

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER, 1922.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 11 a.m.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—FOURTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY.

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

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

LABOUR, FACTORIES, AND WORKERS' ACCOMMODATION.

Question stated—

“That £28,362 be granted for ‘Labour, Factories, and Workers’ Accommodation.’”

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): Mr. Kirwan—

Mr. MORGAN: Is this another stonewall?

Mr. GLEDSON: Yes. You will get all the stonewall you want before we have finished with you. Dealing with this vote last night I had occasion to say something. What I want to do to-day is to contradict statements that have been reported in the Press as having been made. I did not hear them made last night. I want to refer to the unfair criticism of my speech made by the Press. I am going to read what the “Daily Mail” says about my speech.

Mr. MORGAN: Does it say you “also spoke”? (Laughter.)

Mr. GLEDSON: Yes, it does. They are not even fair in that. They put in a criticism of my speech, but do not put in anything that I said. This is what the “Daily Mail” says—

“He was followed by Mr. Gledson (Labour, Ipswich), whom Mr. Warren (Country party, Murrumba) characterised as an advocate of class hatred, and a ‘downright slanderer of returned soldiers.’”

Mr. Gledson.]

That is the "Daily Mail" report of my speech—a cowardly attack, not even putting in what I said, but putting in the criticism of the hon. member for Murrumba of what I said.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is what you would expect from the "Daily Mail."

Mr. GLEDSON: This is what the "Courier" says—

"Mr. Gledson said that he wanted to protest against the efforts being made in certain quarters to set unionists and returned soldiers against one another, citing recent disputes in the building trade. He accused employers of endeavouring to use returned men to smash unionism."

They gave a report of portion of what I said. Then they followed it up with this—

"Mr. Warren protested against what he termed the slurs cast on returned soldiers by the member for Ipswich. He challenged Mr. Gledson to repeat his statements to a body of returned soldiers outside."

I accept that challenge. I place upon the table of the House the proof of my speech made last night, uncorrected by me. I will provide the hon. member for Murrumba, or any other hon. member of the Opposition, with reprints of that speech to send to every Returned Soldiers' Association in Queensland, if he will do so.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLEDSON: I cannot do anything fairer than that. That will show whether there is anything in the speech against returned soldiers, or whether I cast any slurs on them—as the hon. member for Murrumba is reported by the Press to have said I did. I do not know whether the hon. member said that or not. It is no good for members of the Opposition on this or any other vote to try to introduce misrepresentation. If I were to say that the man who made that statement was a liar you would pull me up. Mr. Kirvan, and say I was using unparliamentary language. I am not going to say it. But I do say that the statement is a tissue of falsehoods, and is not a correct interpretation of my speech or of any action of mine at any time in connection with returned soldiers. I am not going to say any more just now; I may have an opportunity, on some of the other votes, of dealing with some of the tactics of the Opposition in connection with the unionists of our State.

Question put and passed.

THE GAS ACT OF 1916.

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

"That there be granted £1,778 for the Gas Act of 1916."

The amount expended last year was £1,563. There is a decrease in the vote this year of £37.

Question put and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

CHIEF OFFICE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

"That there be granted £17,885 for 'Chief Office.'"

[*Mr. Gledson.*

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): In connection with this office I want to enter a protest on behalf of the two unfortunate officers who had to go out with two detectives. I do not think it is a fair thing that public servants should be put in a position like that. The men were taken from the Department of Justice and were forced to act in a position that they should not have been asked to act in. I do not think it is fair that the department should subject its officers to an unfortunate position like that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Does the hon. gentleman object to wrongdoers being brought to justice?

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: The hon. gentleman objects to the existence of a Police Force or detectives.

Mr. MOORE: I do not. I object to public servants who are not engaged for this work being forced to participate in something that very likely they strongly object to because they might lose their jobs if they do not do what they are told.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member for Aubigny and other hon. members will realise the position I am in. This case is sub judice. I do not want to prevent the hon. member protesting, but it is distinctly unwise to discuss the merits or demerits of the case. The hon. member will realise that, if he is allowed to do that, a general discussion might take place, and I, as Chairman, will have to prevent it. I think the hon. member under all the circumstances, should refrain from discussing the merits or demerits of the case.

Mr. MOORE: I have not the slightest intention of touching upon the case at all, or of dealing with its merits or demerits. I only intend to touch upon the unfortunate position of public servants who have been forced to do work that they are really not entitled to do. We know perfectly well that it was unfair to take them from their ordinary positions and ask them to undertake a task which they had no right to be asked to undertake. If I were a public servant, I would have strongly objected. There are detectives, and I suppose reporters, who could have been procured for that class of work.

Mr. PEASE: It is the duty of the Department of Justice to unearth criminals.

Mr. MOORE: I feel quite justified in making a protest on behalf of those two men.

Mr. PEASE: Have they asked you to make a protest?

Mr. MOORE: No. I do not know either of them. They have not the opportunity of coming into this Chamber and making a protest on their own behalf. I judge that their feelings would be probably much the same as mine. If I was asked to do that work, I would strongly object to being used in that capacity. I do not think it is a fair thing that public servants should be asked to do that sort of thing.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murillo*): I would like to ask the Minister why the Government are not going on with the Bill that was promised to control racing in Queensland. I think the Minister and all hon. members will admit that the time is rotten ripe for a Bill to be introduced for the purpose of controlling racing in Queensland. Anyone who has any knowledge of racing as it exists in Queensland to-day, must admit that the time has

arrived when the evil influences that are attached to racing should be controlled, and, if possible, abolished. I am not one of those who are in favour of abolishing horseracing altogether. It is a very large industry.

Mr. COLLINS: What? A large industry?

Mr. MORGAN: A very large industry; it means the consumption of a great amount of produce, and the growing of that produce gives employment to thousands of workmen; and a large amount of employment is created in connection with other things necessary in the conduct of horseracing. I certainly think the Minister should bring in a Bill for the purpose of controlling horseracing.

Mr. PEASE: I never tried to rob the public by painting a racehorse.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member evidently knows something about it. I believe he charged exorbitant prices for groceries to men engaged in railway construction work. By that means he made thousands of pounds, and now he has become a professional politician. He is following the profession of a gentleman with no occupation.

Mr. PEASE: I would sooner be a professional politician than paint a racehorse to rob the public.

Mr. MORGAN: I never robbed the railway employees.

Mr. PEASE: I was never warned off a racecourse.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member is now living the life of a gentleman on the money he got from the employees on railway construction works. He ought to be totally ashamed of himself. A man who would rob railway employees, who only get a few shillings a day, would rob anybody, and now he is living the life of a gentleman and does no work for his living other than that of a member of Parliament. I am one of those who think the Minister has been wrongly advised. It has been stated that sufficient influence has been brought to bear on the Government to prevent the Minister introducing this Bill.

Mr. HARTLEY: What influence do you refer to?

Mr. MORGAN: I refer to the influence exercised by a man known as John Wren.

Mr. PEASE: Do you know anything about the influence brought to bear by Hugh McIntosh to get Parkhill to resign in favour of Mr. Hughes?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not know John Wren, but I know that he is the man who was connected with the totalisator scandals for many years in the Commonwealth. It is a well-known fact that, when opposition is brought to bear on any movement with which he is connected, he adopts the American method of not fighting the opposition but of buying it. That is a well-known method. It is rumoured throughout Queensland, more especially in Brisbane, that Mr. Wren has been successful in buying the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! The hon. member is not in order in saying that the Government have been bought, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. MORGAN: I did not say they have been bought.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I distinctly heard the hon. member say that

a certain person named John Wren was buying the Government, and I hope the hon. member will withdraw.

Mr. MORGAN: I said it was rumoured.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman is not going to shuffle in that way.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not want to shuffle.

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

Mr. MORGAN: I state now that I said it was rumoured, and I leave it to the Press reporters and to the "Hansard" staff.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I leave it to the reporters to say—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I said it was rumoured, and, if I am out of order—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement. I would not ask him to do so if the term was not unparliamentary.

Mr. MORGAN: If it is unparliamentary to say "it was rumoured in Brisbane," I withdraw it. Those were my words. I said it was rumoured.

Mr. GLEDSON: You did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. MORGAN: I did. I am prepared to take the shorthand writers' report. I said it was rumoured about Brisbane that the Government had been bought.

Mr. GLEDSON: You said that John Wren had adopted the American method of buying opponents.

Mr. MORGAN: Exactly; and I said it was rumoured around Brisbane that the Government had been bought.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I still say that Mr. Wren adopts the American method of buying opposition, and it is rumoured around Brisbane that the Government had been bought by Mr. Wren not to introduce the Bill, which, we were told by the Press, had been prepared and was ready for circulation. The Minister in charge of this department, in interviews with the Press, distinctly stated time after time that the time was ripe for legislation to be brought in to control proprietary racing in and around Brisbane. He also said, by inference, if the Press is to be taken as correct, that the Bill had been prepared, and that all that was necessary was to introduce it. In connection with the Governor's Speech, it was most noticeable that there was no reference to the introduction of a Bill to control proprietary racing.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Your Government prepared a lot of Bills that never saw the light of day.

Mr. MORGAN: Independent of any particular racecourse proprietor, the time is ripe for doing away with proprietary racing altogether in Queensland. It is the policy of the Labour party to do away with proprietary or individual concerns, no matter whether in connection with business or any other matter.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What did they do with proprietary racing in Victoria, where you came from?

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: The fact that I came from Victoria has nothing to do with what happens there. I was not a legislator in Victoria and I was just as much against proprietary racing in Victoria as I am against it in Queensland; but there was no reason why there should not be proprietary racing under a Liberal Government because it was not contrary to their platform, but the nationalisation of industries is a plank of the Labour platform. It is well known that from £50,000 to £60,000 a year goes away South from Queensland owing to the fact that racing is conducted here by strong proprietary racing companies. It is no use denying that; the Premier knows it. It is well worth while for Mr. Wren and those connected with him to buy a Government, if a Government is up for sale. A man like Mr. Wren would not hesitate for a moment to buy either a Minister or an individual member or Government supporters in order to prevent a Bill from being introduced. There is no doubt something has happened. Everybody in the street knows that something has happened, and all the knowing men are nodding their heads and winking, knowing full well that Mr. Wren has succeeded in getting exemption from this particular Bill, owing to the fact that the Government have, in some way, been approached and have not thought it worth while to place the measure on the statute-book. No doubt there are members on that side of the House—

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Murilla in order in saying that the Government have been approached by John Wren successfully to keep a certain Bill from being introduced in this Chamber?

Mr. MORGAN: You are putting words into my mouth.

Mr. COLLINS: I cannot sit here and allow these insults to be hurled across the Chamber. I know nothing about it, and I am sitting behind the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the hon. member for Murilla say that, and I have been following him pretty closely. If the hon. member made the statement, he will certainly have to withdraw it.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not think I said that. I am satisfied you are following me very closely, Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. COLLINS: I am going to insist on my point of order. Other hon. members on this side of the Chamber heard the words mentioned by me.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): My recollection of the hon. member for Murilla's remarks is that he said that the knowing ones in the street were nodding and winking, and that it was well known that Mr. Wren had approached the Government, and that, as a result, a certain measure, which was promised, had been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out to the hon. member for Murilla that he is not in order in suggesting or charging the Government with having been approached or with being guilty of corrupt practices. That is distinctly unparliamentary, and is out of order. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. MORGAN: If the hon. gentleman is right in saying that I made that statement, I will withdraw it. I am sure there are members on the other side who would like

to see racing in Queensland improved. I am sure they would like to see the sport much cleaner than it is at present. I know there are hon. members opposite who would like to see the profits go to some other purpose instead of going into the pockets of private individuals. The profits should be distributed for the purpose of providing better facilities on the grounds. Better facilities can be provided for the horses, and the grounds can be improved and made to look more like a park. That would be much better than the present system. I am sure that there are members opposite who agree that the time is ripe for a Bill to be introduced to control racing. In Victoria they have legislation controlling racing. Here we have a system of control under the Queensland Turf Club. I am not altogether enamoured of the management of the Queensland Turf Club, because the Queensland Turf Club has done nothing for the encouragement of racing; in fact, I do not think the Queensland Turf Club has done any more to encourage the breeding of thoroughbreds than, perhaps, Mr. Wren has done.

