to £40 per annum.

Many of our highly qualified school teachers have been induced to go out of the State school into the high school service; and, as a result of this Bill, they will be placed in a very much worse position as regards salary than will those who remained behind. A man who to-day is a teacher in a high school actually will receive less salary than had he stayed in the service and remained a teacher in a State school. That is an anomaly which should be rectified. It can be rectified only by dealing with each individual case on its merits. Such cases could be dealt with by the Public Service Commissioner or some impartial authority. They should not be dealt with in a class, as we are trying to deal with them, in a Chamber such as this, in which members do not understand the details. In many cases we are inflicting a grievance on men who have families to maintain, who are endeavouring to educate and make good citizens of their children—men who have to study the effect

Mr. Vowles.]

of almost every penny's expenditure. We are inflicting decreased salaries on those who have incurred responsibilities, thereby preventing their carrying out the honourable undertakings into which they have entered.

I referred a little while back to the police magistrates. When the Supreme Court Act and the Magistrates Court Act were under review in this Chamber, I pointed out that we were putting upon the ordinary police magistrate increased work of a highly technical nature; that, if we wanted to make the office of police magistrate attractive to professional men or men of culture—with whom it would be necessary to fill the office—we would have to give higher salaries; that, if it were good enough, with the limited jurisdiction of £50 which police magistrates had in the past, to pay men up to £650 a year, when they had the added responsibility of deciding in cases—and without juries, too—where £200 were involved, and the scope of their jurisdiction was very much larger than it had been, they should receive further remuneration for the increased duties which they were asked to perform. In the past we decided to pay the judges in our District Courts £1,000 a year. When we took those judges from the District Court and put them into the Supreme Court, the first thing we did was to increase their salaries. We are asking the police magistrates to take over exactly the same responsibilities which those District Court judges had, and instead of increasing their salaries, we are asking them to suffer a reduction—in the face of an agreement which has been solemnly entered into between the parties. I do not hold any brief for them; but I come more in contact with them than some others, and I know more about their business. Whether they be in connection with police magistrates or any other branch of the public service, if agreements are registered they should be honoured. In respect of other members of the public service, a large proportion will not receive fair treatment; but they will be placed in the invidious position that, although they are employees of the Crown—which is supposed to be the best employer—they will be receiving for their services a great deal less than men of the same qualifications who are doing a similar class of work for other bodies such as the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board, local authorities, and others. I think the Treasurer should consider whether it would not be a wise thing now to follow my suggestion—to make this Bill apply to ourselves, to withdraw it as far as other individuals are concerned, and give those individuals the opportunity which they were intended to have. When the measure went through, we opposed the principle of the public servants going to the Arbitration Court. We say, however, that if one section can go, another section should have that right. Why not give them the opportunity of having their cases dealt with on their merits, so that justice will be done? We have not the details, or the opportunity of getting those details, to enable us to judge those cases on their merits. I sincerely trust, for the honour of this Government—if they have any honour left—that they will repent before they drag down another agreement which has been solemnly entered into. Let us not forget, too, that the very class of persons whom they are attacking—I do not mean ourselves, I mean the public servants—are men who, only a few months ago, on the eve of an election, were told distinctly by a gentleman who was elected to this

[Mr. Vowles.

Chamber, and who is holding an honourable position as a member of the Cabinet, that this Government would not be a party to cutting down the wages of the public servants. I ask the hon. gentleman to stand up to a statement of his Minister. If he will not stand up to it, I ask the public servants to judge his actions, and the words of his Ministers, by the results.

At 4.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Kipwan, *Brisbane*) took the chair as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): It is regrettable that we should have to discuss the Bill which the Treasurer has placed before us this afternoon. It is simply another instance of the Government reaping what they have sown. Had it not been that the State's finances have been so badly administered during the last seven years, there would not have been the necessity to bring forward this Bill to-day. The leader of the Opposition is to be commended on his very fine exposition of the whole of the matters associated with the public servants and the proposed retrenchment. He has practically covered the whole of the ground, showing how agreements which had been entered into by the Government with men in the public service have been broken. The Government have broken faith with the public service in having introduced this Bill. We all know perfectly well that on the eve of an election promises were made to the people that there would be no such thing as retrenchment in the public service. The Opposition parties were termed by the supporters of the Government "The low-wage party." Immediately after the election, instead of being a low-wage party, the Government became a "no wage" party. Men who had spent many years of their lives in the public service were dismissed on all sides; and now we are asked to discuss a Bill to reduce the salaries of men who are in receipt of over £300 a year. Not only that; it is a humiliating position for the Government to be practically mendicants—that is the only term one can apply to them. There are certain officers to whom the Government cannot apply this measure, and it is provided that the reduction will be made in respect to those officers only in the event of their agreeing to such reduction. A Government could not be placed in a more humiliating position than to have to go round to those particular officers and say, "Look here, we are hard up; we have not sufficient money to carry on the government of the country; will you agree to a reduction of 5 per cent. in your salaries?"

Mr. COLLINS: What we should have done was to tax the higher incomes.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think we have had quite sufficient evidence, during the last year or two, that the "higher" incomes have become no incomes at all.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not correct.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is the case in quite a number of instances, and it is due simply to the excessive taxation which has been imposed by the Government and by hon. members like the hon. member for Bowen, who have been supporting them. The Government have found now that the sources of taxation have been practically drained dry, and they are proposing to cut down certain officers in the public service who are not, probably, in the best position to bear these proposed reductions. They now propose to

put the axe in on them and reduce their salaries by 5 per cent. Hon. members on this side of the House have always stood for the Arbitration Court, and for settlement of disputes in the Arbitration Court.

[4.30 p.m.] No doubt, there are anomalies associated and connected with that court. The court may not have the elasticity which one might wish, still those little things which have created so much friction in the past could probably be eliminated and matters could probably go on more smoothly than they have done during recent years. Hon. members on this side stand for the Arbitration Court. There can be no fairer method, to my mind, than the settlement of disputes by means of arbitration. Prior to the last election, the Government had lifted the embargo which prevented public servants going to the Arbitration Court. The embargo was raised from £300 to £500, and immediately after the elections the Government reduced the amount back again to £300. At the present time this State is suffering from what has been termed the repudiatory acts of the Government in a financial sense. The present condition of the finances in this country on account of certain repudiatory legislation. Agreements have been made with the public servants that they should receive increments in their salaries, and we are now discussing a Bill which proposes to tear up those agreements. The Government say, "We are not going to honour them. You will in the future have to accept a 5 per cent. reduction in your salaries." There is no contract of any kind so far as hon. members opposite are concerned. If the Treasurer would simply confine the reduction proposed in the Bill to Ministers and members of Parliament, that would be an eminent fair proposition, and one which would meet with the approval of the people of the State. If we desire an efficient public service, and if we want officers to carry out in an efficient manner the responsible duties which they are expected to carry out, then they should be well paid. We find that, immediately the Supreme Court Act was amended, an increase in salaries was given to the judges, and we find that the magistrates, whose duties have been considerably extended, and who have to accept very much greater responsibilities than they had in the past, are going to be asked to accept a reduction in salaries. I do not consider that that is fair in any shape or form. I do not intend to labour this question nor speak at any length, because I consider that the speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition is worthy of careful consideration by every hon. member. In order to test the feeling of the House, I move the omission of all words after the word "Bill," with a view to inserting the words—

"be withdrawn with the object of introducing a new Bill, having for its sole object a reduction of the salaries of Ministers of the Crown and of all other members of this House."

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I rise to second the amendment moved by the leader of the Nationalist party. I think the name of the Bill should be amended from "Salaries Bill" to its true name of "Reduction in Public Servants' Salaries Bill." All the promises made by the present Government are now going to be smashed. Hon. members opposite will now have an opportunity, without going on to the hustings, of saying whether there shall be retrenchment in the public service or not. During a certain by-election this

year the members opposite stated that there would be no reduction in the salaries of public servants. A certain gentleman opposite was returned, and the first thing we heard was that the Government contemplated a reduction in the salaries of public servants, which meant breaking the promises which had been made. I do not wish to make those statements without substantiating them by facts. The "Standard" of the 8th November, 1920, states—

"It is only the Labour Government that stands between the public servants and a retrenchment policy more drastic and more crippling than has ever been experienced before."

This Government have promised not to reduce salaries, and now they are attempting to reduce them. The hon. member for Fitzroy, on the hustings, said that he would not vote for a reduction in salaries, but now he puts forward an excuse for doing so. The excuse is that a few men in an organisation—

Mr. COLLINS: Intelligent men!

Mr. KERR: A few men!

Mr. COLLINS: Intelligent men!

Mr. KERR: Perhaps so. The hon. member for Fitzroy gave a definite promise and now he is quibbling. He is hiding behind a few men who call themselves an organisation, forgetting all about the thousands of people who voted for him. In any case, he only received a majority of 561, and there are sufficient public servants to turn that majority if he is honest enough to resign and go and ask the people if he can amend his policy by being allowed to vote for a reduction. The hon. member is now trying to sidetrack and camouflage his position. I desire to quote a statement made by the Treasurer at a meeting where he was supported by the hon. member for Rockhampton, the hon. member for Mount Morgan, the Secretary for Railways, and the hon. member for Fitzroy. The Treasurer was defending the policy of this Government, and was referring to the retrenchment in 1902. How on earth an honest man can go to the people and ask them to cast their votes in his favour on the strength of certain promises made, and then come into this House and vote in an opposite direction to what they had promised on the hustings, is more than I can understand. It seems to me to be a continuation of the policy adopted by the Government during the last few weeks. In the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin" of the 4th November, 1920, the Treasurer is credited with saying—

"That is the kind of finance that you get from the capitalistic representatives; but the Labour Government recognises what is a fair deal, and it is endeavouring to arrange the finances so as to save the State from retrenchment."

We have had these professions repeated time after time, and we now find the Government acting quite opposite to those professions. Let me refer to the Railway Department, which is substantially affected in connection with this retrenchment. I find this article in the "Railway Advocate"—

"It is regrettable that a privileged peep into the secrecy of the caucus room disclosed the fact that, on the final vote, only eight members of the party had sufficient courage and loyalty to working-class ideals to vote against a motion having for its object wage reductions."

Mr. Kerr.]

I wonder where the loyalists are going to vote when the division is taken. Where are they going to be?

Mr. RYAN: Whoever wrote that knows nothing about it.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows that this Bill will reduce wages. He knows that he can do one of two things; he can vote for it or against it. We will see when the division bell rings where he stands. There are only two issues—right or wrong—and hon. members can stick to their promises or be hypocrites. We find the hon. member for Rockhampton amongst those hon. members who stood behind the Premier at Rockhampton when he made the promises with regard to no reduction in wages. Even the hon. member for Paddington, in March last, reminded the workers that it was Tory Governments who reduced wages. I venture to say that, if the Nationalist party had been returned to power, they would not have reduced wages at the present time.

Mr. COLLINS: They only gave the workers 6s. a day.

Mr. KERR: I will tell the hon. member something about that before I sit down. The Nationalist party went to the electors on a definite policy, and would not have broken their promises like the Labour party have done. As a kind of set-off, hon. members opposite have said that the Nationalists would have made a 10 per cent. reduction; but that is pure imagination on their part. They have invented that in order to sidetrack and delude the people. Hon. members opposite have had the chance of a lifetime to prove that they are sincere in their regard for the man who to-day is not receiving a living wage.

Mr. COLLINS: What reduction do you propose to take off members of Parliament?

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member had been in the Chamber and heard the motion moved on this side, he would have known that the proposal was to reduce salaries of members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown. We were endeavouring to get the Labour party to carry out their promises. We know that the Treasurer anticipates a deficit of £500,000. We find that in the Railway Department only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is now being earned on the money invested, as against £4 10s. per cent. in 1915. If the railways were made to pay interest, there would be no necessity to reduce salaries.

Mr. COLLINS: How would you make the railways pay?

Mr. KERR: That is apart from the question; but, as I have said before, I would make the railways pay without increasing fares and freights and various other things, which the Government have done. The hon. member for Brisbane, in a speech which he made yesterday, pointed out that financial institutions and commercial businesses were being carried on successfully under this Government. Are those institutions reducing the wages of their employees under £300 a year? Are the Commonwealth Government reducing their public servants who receive under £300 a year? They are not. We find that the Commonwealth Treasurer, in his Budget, indicates a big reduction of expenditure, including the reduction of the salaries of members of the Federal Parliament to £800. He also outlines reductions

[Mr. Kerr.

in income tax, in the entertainments tax, and decrease of duties on various articles. He also intimated that it was the intention of the Commonwealth Government to refrain from trading. A man in the Commonwealth service on a salary of £320 gets an increase of £20, making £340; but under this Government a man getting £320, and who is due for an automatic increase, is losing that increase, and is also suffering 5 per cent. reduction. Owing to the financial administration of the Government, they have to make up a quarter of a million of money out of the salaries of the public servants. They have invested loan money which does not return interest, and they have £900,000 invested in State enterprises, and they utilise trust money to pay the interest on it. That is why they find it necessary to impose these hardships on public servants, who have been suffering for the last six or seven years. The public servants do not know where they stand through the action of this Government. This Bill is going to further unsettle the conditions of the public service, which cannot be compared with what it was a few years ago. I am going to refer to the retrenchment which took place in 1902. There was a provision in the Act passed in 1904 to the effect that any surplus available should be utilised for the purpose of making up the retrenchment; but there is no such provision contained in this Bill. There was a surplus at that time of £13,000 odd, which was utilised.