Mr. HARTLEY: There are just as many jokes put up on the public at Ascot as on any other course in Queensland or on John Wren's courses.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not say that the racing at Albion Park is not as clean as the racing at Ascot, where it is conducted by the Queensland Turf Club. I am not altogether in favour of the way racing is being conducted by the Queensland Turf Club. I think that all racing should be controlled in Queensland. The time is ripe when we should pass an Act of Parliament to do away with so many short races. It would be much better for racing if we had legislation to prevent clubs from introducing so many short races, because the short races do not help the breeding of thoroughbreds at all. The idea of encouraging racing is to give us a chance to breed remounts for army purposes, and not to allow individuals to run it simply from a gambling point of view. If we are going to encourage the breeding of remounts, then we shall have to do away with short races altogether. Racing is carried out in such a way in Queensland at the present time that anything that can gallop at all is put into a race. It does not matter if a horse is crooked in the legs and has other blemishes; provided it can gallop, it is put into a race. So far as the breeding of remounts is concerned, racing at present is not beneficial in any shape or form. It is purely and simply carried out for the purpose of gambling.

Mr. POLLOCK: Was it ever conducted for any other purpose?

Mr. MORGAN: We should make provision for long-distance racing on every programme. We should do away with all the light weights. We should pass a law prohibiting any club from having a weight less than 7 stone 7 lb. At the present time there are a number of lads encouraged to act as jockeys. Because of the light weights, these lads have to sweat and reduce their weight. That affects their health, and they become consumptive. It is nothing but the light weights put on horses nowadays that brings about that system. If any of these lads become experienced jockeys, they have to go out of the game owing to the fact that the weights put upon the horses are too

[Mr. Morgan.]

light. They all have to sweat themselves and bring down their weights, and that only injures their health. Racing at present is injurious to the people of Queensland. If we take an area of 25 miles around Brisbane, we shall find that they have racing on every day of the week except Sunday, and sometimes they have two race meetings on one day. Hon. members opposite must admit that what I say is true. I am not against racing. I believe in racing if it is properly conducted; but we should endeavour to make it clean. We shall never clean it unless we step in and take a hand and control racing ourselves. The Queensland Turf Club will not do anything. As a body, they have got into a rut, and they are not prepared to get out of that rut. The Minister in charge of this department knows as well as I do that he would like to get rid of proprietary racing. I am sorry that we ever allowed it to come into Queensland. It was a mistake for any Government to allow it to get a foothold here, but, unfortunately, it has got a foothold. I say it is doing an injury to the people. The £50,000 or more which is leaving Queensland and going into the pockets of men who do not live here—absentee landlords, of whom hon. members opposite talk so much—should be spent here in improving prizes. Prizes should be awarded at the different agricultural shows for horses of the proper stamp. If the Queensland Turf Club and the other clubs wish to encourage the breeding of horses of that kind, they could offer prizes for stallions to be placed in different parts of Queensland; but they do not encourage the introduction of good blood in any shape or form. All that they do is to conduct racing once a week or once a month, as the case may be. The Government have miserably failed in this matter. I believe that a huge majority of members opposite are in favour of something being done. Why has something intervened? The Minister can get up and clear the atmosphere. If he can give us an explanation he will be able to satisfy the public outside. They are anxious and curious to know what has happened to prevent the Government from introducing this legislation. They are anxious to know if the Government have been bought by Mr. Wren.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I have allowed the hon. member a fair amount of latitude, and I am certainly not going to permit him to abuse his privileges as a member of this House. For the benefit of the hon. member I shall read from the Standing Orders and "May" on the subject. Standing Order 120 is very definite on the question—

"A member shall not digress from the subject-matter under discussion, or comment upon expressions used by another member in a previous debate of the same session; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections, shall be deemed highly disorderly."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: "May," on page 297, says—

"The use of temperate and decorous language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate. The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged; misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his

turn of misrepresentation; charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind;—all these are unparliamentary, and call for prompt interference."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the hon. member to withdraw his statement and apologise to the Committee.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: I do not see that I can do anything else. If it is your ruling, I certainly withdraw. I also wish to state—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I called upon the hon. member to withdraw and apologise to the Committee, and I hope he will obey my ruling.

Mr. MORGAN: Very well, I will obey your ruling.

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

Mr. MORGAN: What am I to do—go down on my knees?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is an old member of this House, and when he is called upon by the Chair to apologise, he knows the method to adopt before he proceeds with his speech.

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw and apologise. Hon. members opposite have spoken very frequently in this Chamber of proprietary racing, and also of racing generally as conducted in and around Brisbane, and it has not been long afterwards that we have had a silence on the part of those individuals. Some time ago a motion was carried unanimously in this House, on the motion of the late hon. member for Carnarvon, Mr. Donald Gunn, to the effect that the Government should bring in a Bill for the purpose of doing away with proprietary racing. The Premier has taken no notice of that resolution. Why?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Did you raise your voice against it?

Mr. MORGAN: I have raised my voice against it ever since I have been in this House. When Mr. Donald Gunn sat on the other side of the House and moved that resolution, I was one of those [11.30 a.m.] who fell in behind him and supported him in every shape and form. I held the same views then as I hold now. We know that at the time when Mr. Gunn brought forward that motion a certain gentleman approached him outside, sounding him as to whether he would be prepared to drop it. Mr. Gunn was the wrong sort of man to attempt to bribe; you could not bribe him, and the attempt was ineffective. Why have hon. members opposite changed their tune? Nobody has ever approached me, because they know the reception they would get. I am not like certain hon. members who may be looked upon as fit subjects for bribing; they would not be able to approach me.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Murilla said that he is not like hon. members on this side—fit subjects for bribes.

Mr. MORGAN: I said, "Who may be."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope that the hon. member for Murilla will withdraw that statement. I have already read to the

Mr. Morgan.]

hon. member the Standing Order dealing with the question, and I have quoted to him the passage from "May." If I have to take action again, it will be drastic action that I shall take. The hon. member must withdraw the statement that any hon. member of this House is open to be bribed.

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw. One hon. member has admitted—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I ask that the hon. member for Murilla be made to apologise also.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: One hon. member has already admitted that someone approached him offering a bribe. I said there may be members on that side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: If any man approached me and offered me a bribe, it would not be a court case; it would be a question of whether he was a better man than I. In connection with this particular matter, the people outside want to know why this Bill has not been introduced. I hope the Minister will give an explanation and not quibble. I hope he will not remain like an oyster, but will let the public outside know why he has not fulfilled the promise which was made to the people that a Bill would be introduced for the purpose of cleansing racing and bringing it under the control it should be under, so that we would not have happening to-day that which, unfortunately, is happening in Queensland generally.

Mr. POLLOCK: How would you cleanse racing?

Mr. MORGAN: I have no time to go into the details of the matter. There are many evils which you cannot do away with. Any sensible man knows that racing is an evil that you cannot do away with. Gambling is another. But you can control them. People will have racing; people will gamble; but when a thing becomes an evil, it is the duty of the Government to bring in legislation which will minimise the evil and control it. Hon. members opposite know that there are evils existing in connection with racing to-day. They should endeavour to cleanse racing of those evils. We should take control instead of allowing the conditions to remain as they are—a disgrace to Queensland.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fit:roy*): It is just as well that the hon. member has brought this question up. I hope that during the discussion the Standing Orders will be strained to their utmost limits to give hon. members opposite every opportunity to make the most definite charge they possible can against this Government in any particular in connection with this business of whether the Department of Justice should control racing—whether there is any reason which has induced the department to refrain from controlling it. I hope that hon. members, if they have any real spirit of fair play and squareness about them, and if they have the slightest scintilla of evidence or suggestion of evidence that any influence of a monetary nature has ever been exerted with this Government, will have the manliness to stand up and say so, and move for the appointment either of a Select Committee of the House or of a Royal Commission to inquire into it. I assure them that they will get my vote, and I am pretty sure that their

[*Mr. Morgan.*

action will have the concurrence of the House.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: I hope they will do that if they have any bona fide item that looks like evidence to support any of the rotten suggestions of the Press outside. The hon. member for Murilla on this question takes up the same attitude as many other opponents of this Government that I have heard. All he can do is to repeat the parrot cry, "Why do not the Government control racing?" I have never heard anyone suggest a tangible plan for the control of racing.

Mr. MORGAN: We are not supposed to work out the details; that is the business of the Government.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. member and those who think with him are the advocates of this reform; they say that we are not in sympathy with it. They claim to know where the evils exist. If an evil does exist, the hon. member knows that there is a possible remedy. Why not come forward with some scheme for the control of racing? I want to remind the House that the first vote I gave in this Chamber was against my party, when they had a majority of twenty-four, on the question of the control or abolition of proprietary racing; I voted on the other side of the House. I have no hesitation in saying now, with a more intimate acquaintance with racing than I had at that time, that I would hesitate to give a vote in the same way again. When you start to talk about the control of racing the first question you have to face is, How are you going to control it? What would be the authoritative body? Are you going to make it a State monopoly? Are you going to make it a State industry?

Mr. MORGAN: We do not intend to do that—an Act under which they would work.

Mr. HARTLEY: You would have to appoint an authority. Would you have a State department administering it?

Mr. MORGAN: Why go into all the details?

Mr. HARTLEY: The first thing you have to face is the appointment of an authority. You have to select men who will be just as unapproachable and have just as high integrity as hon. members on this side. Most people are enamoured of the Queensland Turf Club. Let me say straight out that I have been on their courses and watched the horses running; I have followed their form, and my experience has been—and it is supported by some of the leading newspapers—that some of the roughest jokes have been put up by some of the biggest owners racing under the Queensland Turf Club. If you set out to appoint a body to control racing, what is your first step? You have to appoint handicappers, stewards, and judges to look after the racing. The department would never be out of difficulty; there would always be men who had complaints against the judges, the stewards, and the handicappers. If you bring in a Bill to control racing, what are you going to do with the bookmakers? Supposing you say you would wipe them out, what would the effect be? All betting would have to be done by means of the totalisator, which is a proprietary concern. You would simply be making big fortunes for the two or three men who control the totalisator system of Australia.

Mr. POLLOCK: And who do not live in the State.

Mr. HARTLEY: And who do not live in this State, as my friend reminds me. If you do not abolish bookmakers, if you license them, you will be legalising betting. That is a foundation fact which has to be recognised. The minute you step in you are going to legalise betting; you will have to make laws for the recovery of all debts—which means that you will be encouraging betting and encouraging gambling. I think there is a good deal of racing that is not in the best interests of the development of the horses. In what way that can be remedied I am not prepared to say. I know very well that racing associations outside Brisbane are not at all in favour of having racing controlled by any of the existing clubs or associations in Brisbane, whether it be the Queensland Turf Club or any other association. They prefer to control their racing as they are doing now. There is a difference in the racing controlled by a proprietary owner—John Wren—and racing controlled by club rules. I would draw the attention of hon. members opposite to what was responsible for the existence of proprietary racecourses in Queensland today. It was under their Government—I think the late Mr. K. M. Grant was Home Secretary at the time—that Albion Park was licensed as a racecourse. Kedron Park was also licensed under their Government. If they were so keen in safeguarding the community against the so-called evil of proprietary racing, how is it that they allowed those two courses to be licensed? They have enabled John Wren to make the big income that he is now making. Just by saying "No," they could easily have prevented that in the very beginning. There is a difference between Queensland Turf Club racing and racing at Kedron Park. I have been in this House over seven years, and I have been on the Kedron Park racecourse once, but I have followed their affairs fairly closely through the papers, and anyone who has watched the reports of the meetings at Kedron Park will see every now and again that it is reported that the stewards in connection with such and such a race were not satisfied with the position of a certain horse in the betting, and that he was recalled from the barrier and a jockey with the club colours was put on, with the satisfactory result that the horse won, or, perhaps, ran second. The betting was immediately affected, perhaps, to the extent of bringing an absolute outsider in some cases to second favourite, and sometimes to favourite. Do you ever see that on Albion Park? Do you ever see that at the Queensland Turf Club meetings? You do not. No matter what arguments may be adduced so far as John Wren is concerned, while he is conducting racing for the public, he must conduct it on commercial lines. I have never seen or spoken to John Wren or any of his agents in my life. To play the tricks on his course that are played on other courses would mean that he would soon lose the patronage of the public. That is the difference between proprietary-owned racecourses and those controlled by the Queensland Turf Club. I wish to emphasise that, if there is anything in the suggestion of hon. members opposite about any inducement being given to this Government to induce them to refrain from controlling racing, I hope that hon. members opposite will have the common decency of descendants of the British race and say it in plain language, and let us have a clean investigation into the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): The objections to the control of racing from hon. members opposite—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not objections, but difficulties.

Mr. TAYLOR: Have been in the direction of asking why previous Administrations did not take certain action. I do not see why that should come into the discussion at all. What we have to consider this morning is whether racing is beneficial to the community or not. I do not think there is an hon. member opposite who believes that it is. I certainly do not. If every one was like myself, there would be no racecourses at all, because I never frequent them. I view racing in this way: There is a big expenditure of money associated with it, and Governments get a fair amount of revenue from the transport of the people by train and from the totalisator; but, notwithstanding the revenue which Governments may derive from that source, I think the great objective of Governments should be to see all that money directed into such channels that the greatest good and best results will eventuate to the whole community. The hon. member for Fitzroy was trying to make a policy for racing. There is not an hon. member opposite who, if he had a son, would bring him up as a jockey.

Mr. PEASE: There are some very honourable men amongst jockeys.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not saying that there are not. There is not an hon. member opposite—although there are decent jockeys—who would like to see his son brought up as a jockey. We recognise that there are difficulties in connection with this matter, but have we not had to encounter difficulties in all our legislation? For what reason have Governments done something to regulate the drink traffic? They have passed laws to deal with that business. Why? Because they believe that, if that traffic or that business was allowed to go uncontrolled, it would operate to the detriment of the community. The same thing applies to proprietary and other forms of racing. Is it in the best interests of the people of Queensland that we should have racing nearly every day in the week, as is the case at present? If hon. members would take notice of the men who follow up racing, they would find that those men would be better employed in useful toil. The whole thing is simply one huge gambling concern.

Mr. HARTLEY: It is no worse than the hon. gentleman's business. His is a surer gamble.

Mr. TAYLOR: There is a difference. If the hon. member comes to my place of business and puts down a pound, he gets a pound's worth of goods.

Mr. HARTLEY: What did the hon. gentleman give for it?

Mr. TAYLOR: Never mind. He would get a pound's worth of goods. It is quite evident that some hon. members opposite do not really know what gambling is. My definition is this: One, or a dozen, or 100, or 500, or 1,000 people contribute their money and get nothing back, but it all goes to the enrichment of one person. That is what is happening on the racecourses, and that is what is happening in connection with all forms of gambling that we have in the State to-day. Cannot legislation be introduced to say that there shall not be any more private racecourses licensed, that all men associated

Mr. Taylor.]

with the racing business shall be registered, and that they shall be men of good moral character? I cannot understand hon. members opposite when they say that it is impossible to control proprietary racing, considering that there are so many concerns at the present time controlled by Parliament and various organisations. It is said that the difficulties are so tremendous that we cannot do anything to control racing. I think that, in the very best interests of the young people of this community, racing should be cut out as soon as ever it can possibly be done. You have practically one of the biggest State schools situated right alongside the Kedron Park Racecourse. I do not say that I would be in favour of cutting racing out altogether, but, if it could be so brought about that the gambling element associated with racing were cut out, it would be in the best interests of the whole of us. What are the most popular events of the Royal National Association show held at Bowen Park every year? The ring events—trotting. Is there any betting on these events?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR: If there is any at all, there is very little. Yet people go to the annual exhibition, and they sit in the grandstand from 11 o'clock in the morning till nearly 5 o'clock in the afternoon watching the ring events. There are no bookmakers there betting on those ring events, though there may be a little private betting of a moderate character. Horseracing is a splendid sport, and I should like to see it maintained as a clean healthy sport with the gambling cut out. Then we would not have the trouble that exists to-day; but so long as it exists, not only in Queensland, but in Australia, simply as a means by which people can get something for nothing, then it is in the worst interests of the community, and it should not be allowed to continue. I asked the Minister the other day if it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to deal with horseracing, and the reply I got was that the intentions of the Government would be disclosed in due course. I certainly think the time has arrived when the Government should make some attempt to see if they cannot stop this evil growth which is taking such a tremendous hold on the whole of the community.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): The hon. member for Murilla has certainly laid himself out this morning to misrepresent the actions of hon. members on this side, and he apparently made an attempt to be suspended from this Chamber. I do not know whether he has any cattle to shift on this occasion.

Mr. MORGAN: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. POLLOCK: When the hon. member was suspended previously, it was stated that he had cattle to shift and he wanted a few days' holiday.

Mr. MORGAN: That is untrue.

Mr. POLLOCK: That was the rumour in the lobbies.

Mr. MORGAN: I deny that.

Mr. POLLOCK: Of course the hon. member says things and denies them afterwards, so I do not take much notice of that. If he denies it, although I believe he was responsible, according to parliamentary procedure I have to accept his denial. The hon. member made no effort to deal with this question in a broadminded way. All he did was to endeavour to blacken the

characters of members on this side of the House. He had no foundation for his remarks, and had no idea that what he said had any truth in it. He merely endeavoured to show that a certain man had approached members of this party, and that this party had practically agreed to those approaches, because no attempt was made to deal with proprietary racing. The hon. member sat behind a Liberal Government for a long time without making any effort of a serious nature to deal with proprietary racing when it was a much worse thing than it is to-day.

Mr. MORGAN: No.

Mr. POLLOCK: I can prove it, if the hon. member will keep quiet. At that time the hon. member could have raised a row—so also could the late member for Carnarvon—and could have been successful in having proprietary racing dealt with in its early stages. To-day, the hon. member does not want proprietary racing dealt with.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not true.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the hon. member wanted it dealt with, he could have moved a motion on private members' day.

Mr. MORGAN: We carried one to abolish it, and you voted for the motion.

Mr. POLLOCK: He could have had the question debated, and, if necessary, carried by this House. There is no business in this carping criticism—in the attempt to prove that members on this side of the House have listened to the voice of a man who, as he says, is prepared to buy these concessions. There is no doubt what the hon. member meant when he said that. He went as near to saying that members on this side of the House have been bribed, as he could possibly go without fracturing the Standing Orders.

Mr. VOWLES: There is a rumour that the bookmakers are subscribing the funds.

Mr. POLLOCK: No doubt the hon. member knows all about the Wando Vale rumours.

Mr. VOWLES: There is a rumour that the bookmakers subscribed a certain amount of money in connection with the withdrawal of the Bill for the control of horse racing.

Mr. POLLOCK: To whom did they subscribe it?

Mr. VOWLES: We do not know. That is what we want to know.

Mr. POLLOCK: For what purpose?

Mr. VOWLES: For the withdrawal of the Bill. It is public property that the money has been subscribed.

Mr. POLLOCK: That money has been subscribed?

Mr. VOWLES: Yes.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member knows more about it than I do, and more about it than members on this side. Who is your authority?

Mr. VOWLES: My authority is a man who paid ten guineas.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why don't you produce him?

Mr. HARLEY: Give his name.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the hon. member will give his name and will move for a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter, I will support him. That is a fair thing to do, if he is a man; and, if he is not a man, then he should keep quiet.

[*Mr. Taylor.*]

Proprietary racing was established under the Liberal Government and conducted under different conditions to those which exist to-day. Every registered club—and the proprietary clubs, in the main, are registered clubs—must be registered with the Queensland Turf Club; and they must have their racing dates allotted to them by the committee of the parent body—the Queensland Turf Club—and that body is elected by the members of the Queensland Turf Club. Whether there are more dates given to proprietary racing than are fair and just is a matter for the Queensland Turf Club. When proprietary racing was first established, the Albion Park Jockey Club was registered by the Queensland Turf Club under the Liberal Government. That syndicate was composed, without exception, of men with Tory principles—not members of Parliament, but men who had advanced Tory opinions. The Queensland Turf Club committee were nearly all members of the syndicate which controlled Albion Park at that time. The syndicate that started Albion Park, and which was registered by the Queensland Turf Club committee, consisted of A. Hyde, secretary of the Queensland Turf Club; R. Newton, father-in-law of the hon. member for Merthyr; G. Byrne, barrister and acting judge; W. Richardson, handicapper of the Queensland Turf Club; and D. T. Seymour, ex-Commissioner of Police under the Liberal Government. Races were run every week, and five out of six events were for £15 in prizes—£12 to the winner, £2 to the second horse, and £1 to the third horse. At that time a prize of £12 for the winning horse actually meant that an owner had to win one out of every two races before he could buy ordinary feed for his horse, let alone pay the expenses for shoeing, riding fees, nomination fees, acceptance fees, and every other fee connected with the expensive business of horseracing. At that time, under the proprietary racing run by hon. members opposite, the poor man who had a horse could not afford to race him. The sport was one for the wealthy owner, who could afford to go down there, enter a horse for a race worth £12, and put £50 on him in the event of its having a chance of winning, and then he had to win very frequently, or else the owner had to be a big man, in order to make a living. Can any member on the other side say that the position of proprietary racing to-day—and I am not advocating it—is as bad as it was then?

Mr. MORGAN: It is as bad as when you made that speech against it here.

Mr. POLLOCK: No. At the time I made that speech the average amount of the prizes was £100 at Albion Park [12 p.m.] and at every club registered under the auspices of the Queensland Turf Club. Everyone knows that.

Mr. MORGAN: There were £15 programmes in operation.