The Government of that day paid back 8s in the £1 of the retrenchment money. If we take the value of the £1 sterling in 1902 and compare it with the value to-day we will find that the reduction in the salaries of the public servants made by the present Government is much greater than the reduction which was made in 1902. There was a sliding scale in 1902, but the maximum reduction was 15 per cent. Let us have a look at the purchasing price of money in March, 1902, as compared with March of this year. In 1902 the purchasing price of the £1 was 16s. and to-day it is 28s. 7d., or a difference of 12s. 7d. I am using these figures to show that the amendment is justified, and that the Bill introduced by the Government is not justified, because the public servant is actually worse off to-day than he was in 1902. Let us take the salary of a man getting £450 per annum. In 1902, according to the statistics of the Commonwealth, that £450 was worth £540. I arrive at that by making the purchasing power of each 16s. worth £1. A salary of £450 to-day, taking the statistician's figures, would be minus 8s. 7d. for every £1, and that would bring the purchasing power of that salary down to £257 as compared with 1902. A reduction of 15 per cent. on a salary of £450 in 1902 would be much less than the reduction of 5 per cent. to-day, because of the difference in the purchasing value of money. That is the position. The Government do not recognise that position at all. They seem to think that a man on the basic wage is drawing a greater salary than he did in 1902, and, therefore, should be reduced. That is an erroneous idea. The union secretaries contended that the Government are wrong in assuming that the salaries are greater to-day than they were in 1902. I say that the union secretaries are right in taking up that attitude, because the wages paid to-day are really less than they were

in 1902. Let us take the case of a man on the basic wage. If a man gets £4 5s. a week to-day, that is not sufficient to keep a man and his family in comfort. The highest wage paid in 1902 was insufficient, yet this Government are reducing a man much below the rate of 1902. The Government have gone back on the promises which they made to the electors so far as the reduction of salaries is concerned.

Mr. RYAN: What were labourers' wages in 1902?

Mr. KERR: To-day the basic wage is £4 5s., but, as compared with 1902, it is only worth £1 11s. 6d. to-day. I estimate that by taking 16s. to be worth £1 in 1902, while 28s. 7d. to-day is only worth £1. That is a difference of 12s. 7d. There was no such thing as a basic wage in 1902, but the minimum wage then for the lowest paid man in the public service, paid to the navvies, was 6s. 6d. per day.

Mr. RYAN: It was less than that.

Mr. KERR: It was not less than that. Since 1893, 6s. 6d. per day has been the minimum wage. The hon. member for Cook does not know anything about it.

Mr. RYAN: I do know.

Mr. KERR: I do not mind a pertinent interjection, but I do object to an interjection from a member who knows nothing about it. The navy in 1902 received 6s. 6d. a day, which was £1 19s. a week. Basing that rate on the purchasing power of the sovereign to-day, the wages would be only £1 11s. 6d. per week, so that the 6s. 6d. a day paid in 1902 was 8s. 6d. a week greater than the rate paid to-day. These are not my figures only. They are substantiated and backed up by the statistician of the Commonwealth. They are backed up, too, by the records of the Arbitration Court, and they are backed up by the union secretaries. Wages have not gone up under this Government at all. There are very few men on the basic wage to-day who have families who can put down £2 or less for the purpose of building a workers' dwelling, yet in days past the men owned their own homes irrespective of something which was said a little while ago. In 1902 the workers were able to purchase their own homes, and they were able to do it for many years after 1902. It is only recently, when wages have not increased in keeping with the cost of living, that men have been suffering any injustice. When they talk about the present Government standing for the cause of the workers it is all moonshine. It is all nonsense. The Government have done nothing for the workers.

Mr. DASH: What were the hours and overtime in 1902?

Mr. KERR: The same thing applies to the lower-paid public servants. I dealt with a salary of £450, because this Bill provides for public servants receiving over £300 per annum. I would like to ask hon. members opposite a plain question. When they voted for a reduction in the salaries of the public servants, did they have a look to see what the public servants were receiving? I looked up the income tax returns myself to find out whether the public servants were amongst the wealthy men in the State. I wanted to see if they were amongst the men who are looked upon by the Government as having easy jobs, seeing that the Government increased their hours. I want to quote figures

to show that the public servants to-day are inadequately paid. There is not the slightest doubt about that. The income tax returns for 1921 show that the public servants of Queensland paid 1.62 per cent. of the total taxation.

Mr. COLLINS: What did the average worker pay?

Mr. KERR: I will tell you.

Mr. COLLINS: He paid no income tax at all.

Mr. KERR: The number of public servants who paid income tax represented 18.25 per cent. of the total number of taxpayers, and they paid 1.62 per cent. of the total taxation. That shows that that small sum in taxation paid by the public servants was spread over a large number of persons. It shows that the salary to-day must be inadequate. Other employees, about whom the hon. member for Bowen has interjected, paid 9.31 per cent. of the total taxation, or something like seven times that paid by the public servants. Yet the percentage of

number in their case is only [5 p.m.] about double, showing conclusively that men outside the public service are getting far higher rates than men inside the public service. That is why I am contending, and am going to contend at every stage, that the public servants should not be reduced under any circumstances, more especially in the circumstances of the maladministration of loan money by this Government. For the year ended 30th June, 1922, the percentage of the total tax paid by public servants increased to 2.9 per cent., yet the number has only gone to 21.40 per cent. The whole of the public servants whom it is proposed to reduce contributed only £8,125 for the financial year 1921-22 to the total taxation of nearly £3,000,000, and the number who paid tax was only 1,683. It seems to me that hon. members opposite have not given sufficient consideration to this matter. It seems incredible that they should adopt their present attitude towards the only people who seem to have no remedy. They have extracted income tax from the community generally to the very limit, and now their only resource seems to be the public servants. They make no bones about it, but go straight into them to the extent of £250,000. I have said that the Railway Department was largely responsible, and that the unwise investment of loan money was the reason. Instead of returning us £5 per cent. or £4 10s. per cent., that department is now giving us 10s. per cent. on the capital invested, and during the term of this Government it has absorbed the following amount of loan money:—

	£
" 1915-16	2,034,000
1916-17	1,342,000
1917-18	984,000
1918-19	1,416,000
1919-20	2,356,000
1920-21	1,750,000
1921-22	1,168,000 "

That makes a tremendous total of loan money in the few years of this Government, and we know perfectly well that that money has been wasted in the department. There is no doubt that hundreds of men could confirm my statement. In respect of loan money used for the building of carriages and other things in the Ipswich Railway Workshops, thousands of pounds have been wasted. We have got well into the tens of thousands of

Mr. Kerr.]

money lying idle in the main works without prospect of return. We have had shops shifted from one place to another without apparent reason. We have had loan money expended in the department in many ways which will not pay, and the department has also started new construction works involving the expenditure of extra loan money, instead of using that money to place Queenslanders and immigrants along existing lines, such as at Boerburum, so that the traffic backwards and forwards will make those lines pay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: I do not want to get too far from the subject—I have stuck to it fairly well, I think. I say, in conclusion, without fear of saying anything that I should not say, that no hon. member opposite, if he has the courage of his convictions expressed during the campaign—and a very severe campaign it was, from which the Government got back with a majority of a few members—should dare to vote for this Bill. I may refer particularly to the hon. member for Fitzroy and the hon. member for Bowen—a Karl Marx man, with ideas that that writer laid down many years ago. The Premier made statements at Rockhampton, in which other hon. members backed him up on public platforms, and they have now the opportunity of putting their promises into effect. Instead of that, they take the other course and bring in a measure that was never advocated, that was never thought of, for the retrenchment of public servants. I second the amendment.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillogoe*): I am sorry I was not here to hear the arguments of the hon. member who moved the amendment; but I have heard the leader of the Opposition use arguments which, I have no doubt, were practically on the same lines. He suggested that the Bill should be confined to members of Parliament. That is not sufficient. It leads to this anomaly—that, whilst members of the public service receiving under £300 per annum have already suffered a reduction, many of those receiving over £300 will, if this amendment be carried, suffer no reduction at all. That is an anomaly to which I cannot agree. There are officers who are in receipt of £400 per annum and thereabouts—of £500 and upwards—who would retain those salaries and suffer no reduction if this amendment were carried, whereas the men on the basic wage and the men under £300 per annum have had their salaries reviewed and reduced by the Arbitration Court. Surely that would not be fair treatment! Everyone must recognise that, in order to bring about uniformity of action and general fair treatment throughout the service, this Bill is necessary.

Mr. KERR: Why do you not give the automatic increases?

The PREMIER: The hon. member has harped upon that, and so, too, has the leader of the Opposition. Let me inform the hon. member that he apparently does not understand the effect of the proposal.

Mr. KERR: He is being reduced, too.

The PREMIER: The hon. member's voice creates a loud noise. If he wishes me to deal with the point raised by the interjection, I am quite willing to do so if he does not

[*Mr. Kerr.*]

continue to interrupt. An officer in a classified position on £400, if he is above the minimum, has no arbitrary right to an increase, for, although graded increases are provided in the classification, the payment of the increase in each year depends on parliamentary appropriation. The classification scheme for such an officer lays down an increase of £25 a year; but he would not, under normal circumstances, get that £25 unless Parliament appropriated it. He did not get it last year; he got it the year before, but not the year before that. The man on £400 a year, unless this Bill is passed, will suffer no reduction.

Mr. GREEN: Did not the leader of the Opposition suggest that each case should be dealt with on its merits?

The PREMIER: You cannot consider each case of the whole of a public service embracing thousands of officers upon its individual merits. That is why we have classification; that is why we have a Public Service Commissioner and his organisation. You must deal with them in grades and classes, and that is the whole basis of the settlement in the public service. The Public Service Commissioner, or, at any rate, his organisation, does nothing else but examine the different grades and classes with a view to placing public servants on an equitable basis.

There is no difficulty except in regard to one or two anomalies that occur naturally as a result of having imposed a limit of £300 on access to the Arbitration Court, and because of the non-operation in past years of the increases. In those cases the individuals who otherwise would suffer an anomaly are considered by the Commissioner and the anomaly is cured. When speaking on the second reading, I mentioned that you might take the case of an officer who, probably through his late promotion or through the operation of previous embargoes, has not reached the minimum salary of his classification. In that case it obviously would be an anomaly now to reduce his salary; and in most of those cases a reduction will not be made—the Public Service Commissioner will inquire into them with a view to treating the officers justly. If the argument used by the Opposition were applied and the amendment were carried, it would create this anomaly—a man receiving £400 a year would get the grade increase of £25, and suffer a reduction of 5 per cent. after the increase had been granted; that is to say, he would get an increase of about £2 10s. a year; whereas a man receiving under £300 a year, who is on the basic wage, would suffer an outright reduction. There is no justification for that; there would be no equity in it. That is the reason why this Bill is necessary. I cannot see that the amendment is moved seriously. If it is, and if it were carried out, it would create the anomaly of allowing all officers receiving over £300 a year—except Parliamentarians and Ministers—to retain their present salaries; whereas the Arbitration Court, with the full knowledge of Parliament, has reduced the man on the basic wage by 5s. a week. I do not think we could justify that discrimination. For the purpose of bringing about uniform and equitable treatment throughout the service, following the reductions of the Arbitration Court this Bill is necessary.

Mr. GREEN: What about the men who have received no increases since 1914?

The PREMIER: There are no such men; unless it has been the result of an adverse report from their permanent head.

Mr. GREEN: If you compare the two Estimates, you will find that in each department there are men in that category.

The PREMIER: I am sure that the hon. member is wrong. Where the salary appears not to have moved, it does not indicate that the same officer is drawing it. Is the hon. member speaking of officers who are receiving £500 a year?

Mr. GREEN: From £400 up.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is wrong; unless the particular officer has had an adverse report, every officer in the public service, so far as I know—I would be glad to have any exceptions pointed out—received increases in the last three years.

Mr. MAXWELL: Look at the treatment that is being meted out to the Auditor-General; his is a statutory salary.

The PREMIER: I recognise the harshness of the application of this Bill to an officer like the Auditor-General, whose salary has not been altered for forty years. If an amendment is moved, providing that the Bill shall not apply to that officer, I shall be only too happy to agree to it. I recognise that that officer's salary has not been increased as a consequence of the increased cost of living; yet he has to suffer a reduction. The same argument applies to Ministers—I am not asking that any exception should be made in regard to Ministers—but I can see that the Auditor-General is in a different position from most other officers.

Mr. FLETCHER: Does not that apply to police magistrates to some extent?

The PREMIER: No; they have all had increases, but the Auditor-General has had none whatever. That officer's work now involves twice the responsibility, and twice the actual work of the Auditor-General of twenty or thirty years ago, yet there has been no increase in his remuneration. He is about the lowest paid Auditor-General in Australia.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS: What is his salary?

The PREMIER: £1,000.

Mr. SIZER (*Vundah*): I wish to support the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the Nationalist party, and to point out to the Premier that he is making a point that we wish to deal with officers receiving over £300 at the expense of those receiving under that amount. The amendment is liable to have that construction put upon it, but that is not the construction to which it is entitled after it has been explained. The hon. gentleman will realise that we, as a party, are not going to assist the Government to break its pledges to the electors—particularly the public servants. We had no opportunity of moving a motion dealing with those officers who were reduced by the Arbitration Court. The only opportunity we have had to stand the Government—or the members of the Government—up to their responsibilities, or make them place themselves in the position of being repudiationists, is by an amendment such as this. They have to confirm, or otherwise, by their vote the fact that they are in favour of retrenchment, a reduction in wages, and a lowering of the standard of living—actions which they pledged themselves not to take and upon which pledges they climbed into power once again. Hon. members opposite

distinctly made it a feature of their campaign that they were the only party who stood behind the public service in preventing retrenchment and a lowering of the standard of living. On that they were returned. To that, to-day, we intend to hold them. They have the opportunity of supporting the amendment. If they are prepared to cast all those pledges to the wind it is for the people—the public servants in particular—to judge them by their actions. The Secretary for Mines only a few months ago entered this Chamber trailing behind him a long list of those pledges—pledges that the high standard of living would be maintained, and that this Government would not be a party to attacking wages. To-day we want to know how that hon. gentleman will stand.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I stand all right.