Mr. POLLOCK: £15 programmes were not in operation when I made that statement. I am no more in favour of proprietary racing than I was then, but I want to show the hypocrisy of hon. members opposite who raise a howl against the Government and say they are willing to accept money to permit proprietary racing, when they sat down quietly when things were a thousand times worse than they are to-day. Proprietary racing, with all its faults, has been responsible for increasing the prize money

to such an extent that the poor man who has a horse has a chance of racing it; but previously no poor man with a horse had a chance of racing it. One of the objections of hon. members opposite is that to-day so many poor men are coming into the game. The Queensland Turf Club, as the parent body which controls racing in Queensland, has certainly done a good deal for racing, but, if we gave control of racing to the Queensland Turf Club—

Mr. MORGAN: Why not have a Bill brought in like they have in Victoria, and have the racing supervised by the local authorities, under the control of the Government?

Mr. POLLOCK: Who would control it then? You would have the Minister in charge of the department controlling it; if we had the Minister controlling it, the hon. member would still say that the Minister was not doing right. No matter who had control, we would still have the howl of the hon. member for Murilla that the Government were getting something out of it. Does the hon. member say that the same remarks were not passed about the Commonwealth Government when the control of racing was handed over to the Defence Department? Does he say that the same insinuations were not made against Mr. Hughes and Senator Pearce when they were controlling proprietary racing and all racing during the war? Everybody said that the members of the Hughes Government were getting "graft" from John Wren, but I do not believe it.

Mr. MORGAN: Why not abolish proprietary racing altogether? Are you in favour of it?

Mr. POLLOCK: I will say in my own way what I think. I am not here to be put in the witness box by the hon. member.

Mr. MORGAN: Let us know what you think.

Mr. POLLOCK: My opinion of proprietary racing is this:—It has done nothing else, it has increased the prize money on all the racecourses around here, including the proprietary racecourses. John Wren certainly did raise the prize money, and he forced the Queensland Turf Club to raise it, so that racing can now be a profitable game for the poor as well as the rich.

Mr. MORGAN: Have you changed your views?

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not change my views as much as the hon. member. The hon. member knows that on this question I am quite consistent and say what I think, and I am not going to be led into saying something which I do not think. The hon. member for Windsor said that racing is merely the hot-bed of gambling. Everybody knows that. The hon. member for Toombul, as an old proprietor of a racecourse, knows that. He was one of the proprietors of a proprietary racecourse, and he knows that, unless you have gambling, you cannot have racing. People go to the racecourse, not because they are lovers of the thoroughbred—

Mr. PERRIE: I lost a lot of money.

Mr. POLLOCK: I believe the hon. member lost a lot of money. The hon. member was originally interested in one of the proprietary racecourses and so were his friends, but I am not accusing the hon. member of anything improper. I know that, if you cut out the gambling from racecourses, you would mighty soon have no racecourses at all. Why

Mr. Pollock.]

does the hon. member for Murilla go there? Does he go to see the improvement in thoroughbreds or to win a few pounds?

Mr. MORGAN: To see the horses. I often do not make a bet.

Mr. POLLOCK: I go to the racecourse occasionally, and I go, if possible, to win money. Nine out of ten of the public who go to the races would not know which end of a horse to put a bridle on, and the hon. member knows that. He also knows that the majority of the women who gamble would go to a "two-up" school if it was under the patronage of the Government. The gambling spirit is in most of us. If you cut out racing, you will have people going to the Terriers Club and places of that kind.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not want to have it cut out.

Mr. POLLOCK: You can be a member of Tattersall's Club for a guinea a year and go down and have a gamble. I do not object to it. It is a fair thing to let people have a gamble if they want it. It does not matter in what form it is—in connection with clubs, racecourses, "Golden Caskets," or other forms of gambling—people will gamble.

Mr. MORGAN: Don't you think it ought to be controlled?

Mr. POLLOCK: I believe there ought to be a restriction of the number of racing days. I have altered my views about the total abolition of proprietary racing. I believe that competition in racing is fairly healthy. The competition of proprietary racing clubs has certainly forced the Queensland Turf Club to give additional prize money, has enabled owners to draw decent prizes for their horses, and has given everybody a chance of going to a racecourse with the opportunity of getting a win. But I believe there should be a restriction of racing, and I am not particular who has the majority of racing days. I believe that a reduction of racing days can be made, and I believe that less racing than is going on now should be brought about. That would not only be of benefit to the public, but to the benefit of the Queensland Turf Club and proprietary racing concerns and everybody concerned. I believe it would be a very good thing in the metropolitan area if that was done; but how is it to be done? Is it to be done by the Government having control of it? Then the Queensland Turf Club would be protesting to the Minister that John Wren got more racing dates than they did; and John Wren would be accused of buying the Ministry in connection with the number of racing days allowed. The hon. member would never dream of allowing the Government to control racing.

Mr. MORGAN: That is wrong. I would have an Act of Parliament to control it.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member was at one time the deciding factor behind a Government that could have done it, and he did not exercise his power. Mr. Donald Gunn and himself were men who could have exerted some authority with the Ministry of the day, and could have dealt with this thing in its early stages, but they did not take the necessary action. Was it because they had changed their minds? I am not saying that anyone bought them. I am not going to say that anyone comes into this Chamber and buys a Government on the question, or attempts to induce them by "graft" to drop

[Mr. Pollock.

a Bill; but it would be just as right for me to say that hon. members opposite are bought, as for the hon. member to say the things he has said against us to-day. On the question of being purchased by the man to whom the hon. member for Murilla refers, I want to say, in conclusion, without being more nasty than I can help—because as a member sitting behind the Government I feel very keenly on the question—that the Opposition in their attitude on this question are, apparently—certainly the hon. member for Murilla—giving John Wren credit for having long exploited something that their organisations have been willing but unable to do.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): We must all realise that it is necessary to do something in order to bring about a curtailment of horseracing generally. It does not apply to the country so much as to the cities.

Mr. WEIR: What purpose does it serve?

Mr. VOWLES: It will bring about a better lot of citizens. When you see the hangers-on and followers of racing stables there are in Brisbane, and the unlimited amount of racing that goes on—practically every day in the week—I think it will be admitted that it is no good to the place, and that it is no good for the morals of the country. In one place we have a State school right alongside a racecourse, and there are racing tracks everywhere. I do not want to be called a "wowsler," because I admit that I go to races. I go to win money sometimes, but generally I do not win any money at all. With regard to the hon. member for Fitzroy, I must say that I have never been to the Ascot racecourse without seeing the hon. member there.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is quite likely. I do not hide under any cloak.

Mr. VOWLES: I go to races, and I invariably lose. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARTLEY: Every time I back a horse I back my own opinion, and not because of any stable information.

Mr. VOWLES: Judging by conversations I have had with the hon. gentleman, I doubt it. He has always been able to give me some inside information.

Mr. HARTLEY: I gave you my own opinion.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not doubt the hon. gentleman in any way. The hon. member for Gregory was talking about his consistency, but I will quote some paragraphs from a speech he made in 1916 to show where he is not consistent. He made a speech on another occasion in this House in reference to proprietary racing. The motion that was introduced on that occasion to restrict horseracing to licensed clubs was carried unanimously in this Chamber. The hon. member condemned proprietary racing at that time, and said that it was necessary to do something in regard to proprietary racing. We know the debates that take place on private members' day are generally of an academic nature and are not taken seriously; but since then we have had a statement from the Minister that it was intended to introduce legislation during the coming session. That legislation has not come forward, and the natural thing for us is to ask the reason why it has not come forward.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Don't put words into my mouth.

Mr. VOWLES: That is the effect of what you said.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not the effect at all.

Mr. VOWLES: It was understood that legislation was to be introduced this session to deal with proprietary racing and racing generally, but it has been dropped suddenly.

Mr. HARTLEY: You said you knew one man who subscribed ten guineas to have the Bill withdrawn, but you did not mention the man's name.

Mr. VOWLES: It is a remarkable thing that Mr. John Wren was in town at that time, and after his disappearance we heard no more about the legislation.

Mr. HARTLEY: Tell us the name of the man who subscribed the ten guineas.

Mr. VOWLES: This topic is freely discussed in the street, and the people want to know why the legislation is not being introduced. I would like to ask the hon. member for Gregory why his opinions have changed. The hon. gentleman speaks about consistency, but he is only consistent in his inconsistency. On the last occasion when the hon. gentleman was dealing with proprietary racing he did not worry about the prize money. He was more concerned about the stamina of the horses and the class of racing. He said that, if we had longer-distance races, we would get a better class of horses.

Mr. MORGAN: The same views as I had.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Gregory did not tell us then that his object was to make the Queensland Turf Club put on a bigger programme. The hon. gentleman spoke against the principle of proprietary racing, and he made very strong statements in reference to it. For instance, speaking during the debate in 1916, he said—

“For once in a while I am in accord with the hon. member for Carnarvon in some of the views he has expressed, and also with the hon. member for Murilla, because I realise that those gentlemen have hit the mark in many places. Now, I am against proprietary racing, because I am against all monopolies. That is the reason why I believe that proprietary racing in Queensland should be exterminated, and I think that the only way in which that can be done is by getting hold of the hub of racing in Brisbane. The Queensland Turf Club is the hub of racing in Brisbane, and there could be no proprietary racing in Brisbane, which is practically the only proprietary racing of any consequence in Queensland, unless the Queensland Turf Club so desires.”

Mr. POLLOCK: Hear, hear! I say it now.

Mr. VOWLES: He was out to do away with monopolies then, but now he is in favour of perpetuating them.

Mr. POLLOCK: Did I say I was out to perpetuate them?

Mr. VOWLES: You believe in them.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is a lie, if you say I said that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VOWLES: I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I appeal to the hon. member for Gregory to withdraw that remark.

Mr. POLLOCK: Certainly I will withdraw it. It is a misstatement that the hon. gentleman frequently makes.

Mr. VOWLES: That is your usual style. The hon. gentleman tells us to-day that he has changed his views. On page 394 of “Hansard” for 1916 we find that the hon. member made use of these words—

“Every race club, or every proprietary owner, is not treated alike by the Queensland Turf Club, although it and other race clubs may have been treated alike by the late Government. And they knew, when they gave that land over in fee-simple, that they had no power to interfere whatever in the disposal of it or the use to which it was put; and it was given free of rent. Apart from that, it is rumoured—and I think most people will admit that it is a fact—that the people who control proprietary racing really control the committee of the Queensland Turf Club.”

Mr. MORGAN: When I made a similar statement this morning I had to withdraw it.

Mr. POLLOCK (to Mr. Vowles): They were controlling the Queensland Turf Club when you were supporting the Liberal Government.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Gregory also said on that occasion—

“I have been led to believe that such is really the case. What chance, then, would there be of the Queensland Turf Club committee refusing to issue further permits to owners of proprietary courses? I should like to mention the attitude that a certain sporting paper in Brisbane has adopted towards proprietary racing. Everyone knows, or should know, that since Mr. Sharpe, a member of the House of Representatives, has instituted an action against the ‘Daily Mail,’ asking for control of that paper, which is really controlled by John Wren and Harry Nathan, although the paper has adopted a very definite attitude on the question of conscription, and talks about the shirkers and loafers who stand at street corners, and supports conscription for all it is worth, yet it never says a word about the man who is a habitue of the racecourse.”

Further on, he said—

“Racecourses are, of course, the means by which the ‘Daily Mail’ has been able to carry on. If my information is correct, the ‘Daily Mail’ had been running at a loss for some time, but when Mr. Sharpe was reported to have taken it over—I do not know whether he really did so or not—and its management was in new hands, the paper was a pronounced success. That may be so, but my opinion is that the profits derived from Albion Park and other racecourses enabled the ‘Daily Mail’ to get on its feet.”