Mr. SIZER: The Government to-day are in the position of being the most reactionary Government in the world. Members sitting behind the Government are fond of referring to the old days, to the old reactionary Governments. From my understanding of the word "reactionary," this Government are equally as reactionary as any Government in any part of the world. The remarks of the Premier just now have not altered that fact. I recognise that it is not competent for us to deal with the cases of the men who have been dealt with by the Arbitration Court. But the argument we are using applies equally to those men. They were led to believe that there would be no reduction, that the Government were going to manage the affairs of the State in such a manner that there would be no need to wring that amount of money from what Government members called "the swatted civil servants." Hon. members opposite told the public servants that they were threatened with the retrenchment of 1902—that that would happen surely if members who are now sitting on this side got into power.

At 5.20 p.m.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. SIZER: I want to remind hon. members opposite that we are not in power, but the accusers now stand in the position of being able to be accused of accomplishing an act which they piously endeavoured to camouflage and place at the door of their opponents. If the affairs of the State had been conducted in a manner that one would have expected there would have been no need to sweat that amount of money out of the public servants. I am opposed to a reduction in the salaries of public servants. The hon. member for Bowen should also be opposed to that. He alleges that he is opposed to something similar in other industries. He is very concerned about other workers having to suffer a reduction; but, of course, he is going to vote for a reduction in the salaries of public servants. It has been alleged that the hon. member is one of the "noble eight." I do not know if he is, but, if he is, he and his seven comrades should be pleased that the Opposition have brought this amendment forward. Let them say once and for all whether they are or are not "in the bag" with the Premier. When a vote is taken we shall know who is and who is not "in the bag." The Government got into power as a result of their pledges to the public servants—particularly to railway workers in some electorates—that there would be no reduction of wages and no retrenchment.

Mr. Sizer.]

There has been a reduction of wages, and there has been retrenchment. That portion of their policy has been torn to atoms, and is no longer recognisable. Before we allow this act of repudiation contained in the Bill to come into operation, there is only one thing that the Government should do. They should get a further mandate from the people as to whether or not, under the circumstances, they should be permitted to change their policy from one of no retrenchment to one of retrenchment, as contained in the Bill, and which is the policy of the Government generally. They should go to the country and say, "The pledges we made cannot be fulfilled." If they are then returned, they would be justified in going on with this measure. Unless they do that, they are holding a position under circumstances which are not honourable to themselves politically, and they are unfair to the electors who placed them there. The amendment proposes to confine the reduction to members of Parliament.

Mr. COLLINS: Wonderfully courageous!

Mr. SIZER: During the last few weeks hon. members have witnessed in this Chamber the wasting of a good deal of time which could have been profitably spent elsewhere. I think, judging by the way the country has been governed in this Chamber recently, and the fact that the members can vote by means of a proxy, that we can very fairly apply the term used during the plague in London, "Bring out your dead."

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER: I believe that the country would welcome a reduction in the number of members by twenty-two.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should reduce himself for a start.

Mr. SIZER: The Premier would be the first I would reduce if I had my way.

The PREMIER: No doubt; but, fortunately, the hon. member shall not have his way.

Mr. SIZER: Not for the moment. We are not only prepared to agree to a reduction of hon. members' salaries, but I believe all hon. members on this side of the House would be prepared to support a measure to reduce the number of members of Parliament, and thereby save the public a good deal of money. If we do that, we will show that we are honest. The people outside realise, as well as we do, that even Government members are not altogether favourable towards a reduction. It has only been brought about as a sort of sop to make the big pill probably a little more sugar-coated, and probably to let it fall a little bit lighter when they go to the next election, when they will be able to stand before the electors and with honest piety say, "Well, comrades, we are only asking you to do exactly what we did ourselves." Bear in mind that the workers are on the lowest rung of the ladder, and we are in an infinitely better position.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member was very anxious for an increase.

Mr. SIZER: Yes; I stood up to my obligations for an increase, and that is the reason why, seeing there has been a change, that I am prepared to accept a reduction. I would like to draw attention to the fact that it is very noticeable that while we are dealing with a subject vitally affecting the honour of the Government in respect to their policy,

and a subject which is admittedly very objectionable to them, they are so ashamed of their position that only six of them dare remain in the Chamber and hear the criticism. They are prepared to sneak away into every corner of the building and get behind screens.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER: When the bell rings they will, true to type, come along and array themselves on the benches opposite, without having heard one word of argument. I am sorry that there are not more workers present in the galleries to-night. This debate is more objectionable to the Government than the stage-managed affairs that we have seen lately.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Hon. members want to get away from your dribble.

Mr. SIZER: Had this affair been stage-managed, we would have had workers here to-day. They would have then noticed the callous indifference on the part of the Government. Evidently the Government are ashamed of their position, and the public outside should know that there are only seven Government members in the Chamber, and they are pretty silent.

Mr. COLLINS: Give us some argument.

Mr. SIZER: I intend to give some argument, and I want to show that the public servants are worse off to-day than they were in 1902.

Mr. COLLINS: No one believes that.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member for Mundingburra took the hon. member for Enoggera to task for citing the case of a public servant on the £450 mark in 1902. The hon. member for Mundingburra interjected that no public servant was on that mark in 1902. I have taken the case of a public servant on the £150 mark in 1902, and this year. We find that in 1902, 16s. could purchase £1 worth of commodities, whereas in 1922 it required £1 8s. 7d. to purchase £1 worth of commodities. On those figures we find that a public servant's salary of £150 in 1902 was worth £180; but in 1922, when the purchasing power of the sovereign is less, we find that £150 is only worth £85 13s. The hon. member for Bowen often quotes the Commonwealth Statistician. I ask him to take the facts and figures I have given, and try and reconcile them with his statement that a public servant is not worse off to-day than in 1902. It is stated by hon. members opposite that the Government were so magnanimous that they allowed public servants receiving under £300 per annum to go to the Arbitration Court. The Premier should tell us the reason why he [5.30 p.m.] revoked that decision and allowed those over the £300 mark to go to the Arbitration Court, and why, when an election took place and the Government were returned to power, the privilege was taken away. Surely, we are entitled to some explanation of such an extraordinary reversal of policy. I cannot believe that the Government willingly adopted a policy of repudiation, but that they simply took that course as the line of least resistance. I intended to refer to the case of the Auditor-General, but, as the matter has been cleared up, there is no need to do so.

Mr. COLLINS: He is not on the bread line; there is no need to worry about that.

[Mr. Sizer.]

Mr. SIZER: I also want to mention the difference between the treatment of the police magistrates and the judges. After all, they are acting in similar capacities—they both administer justice. How does the Premier reconcile the fact that a police magistrate has to accept a reduction through the breaking of an agreement with the fact that the judges need not accept a reduction unless they themselves like to agree to it? Surely, there is an anomaly there. Does the hon. member for Bower say there is any reason why these judges should be a privileged class? Why should they not be placed in the same position as police magistrates or men on the basic wage? Many Government members state that the man who adjudicates on the question of whether a worker should get £4 5s. or £4 a week receives £50 a week; and what capacity has he for judging the position? Yet hon. members opposite are reducing the wage of the man who receives £4 5s. a week and are leaving the salary of the man who receives £50 a week alone.

Mr. COLLINS: We introduced the Judges' Retirement Bill. Do not forget that.

Mr. SIZER: What about the Lieutenant-Governor? Has anything happened to him? No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: What about the Governor?

Mr. SIZER: I only want to use that as an argument. There seems to be something wrong when the police magistrates, who act in a similar capacity to the judges, have to accept a reduction through the breaking of an agreement, while the judges have not, unless they care to do so. The hon. member for Bower is protecting the man right at the top of the tree on this occasion.

Mr. COLLINS: Prove your case.

Mr. SIZER: I am stating facts, and it is on the hon. member and his colleagues to disprove them, but they cannot do so.

The PREMIER: If you say we are breaking an agreement with the police magistrates you are telling an untruth.

Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I rise to a point of order. Is the Premier in order in saying that the hon. member for Nundah is telling an untruth?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member does not seem to know the difference between "untruth" and "lie." The word "untruth" is not unparliamentary.

Mr. SIZER: I had no intention of misconstruing anything the hon. gentleman said. What I said was that the police magistrates are compelled to accept the reduction.

The PREMIER: That is an entirely different thing to what you did say.

Mr. SIZER: But the judges, who act in a similar capacity, need not accept the reduction unless they care to do so; that the man lower down is compelled to accept the reduction, while the man up above is not subject to the reduction, unless he agrees to it. Hon. members opposite are always accusing members on this side of being anxious to get back to the bad old days of 1902. The retrenchment in 1902 was brought about as a result of extraordinary circumstances, and was far less against the interests of the public servants than the retrenchment which is being brought about by the present Government. On that occasion, as has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition,

there was a sliding scale in connection with the retrenchment, and it will be worth while repeating the figures. On salaries of £450, the first reduction was 15 per cent., and the second reduction 7½ per cent. On salaries from £301 to £450, the first reduction was 12½ per cent., and the second reduction 6½ per cent. On salaries from £151 to £300, the first reduction was 10 per cent., and the second reduction 5 per cent. On salaries from £101 to £150, the first reduction was 7½ per cent., and the second reduction 3½ per cent. The public servants were entitled to a deduction with regard to income tax, and the retrenchment lasted only for three years. This retrenchment is for ever and for aye, I presume. The position changed in 1905, and the Government realised that they had been taking money from those who could least afford it, and immediately returned it to them.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They did nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIZER: They immediately returned 8s. in the £1, which they were able to do through having a surplus of £13,995. That was a modest surplus, but it would be a most extraordinary surplus if it occurred with the present Government.

The PREMIER: You said the Government returned it.

Mr. SIZER: I said that the Government in 1905, immediately a surplus accrued, returned it at the rate of 8s. in the £1.

The PREMIER: The Morgan Government returned it, but it was the Philp Government that took it away.

Mr. SIZER: I also want to point out how this retrenchment is, in some cases, going to act most harshly on some public servants in regard to automatic increases. We have on several occasions endeavoured to deal with the subject, but this is the first opportunity we have had of getting a direct question on which we could speak. I want to show how the public servants will be affected by this reduction of 5 per cent. in their salaries in addition to losing their automatic increases. The men getting over £300 a year were entitled to an automatic increase of £20 per annum. In the first year they will lose this £20 increase in addition to the 5 per cent. reduction; in the second year they will lose £40 plus 5 per cent. reduction; in the third year they will lose £60 plus 5 per cent. reduction. The maximum would have been reached in three years, but under this Bill the public servant will lose £120 in addition to the 5 per cent. reduction. Do you tell me that that is a fairer deal to the public servants than the retrenchment of 1902?

The PREMIER: Ask the public servants if they would rather have a reduction on the present scale or on the scale adopted in 1902.

Mr. SIZER: Let the hon. gentleman go to the country and ask them that.

The PREMIER: We will go to the country and ask them in good time. After every election the Opposition always want another election.

Mr. SIZER: The Premier's words are quite true. The Opposition are always asking for another election. It is equally true the Government are in a minority and that they are carrying on with proxy votes and they won't have an election if they can avoid it.

The PREMIER: Where is such a Government?

Mr. Sizer.!

Mr. SIZER: Listen to Satan reproving sin.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman says that this Government are in a minority, he is not speaking the truth.

Mr. SIZER: I said that you represent a minority of the electors.

The PREMIER: You might have intended to say it.

Mr. SIZER: I was pointing out that, as a result of this Bill, certain officers in the public service will lose £120 in three years, in addition to the 5 per cent. reduction in salary. That is far more than they received in increases from the Government, so that they really received an Irishman's rise. Their position compares very unfavourably with what it was in 1902, when, after three years, the retrenchment was returned to the public servants at the rate of 8s. in the £1, whereas this retrenchment will go on for ever and aye as long as the present Government are in power.

The PREMIER: I suggest that the hon. gentleman should give a lesson on finance to the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member for Enoggera could give a lesson on finance to the Premier, and give him some good information. I will conclude my remarks by saying that the amendment has been moved as a protest against the action of the Government towards the public servants. This is the only opportunity we have of protesting. The Government are repudiating their election pledges, and if they were fair and honourable they would go to the country and ask for a fresh mandate. At any rate, we are not going to be a party to allow the Government to carry out a policy of repudiation so far as the public servants are concerned.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I do not intend covering the very thoughtful and argumentative aspect placed before the House by hon. members on this side of the House, but I shall confine myself briefly to the statement that we cannot be a party to the proposals in the Bill. We are out to support the amendment which has been proposed by the leader of the Nationalist party, and which was indirectly supported by the very fine speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition. There are certain actions which seem to me to be altogether unseemly. If I gather rightly from the speech of the Premier, various members of the public service have been consulted with regard to the proposals in the Bill and they practically consented, willingly or unwillingly, to a reduction of their salaries. If such is the case, then a more unseemly thing could scarcely have taken place. Is it possible that the Premier or the members of the Ministry have been going round cap in hand to various members of the public service and soliciting from them their acquiescence in a reduction of their salaries? I understood the Premier to say so.

The PREMIER: I did not go cap in hand.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: There seems to be some proof that it was done, and I say that it was a most unusual procedure. If it was done unanimously on the part of the public servants then they are to be appreciated; but it does not strike me as a reasonable or fair thing for the Ministers or Under Secretaries—or whoever did the business—it was an

[Mr. Sizer.

unfair procedure to adopt, to go to the public servants and ask their approval to a certain reduction in their salaries. The amendments will not touch the public servants at all. We are not going to be a party to that. We are going to keep the Government up to their promises. We are going to keep them to the standard which they set.

The PREMIER: How are you going to do that? Are you going to speak in the Market Square to-night?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: At any rate, speeches will not only be made in the Market Square to-night, but in other places. A good deal of talking has been done in certain caucus rooms. (Hear, hear!) We know that there is a house divided so far as members opposite are concerned, and a house divided against itself cannot stand. The hope we have here is that there will be further evidences of a breakdown of the condition of things that exist at present. The only true and laudable thing which the Government have done is to some extent to undo what was done by this Government some years ago when they increased the salaries of members of Parliament. To me it seems a scandal that members of Parliament should be asked to suffer a reduction of 5 per cent. only, when a few weeks ago they had their salaries increased by 66.23 per cent. Is it a fair thing to ask the labouring men outside to have their salaries and wages cut down by 25 per cent. and more, while members who are enjoying an increase in their salaries of two-thirds over and above their political salaries have simply to submit to a reduction of 5 per cent.? There is no congruity in it. We have no right to be a party to that. Members opposite should veto the Government proposal and set an example. The Government should not cut down the low-wage man or the middle-wage man, but the high-wage man.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: You are protecting the high-wage man with your amendment.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Members on this side of the House are prepared to agree to a reduction in salaries of more than 5 per cent. To revert once more to the true aspect of the question before the House, we cannot assist the Government in repudiation, or in going back upon their obligations. They are under a distinct pledge to the country, and we call upon them to stand by it. Members on this side of the House have opposed repudiation in every way, and we are no more going to acquiesce in repudiation in respect of the wages of public servants than in respect of the landowner or the Tramways Company, or judges, or anybody else. We are not going to be parties to it, and we are not going to allow the Government to be parties to it, if we can prevent it. There is no doubt that there is a vast difference in the earning power of money now as compared with the earning power in other days. One can safely calculate that in 1904 it was worth double what it is to-day. I have heard some reference to men earning 6s. 6d. a day. My experience of life and dealings with men—lengthsmen and others—goes back to that year, and I say unhesitatingly that men saved money in those days and were as well off as they are to-day with 12s. a day. I support the amendment, and I am hopeful that at least those eight members who have been fighting this question in caucus will support it also.

Mr. FRY (*Kuvitpa*): I support the amendment. I would like to see the Bill withdrawn with the object of submitting a new Bill excluding public servants. It would be in the interests of the Government themselves to accept the amendment. It is very, very difficult, perhaps, to retrieve the position which they have brought about, that is, by the breaking of their election promises, but even at this late hour there is an opportunity for them to redeem themselves somewhat.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is your opinion.

Mr. FRY: Certainly, on this question it is more reliable than that of the hon. member, and if I quoted his own speech on this very subject it might be very enlightening to the Chamber and also educating for the workers outside. I quote from the "Daily Standard," an authority he will not question, of Monday, 1st May, 1922, in which appears a report of a speech at the May Day dinner at the Trades Hall, when Mr. Brice made some remarks to which the Secretary for Mines referred—

"In reply to the remarks made by Mr. Brice, he could not agree that the Government had not stood up to the question of the reduction of the basic wage. The only reference made was during the Paddington by-election, and it would have been unwise to call Parliament together while the Government was fighting for its life."

On the authority of the Secretary for Mines, the Government were fighting for their life, and, therefore, he could not agree with Mr. Brice that the Government had not stood up to the question of the reduction of the basic wage.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Quote the rest. Did I not say I stood for arbitration?

Mr. FRY: I will quote the rest: I would be very sorry to misrepresent the Minister. I have not said he does not stand for arbitration. The Minister could not do anything else, if he is at all sensible, because it is part of our platform.

Mr. F. A. COOPER interjected.

Mr. FRY: These gentlemen opposite, including the member for Bremer and the member for Ipswich, pledged themselves on their honour not to support a Government that brought about retrenchment or reduced the wages of public servants. If it was not on his honour, why did the hon. member for Bremer publish the pamphlet called "The Red Light"?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I never published it.

Mr. FRY: The hon. member has never denied it. He approved of it. He is the person concerned, and he has not denied that he compiled it. These gentlemen went to the electors, and it was on the promises made then that they got enormous support. They said that men on this side of the House would reduce wages; that they would retrench.

Mr. W. COOPER: Quite right.

Mr. FRY: The men on the Government side said that they would not do that. They have broken their promises, they have broken a solemn contract with the workers of the State, and they would lead the people to believe that we would do likewise.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You should not pose as being in the workers' camp.

Mr. FRY: I would reply to the Minister by saying, "Far better be a friend outside the camp than a traitor in it."

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's remark is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. FRY: If it is your wish, I withdraw it, but I say it is far better to have friends outside your camp than untrue friends in it. You rule that that is parliamentary. What is an untrue friend but an unreliable "pal," and the worst man to have as your representative? Who would think of trusting his affairs to the care of men who were untrue friends, of men who were unreliable, untruthful—since that term is parliamentary now, I use the words "untruthful friends"—men who make promises and deliberately break them. I am not going to say that they all broke their promises; a few of them have kept their promises in caucus. I am going to quote an authority which I am sure the Government will not question.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: Tell us something about the Ipswich Workers' Political Organisation.

Mr. FRY: I will. Some years ago the Labour party were not composed of men who ruthlessly broke their solemn pledges, or of men who had dictaphones, autophones, or people behind the screen waiting to take down private conversations. (Dis-

[7 p.m.] order.) The men who made the

Labour party were honourable men, at whose lives you could not throw anything; they were men who believed in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It appears that members of the Labour party have changed their principles, and now it is the fatherhood of pocket and the brotherhood of self. I hope the Minister who interjected will be satisfied with the difference. These are not my words and opinions only, they are those of the great body of the workers, who are now standing behind me and the National party. It is a fact which was demonstrated last May Day in the procession down Queen street, which was the smallest on record. Never has there been such a miserable, thin, small procession as there was on last Labour Day. Is not that confirmation of what I say? Ever since I have been in this Chamber I have advocated the cause of the working man. (Government laughter.) How could I do otherwise, when I am the son of a man of lowly birth. I know not riches; everything I have, I have earned by the sweat of my brow—by working from 6 o'clock in the morning till 10 and 12 o'clock at night. My sympathies are with the working man. I have no sympathy with people who say of members sitting on the Opposition side, "They will reduce your salary, they will retrench; we will not do it," and, when returned to place, power, and pay by the votes of the workers, do exactly what they said they were not going to do and that this side would do. When men throw away their principles because of the pay that is attached to a position, it is time that we took stock of the situation and seriously considered the position. I am going to analyse the position and give reasons why those eight members sitting on the Government side can support the amendment. Their vote in caucus may not have been effective; but their vote in this Chamber tonight can be most effective. When you cast

Mr. Fry.]

a vote in caucus, behind closed doors—in secret—nobody knows. When you cast a vote in this Chamber, when the Press are present and the proceedings are open to the world, everybody knows. This is the place in which to stand up and back your principles and election pledges. The "Railway Advocate" is the official organ of the Australian Railways Union, Queensland Branch, incorporated with which is "Unity," "Solidarity," and "Western Unionist Tribune." In the issue of the 10th August, 1922, it criticised what took place in caucus. It states—

"The action of the Labour Government in applying to the Arbitration Court for a reduction in the wages and salaries of its employees was not decided upon without a strenuous fight by a few members of the party in an effort to keep the party on the straight path that leads to the accomplishment of Labour's objective."

Arbitration is a plank of the Labour party's platform, and I am not going to criticise the Government from that standpoint. The Labour party during the elections made certain promises, but they have not been kept. The "Railway Advocate" states further—

"It is regrettable that privileged people, acting in the secrecy of the caucus room, disclose the fact that, on the final vote, only eight members of the party had sufficient courage and loyalty to the working class ideals to vote against a motion having for its object wage reduction. This is, perhaps, the first time that the workers of Queensland have been publicly informed how members voted in caucus. We would not be in that fortunate position this time were it not that certain members of the party rightly regarded their duty to the workers' cause of more consequence than the 'gag' of caucus secrecy on such a vital issue as wage reductions.

"The names of the eight loyal members are—Myles Ferricks, South Brisbane; Dave Weir, Maryborough; F. Bulcock, Barcoo; F. Forde, Rockhampton; F. Brennan, Teowoomba; D. Riordan, Burke; T. Foley, Leichhardt; and C. Collins, Bowen."

I call upon those hon. members to redeem their promises.

Mr. KERR: They will never do it.

Mr. FRY. They can show how they stand by casting a vote in public. If they vote against the amendment they confirm everything the Government have done, which will really be a vote of confidence in the Government. Every man, from the Premier down, will come under the same category. It is useless to say here anything about any secret votes. The country and the people and the working class desire that there should be a vote in public. This is the vote of the year, the vote of the session, the vote of Parliament, and a vote that will determine for all time the sincerity and honesty and dependability of the Government and its supporters. It will determine for all time whether those eight hon. members are to be known as heroes of otherwise. The "Railway Advocate" also states—

"It will be observed that the members for such large railway centres as Ipswich and Mundingburra were in the bag with wage-reducer Theodore, whilst not one member of the Cabinet was in the loyal

[Mr. Fry.

eight—not even the member for Paddington, whose by-election literature in March last reminded the workers that 'Tory Governments reduced wages.'"

The "Worker" and other Labour papers stated that the Tories were going to reduce the wages! I do not know to whom they refer when they say "Tories." I think the "Tories" sit with the Government. The "Railway Advocate" further states—

"The names also serve to remind us that only one member from the one-time militant North voted against reduced wages, and the ex-platform porter of Brisbane deserted his working class supporters on that vital issue."

It further states—

"The unionists of Queensland can rest assured that the above information is absolutely beyond question—so much so that the undermentioned challenge thrown out by the editor of this journal to Messrs. Cooper (Bremer), Pollock (Gregory), Stopford (Mount Morgan), who were sent by the parliamentary caucus to Ipswich to reply to a speech delivered by him over a month ago, remains unanswered—

"Our challenge was published in the Press as follows:—

Will Mr. Cooper and his two political friends, Messrs. Stopford and Pollock publicly say that they finally voted with the eight members of the party against the plaintiff being lodged in the Arbitration Court?

"The challenge was thrown out in view of the member for Bremer having told the workers of Ipswich at a mass meeting that he was 'Not in Theodore's bag.' The publication of the above names affords the answer to the question why didn't they accept the challenge."

I am not worrying about the vote which took place in caucus. What I am concerned most about is having men in this House whose election pledges can be relied upon. Men go to the electors and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, here I stand, and express my principles, and I will abide loyally by everything I say. Put your confidence in me, and return me as your representative, and I will do everything that lies in my power to carry out your wishes." Men make use of these words at the elections. I have heard them myself appeal to the electors, and say, "Be not like dumb-driven cattle; be a hero in the strife." (Government laughter.) Where are the heroes? They are all like dumb-driven cattle. They go to the country and say, "Fellow workers, be not like dumb-driven cattle, but be like heroes in the strife." There are eight men in this Chamber who will to-night either be heroes in the strife or like dumb-driven cattle. They will have the chance of being heralded as heroes or of being branded as dumb-driven cattle. Everyone in Queensland will know exactly the attitude which they take up.

Mr. COLLINS: Quote the other resolution in the "Railway Advocate."

Mr. FRY: All right, I will quote the resolution—

"We regard the disclosure of the names as a duty to the workers, and in so doing join issue with the Queensland Central Executive by making public their decision as contained in the following resolution (but which, unfortunately,

the Parliamentary Labour party stubbornly refused to comply with)."

The hon. member for Bowen is one of the members of the Parliamentary Labour party who stubbornly refused to comply with it.

Mr. COLLINS: Quote the resolution.

Mr. FRY: This is the resolution—

"That this executive strongly disapproves of the action of the Government in approaching the Arbitration Court for a reduction of wages of Government employees, as we believe that the present basic wage of £4 5s. in the public service is barely sufficient to support a family in comfort, and we urge upon the Government the necessity of altering its policy of interfering with the said basic wage, and seek other sources to effect economy."

Mr. COLLINS: Stick to the basic wage. Where does your amendment come in according to that resolution?

Mr. FRY: That is the resolution, and it does not relieve the hon. member for Bowen, nor any of the noble eight, of the responsibilities which rest upon them. Let them come out as men, and vote with the people's representatives—the Nationalist party and the Country party—and show their manliness. Why were these promises made at the 1920 election? The answer is supplied by the Secretary for Mines, who, speaking at the May Day dinner, as reported by the "Daily Standard" of 1st May, 1922, said, "We are a high-wage Government," and then he went on to say, in conclusion—

"that the Government had passed over its most critical period which was most serious, at about the time of the last State election. He believed that when they went up for re-election the Government would be returned with a majority of five or six."

The Secretary for Mines tells us that the Government during the 1920 election were facing the most critical time in its history. At a time of crisis there is a great need for caution. When a crisis comes wise men generally review the position and walk cautiously and act wisely. When the critical position occurred with this Government they were willing to promise anything if they were returned to power. They were returned to power, but they represented a minority of 20,000 votes. They immediately set to work and started retrenching. They continued their retrenchment until now they have retrenched nearly 3,000 persons. On top of that we have this Bill, which follows an appeal made by the Government in the Arbitration Court for a reduction of salaries. We were told that the country was flourishing and prosperous. If that is so, where is the necessity for this Bill? The Commonwealth Government are not reducing the wages of their employees. I want to say in conclusion—

Mr. BULLOCK: Tell us what you were going to say about the Commonwealth Government not reducing wages.

Mr. KERR: They are not reducing wages.

Mr. FRY: The Federal Government have great responsibilities resting on them—much greater than those resting on the Queensland Government. I do not think that Mr. Hughes would have a dictaphone in his room and he would not have a stenographer behind the screen.

Mr. BRENNAN: He does it openly.

Mr. FRY: We will give an opportunity to the eight men to vote openly to-night.

Mr. BRENNAN: Sit down; we will vote openly.