He also said—

“Nationalisation of the sport would enable the Government to deal with the problem effectively. As far as the smaller courses—the Ipswich course, the Kedron course, and the newly-formed course at Goodna—are concerned, I believe they are only the home of ‘dead uns’—horses which cannot run at Ascot or Albion Park.”

Mr. Vowles.]

Now he is advocating that that should be continued, although we know the horses are not run honestly, but for the purpose of taking the public down. The hon. member also said—

“And men who cannot go to Ascot or Albion Park to gamble will go there, and there will be a good deal of impure sport. I do not say there will be impure sport because the men who have the least amount of money will go to those places, but because the men who run those second-class horses are more amenable to arguments for pulling horses than the men who run horses on a big registered course. As far as the ‘dead uns’ are concerned, I believe that a racing man gave a pair of field-glasses not long ago to the soldiers’ field-glass fund, and sent along with them the following note:—

If the soldier who gets these glasses sees as many dead Germans with them as I have seen dead horses, I will be fully recompensed.”

On that occasion the hon. gentleman said that he had seen “dead” horses. Now he says that he wants to carry on this sport, and that his opinions have altered.

Mr. POLLOCK: I told you I believed the number of days for racing ought to be curtailed.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member went on to say—

“That gentleman was evidently a frequenter of the unregistered or proprietary racecourses around Brisbane. I hope this matter will receive the united action of this House and that this motion will be carried.”

That was a motion for the abolition of proprietary courses, and it was carried with the support of the hon. member on the motion of a member of the Opposition. Why this change of front? The hon. member took a leading part in the debate and condemned in a very emphatic way the continuation of proprietary racing. We know that it is a monopoly. We know that the gentleman who created that monopoly in Queensland made his rise in the South on the totalisators. We know exactly what took place, and we know that he is prepared to go to any extreme in order to carry on this business. We find that the opponents of this proprietary principle suddenly became dumb, and then we find a change in their minds. We want the responsible person, the Minister, to put on record why this has happened. We are told in an indirect way that it is not a practicable Bill to handle—that the passage of such legislation would create a position in the department in which they might be accused of giving dates to one person rather than to another and of receiving bribes. If the Government are not going to tackle an evil for fear they may be charged with “graft,” I say they do not understand the first principles of government. I say that they should be prepared to tackle this. They are being asked in all quarters.

Mr. HARTLEY: Why did you not tackle it when you were on this side?

Mr. VOWLES: I did not have the opportunity, but I can assure hon. members opposite that, if the opportunity does come to me, the matter will be tackled very effectively. Hon. members know that, from the moral point of view, proprietary racing is

[Mr. Vowles.

absolutely killing racing in this country. The attractions to the city are so great that practically every horse that is bred is sent off to the city as soon as he is put into training, with the result that, when programmes are brought forward in the country, there are practically no nominations. I say this because I belong to a horse-breeding district.

Mr. HARTLEY: You are pleading for racing in the country clubs.

Mr. VOWLES: If we are going to tolerate racing, there should be an equal distribution of it.

Mr. HARTLEY: You know very well that the only way to control it is to abolish it and make it illegal; and neither you nor anybody else is prepared to advocate that.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member knows that there is a very big distinction between racing and gambling.

Mr. HARTLEY: No.

Mr. VOWLES: If you like to do away with the totalisator and the bookmakers, you can, but I do not advocate that. So far as gambling is concerned, I would restrict bookmakers to registered courses.

Mr. HARTLEY: What difference would that make? The same men would go to the courses.

Mr. VOWLES: On these unregistered courses they do all sorts of things. They fine jockeys and interfere with the liberty of jockeys. On one occasion I had to institute Supreme Court proceedings because they refused to accept the nomination of a man who wanted to race.

Mr. HARTLEY: The Queensland Turf Club do that.

Mr. VOWLES: When they heard that there was a writ coming along, it did not take them long to decide what to do. If they are going to conduct these things in a little autocracy of their own, it is high time that the Government stepped in. When we find them monopolising the whole of the sport and creating perpetual racing instead of occasional racing, making it a business instead of a sport, it is high time a self-respecting Government stepped in. We do not wish to abolish it, but we want to put it on proper lines.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why your change of front? You wanted to abolish it before.

Mr. VOWLES: I wanted to abolish proprietary courses, and I want to abolish them now, for the same reason that the hon. member gave on a previous occasion. He did not want to encourage monopolies, and I do not want to encourage them. Anyone who goes to Albion Park when an Albion “Thousand” is run, or to Kedron Park when an Exhibition Handicap is run, can judge for himself the amount of money they take in nomination fees, acceptance fees, jockeys’ fees, sales of privileges, and sales of tickets, and he will find that practically the whole of the prize money for the programme is derived from such sources, and that the whole of the admission fees of the public, 7s. 6d. each, are the profits of John Wren and his proprietary concern. The thing is out of all reason, and, if it is going to be continued, I would suggest that the Government, for the sake of trying to make it cleaner, should not only compel them to give larger prizes, but also make them announce in their programmes certain races which will encourage the breeding of

horses of stamina, and do away with this short sprinting which we have now and the encouragement of a class of horse which serves no good purpose and is useless except as a racing machine. I should say that no race club should be entitled to race or issue a programme unless it includes races of a certain distance. I would limit the distance of the shortest race and the weights the jockeys have to carry, the lowest weight in particular, so as to put an end to this sweating and reducing these unfortunate small boys to the point of sickness.

Mr. POLLOCK: Who would have control of it?

Mr. VOWLES: The Government. The clubs would receive a certificate of registration, and there would be a certain scale of programme to work up to, both as regards money and weights and distances; and, if they would not observe that, they would have to strike the race out. By doing that we would encourage a breed of horse with stamina, and be doing what, to my mind, is the only reason for the promotion of racing at all.

Mr. HARTLEY: Before you sit down, tell us the name of the bookmaker who you know subscribed ten guineas to a fund to suppress this Bill.

Mr. VOWLES: Do you want to victimise him?

Mr. POLLOCK: No; but we want to find out whether you are a man.

Mr. VOWLES: I ask the hon. member, next time he goes to Tattersall's Club, if he ever goes there, to ask the bookmakers themselves.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am prepared to ask for the appointment of a Royal Commission, and you can put your own men on it.

Mr. HARTLEY: We will get another Wando Vale out of this.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): There is a different kind of Simon Pure from the one who goes to the races. There is one who does not go to the races. I do not go to the races, and it might be just as well for me to say a few words on the question of racing in general and on the accusations which have been made against this Government that John Wren or any of his breed controls this side of the House in particular. I do this to protect the Government from such contemptible references. I recollect distinctly that the same people said that "Bung" controlled this side of the House, and that it found funds for us, and that we were, therefore, frightened to do anything against it. I say right here and now that we rammed that lie down their necks.

Mr. MORGAN: You refused to appoint a Royal Commission.

Mr. WEIR: We did not want a Royal Commission. We gave the people the right to settle the matter in their own way. Proprietary racing did not commence with this Government. It began under their Government, and now they are squealing and saying, "Why don't you undo it?" It is absolutely the product of their own class, and they introduced it to rob the workers.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do you consider it is wrong?

Mr. WEIR: I am not concerned about whether I consider it is wrong or not. I will tell the people what I think about it in due

course. This breed all their lives have been inventing something or other to rob the people, or rob the people through their representatives. Is there any difference between a man or a woman being skinned to the hide in Roma street when they are selling wheat and chaff and so forth? I do not go to a racecourse once in sixteen years; but I want to say that, if I did want to go, I would go. There is no Simon Pure about me in that respect, and I do not blame hon. members for going if they want to go. There is nothing that I am saying now which can justify any hon. member in saying that I am casting reflections on the hon. member for Murilla. If he wants to have a day at the racecourse, he spends his own money, not mine. I do not go, because I do not want to go; but I would go if I wanted to go, just the same as, if I wanted a pint of beer, all the devils in hell would not stop me from having it. There is something bigger in the working-class movement than bothering about John Wren. Fancy saying that he or any of his breed control this Government! If Wren could see into the caucus room for five minutes, he would see that the caucus determines these issues. What this Government do is not dictated by John Wren. If everyone held opinions like mine, John Wren would not be tolerated for five minutes. How [12.30 p.m.] can hon. members opposite saddle us with being held down by John Wren? If they can prove to me that proprietary racing is wrong—I do not know anything about it—if, as the leader of the Opposition said, we can improve the morals of racing—I have yet to learn that morals has any morals—if we can improve the standing of the people of this country by abolishing proprietary racing, I will help them to abolish it, so far as lies in my power, in the same way that I helped them in connection with the drink question, so far as it lies in my power, by giving the people the opportunity to decide the issue. I think this is a storm in a teacup. The big argument seems to be the curtailment of racing. Whether they race five, six, or seven days a week, what does it matter to me? They can race every day so long as they do not make me race if I do not want to. I claim the right to go or to stay away. What good purpose can we serve by abolishing proprietary or any other type of racing?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Don't you appreciate that some people have not the strength of mind that you have, and go to racing?

Mr. WEIR: I am not seeing those people, because I do not know of them. Why should I reflect on the hon. member for Murilla for going to racing, or upon the hon. member for Oxley for attempting to be the secretary of "France's Day?" I do not look at the matter from that point of view. These men have their own views on gambling, and they must allow me to have mine. I have been to Ascot once in my life as a sight-seer, and I saw quite a lot. Am I to be blamed for going to see the ramifications of the bookmakers and the totalisator; and, above all, the "mugs" that the "books" get hold of? What would be thought if I were to stand up as a "wowsler" and say that I did not know anything about these things? I was reared in the North; I was a footrunner for "donkey's" years, and footballer. Who is going to tell me about

Mr. Weir.]

the evils of betting? If you can convince me that proprietary racing is sapping the morals of the people, I am prepared to say that I will give my support in having it abolished. But to say that John Wren has got hold of me is too ridiculous. My colleagues are in exactly the same position. I know thousands of men in this movement who are of the same make-up as myself. I know numbers of men in this party who hold the same views that I hold on this particular issue. Therefore I resent the insult. I think it is a thing that the Opposition should not attempt to saddle the Government with unless they have some very good grounds for their assertions. Have they got any grounds?

Mr. COLLINS: Why don't they trot them out if they have?

Mr. WEIR: Do you mean to tell me that they would not trot them out if they had them—these good Christians who belt us with everything they have got? We know perfectly well that they have no case, but they want to throw mud at somebody. I recollect how they told us that the funds of this party were found by "Bung." My complaint is that "Bung" did not send me any—I never got any share of the money provided by "Bung." I know that "Bung" has a terrible grievance against this party as being the only party in this State who were big enough to give the people the right to settle the argument. We had to face "Bung," which was a bigger issue than John Wren. Surely, then, nobody will tell us that we cannot face John Wren. The thing is too paltry.

I said at the outset, and I want to repeat it in conclusion—where has this proprietary racing come from? Is it not, like the prickly-pear, the product of these people opposite? It was born under them and their class, and it is our class who suffer.

Mr. MORGAN: If you admit that they suffer, why don't you take steps against it?