Mr. FRY: The opportunity is here. Hon. members opposite have their opportunity of choosing either to be branded as heroes or as dumb driven cattle. They have their choice and they cannot get away from it. Just before the dinner adjournment I made reference to the "Red Light," and the hon. member for Bremer asked me to say who authorised the printing of this paper. In deference to that hon. gentleman I looked at the pamphlet, and I notice at the bottom that it said, "Bremer Campaign Committee. Printed by the 'Queensland Leader,' Brisbane street, Ipswich." That does not altogether absolve the hon. member for Bremer because he did not take exception to it, and I believe he is interested in the printing works that prints the "Queensland Leader." The hon. member asked me to quote the authority, and, as I believe in doing a fair thing when any statement of mine affects an individual, I quote that authority. I am attacking a principle—the principle of hon. members going to the electors, making statements, and accusing their opponents of doing everything that is wrong and bad, and yet they come in and do exactly the thing that they said their opponents would do if returned. They claim that they would not do these things, yet once they got into office they did them. The cause of all this is maladministration and reckless spending of the State's money. It is maladministration of the State's affairs. The prodigal son was a wise man compared with this Government. As a matter of fact, he would be hailed as a successful financier by the Government. There is one thing about the prodigal son. He had some respect and he went back to his father and confessed his wrong, and his father gave him a feed. We ask this Government to play the part of the prodigal son. Let them go to the public which elected them. Let them put their case before the public and see how the people will act. The public will give the Government a feed, but I am afraid it will be the feed that they doled out to the unemployed. Many of them will be among the ranks of the unemployed after an election; and, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary for Mines, as published in the official organ of the Government, has said that they would be returned with a majority of five or six, I venture to say they are not game to try it on. The State has been brought into this condition by men who have not the capacity, nor the ability, to administer the affairs of the State in a time of crisis. In conclusion, I ask those eight men to declare themselves by an open vote in this Chamber, and let the public see just where they are. They have to vote either for the amendment or against it; they have to vote either for their principles or against them; they have to vote for or against their promises. Let them vote here and let the people see how they vote.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): During the general election campaign in 1920 and during the Paddington by-election campaign the Government and their supporters went out of their way to abuse the party with whom I am associated, and also the party under

Mr. Maxwell.]

the Country banner, by stating that it was the intention of those parties, if returned to power, to move for a reduction of wages and retrenchment. I think circulars were issued by Government supporters which verify that statement. They wanted the people of Queensland to believe that they were going to be the salvation of the community, and that they would not do any injustice whatever to the unfortunate workers of the State. We find that one of the first things they do is to appoint another Minister to assist them in their work; and in the Governor's Speech, submitted to us only a short time ago, we find a similar proposal. In the face of those actions they have the temerity and the impudence to submit a scheme such as that contained in this Bill. I stand for what the Nationalists advocated when they went to the poll, and for that reason I support the amendment of the leader of my party. We stand for consistency; the only consistency in which members on the Government side are consistent is their inconsistency. The Premier, when speaking on the amendment, said that the Bill was introduced to equalise matters; that the workers who had gone to the Arbitration Court had received a reduction of wages of 5s. a week, and it was necessary to bring the others into line. I want to know who took those public servants to the Arbitration Court. Did they go themselves?

Mr. BRENNAN: What did you do?

Mr. MAXWELL: It is not a question of what I did; I would remind the hon. member for Toowoomba that it is a question of the false promises that these men have held out to the people. I submit that the people who took those men to the Arbitration Court are the men sitting on the Treasury benches, and with a view to reinstating themselves in the opinion of those men and removing a little of the responsibility from their shoulders, want to be able to say, "If you did go to the Arbitration Court, or if we did take you there, we at the same time introduced a measure to deal with other members of the public service." To me it was a most reprehensible thing to do. They went to the people and told them that they were not a "low-wage" Government. "We believe in paying a high wage," the Secretary for Mines told the people at Paddington, "because if you do not pay a high wage you are going to have a state of inefficiency throughout the length and breadth of Queensland." What do we find [7.30 p.m.] now? This Government, who have broken their promises, are coming forward to try and placate the unfortunate men who were getting scarcely sufficient to keep a wife and children. They say, "This is what we have done to the other fellow."

Mr. PEASE: Why did you reduce them in the Employers' Federation?

Mr. MAXWELL: I remember a newspaper cutting which showed that this hon. member who is interjecting, at one period, did not pose as the friend of the worker. When an opportunity was given to the people to vote as to whether they wanted a certain thing or not, he did not want to let them have it.

Mr. PEASE: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. MAXWELL: The people wanted to make certain improvements in the city the

[Mr. Maxwell.

hon. member resided in. He demanded, under the Local Authorities Act, that a poll be taken.

Mr. PEASE: Quite right—refer the thing to the people.

Mr. MAXWELL: As a matter of fact, his protest was unavailing—the vote was carried against him.

Mr. PEASE: The boodlers' vote.

Mr. MAXWELL: This is the gentleman who comes into this House and poses as the friend of the worker. "By their works shall ye judge them." This is the class of man who says, "We are the men who stand for the worker," yet stand against them all the time. The opportunity comes to-night to show on which side they stand—to say what they said in the caucus. "We do not stand for the reduction of wages."

I want to refer to this pamphlet, headed "Who is Jones?" This pamphlet was issued to the electors of Paddington—

"Remember that the fate of Queensland is in your hands.

"On Saturday, 11th March, you will be called upon to decide whether you, through your Labour Government, will retain the reins of administration or hand them over to the Nationalists, who have already launched a low-wage campaign.

"Don't forget that a policy of wage reduction all round has been unequivocally advocated by Nationalist members of the Queensland Parliament.

"Alf. Jones comes before you as a tried and trusted champion of Labour."

The Secretary for Mines stated that he did not stand for low wages. If he does not believe in the reduction of wages in the public service, why does he not be man enough to come from the Treasury benches and vote against the people who are bringing forward such a measure as this? I will have an opportunity of discussing the question further on the second reading.

Mr. COLLINS: This is the second reading.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am speaking to the amendment. It remains for the people of this community to know the class of individuals who are occupying the Treasury benches, and what they stand for.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Kippell*): I rise to emphasise one point. The word "repudiation" has been bandied about in this debate, and mention has been made of "tearing up scraps of paper." One would think that hon. members opposite did not know the meaning of the word "repudiation" before this Government came into power. One would think it was not a word that occurred in their vocabulary. Since the present Administration have come into power, hon. members opposite have repeated that word just as the old woman repeated "Mesopotamia." It seems to flow from their mouths just as freely as that famous stream flows on that has been immortalised in the well-known Salvation Army song. That being so, one wants to analyse the strength or otherwise of the argument urged by hon. members opposite. One wants also to ask the question if hon. members opposite have ever been guilty of repudiation—because the charge of repudiation urged by hon. members opposite against this Government tacitly assumes that hon. members opposite have never been guilty of

that offence? What are the facts? In 1914, hon. members opposite flagrantly repudiated the automatic increases that were due to the public servants of Queensland. That fact stands out prominently in the history of Queensland politics, and it needs emphasising. I desire to emphasise it to-night—I desire to emphasise the fact that the public service regulations at that time were repudiated, that the public servants were deprived of the automatic increases to which they were entitled in that year.

Mr. KIRWAN: Also the railway men.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The public servants generally.

Mr. FLETCHER: Do you know what one of your "chaps" said to me? He said, "I could understand your Government doing it, but I cannot understand the Labour Government doing it."

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I want to develop this argument step by step. I am prepared to deal later with any other aspect that hon. members may care to touch upon. I am not going to allow hon. members opposite, by interjection, to deflect me from placing the necessary emphasis upon their flagrant repudiation in 1914 and 1915. That repudiation took place when there was no great war effects—it was before the disastrous effects of the war began to be felt. It was not only a repudiation of increases to officers receiving over £300; it was a repudiation of increases to officers receiving over £100. It remained for a Labour Government to repudiate that repudiation, and to restore the automatic increases to which the public servants were entitled.

Mr. SIZER: The outgoing Government left you the money with which to do it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Nothing of the kind. The Government of 1914 repudiated their agreement. It is nothing but humbug and hypocrisy for hon. members opposite to accuse this Government of repudiation when they have been guilty of that very offence. Let them cast the mote out of their own eyes: let them first examine their record before they accuse this Government of repudiation.

Let us review another phase of Queensland Public Service history from the viewpoint of hon. members opposite. In 1902, they retrenched, they poll-taxed, and reduced with a vengeance. The public servants who then were receiving £101 per year were reduced to £83, the public servants who were getting £150 were reduced to £135.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member for Albert hears that in silence.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: And Ministers reduced their salaries by £200.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Ministers are reducing their salaries now. This is the point—the very offence that hon. members opposite accuse the Government of, they have been responsible for in an aggravated form. Where is the force, the logic, the strength of the criticism that has been urged against the present Government?

Mr. GREEN: They made no promises to the electors.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I will deal with one phase of the question at a time. I would remind the hon. member for Townsville that he has been a party to a

reduction of wages in the municipal sphere in Townsville.

Mr. GREEN: He has not.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is a fact; the hon. member has been responsible for, and a party to, a reduction of wages in Townsville.

Mr. GREEN: That is not correct.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member is shifting his ground. First he said that I was incorrect, and now he says that I am correct, but there are certain qualifications. Just fancy the hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Toowoong and other hon. members opposite, who attended that great Employers' Federation which had for its object reduction of wages and the crushing of the workers in this State, complaining as they have done this afternoon!

Mr. GREEN: I have not spoken.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member has interjected. It is not necessary for one to rise in one's place to express views in a certain direction. The leader of the Opposition was very frank in his utterances when he said that hon. members opposite had opposed the public servants' right to go to the Arbitration Court. If hon. members opposite were in power the public servants of Queensland would be deprived of that right.

Mr. GREEN: They would not.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What is taking place in New South Wales? No sooner had the Nationalist Government been returned than they set about to deprive the public servants of that State of the right to go to the Arbitration Court. They quietly indicated that they were going to deprive the public servants of that right. They are going to make the public servants of New South Wales industrial slaves. This Queensland Labour Administration gave to the public servants of the State, for the first time in their history, the right of industrial citizenship, and removed from them the stigma of industrial slavery. This Government have been responsible for the public servants receiving increased wages and improved conditions, and the public servants at the various elections, by virtue of their votes, have expressed their gratitude for what has been done.

Mr. MAXWELL: Try them now.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Let us bear in mind for a moment the attitude of the anti-Labour Press of Queensland on this matter. We hear a lot of mock sympathy expressed for the public servants. The "Daily Mail" in the year 1920 referred to the public servants as a body of parasites which the people of Queensland were not going to be taxed to tolerate much longer. That is a nice expression to come from a party journal which is supposed to have some consideration and sympathy for public servants. The "Courier" has expressed similar sentiments. I have had those sentiments placed in "Hansard" when dealing with the Railway Estimates. In view of all the circumstances and facts, the criticism on the part of the Opposition is mere humbug. If hon. members opposite contend that we are guilty of repudiation, we can smile in reply; when we know that they have been

Hon. J. Larcombe.]

guilty of that very offence. The hon. member for Albert and the hon. member for Bulimba were in the Cabinet in 1914.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Was there a war on?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No. No effect of the war had been felt in 1914. We have had four or five years of war since that date. The hon. gentleman's interjection is no reply to my criticism.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: The Government put everything down to the war.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Hon. members opposite admit the truth of my impeachment, but say that they took action because of the war. The effect of the war had not been felt in 1914, nor for some years subsequent to that. Notwithstanding that the war had been on for several years, this Government enabled the public servants, through the Arbitration Court, to obtain increased wages and improved conditions. Despite the intensified influence of the war in commercial, industrial, economic, and political circles, the Government were able to enormously improve the position of public servants.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: As soon as peace was declared the Government deflated them and reduced their wages.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: In 1902, when there was no world-wide war, the party opposite deflated, poll-taxed, reduced, and committed every sin and offence that public servants could offer criticism against.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: There was a falling revenue at the time.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This is a remarkable change of attitude. Hon. members opposite admit the offence, and say it was because of a falling revenue, war influence, or some other excuse. Those excuses do not hold good.

Mr. SIZER: What is the hon. gentleman's excuse?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am dealing with the excuses of hon. members opposite.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: The hon. gentleman is making the best of a very bad case.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: All I am concerned with at the present time is the emphasising of the sins committed by hon. members opposite in a political sense as affecting public servants. I am endeavouring to show, and I think successfully, that their criticism against the present Administration carries no force, because they have been guilty of the offence that they accuse this Government of.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I would like to say a few words before the debate closes.

Mr. COLLINS: I hope the Country party do not stand for big salaries.

Mr. WARREN: This Bill is brought in to save the Government from a very difficult position. It is intended to wipe out the deficit that the Government have been responsible for through their mismanagement. Anybody who understood government or understood men would expect the Government of Queensland to be comprised of men with some business acumen. Take the personnel of the Government. You will not find

one business man there. The Government were handicapped from the start because of that fact.

Mr. COLLINS: We have brains on our side, which hon. members opposite lack.

Mr. WARREN: Hon. members opposite have neither business acumen nor brains.

Mr. COLLINS: I have no diamond rings, like the hon. member for Albert.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Good old "Bolshie"!

Mr. WARREN: I want to make myself perfectly clear so far as public servants and my constituents are concerned. I do not want to come here as a humbug. I come here to do my best to assist in the government of this State in the interests of the majority of the people. Not only do I think that it is wrong at this stage to reduce the salaries of the workers, but I think it is going to have a bad effect on the State. What we want is more efficiency, and not low wages. We find, after consideration of the purchasing power of the sovereign, that a man is no better off now than he was in 1914. He is not as well off. That is proved by the figures which have been placed before us to-day. Are we going to benefit Queensland by having a small deficit or a large deficit, as the case may be, and making the Government right from a bookkeeping point of view? To my mind, we are going to do a very serious thing if we pass this Bill, and to have the most discontented service in Australia.

Mr. COLLINS: You are going to support the amendment.

Mr. WARREN: Yes. I do not say that the representatives of the people are getting too much money; but I say that the man who is representing the people is much better able to stand a reduction than the worker. I do not think public servants are as well off as those employed in private concerns, and I think the Government should be the best employers. What is wrong is not due to the public servants, but to the bad management of the Government. We find that right through the service the Government are trying to reduce expenditure. In the Railway Department there is a most ingenious method of reducing expenditure, but it is not the best method. If I want to send an article to Nambour, I have to send it on a certain day, or else it may be a week behind time. The country districts are being penalised on account of this method. If the Government brought in good business methods, they would encourage the country districts, and that would enable them to pay the wages and allowances being paid to-day. We on this side have been accused of being non-sympathetic to the worker, but on which side would one expect the most sympathy? You would not go to the other side for sympathy. If you were stumped, and wanted charity, you would go to the left hand of the Speaker, and not to the right. The accusations which are being hurled across the Chamber from hon. members opposite are only to throw dust in the eyes of the worker. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat waxed hot, and told what awful things the Tory Government of Victoria had done. I have no time for Toryism, or for people who are not progressive. At the time the hon. member referred to there was no war, but he did not mention that there was the most terrible drought raging that Queensland had ever experienced. He

[*Hon. J. Larcombe.*]

did not tell us that chaff to feed starving stock was dearer than it had ever been known to be. He did not tell us that hundreds and thousands of people were practically starving on the land and looking for work.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is not true.

Mr. WARREN: Hon. members ought to be ashamed of themselves when they say it is not true. There is not a man in this Chamber but knows that I am speaking the truth. While this Chamber stands for this sort of work, we shall never progress. Is it not best to have a contented service, if we pay half a million more for it, than to save that amount and have a discontented service? This is a bad business proposition, and does not come from men with business experience behind them. Even at the eleventh hour the Premier should withdraw the Bill. I do not stand for throwing mud at hon. members opposite for election purposes. I feel that this Bill is going to have a bad effect on Queensland, and that the State will lose considerably more by this reduction than by having a contented service and leaving the wages as they stand. I quite admit that when the purchasing power of the sovereign becomes the same as it was in 1915, wages should be reduced, particularly in connection with those who are raising primary products, as it will be impossible for a producer who exports his produce to pay a higher wage than what the produce is worth on the London market. The Premier has made the excuse that a certain section of workers have already been reduced. The hon. gentleman was responsible for those people going to the Arbitration Court. It is not too late even now to rectify the evil. It is easy enough for the Government to replace those people on the same level as they were before. It will be better to have a contented service. If a man does not do his duty in the service, he should not be kept there. In a certain newspaper the public servants have been called parasites, but I say that the public servants in Queensland are as good as any class of workers, and the defects in the service are not due to the individuals but to the faulty system in vogue. If the system in operation in private concerns were adopted in the Government service, we should get as good a result for the State as private concerns get. I would like hon. members opposite, who have already voted against this wage reduction, to vote for the amendment. I am not a party politician myself. (Government laughter.) It is a ridiculous position for those gentlemen to vote in a room below for a certain thing, and then in this Chamber, where their actions are open to the country, to vote against their principles. If they do that, they can be branded as the very worst type of human being it is possible to mix with. I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. STOFFORD: You spoke against the Primary Producers' Bill, and walked across the House and voted for it.

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. I voted in favour of it.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I wish to say a word or two by way of comment before the amendment is disposed of. What appears to me about this matter, is the revelation it will give to the workers whose names have been so much in the mouths of hon. members

opposite, as to who are really their champions. The principle of this Bill is to reduce salaries over £300 by fixing [8 p.m.] the minimum to which salaries cannot be reduced below £300.

We have had hon. members opposite this evening tearing their hair and working themselves into a state of excitement and indignation in defence of the men getting £300 per year and over. (Hear, hear!) Members of the Country party are always telling us of the hard toil and the destitute condition of the men on the farms and the small amount of remuneration they earn. I dare say that many farmers in the early stages of their career do not earn £300 a year, but here we have hon. members championing the cause of men earning from £100 to £1,200 a year.

Mr. FLETCHER: We want you to stick to your pledges.

Mr. HARTLEY: Did I understand the hon. member for Port Curtis to say something about men keeping their pledges?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. HARTLEY: Talk about Satan reproving sin—why, it is a Sunday school picnic. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Port Curtis was returned here pledged to the Nationalist party, and after associating with them he found things were going against him in that electorate and that he was likely to be turned out by the Labour candidate if he did not get some assistance from the farming community. He went over to the Country party, and now that man comes here and talks about keeping pledges.

Mr. WARREN: What about your pledge?

Mr. HARTLEY: With regard to any pledge that I have given to any hon. members, if they come along to me at any moment and ask me to redeem it, it will be redeemed. That is the position of every hon. member on the Government side of the House. What I want to impress upon hon. members in connection with this amendment is the slim, shallow attempt to fool the real wage-earner. This is not a wage reduction Bill, but a salary reduction Bill, and that is a big difference. They are attempting to induce the workers to think that they are standing in their interests when really they are standing in the interests of the highly paid men. If the principle on which an earlier reduction took place was right—I do not think it was right as applied to the State—but if the principle of the application to the Arbitration Court for a reduction of wages is good for the man on £150 per annum or £200, or £300, then it is a much better principle to apply to the man getting £300 per annum and over. I would like to know where there is any weakness in that line of argument. If the Judges of the Arbitration Court can say that, owing to a certain fluctuation in the value of commodities, the purchasing power of the sovereign has increased and it is permissible to reduce the salaries of men getting £200 a year by 5 per cent., then I think that the same thing should apply to other salaries. Why we have hon. members opposite standing as the champions of the men getting these amounts, I cannot understand. Hon. members opposite have not said a word against the action of the Arbitration Court in reducing wages. They are always going there through their private Employers' Association seeking a reduction of wages, and yet here, when the same principle is being carried out, so far as the

Mr. Hartley.]

higher salaries are concerned, we have them objecting. They do not object because there is any sincerity in their objections. They are camouflaging and trying to fool a certain section of the people and pretending that they are standing as their champions.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is the second part of the pledge. You broke the first part at the Arbitration Court.

Mr. HARTLEY: Did not you make a pledge?

Mr. FLETCHER: No.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. gentleman has given so many pledges that he really does not know where he is. There is only one other question in this Bill, and that is that it does not contain all who should come under its scope. If the principle of a reduction of wages in the Arbitration Court is good to apply to workers, then it is good to apply to everybody, and it even ought to apply to the Judges themselves. I am sincerely sorry to hear that a number of the Judges have not consented to have their salaries reduced on the same scale as will apply in this Bill. If their arguments that we hear from them on the bench, and which we read in the papers, are good, then they ought to be men enough to set an example and consent to a reduction of their salaries. That is all I have to say on this amendment.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I confess myself somewhat in sympathy with hon. members sitting on the Government benches.

Mr. FLETCHER: They look sorry.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The position is a remarkably awkward one, when we realise that they have always posed as the apostles for increased wages. Now they seek to draw a distinction between salaries and wages. Apparently, they are salving their consciences by saying that this man receives a salary and shall be reduced, but that man receives a wage and he is not going to be reduced. I confess that, whether the amount given as a reward for labour or remuneration is called salary or wages, that the reduction is equally effective so far as the finances of that individual are concerned. I was in complete sympathy with the Secretary for Railways. He is a gentleman I have the utmost respect for. He has always treated me with fine courtesy on any occasion I have had to present matters to him in connection with the interests of my electorate. There is no doubt about it he certainly endeavoured to apologise for the position, but unfortunately, and I think he will admit it himself, he failed to succeed. He made out a very poor case indeed in support of the position that he is forced to take up at the present time. Is it any apology, or is it any excuse for an injustice inflicted on a section of the community, to say, "We are only doing what some other bad Government did before us"? We have always got to realise that, when hon. members sit on that side of the House, they always condemn a previous Administration and always state what they would do, so far as their politics and principles are concerned. They condemn the action of the previous Administration; but they have out-Heroded Herod on this occasion, and their only excuse is that other Administrations did it. Therefore, they say, other Administrations having done it, we are entitled to do it; we are entitled to repeat their misdeeds. The

[Mr. Hartley.

reductions of 1902 were referred to. We have to realise that, with the exception of the hon. member for Toombul—and he is not a man who ever supported the reduction of wages; it is absolutely against his principles and his nature—no member of this Parliament was in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland in 1902.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What about the hon. member for Bulimba?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I do not think the hon. member for Bulimba was in this House in 1902. It is a matter easily susceptible of proof that the reduction in that year was necessary, owing to the terrible season of drought which the State had experienced. I do not recollect—and I speak as a native of this State—such a disastrous drought ever having taken place, either before or since. The revenue dropped. Everything dropped. You, Mr. Speaker, will probably remember the financial depression which existed in the State of Queensland, no matter where you went. The Administration were forced, as business men, to take certain action, but they started at the top of the tree. They reduced their own salaries by £200 per annum.

Mr. COLLINS: That left them more than they were worth to the State.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Apparently the hon. member who interjects has missed his opportunity, because every individual who was connected with that party made a success of his life, whereas I venture to say that, so far as the private life of the hon. member is concerned financially, he never has nor ever will make a success of it.

Mr. COLLINS: Nor does he ever wear diamond rings on his fingers. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member seems to have a remarkable eye for my personal jewellery. I suppose he dreams of it. (Renewed laughter.) However, let us remember that the Administration of that period, in the first instance, reduced their own salaries by £200 per annum, and then they left it to the public servants to say whether they would prefer a reduction in their salaries or that a certain number should, as the Premier calls it, be deflated. They preferred retrenchment, and that retrenchment existed till the reviving resources of the State enabled the Administration to restore the public servants to the position in which they had been. But I notice that hon. members who go so far back, as they call it, to ancient days, in their desire to criticise previous Administrations, nevertheless object to any criticism of themselves which goes back to any previous period. Let us go back to the time when we find the Labour party, combined with another party, occupying the Treasury benches, and only seventeen members in Opposition, and with an overflowing Treasury. What was the condition of the public servants? What was the condition of the police?

At 8.15 p.m.,

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the

"Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Conroy	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Cooper, F. A.	" Mullan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pease
" Dash	" Pollock
" Dunstan	" Riordan
" Ferricks	" Ryan
" Foley	" Smith
" Forde	" Stopford
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Theodore
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gledson	" Wellington
" Hartley	" Wilson
" Huxham	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Forde and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 30.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macgregor
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Bell	" Nott
" Brand	" Peterson
" Cattermull	" Petrie
" Clayton	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Costello	" Roberts, T. R.
" Deacon	" Sizer
" Edwards	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Kerr	" Warren

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Peterson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Taylor's amendment*) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Conroy	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Cooper, F. A.	" Mullan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pease
" Dash	" Pollock
" Dunstan	" Riordan
" Ferricks	" Ryan
" Foley	" Smith
" Forde	" Stopford
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Theodore
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gledson	" Wellington
" Hartley	" Wilson
" Huxham	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Pease.

NOES, 30.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macgregor
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Bell	" Nott
" Brand	" Peterson
" Cattermull	" Petrie
" Clayton	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Costello	" Roberts, T. R.
" Deacon	" Sizer
" Edwards	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Kerr	" Warren

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

1922—3 L

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): Mr. Speaker—

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

HON. W. H. BARNES: They do not like the truth.

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Conroy	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Cooper, F. A.	" Mullan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pease
" Dash	" Pollock
" Dunstan	" Riordan
" Ferricks	" Ryan
" Foley	" Smith
" Forde	" Stopford
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Theodore
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gledson	" Wellington
" Hartley	" Wilson
" Huxham	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Conroy.

NOES, 31.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Logan
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macgregor
" Barnes, W. H.	" Maxwell
" Bebbington	" Morgan
" Bell	" Nott
" Brand	" Peterson
" Cattermull	" Petrie
" Clayton	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Costello	" Roberts, T. R.
" Deacon	" Sizer
" Edwards	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Kerr	" Warren
" King	

Tellers: Mr. Logan and Mr. Warren.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Carnarvon, who is flashing a paper here containing a paragraph regarding Mr. Collins having been killed in Ireland; and calling across at the Premier, "Ambush." If he wants "ambush," he will get it.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I desire to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Weir, referred to an hon. member on this side of the House as "a dirty dog."

Mr. WEIR: So he is a dirty dog.

HON. W. H. BARNES: He repeats it, Sir

The SPEAKER: Order!

[8.30 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Maryborough is not in order in referring to an hon. member as a "dirty dog," and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): I withdraw unreservedly. The remark was directed to the hon. member for Mirani, because he insinuated that hon. members on this side were responsible for the accident that has befallen the hon. member for Aubigny.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Not an accident.

Mr. Weir.]

Mr. WEIR: The hon. member for Mirani deliberately said that hon. members on this side were associated with the blinding of the hon. member for Aubigny, and I said that the hon. member was a "dirty dog."

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: So he is.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member for Mirani will not impute motives of that kind to hon. members on my right.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He never said any such thing.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I distinctly heard the hon. member for Carnarvon refer to hon. members on this side as a lot of "dirty skunks," and for that reason I offer to pull his nose if he comes outside. (Interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. COSTELLO: I will accept that offer.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Carnarvon to withdraw that remark.

Mr. COSTELLO (*Carnarvon*): I am not conscious of having made the remark, but I will withdraw it. (Disorder.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): The greatest offence committed to-night was committed by the hon. member for Carnarvon when he half rose in his place and flashed a newspaper containing an account of the assassination of Mr. Collins in Ireland. He flashed it across to the Premier and said, "Ambushed." What does the hon. member mean by that?

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Pease and Mr. Weir.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[Mr. Weir.

MOTION THAT SPEAKER LEAVE THE CHAIR.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move—

"That you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill in detail."

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I would like to draw the attention of the House to the reason why the hon. member for Aubigny is not here. He left this House when the House rose at 6 o'clock, and went to the Opposition room to put on his hat, but some cur or some skunk, whatever you like to describe him, had put some mixture in his hat which fell into his eyes when he put on his hat, with the result that we had to lead him home and get a doctor to him.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Did that person come from the opposite side of the House?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know. I hope that nobody in this Chamber is responsible for it. Somebody has done it.

The PREMIER: What mixture is it?

Mr. VOWLES: We do not know. The detectives have the matter in hand.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Aubigny thinks it is cayenne pepper. It may be something else; but, at any rate, it is some virulent stuff, which has knocked him out completely, and he is now at his hotel.

The PREMIER: Whoever would do that deliberately is a scoundrel.

Mr. VOWLES: I quite agree with that. I desire to explain the reason for the hon. member's absence, and why he is not present at the divisions to-night. On the question of your leaving the chair, Mr. Speaker, I think a good deal more discussion might have been given this matter than has been allowed by the Premier. I cannot understand why there should be this haste in connection with this legislation.