Mr. WEIR: The hon. member is telling me that they suffer. I have an open mind on the question—I know nothing about it. I am satisfied that racing is no good to the working class as racing. I am satisfied that gambling is no good to the working class. I preach that publicly. But the class of gambling that I have my knife into is that which goes on on the Stock Exchange and the food markets, and other places connected with the "kiddies'" bread and butter. People can go to races; they can go to "billy-o'," so long as they do not take me there, too.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I certainly am not going to be misrepresented on this question. I take the stand that to-day there is no monopoly of proprietary racing in Queensland. I am not going to allow any man to say that I am not against monopolies. There are at least four proprietary racing clubs racing in and around Brisbane.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There are others in different parts of the State.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not know how many more there are in other parts of the State—I am not concerned with that. There is no doubt that most of the racing goes on in and around Brisbane; the racing in other parts of the State does not really matter. I have changed my views in regard to the abolition of proprietary racing; to some

extent their competition is helpful. In view of the statements which have been made regarding approaches by John Wren, it is rather difficult to take up the position that you have changed your mind on this question. But the people who have known me all my life are prepared to take my word. When I say that I have changed my mind on the total abolition of proprietary racing, I say it in all seriousness. If you abolished proprietary racing to-morrow, the Queensland Turf Club would only put on more racing dates to fill the bill, and you would not have brought about the abolition of racing. My solution, as I said previously, is a curtailment of racing dates. The body to control that curtailment is a body to which I would not care to belong; because, no matter how you allocated the racing dates, there would always be members with as much sense of fairness as the hon. member for Murilla, who would say that this, that, or the other body had purchased those dates from you.

Mr. MORGAN: They do it in Victoria by Act of Parliament.

Mr. POLLOCK: Does the hon. member remember what happened when the Commonwealth Government took control of racing during the war? Does he remember what happened in Victoria when everybody was saying that, because the Hughes Government granted more racing dates to John Wren in Brisbane than were granted to the Queensland Turf Club and the other clubs put together, Hughes and Pearce had been bribed?

Mr. J. JONES: Do you think they were?

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not; I think that the Queensland Turf Club were satisfied with a limited number of dates; and as there was nobody else, John Wren got the balance of the dates. That is the position to-day. There is no monopoly. There are four or five proprietary racing clubs and persons. The position is entirely different to what it was when the party voted to control proprietary racing. I do not care a tinker's curse whether the Government do or do not control proprietary racing. I would be a little afraid to sit behind any Government that controlled any sort of racing. If the Government are going to do such a thing, they could curtail the racing dates and give to the premier body—the Queensland Turf Club—the power to allocate the dates, and let them get the allegations which hon. members like the hon. member for Murilla are always hurling.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): The position seems to be a most extraordinary one. Everybody recognises that this proprietary racing did not start under the present Government; but we know the extent to which it has grown under the present Government—it has grown to be a tremendous evil in this State.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is a better system now than it was then, with all its faults.

Mr. MOORE: I cannot agree with the hon. member at all. We know the large number of people who really cannot afford to go to racing and who cannot afford to race honestly; and when dishonesty comes into the sport, it does away with the sporting part of it altogether.

Mr. HARTLEY: How does it differ from the Queensland Turf Club races in regard to honesty or dishonesty?

[*Mr. Weir.*

Mr. MOORE: I do not know anything about either of them.

Mr. HARTLEY: Then why express an opinion?

Mr. MOORE: I am entitled to my own opinion. I know that the type of people who race horses on unregistered and proprietary racecourses is the type that is out for the special purpose of making money; it is not a question of running a horse because it is a good horse.

Mr. HARTLEY: Do you mean that the Queensland Turf Club race for the fun of the thing, and not to make money?

Mr. MOORE: On every course there are people who go there for the special purpose of making money. There is no justification for failing to deal with this matter because the Government find themselves in an awkward position. There is no reason why they should not deal with the matter because they are afraid of public opinion, or because they are afraid of some people accusing them of accepting a bribe in connection with racing dates. It should be provided that races are to be of a certain distance, that a certain amount of prize money and certain dates are allotted.

Mr. WEIR: Advance some logical argument in favour of that.

Mr. MOORE: If the Act is administered honestly and fairly, everything will be all right. Because someone accuses the Government of acting unfairly, there is no reason why they should not deal with the matter. I think every hon. member knows perfectly well that there is too much racing in Brisbane. The hon. member for Maryborough said that our class started racing to rob his class. If he admits that, then surely he should do his best to protect his class from being robbed.

Mr. WEIR: I do not know anything about the proprietary "stunt."

Mr. MOORE: Proprietary racing is worse than club racing. Club racing is conducted for the sport. There are many people who attend races simply for the sport. In the country there is a large number of people who do not go to races to bet at all. They simply go for the sport of racing. You never hear of anybody going to a proprietary racecourse just for sport; it would not pay them. They have too much running expenses. The mere fact of the Government shirking the responsibility because they are afraid of people insinuating that they are acting improperly is not a fair thing. All hon. members opposite know exactly what takes place.

Mr. WEIR: No.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman does not go to races, and, perhaps, he does not know. In Brisbane to-day, there is an extraordinary number of people getting their living in a way that they should not get it. That is no good to them and no good to the country. I give the hon. member for Maryborough credit for saying that, if the Government do deal with the matter, he will not be afraid of any insinuations of bribery from outside. I believe that, if the Government do attempt to deal with it, the hon. member will not be afraid to give his support. The hon. member can be as bitter as any man in this Chamber, but I believe he is sincere in what he says with regard to this matter.

Mr. POLLOCK: Does the hon. member not think that racing will find its own level?

Mr. MOORE: No. It is increasing every day, and is not finding its own level. I think the only way it will find its own level is in this way—the more people you ruin the less there will be to attend the races.

Mr. FOLEY: It is a bitter experience.

Mr. MOORE: Why should this bitter experience be forced upon the people?

Mr. FOLEY: They gain this bitter experience at the Queensland Turf Club races which the hon. gentleman is advocating.

Mr. MOORE: No. Young people go to these places to gamble who would not otherwise think of gambling.

Mr. PRASE: No Act of Parliament will alter that.

Mr. MOORE: The more opportunities that are given the more people will fall in. If you take away a certain amount of opportunity and of corrupt influence, you can say to the people, "You are going to have sport as clean as it is possible to make it, and you are going to have a fair chance." That is a different thing altogether. There are some courses where you know that you are not going to get what is right as soon as you get there.

Mr. FOLEY: What courses are they?

Mr. MOORE: The unregistered courses.

Mr. FOLEY: You get a better deal at Kedron Park than you do at Ascot. They do bring the jockeys back at Kedron when there is anything wrong.

Mr. MOORE: We know that the prize money is not sufficient to enable the people to keep racehorses and pay nomination fees and jockeys' expenses. They race because they can make money crookedly. They pull horses, stiffen them, and deaden them.

Mr. HARTLEY: There are more "dead uns" at Ascot in one day than in a month at Kedron. The hon. gentleman should read "Sporting Life," or any other sporting paper, for the last three weeks.

Mr. MOORE: I do not want to read "Sporting Life." The number of racing days is on the increase. In the metropolitan area last year the number was 222. We all know the class of racing that goes on. What sort of a race is a three-furlong or a four-furlong race to improve the breed of racehorses? It is only a means of gambling.

Mr. HARTLEY: There are five-furlong and six-furlong races at Ascot, too.

Mr. MOORE: They have long races there. I have only been to Ascot a couple of times in the last two years, and on those two days there were no races under seven furlongs.

Mr. HARTLEY: Does the hon. member say that the Kedron Park races do not improve the breed of horses?

Mr. MOORE: I do not think they do.

Mr. HARTLEY: I will show where the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. MOORE: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find an excuse now and again. The Government are advancing excuses for not dealing with such a cancer as this. Hon. members know perfectly well that such a cancer as this in our State should be curtailed.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It is a cancer, yet the hon. member wants it curtailed?

Mr. Moore.]

Mr. MOORE: Yes. If racing was cut out in one day, look at the distress it would cause. Even under the Liquor Act the Government propose to give a certain number of years to prepare for the closing of hotels. The hon. member regards the liquor traffic as a cancer, yet he does not want that cut out in a day.

Mr. HARTLEY: Yes he does.

Mr. MOORE: He wants it curtailed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If the hon. member could abolish racing throughout Australia to-morrow, would he do it?

Mr. MOORE: No; the breed of horses can be improved by improving their stamina and pace.

Mr. WEIR: Could a number of youngsters be improved by cutting out racing?

Mr. MOORE: Yes.

Mr. WEIR: Then cut out the lot.

Mr. MOORE: I think the breed can be improved.

Mr. WEIR: Why does proprietary racing matter?

Mr. MOORE: In my opinion it is the worst of two evils. Proprietary racing is not run in the interests of sport at all. It is a money-making concern.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is the way every business is run.

Mr. MOORE: I have been to races, and I know men who only race because they love the sport and desire to improve the breed of the horse. I think the hon. member knows some of them in his electorate. Those men endeavour to improve the class of horse, and they deserve encouragement. Can anyone say that the sprinting races that we have are going to do that?

Mr. POLLOCK: There is not a man in racing to-day who has as his objective the improvement of the breed of horses. He likes to own a classical winner and win races.

Mr. MOORE: He endeavours to improve the class of horse because he knows that they will bring a good price and that he will be able to make money. He endeavours to breed horses for a specific purpose. We have breeders in this State who do that.

Mr. POLLOCK: They try to breed horses that they know will win races.

Mr. MOORE: Naturally. If he can improve the horses so that they will possess a fine stamina and are of a type that can run long distances, it is all the better for him, because he will get a better price for them. I would like to see the Government take hold of this question regardless of the consequences. I think it is up to them to take the responsibility on their shoulders.

(The bell indicated that the hon. member had exhausted the time allowed him by the Standing Orders.)

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I would like to put the hon. member right in the comparison he has drawn between proprietary racing as conducted in Brisbane and club racing. In club racing most of the committee own horses, and the stewards and other employees on the course are controlled by the owners of horses who are the committee, and it is going to be a very stiff-backed, strong-minded man who is going to take action if he

thinks anything is wrong on a club course when he knows that he may be sacked next day for dealing with it. I have been both to the Kedron Park course and to the Queensland Turf Club course, but I have been oftener to the Queensland Turf Club course, and I have never seen a jockey recalled at the Queensland Turf Club course. I have seen a well-known horse, the property of one of the biggest owners, go out on Saturday and run an absolute duffer, and another horse, the property of a struggling owner, go out on the same day in another race and run an absolute duffer, and on the following Monday both horses win races. Then the little-known owner was brought up for an explanation for the inconsistent running, and the big owner had nothing said to him. The matter was made prominent in the papers at the time, and it showed that in the cases where clubs are controlled by the so-called amateurs the sport is not as clean as it ought to be. One reason for that is because the employees are controlled by the owners.

Mr. VOWLES: Would not Government control get over that?

Mr. HARTLEY: No. The only way to control racing and prevent gambling is to abolish it altogether. We have laws against gambling now and we cannot prevent it.

Mr. MOORE: The Government encourage gambling.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: That is another of those innuendoes.

Mr. POLLOCK: You know that the Home Secretary gave instructions to the whole of the police that gambling was to be stopped.

Mr. HARTLEY: There is no use in having any humbug over this matter. There are half a dozen men at least in this House who go down to the racecourse and have a "bit" on some race, so what is the use of talking about gambling? We all like a bit of a hazard. It is the love of adventure that causes many of us to put a little money on a hazard. Why, men gamble with their lives on a hazard. It is no use men getting up here and saying we should prevent gambling when they have a bet on a race themselves. It is just as well to be fair and honest. The position at Kedron Park is absolutely different to what it is at Ascot. Wren controls Kedron, and I do not think it is a good thing that he should be allowed to make the big money that he does. He is making big money, and so do those who control other sports. The difference is that the men employed at Kedron Park are the servants of Wren, and they have to adjust weights equitably so as not to give undue preference to any owner. If they think there is anything wrong they put up a jockey who rides with the club's colours, and that very often reverses the result. They have frequently brought a horse back and changed the jockey. I have never seen that done at the Queensland Turf Club course or at Albion Park.