The PREMIER: The Government must get this Bill through before the 23rd in order to allow it to operate for this month.

Mr. VOWLES: This is the 24th, and we are now being asked to rush the Bill through the Committee stages, and for what reason? We will be four days ahead of time.

The PREMIER: There is only one principle in the Bill, and we have had sufficient discussion on that. If every hon. member is going to speak on every question, we will never get finished.

Mr. VOWLES: Many hon. members do not get an opportunity of speaking on any question. Surely every hon. member in this Chamber who wants to speak has a right to speak. There is a meeting down the street to-night in Albert Square, where some hon. members who were deprived of the right of speaking last night—a right that they were promised—are going to speak in public as a protest against the action of the Government. I remember the time when matters of a great deal less importance occupied five days in discussion. Every member of the Opposition at that time claimed the right to speak.

The PREMIER: They claimed the right, and they got the axe.

Mr. VOWLES: They only got the axe when they were obstructive. The Premier cannot say that the Opposition have been obstructive this afternoon. It is most unfair to members on both sides. Even last night, the time at our disposal was occupied by hon. members opposite quite as much as members on this side, with the result that we were deprived of an opportunity to speak, because the Premier moved the "gag." If matters are carried on like this we might just as well leave the House altogether. What rights we have we are going to stick to as long as we can.

The PREMIER: I move—

"That the question be now put."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Shame!

Question put; and the House divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
.. Brennan	.. Kirwan
.. Bulcock	.. Land
.. Collins	.. Larcombe
.. Courroy	.. McCormack (Proxy)
.. Cooper, F. A.	.. Mullan
.. Cooper, W.	.. Payne
.. Coyne (Proxy)	.. Pease
.. Dash	.. Pollock
.. Dunstan	.. Riordan
.. Ferricks	.. Rynn
.. Foley	.. Smith
.. Forde	.. Stoford
.. Gilday (Proxy)	.. Theodore
.. Gillies (Proxy)	.. Weir
.. Gledson	.. Wellington
.. Hartley	.. Wilson
.. Huxham	.. Winstanley
<i>Tellers: Mr. W. Cooper and Mr. Foley.</i>	

NOES, 32.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Logan
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Macgregor
.. Bebbington	.. Maxwell
.. Bell	.. Morgan
.. Brand	.. Nott
.. Cattermull	.. Peterson
.. Clayton	.. Petrie
.. Costello	.. Roberts, J. H. C.
.. Deacon	.. Roberts, T. R.
.. Edwards	.. Sizer
.. Fletcher	.. Swayne
.. Fry	.. Taylor
.. Green	.. Vowles
.. Jones, J.	.. Walker
.. Kerr	.. Warren
<i>Tellers: Mr. King and Mr. Maxwell.</i>	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Speaker leave the chair—put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clause 1—"Short title and commencement of Act"—

HON. W. H. BARNES (Bulimba): The clause provides that the Bill shall come into operation on 1st July, 1922. I take it that no member on this side objects to the clause. We believe that, in connection with retrenchment, the man who is receiving the biggest salary should receive the biggest reduction.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: Any reductions should be in the ratio of 15 per cent. for men who are earning £1,000 a year, and 10 per cent. for members of Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This is the title of the Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: You are the Chairman, Mr. Kirwan, and not that little cock sparrow there. (Opposition laughter.)

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

HON. W. H. BARNES: In deference to you, Mr. Kirwan, I withdraw that statement.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am not a hypocritical old wowser like you are. (Disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am sorry that the hon. member is losing his temper.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to clause 1.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It seems to me that this Bill has not been sufficiently discussed; and that, consequently, the time fixed for its coming into operation is out of place. There should be no legislation placed on the statute-book which has not received fair discussion; therefore, there is abundant reason why we should delay this measure. The Premier said that a certain number of hours had been spent in discussing the Bill. Are we here simply to sit down and endorse everything the Government do?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would point out that clause 1 deals with the time when the Bill comes into operation. I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that principle; otherwise, I shall have to ask him to resume his seat.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: I will confine my attention to that point; but I am showing that, as we have not had sufficient time to discuss the Bill, 1st July should not be the date of its coming into operation. The Premier must admit that we have not had sufficient time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member offends again I shall ask him to resume his seat.

HON. W. H. BARNES: To bring my remarks into order, I move the deletion of the word "two," on line 8, with the view of substituting the word "three." There is abundant reason why we should delay this measure to give opportunity for further discussion, especially under the present circumstances.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I have an amendment to move on line 5, and I ask the hon. member for Bulimba to withdraw his amendment for a few minutes to enable me to move my amendment.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am quite agreeable.

Mr. KERR: I beg to move, on line 5, the deletion of the words—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is an amendment before the Committee, moved by the hon. member for Bulimba, and I ask the hon. member to speak to that amendment.

Mr. Kerr.]

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Bulimba has agreed to withdraw his amendment, as I have a prior amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: That is for the Committee to say.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: With the permission of the Committee, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the hon. member for Bulimba be allowed to withdraw his amendment?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment (*Mr. W. H. Barnes*) withdrawn accordingly.

The PREMIER: Mr. Kirwan, I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

(Government laughter.)

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the “Ayes” as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Walker.

Resolved in the affirmative

Question—That clause 1 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote as proxy

[*Mr. Kerr.*]

for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Peterson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 2—“*Interpretation of ‘salary’ and ‘officer’*”—

Mr. KERR: I would like a little explanation from the Premier. On going through the Estimates we find that no reduction has been made in the salaries of the Agent-General or any of his staff. The [9 p.m.] Agent-General has expressed a desire, I understand, to get back here. Evidently his salary, even without a reduction, is not sufficient to keep him in England, although I am sure that if he could see the motley crew with whom he would have to associate here he would want to stay there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will discuss the clause. If he does not I shall have to ask him to sit down.

Mr. KERR: I rose to seek some information and ask the Premier to accept an amendment to include the officers of the Tourist Bureau and the Agent-General and his staff. Hon. members opposite talk a good deal about highly-paid public servants. The Agent-General is a public servant and a highly-paid officer. I therefore move the insertion, after the word “Queensland,” in line 20, page 1, of the words—

“Whether employed within the State or outside thereof.”

I think the omission of those words must have been an oversight, for I do not think it was ever meant that the Agent-General should not suffer this reduction, irrespective of the fact that possibly he had in his pocket a long-standing agreement before he accepted the job. Other agreements are being broken, by permission or otherwise, and I would like to know whether the Agent-

General has been communicated with and declared that he is willing to forego his 5 per cent., the same as the men getting under £300 a year. There is also this fact to be remembered—that the officers of the Agency-General are not Queenslanders, and there is no reason why they should not also be included in this wage cut, when we are suffering from the maladministration of the finances.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the hon. member that it is only fair to the Chairman and officers of the House that amendments should be written out.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I wish to support the amendment. I think it is just as well that we should thoroughly understand whom a Bill like this embraces. It is not quite clear whether the clause includes the Agent-General and his officers in London and the officers of the Tourist Bureau in Sydney, and other officers in the employ of the Government. If employees within the State have to suffer this reduction, it is only right that all officers in the employ of the Government, wherever located, should also come within the operation of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Lacombe, *Keppel*): I just want to emphasise the redundancy of the amendment. It is unnecessary. It is a time-wasting amendment. It is an obstructive amendment. Yet hon. members move such amendments and wonder why the Premier applies the "gag." How does the clause read? It reads, *inter alia*—

"payment for personal services rendered by any person employed in the service of the Government of Queensland."

Is that not plain enough? It does not matter where the employee is working. The clause already provides what the amendment seeks to do, and if the amendment were carried, would it not be redundant?

Mr. KERR: The Secretary for Railways has certainly not gone into the question at all. If the hon. member will turn to the Estimates of "Probable Ways and Means" for this financial year, he will find that at the bottom of the Estimates for every department there is a provision deducting 5 per cent. from salaries.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Read the clause.

Mr. KERR: If the clause can be interpreted in that way, then a definite statement should be made, and I will withdraw. If it is intended that the Agent-General should have 5 per cent. of his salary deducted from the Estimates as printed—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am not discussing that point.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member can discuss no other point. Why should a deduction be made from the Estimates of the Chief Secretary's Office and no deduction from the Agent-General and his staff? I am not prepared to accept the statement of the Secretary for Railways. What we want is a statement from the Premier that the highly paid Agent-General, who is a State servant, will also come under this reduction. The Secretary for Railways has not given one reason against the amendment. He says that what we want is provided for in the Bill. I am not prepared to admit that it is. If it were so, the reduction would be provided

for in the Estimates. If the hon. member can speak for the Government and is prepared to say that the wording of the clause is going to cover the salary of the Agent-General, I will withdraw my amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I want to make this point clear: I am not discussing the merits of the proposal to interfere with the Agent-General's salary. I am discussing only the terms of clause 2 and the relation of the proposed amendment to it. The Agent-General is under a specific contract.

Mr. KERR: So are the Judges.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: If the amendment is carried, it gives no greater power to the Government, because the clause as it now stands gives the Government power to reduce those servants who are outside the State, if they so desire.

Mr. GREEN: Why have they not dealt with the Agent-General?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are dealing with the terms of clause 2 and the relation of the amendment to it. That is a different point altogether.

Mr. GREEN: Can you tell us why?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am sure the hon. member can realise the logical distinction. The point I am emphasising is that, if the amendment were carried, it would be redundant and would confer no greater power than is conferred by clause 2.

Mr. FLETCHER (*Port Curtis*): The Minister says that we are wasting time, and that this is pure obstruction. I say it is not. The question brought up by the hon. member for Enoggera is a sound question. That hon. member asked a specific question as to whether the Agent-General was included in the operations of this Bill; and the Secretary for Railways says that the hon. member's amendment is pure redundancy. I venture the opinion that the Agent-General has not been asked to accept the reduction. The Judges, the Commissioner for Railways, and other officials who are under contract have been asked whether they will accept a 5 per cent. reduction. Why does not the Minister say whether the Agent-General has been asked? He is not in a position to answer it. It is a most important point, and the Minister should answer it instead of saying that we are obstructing and asking for the "gag."

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: So you are.

Mr. FLETCHER: We are doing nothing of the sort. We are out for equity. If one employee of the Government is going to suffer this reduction, we say that all should suffer likewise. Undoubtedly, the Agent-General, who is drawing a salary of £1,250, should come under the operation of the Bill the same as anyone else. It is a question whether there are not two Agent-Generals drawing salaries at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FLETCHER: If that is so, they should both come under the operations of the Act and accept a 5 per cent. reduction.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you know that clause 2 covers persons employed in the service of the Government of Queensland?

Mr. Fletcher.]

Mr. FLETCHER: That does not meet the point. The hon. member for Enoggera said that he would withdraw the amendment if the question were answered. Why does the Minister not answer it? He gets up, and with an array of words, he tries to blind the issue. I ask him to give an answer to the question and settle the matter.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*): I am in accord with the contention of the Secretary for Railways—that apparently the amendment is not necessary so far as the power of the Government is concerned. We have asked the Minister, in the absence of the Premier, why the Agent-General's Department has not been brought within the same category as the other departments of this State. The Estimates disclose that, whereas other officers are reduced, neither the Agent-General nor his staff is touched.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He is under a specific contract.

Mr. DASH: Some of the staff are reduced.

Mr. GREEN: The staff is not touched. We are penalising the public servants of Queensland and allowing those who are living in London to go untouched. I cannot stand for such a state of things. If we had the assurance of the Minister that the Agent-General and his staff will be affected the same as the other departments, I feel quite sure that the hon. member for Enoggera will withdraw his amendment and allow the question to go through. We should have that assurance or some explanation as to why it is not applied to that department as well as to the other departments of the State.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): I would like to ask why the Secretary for Railways happens to be in charge of this Bill at the moment. I thought the Premier was handling the Bill. I think it was discourteous to the House for the Premier to go out when important amendments were being moved.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He knew you were obstructing.

Mr. SIZER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is temporarily in charge of the Bill—probably as a proxy or something for the Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SIZER: Is it his intention to claim that clause 2 covers all the powers that the Government want?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are purely obstructing.

Mr. SIZER: I am asking whether the hon. gentleman says that all the powers that are necessary are contained in clause 2?

Mr. KING: He does not know.

Mr. SIZER: If he has not read the Bill, I will excuse him.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: My view is correct; you are obstructing.

Mr. SIZER: Does the hon. gentleman claim that the Government have, in clause 2, all the power necessary to deal with the whole of the public servants? He has evidently not read the Bill if he does claim that; otherwise, what is the meaning of clause 4—"Any other persons determined in that behalf by the Governor in Council." If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to accept this amendment, and gives the assurance that they have all the power necessary

in clause 2, it will naturally follow that we can move an amendment which will be acceptable on clause 4—which would be superfluous. I think there is good reason why this Committee should know whether or not it is intended to include the Agent-General under the operations of this measure. The secretary to the Agent-General is on a salary of £560. Is he to be reduced? There is no reduction for the chief clerk, who is on £435. There are two inspectors who last year received £669, and they have been reduced to £600. What is the object of the differentiation there?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Clause 2 confers the power to reduce; clause 4 confers the power to exempt. They are two entirely different powers.

Mr. SIZER: There is no provision on the Estimates for a reduction of the high salaried officers in the Agent-General's office. I think it is unfair that officers in this State should have to accept a reduction, while the political appointment of the Agent-General, carrying a salary of £1,250 per year, is not subject to the same reduction. I ask the hon. member for Bowen if he will still submit to the man on £4 5s. being subjected to a reduction, while the Agent-General is not subject to the same reduction?