With regard to the question whether proprietary racing has improved the breed of horses, the hon. member showed that he is an absolute novice in this matter in face of the example the racing patrons have had in Brisbane in the last two or three months. Two or three months ago it was thought if you could not win at Ascot you should

[*Mr. Moore.*

take your horse to Albion Park, and then, if he did not show good enough there, take him over to Kedron and he will sweep the course. A lot of people had the idea that the horses at Kedron Park could not run anything but three-furlong races. What was the result? So soon as the Queensland Turf Club removed the disqualification for unregistered horses the bettors, particularly the heavy bettors, got the biggest shock they had had for a very long time. It is well known that about 50 per cent. of the horses at Kedron Park that came over into the registered fold absolutely ran the lily-white amateur horses off their feet. They very often won four or five races out of the programme in one day. That goes to show that there is very little difference in the stamina and speed of the horses, whether they run at proprietary courses or not.

The leader of the Opposition said that he knew a bookmaker who had given £10 10s. to be given to this Government in order to prevent a Bill dealing with proprietary racing being brought in. That is the only tangible statement we have had yet, and I pledge the hon. member my vote and my support, and also the support of the hon. member for Maryborough and all other hon. members on this side who, by their interjections, are assenting, if he will bring forward a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into that charge, or, if necessary, a Royal Commission to inquire into it to enable him to support that statement by producing the man here. Then we will see how matters stand. If he does not bring it forward I will brand him a coward for making a charge under the privilege of this House, and a quib and a fraud. That is his only alternative. He has made the charge, and I pledge him my support and the support of hon. members here if he will move for the appointment of a Select Committee.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremser*): I do not know that the pledging of the support of any hon. member of this House is going to get us any further, because we already know the value of the evidence of the leader of the Opposition. It is like the evidence of a certain young man as to when the war would end. With a little alteration, we might very well put it this way—

“Actual evidence have I none,
But my aunt's gardener's sister's son
Heard a man in Edward street
Say to the ‘John Hop’ on the beat
That he had a friend who knew the
men
Who took the ‘dough’ from Mr. Wren.”

That is about the depth and strength of the charge made by the leader of the Opposition. I take no notice of it, or of the whisperings of the hon. member for Murilla. In this matter we are inclined to get away from the real point of the debate. I do not think the point of the debate is whether one club recalls a jockey and puts up another jockey, or whether a club runs three-furlong or ten-furlong races. What we have to consider is whether racing is of benefit to the State or not. It is not a question of whether someone puts a “bob” on a horse or not. So far as that is concerned, I suppose most people put a few shillings on a horse at one time or another. Most people like a bit of a hazard. I wish to goodness we would be a little more frequent in our condemnation of other abuses—such as usury. While

attention has been drawn to the arm of hazardry, I think there are other evils in the community that we might

[2 p.m.] easily have something to say about. There is no objection to a man having a little flutter on a racecourse or anywhere else; but the danger is that it may get into a habit and become the main occupation of a man. In connection with the crooked arm of hazardry, which is more often exercised on a racecourse than anything else, we have developed something else. We have developed the clutching hand of usury and the staring eyes of wizardry, which are something allied to the scene we had in the Chamber this morning, when we had the bare-faced cheek of innuendo. I know of nothing more shocking than the innuendoes we had to listen to in the Chamber this morning. However, I think we have thrown down a challenge which ought to be definite enough to clear the whole matter up one way or the other. I heard racing referred to this morning as a cancer. If there is something wrong with racing, let us deal with it like the medical man deals with a cancer patient who comes to him. First and foremost, he would examine his patient carefully, and, if an operation was necessary, he would prepare the way. It would need to be a desperate case indeed for him to grab the patient by the nape of the neck and throw him on to the operating table before he could say, “Jack Robinson.” Let us examine this evil, and if it is wrong, ruthlessly cut out that wrong. I must confess that I am not a great authority upon the horse. I have never been to a racecourse in Brisbane, and I do not know whether John Wren owns the racecourse or whether the racecourse owns John Wren, so that I cannot speak as one having authority. But I have some knowledge of what a man with a cork eye can see in big cities like Brisbane in matters like racing. You cannot tell me that it is an excellent thing or a good thing for the State to have racing every day in the week. If it is a good thing to have racing every day in the week, football is a much cleaner and better sport, and why cannot we have football every day in the week? If football is a good thing every day in the week, I am in favour of having cricket every day in the week, because I like it better than football, and it is a cleaner sport than football. You cannot convince me that racing is a good thing, and that, because it is a good thing, we are entitled to have it every day in the week. The Committee cannot put it down my throat that, if the people like to do it, we should let them do it, and that you cannot stop them if you want to do it. There are heaps of people in this community who wanted to trade after hours, but it was stopped; and there are heaps of people who want to run sly-grog shops, and we will not let them. There are heaps of people who would like to buy that sort of liquor, but we will not let them buy it. We say that it is not good for them. There are heaps of things that can be controlled by law. We cannot make people good by Act of Parliament, but we can make them decent.

Mr. FLETCHER: Why don't you do something in regard to racing?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am in favour of it. I do not say that racing is the only evil. There are heaps of other evils that we have to contend with, and that have taken up our attention. Our time has been fully occupied. I do not know any Government in Australia that can show such a long

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

list of accomplished measures as this Government can show since it came into power. The Government have been doing things. If racing is an evil, as I am convinced it is, and if we can find out that it is an evil, then we will readily and quickly do something. If the only obstacle in the way is that we cannot get someone who is game to take control of it for fear that he will be told that he accepts bribes, then I am prepared to take the job on. I will tell the Minister that, if he thinks that we ought to have someone to allot the number of racing days, then I am prepared to take that job on and see that fair play is given in the allocation of the racing days. I do not mind what anyone might say about me in the matter of taking a bribe. I have never been offered a bribe, and I would not take one if I were offered it. Bribery may be a common thing, but it does not worry me. I can get an honest living even if it is only to take control of racing and allot the number of days. If our party cannot take control of racing because it cannot find anyone who will take charge of it, for fear that an allegation will be thrown at him that he is doing it for money, then I am prepared to take it on. Is racing an evil? We know that a lot of people holding high positions in the State attend race meetings. Only recently, when we were entertaining Royalty in Queensland, I remember that our Royal visitor was driven from Parliament House to Ascot in a motor-car. While at Ascot he received a tip from the Treasurer of the day, the Hon. John Arthur Fihelly, and I heard that he said afterwards that the tip was a bad one and he lost his money. It is a good job that the Prince did not wager his crown because it would have been a terrible thing if he had lost his crown, although I have read that kings have lost their crowns for less than that. If it is a good thing for the Prince to go to a race meeting, surely to goodness it is good enough for a labourer to go to a race meeting. There is an open inference in the remarks of hon. members opposite that it is all right when some people go to a race meeting, but the labourer should not waste his substance on racing at all.

Mr. FLETCHER: The racing should be limited.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: How far are you going to limit it? To what degree will you go? How far down are you going to limit racing? It is like telling a man that drinking is an evil; but how far are you going to limit him? The proper thing is to limit him down to nothing. I want to get this patient into my consulting-room. I want to tap him on the chest and ask him to say "9; 9; 9." I want to ask him to take a deep breath so that I can find out what is wrong with him. Let us find out what is wrong with racing; and, if we find out that there is anything wrong with it, let us deal with it. We have a class of people in the community who have too much leisure. If we did not have a leisured class in the community, we would not have a class that is looking for some way to fill in their time from Monday morning till Saturday night.

Mr. BRAND: You are hitting some of your own supporters.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I cannot help that. I am quite fearless in that regard. I do

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.

not regulate my speeches according to the number of votes I get. If I did that, I would never make a speech in this House at all. I believe that the Government should make a start in connection with this matter and be honest and straight-forward enough to deal with it. I say that we have a leisured class in the community who fill in their time in this way. We have another class that has no leisure, but who fill in their time working from morning to night, scheming, rigging things, making "crook 'uns," making "dead 'uns"—

Mr. BRAND: With stenographers behind the screen.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: In connection with racing there is an amount of scoundrelism going on that is astonishing. It is not sufficient for me to be told that we should encourage horseracing because it helps the farmers. If we cannot use horses for some better purpose than running round a track, why, bless my heart and soul! the highest ideal we could have would be that all of us should be proprietors of merry-go-rounds. They are everlastingly going round. If that is the grand idea, let us all have merry-go-rounds.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why do you not start?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I believe that I could make a fortune if I did, and if I could get the hon. member for Nanango as my manager. It is not the mere fact that in racing a number of horses run round a track and one wins that is the evil. The great evil occurs with these side-growths—whisperers, book-makers, "snide" agents, and all the other people who make a living out of it. If that is a high ideal for this party to support, I am surprised. I do not think that any of us can say that any of these people contribute anything to the substantial wealth of the community, and that is the aspect from which I look at it. Are these people creating any wealth? Are they doing anything for posterity? Are they tending to make us better people? Are they working in the direction of making the future any more secure? Of course they are not. If we could get our people to pay as much attention to political economy as they do to "picking the cards" for Saturday, our troubles would be solved. Our unfortunate position is that our economic position is such, and our existence is such a weak thing, that there is no security about it, and we take any possible opportunity we can get to make it more secure, and if we can do that by putting a "tenner" on so and so, and leaving the course with £100 in our pocket, we feel all the better for it. If we had a community so alive to its own interests that it saw that everybody had a decent opportunity, that the future of everybody was secure, there would be no need for anyone to make provision for next week by running a "stiff 'un" this week or backing a "dead 'un," or anything of that nature. If we had a community which could make the future secure for everybody, we could have our races and our other sports on Saturday, and the winners would get, as in the days of old, a laurel wreath, and that would be sufficient. And when we have enough common sense and vision to see that the great thing is to make the future secure, we shall have the courage to put this thing on the table and cut from it that which is causing all the trouble.

Mr. EDWARDS (Nanango): I am at one with the hon. member in a lot of the

arguments he has used in this Chamber this afternoon. Whilst I have no objection to racecourses or racing, I believe that, as representatives of the people, we need to consider very seriously whether racing in our State has not gone too far. In my opinion it has, for reasons which I will give. In the first place, we have in racing a wonderful waste of capital and men. I think hon. members opposite will admit that there are many men following racing to-day who have no other occupation in life. No one will say that that is best in the interests of the State. But that is only one phase of the question. While we have these thousands following racing as their occupation, it must mean that thousands of pounds are involved in the racing circle, and not in any way being devoted towards the development of the State. The time has come when the Government should take some steps to control the racing of this State.

There is another tendency which affects detrimentally the development of the State. When there is racing practically every day in the metropolitan area, it has the tendency to draw the population from the country to the metropolitan area. Many men would be very much better engaged, and very much more healthy, if they were doing some work in the interests of the State in country districts.

Mr. W. COOPER: Does that apply to your electorate?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know whether it applies to my electorate any more than it does to the hon. member's electorate. The man who makes a practice of going from course to course, getting his living by that means, is of no benefit to this State other than in respect of what he eats and wears. I do not think anyone will say that that is a good thing. It has been mentioned that racing has a degrading influence on the rising generation of children. In the trams, in the trains, or on the street, wherever you go in the metropolitan area, the first thing that seems to be in the minds of the majority of people is, "What is going to win on Saturday or Wednesday." Naturally, that must have a degrading effect on young children.