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member should address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SIZER: An argument of this sort cannot be called obstruction. If the reduction is not to apply to the Agent-General's Department, then amendments should be moved when the Estimates are under consideration to bring about that reduction.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will discuss the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. SIZER: We desire to make this Bill equitable and we want the reduction to apply to the Agent-General's staff. Probably the Government were not game to suggest a reduction to the Agent-General, because they were afraid of his answer. Probably the Government doubted the Agent-General's attitude on this Bill, and appointed him to the present position. No preference should be shown to any political Agent-General.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): There is a good deal in the point raised by the hon. member for Nundah. On looking through the Bill we have the definition of "salary," and in another clause reference to the 5 per cent. reduction, and a little later on power to exempt certain persons from the operation of this Bill. The Governor in Council can determine that "any other persons" may be excepted. On looking through the Estimates, we find that in some cases no provision has been made for the 5 per cent. reduction, and one of the departments concerned is the Agent-General's Department. When information is asked, it should be honestly given. Under clause 4, the Government have the right to exempt certain persons, and according to the Estimates that has been done.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The amendment does not cover the point. What is proposed by the amendment is contained in clause 2.

Mr. VOWLES: Why does the hon. gentleman not be honest and say that it is not proposed to apply the reduction to the Agent-General's staff? It is perfectly clear that Queenslanders here will be subject to the reduction, but the Queensland public servants

[Mr. Fletcher.

in England will not. I am speaking simply to emphasise that point. What special virtue is there for one or two Agent-Generals to be given special consideration? It was suggested by the Minister temporarily in charge of the Bill that there was a special agreement with the Agent-General. I would point out that there was an agreement between the police magistrates of Queensland and the Arbitration Court. The Government are now going to tear up that agreement.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There is no analogy. In one case it was a specific contract for a certain number of years, and the Government cannot touch it.

Mr. VOWLES: The Government can "suck" the Agent-General to-morrow, and nobody knows it better than the Secretary for Railways. The police magistrates had an agreement with the Arbitration Court, but now they are subject to the 5 per cent. reduction; but, because Mr. Fihelly happened to be a friend of the Government, he is to receive an annuity. The explanation given to-night on the matter is very unsatisfactory.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I have always contended that when it is necessary to bring about a reduction in wages we should start at the top, instead of what is being done by a Government who allege that they are the friend of the workers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like to point out for the benefit of hon. members that the amendment is to add after the word "Queensland" the words "whether employed within the State or outside thereof." I hope hon. members will not wander all around the various clauses of the Bill and repeat their second reading speeches. I hope they will confine their remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. MORGAN: I am just as well acquainted with the amendment as you are.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is reflecting on the Chair. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: It would be a reflection on me if I admitted that I did not know the amendment.

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

Mr. MORGAN: I have nothing to withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member withdraw?

Mr. VOWLES: What?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has cast a reflection on the Chair, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. MORGAN: I have nothing to withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member withdraw? If he does not, I will have to name him to the House.

Mr. MORGAN: Will you tell me what I have got to withdraw? I said that I was just as well acquainted with the amendment as you were.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman, to my way of thinking, made a reflection on the Chair, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw it if that is your way of thinking. In connection with this matter, I understood the Government were dealing with all sections of the [9.30 p.m.] public service, but those engaged in the Agent-General's office are

going to escape the 5 per cent. reduction. I think that those public servants outside the State should have their salaries reduced by 5 per cent., the same as has been done in connection with the public servants within the State. The reduction is brought about because the finances of the State are not in such a position as to warrant the continuation of the high wages that have been paid previously, and the Government, in order to reduce expenditure, have brought in the Bill.

The PREMIER: I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Forde.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Logan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Noes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Logan.

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

NOES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Forde.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: I claim the closure on the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier having claimed the closure on the clause, I will now put the question.

Question—That clause 2 be agreed to—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Logan and Mr. Nott.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 3—"Reduction of salaries"—

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): I have a new sub-clause to move after line 30, to read as follows:—

"Provided further that all automatic increases be allowed and paid."

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

I hope the Premier will not say that this is obstruction. We have maintained all the way through that, in addition to having a percentage taken off their salaries, the public servants also lose their automatic increases. I pointed out on the second reading that in some cases the public servants will lose £120 in three years. It is certainly unjust and unfair that the public servants over £300 should have to lose such large sums. I think the Premier should accept the amendment. The Secretary for Railways attempted to belittle this side by saying that when the Liberal Government were in power in 1914 they did not pay the automatic increases. It is true they were not paid then, but provision was made for them to be paid when the new Government came into office. The Liberal Government, true to its principles, did not make any election promises about paying the automatic increases on the eve of an election. They did not promise that, if they were returned to power, they would be paid. They thought more of their political integrity than to make such a promise. The Liberal party did not adopt low political methods. If the Liberal party had been returned to power the automatic increases would have been paid. The money was there for the new Government to pay when they came in.

Mr. BRENNAN: We gave the automatic increases, and your side opposed them.

Mr. SIZER: In view of the fact that salaries over £300 are reduced 5 per cent., it is only right that the automatic increases should be paid.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): When the war broke out in 1914 no one knew how things were going to turn out, and the Deuham Government proposed that there should be no automatic increases and no reduction of salaries. I was one of those who claimed that the automatic increase was a contract with the public servants, and, that being so, it should always be adhered to.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I support the amendment. It is a very important matter. The Public Service Commissioner prepared a scheme providing for certain increases in particular departments. Those getting from £300 to £400 were to receive an annual increment of £20 and those getting £400 to £600 were to get an annual increment of £25. That scheme was agreed to by the Government and the different unions concerned. It was properly drawn up and agreed to. This Bill is designed to get over that agreement. In a previous speech on this subject I referred to the Commonwealth Government service, in which there are also annual increments within certain classes. On inquiry I find that, not only are the annual increments or automatic increases going to be paid for 1922-23, but they also go a good deal further and receive £13 for each child, and in addition to that they are suffering no reduction of 5 per cent.

Mr. GLEDSON: Tell us what their basic wage is.

Mr. KERR: The salary of an officer over £300 a year is increased in accordance with the basic wage by an addition of £50. I say that the public servants of Queensland are

underpaid. Hon. members opposite—hypocrites I call them—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KERR: I withdraw that, but all the same I call them that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like to point out that under the clause the basic wage is not involved, and I hope the hon. member will deal with salaries over £300 a year.

Mr. KERR: That is quite correct, but through you, I had the courtesy to answer an interjection. Take the salary of an officer of this House of £460. In accordance with the agreement prepared by the Public Service Commissioner, he would have been entitled to an increase of £25 from 1st July last. In order to reach the top of his class, he would be entitled next year to an increase of £15. This year, with a 5 per cent. reduction, he loses, approximately, £50. In the second year he loses another £15, or £65 in all in that year, or a total of £115 in the small space of two years. If there were any compensating influence, I would not be so emphatic that these automatic increases should be granted to officers receiving over £300. In 1902 the Government of the day made due provision for income tax exemption. I quoted earlier to-day income tax figures to show that public servants are underpaid, and here they have no compensation in respect of income tax as they did in 1902, when, if a man had £450 salary, he paid no taxation until his earnings from personal exertion from other sources reached £150. I do not think the ramifications of the Bill are realised by the Government. It is most difficult to reconcile some of the statements made by hon. members opposite at the time of the general election and at the by-election for Paddington with their statements to-day. It is most surprising that hon. members should forget that they represent the people of the State, and should get away from that consideration to the personal element, and think, "If I do such and such a thing I shall lose my salary."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already pointed out to the hon. member that the amendment refers to automatic increases.

Mr. KERR: There is no doubt that it is a logical conclusion that no man should be asked to forfeit this large amount of £115. I have taken a special case, but, nevertheless, it is an existing case. If automatic increases were granted in that case, without any exemption from tax, all that the officer would lose would be his 5 per cent. reduction. What applies to salaries over £300 a year applies also to the basic wage. We know that the basic wage in 1902 had a greater purchasing power than the basic wage to-day.

Mr. BELCOCK: Do you mean to say that the basic wage of 1902 was assessed on the same basis as the basic wage to-day?

Mr. KERR: No. I have already stated that 6s. 6d. a day in 1902 gave a greater return than £4 5s. a week to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member again that he should deal with automatic increases, and not the basic wage.

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member had one spark of sympathy for the public servants,

he would not raise objections to this amendment. If he is forced by party discipline to vote as the Premier wishes, I would still crave his sympathy. I crave his [10 p.m.] sympathy in regard to the public servants whose automatic increases have been stopped. We will give the hon. member for Bremer and others an opportunity of doing the right thing in carrying out their pledges.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I rise to support the amendment. The public servants are fully entitled to have their increases.

Several hon. members interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I appeal to hon. members not to interject so freely while the hon. member for Cunningham is addressing the Chair.

Mr. DEACON: I will quote figures to show the position of certain officers in the Department of Public Instruction twenty-two years ago and their position to-day. I am taking for comparison some of the best schools in the service. The officer in charge at Leichhardt street has risen from £320, twenty-two years ago, to £480—a rise of a little over £7 a year. Under this Bill, the Government propose taking £24 a year off the salary of that officer. The teacher in charge at Ipswich has had a rise averaging a little over £20 a year during the last twenty-two years.

Mr. GLEDSON: He is not the same officer.

Mr. DEACON: I have the Blue Book, from which I have taken his position in the department twenty-two years ago, and the salary he is getting to-day.

Mr. GLEDSON: There was none there twenty-two years ago.

Mr. DEACON: This man was in the service of the department twenty-two years ago. It is now proposed to reduce him by £27 a year. The officer in charge at Fortitude Valley was getting £280 twenty-two years ago. He has had an average rise of about £10, and now is to be reduced by £25 6s. 6d. Mr. Hutcheon, at Kangaroo Point, twenty-two years ago was receiving £320. His rises have averaged about £10 a year, and now he is being reduced by £27 a year. The officer in charge at Breakfast Creek has had an average rise of £18 a year, and is to be reduced by £26 a year. When you have a contract, you want to keep it. I want to quote what the Premier said in Melbourne, at a conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers, on the subject of observing the terms of a contract. He said—

"We have no right to vary this agreement while one party to it dissents."

The PREMIER: A very good sentence. That was in connection with wheat prices.

Mr. DEACON: I am not going to wait for the "gag," so I will sit down. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

"Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Payne.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Costello.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Noes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 32.

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

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

NOES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Hartley.

Resolved in the negative.

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

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

The PREMIER: I claim the closure on clause 5.

Question—That clause 3, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Bulcock.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Logan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 4—"Exception"—

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

The CHAIRMAN put the question to the Committee, and declared in favour of the "Ayes." (Disorder.)

Mr. SIZER: I was speaking on the clause when you put it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Clause 4 has been carried.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting,

The CHAIRMAN: Did I understand the Premier to move the closure on clause 4?

The PREMIER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the question of the closure again.

Mr. VOWLES: Clause 4 was not put to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the leader of the Opposition that I did put clause 4 to the Committee, and the Premier moved the closure.

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

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the

"Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Larcombe
" Collins	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pollock
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Collins and Mr. Hartley.	

NOES, 32.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 4 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Larcombe
" Collins	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pollock
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Riordan.	

NOES, 32.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

[10.30 p.m.]

Clause 5—"Reduction not to alter seniority"—

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: Mr. Kirwan, I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

Mr. VOWLES: The question has not been debated.

The CHAIRMAN put the question, and declared the "Ayes" have it. (Disorder.)

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the question—

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: We called "Divide" on the previous question.

The CHAIRMAN: Did an hon. member call "Divide"?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Yes, I did.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. VOWLES: I claim that the question has not been debated.

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

Mr. VOWLES and other Opposition members thereupon left the Chamber in a body.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Walk out!

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxham
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Larcombe
" Collins	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pollock
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Winstanley
" Hartley	" Wilson
<i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Ferricks.	

NOES, 5.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Roberts, T. R.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Taylor
" Maxwell	

Tellers: Mr. Maxwell and Mr. T. R. Roberts.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

The whole of the members of the Opposition then left the Chamber in a body.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no tellers for the "Noes," I declare the question to be resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

Clause 6—"Rates of pension, etc., not affected by reduction"—

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put: and the Committee divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Logan
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Maxwell
.. Bell	.. Morgan
.. Brand	.. Peterson
.. Cattermull	.. Roberts, J. H. C.
.. Clayton	.. Roberts, T. R.
.. Deacon	.. Swayne
.. Edwards	.. Taylor
.. Green	.. Vowles
.. Jones, J.	.. Warren

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Warren.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—That clause 5, as read, stand part of the Bill. Those in favour say "Aye," on the contrary "No." The "Ayes" have it.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): "Divide" was called.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear anyone call "Divide."

Mr. VOWLES: "Divide" was called, and I drew your attention to it. You should not act in such an arbitrary way.

The PREMIER: I think "Divide" was called while the hon. member for Dalby was on his feet. There was a call from the corner.

The CHAIRMAN: I can assure the leader of the Opposition that I did not hear the call "Divide."

Mr. VOWLES: You should have heard it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is the common practice of leaders of parties to call "Divide," and the hon. member did not call "Divide." If I am assured that "Divide" was called, I will accept the assurance.

Mr. VOWLES: The Premier assured you.

Question—That clause 6, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

Members of the Opposition then left the Chamber.

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no tellers for the "Noes," I declare the question to be resolved in the affirmative.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That you do now leave the chair."

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 32.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Logan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Chairman leave the chair and report the Bill without amendment—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division.

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Ayes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 34.

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

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Walker.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.”

Mr. SIZER (*Vundah*): I wish to move—

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the “Ayes” as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Kirwan
„ Bulcock	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Conroy	„ McCormack (Proxy)
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Mullen
„ Cooper, W.	„ Payne
„ Coyne (Proxy)	„ Pease
„ Dash	„ Pollock
„ Dunstan	„ Riordan
„ Ferricks	„ Ryan
„ Foley	„ Smith
„ Forde	„ Stopford
„ Gilday (Proxy)	„ Theodore
„ Gillies (Proxy)	„ Weir
„ Gledson	„ Wellington
„ Hartley	„ Wilson
„ Huxham	„ Winstanley
„ <i>Tellers:</i> Mr. Pease and	Mr. Riordan.

NOES, 34.

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

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow—put and passed.

The House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.