Mr. HARTLEY: You gamble on whether it is going to rain to-morrow or next year.

Mr. EDWARDS: It would be a good thing if sometimes it rained on the hon. member; a damp cloth would do him a lot of good. It would be more fitting if the hon. member thought seriously about some of these things, and considered whether it would not be better to take some action in the interests of the children. I believe that racing has gone too far, and that the majority of people in Queensland are taking too great an interest in it. It would be far better if their energies were directed towards advancing the welfare of the people of the State. Hon. members opposite are continually telling us that we will never get on to those benches. If that is so, I hope the Government will take steps at once to introduce legislation in the interests of the people and the development of the State—particularly the country districts—legislation which will drive people from the large centres to the country and place them in useful occupations. That is not the only question. There must be a huge sum continually circulating in racing circles

throughout Queensland which could be much better employed in developing the empty spaces in the outer districts of our country.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): My reason for rising is to let hon. members opposite know that this Government do things in their own time. In connection with the bribery charge or the charge about money supposed to have been contributed by John Wren, I would say that people who deal in those kinds of transactions, no doubt, are suspicious of others. Another hon. gentleman also made a charge about a bookmaker having told him that he had contributed ten guineas to some fund. I, as one of the members of this party, am prepared to allow my banking account to be investigated—it will stand any amount of investigation. I am sure that, if some of my Christian friends—as the hon. member for Maryborough called them—on the other side were to see my banking account, they would be anxious to contribute a little towards my electioneering expenses. I think that the hon. member for Murilla and the leader of the Opposition endeavoured to make members of this party suspicious of somebody higher up in control. The anxiety shown by the Opposition on this occasion makes me a little suspicious of that article or that smoke screen which appeared in the "Daily Mail"—a paper which John Wren once controlled. Whether he does control that paper at the present time I am not in a position to say. The article referred to Mr. Wren leaving Melbourne. Are hon. members opposite trying to get the control of racing for the Queensland Turf Club? This throttling of proprietary racing in order to give it another name was carried out in Western Australia some time ago, when proprietary clubs were white-washed and all the unregistered horses were taken over by the registered clubs. Before Mr. Wren visited Brisbane, the unregistered courses were white-washed, showing conclusively that Mr. Wren, or whoever controls proprietary racing, fears that this Government are going to take some action in that regard. We saw a general white-washing of the unregistered courses. I do not think for one moment that this Government are going to neglect their duty in that regard. They will deal with that matter in good time. We heard hon. members opposite twitting this Government some time ago about the Upper House. Do you know what action was taken in regard to that? I feel sure that the Government will take some action in regard to racing and at a time when hon. members opposite least expect it. We know that the friends of hon. members opposite in the Federal Parliament are not sincere in regard to doing away with this cancer—as they call it—of proprietary racing. Whether the racing is under the control of a club or a proprietor is a matter of indifference. They talk about the urger and the whisperer, and the class who are the victims of society. What do they call this great racing game? The sport of kings! And the kings are responsible for the class who are hangers-on. They are not the only "crooks" in the game. I remember one of the Queensland Turf Club committee having a horse which ran second, and a battler had a horse called "Hoyden," which ran first.

Mr. VOWLES: Which one were you on?

Mr. RIORDAN: I had a "bit" on both. (Laughter.) I am not going to attack that unfortunate class who have been brought

Mr. Riordan.]

into existence by the class who first initiated racing. It was not this party who did it. We see the spectacle of boys taking 4 or 5 lb. weight off in order to ride a horse for some leading sport who happens to have a good thing going, and which he has "bottled up" for some time in order to get a good price and take the public down. No mention is made of the jockey boys working in this industry. What sort of accommodation is provided for the employees in this game? Those boys are badly treated. The racing game, whether it be from a Kedron Park point of view or Ascot point of view, is all the same. I am not going to say racing is a bad thing, but I say that there is too much racing in the metropolitan area. I am not going to be a kill-joy, one of those who want to knock a man off smoking. I go along to Kedron Park if it suits me. I am like the hon. member for Maryborough—if a thing suits me, I go there. I go to Ascot or Albion Park just as the fit strikes me. If hon. members opposite can convince me that racing is a cancer and we must cut it out, I will support them in cutting it out.

Mr. MOORE: What is the good of convincing you if your party are against it?

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. gentleman has no reasons for making that statement.

Mr. VOWLES: We know that everything is agreed to in your caucus, and then you have to support it unanimously.

Mr. RIORDAN: You only got the leadership of your party by one vote. (Government laughter.) You only had a majority of one over the hon. member for Port Curtis, who deserted from the Nationalists. (Laughter.) When the proxy vote was under discussion the hon. member for Normanby, who left these benches and crossed over to the other side, was one of those who told the leader of the Opposition that he did not go to the Country party to keep the Labour party in power by giving "pairs"—he joined the Country party to defeat the Labour party. Six or seven country members in their caucus voted for the proxy vote. If the hon. gentleman wants any more secrets about his caucus he will get them. (Laughter.) My vote in caucus is always

given as my conscience dictates.
[2.30 p.m.] I am sent here by the people I represent to carry out a definite platform, and when I can no longer support that platform I will go to those people and tell them so. I will not do like hon. members opposite—change my mind without giving the people an opportunity of asking why I have done so. I have no doubt that the Government will take some action in the direction of limiting the number of racing days; but I hope that they are not going to hand over the control of racing to the Queensland Turf Club. I am like the hon. member for Bremer. If the Government are afraid of the innuendoes of the kind we heard thrown across the Chamber this morning and decide to take over the control of racing, I will certainly be an applicant for a position in connection with allotting the days of racing if there should be a vacancy, and I can give my assurance that I will put the Queensland Turf Club, as well as any other monopoly, in their place.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): The attitude I have taken up since I have come into the House is that some restrictions should be

[*Mr. Riordan.*

placed upon racing, at any rate, in the metropolitan area. The Minister will remember that when the nuisance of street betting was rampant in the city—and it is rampant to a certain extent at the present time—I asked the hon. gentleman certain questions, and he told the House that, as soon as the opportunity offered, the matter would receive attention. This is a matter which ought to be discussed in a non-party way.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Home Secretary has taken action in regard to that.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am fully aware that the Home Secretary has exercised his powers in connection with the police to curb the evil to some extent. Owing to legal entanglements, it was impossible to deal with certain individuals when they were betting in lanes in the area; but when they concentrated their efforts in a little shop, they could be dealt with. It is not the use of the thing that is a curse, but the abuse of it. I venture to say that there is not a man in this Chamber but must be fully alive to the seriousness of this question. There was a time when it was not so noticeable, when, perhaps, there were one or two days during the month on which horseracing took place. It is said that horseracing is the sport of kings. All that I have to say about it is that it is degenerating into the sport of loafers. I have seen the regrettable condition of things which is taking place in our community. I have seen boys and girls with their sixpences and shillings going to the street bettors with a view to putting their money upon a horse that is running. If those horses were not running on those days, there would not be the opportunity for these young people to waste their money in such a manner. We find that there is horseracing nearly every day in the week, and it is breeding a race of degenerates in our community. It is all very well to say that by allowing this we prevent a monopoly being exercised by another racing club. Surely, the Government can do something in this matter? They have opportunities of inquiring into the best methods of dealing with it and preventing the growth of this cancer in our midst.

At 2.35 p.m.,

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. MAXWELL: Some hon. members opposite have said that, if it could be shown that the community were in jeopardy through horseracing, they would be quite prepared to assist to prevent this menace from getting a grip on the community. They are at one with hon. members on this side in that respect, which shows that this is not, and should not be, a party question. One hon. member opposite said proprietary racing was brought into existence when a previous Government occupied the Treasury benches. I do not know about that, but the fact remains that this is a menace to our community; and, irrespective of what Government were in power when it was brought into existence, if in the opinion of the people it is wrong, it is our duty to try and remove the evil. How many young people have slipped and fallen by the wayside through the opportunities given to them every day to spend 2s. or 3s.? If they go down to Ascot, the opportunity is not so great for them to squander 6d., 1s., or 2s. 6d.; but in other branches of racing the

opportunities are there for them. We know of some fine young men who have slipped and have paid the penalty for wrong-doing in Boggo road, or somewhere else. I would ask the Attorney-General to try to remove the temptation from the people. I have a case in my mind of a young man who was employed in a bank. He was well connected, and had a young wife and a baby. He got infatuated with this cursed Kedron Park, and put his hand into the till. He started with a shilling, and went on and on until he ended in Boggo road.

Mr. RIORDAN: What about the banker who stole thousands, and afterwards became a member of the Victorian Stock Exchange?

Mr. MAXWELL: If a man commits a criminal act, he has a right to be punished for it. The hon. member for Bremer to-day gave what, in my opinion, is good advice to the Government, and I hope that he will back it up in caucus—that is, where the opportunity offers to tempt a young man or woman to fall, the temptation should be removed. I would be wanting in my duty as the representative of a metropolitan constituency were I not to impress upon the Attorney-General the desirability of carrying out the pledge that he gave when I raised the point some time ago, when I asked him if he would inquire into the matter and see if it is not possible to remove from our midst a class of people that this city can do better without.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I have one or two casual remarks to make on this subject, although I cannot say that I know anything about racing from experience. It has been said that, when a man learns from his own experience, he is 50 per cent. wise; but, when he learns from other people's experience, he is 100 per cent. wise. I have been listening to the arguments of hon. members opposite. While the Opposition have been urging on the Government the necessity of doing something to curtail proprietary racing, it is a well-known fact that, if they could have managed it, they would have prevented the Government doing anything at all in connection with racing or anything else. The hon. gentleman who just sat down said he was not concerned about what other Governments did or did not do, but the present Government should do something in this matter. That shows the insincerity of hon. members opposite. Hon. members opposite sat behind a Government for years that would not deal with racing, but practically fostered it and provided facilities and opportunities to register these people and institute proprietary racing in Queensland. It is easier to prevent something taking place than it is to cure it when once it gets a start. Whatever hon. members opposite may say, they are responsible to a very large extent for what exists at the present time, because the Government they sat behind allowed it to get into the State, and now it is difficult to deal with it. One argument of an hon. member opposite was that racing was a good thing because horses ate fodder. If that is all that he has to support his argument, it is not much. Another argument was that racing would help to breed better horses, but there is not much in that argument either. It is no use saying that people go in for racing for the sake of breeding horses, because ninety-nine out of every 100 people who go in for racing do it for entirely different reasons. They

do it for the purpose of making money out of it. They do not go in for racing for the purpose of selling their horses but for the purpose of gambling. Hon. members opposite talk about the breed of horses; but what I want to know is, "What kind of character does it breed?" The hon. member for Murilla, in the course of his speech, was full of innuendoes and suggestions about bribery. Does not that sort of talk belong to the racecourse? It seems to me that his speech and the speech of the leader of the Opposition were both evidence that to some extent they are demoralised by going to the races, because that is the sort of thing they come into contact with on the racecourse every day. The hon. member for Dalby threw out innuendoes, but, when he was challenged to prove what he said, he refused to do anything of the kind. Is not that evidence of what takes place on the racecourse? I admit that it is necessary to do something in connection with racing.

Mr. VOWLES: Tell us why the Bill was dropped as soon as John Wren went away.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. member for Aubigny said that racing is something like a cancer, but he is not prepared to cut it out altogether. He merely wants to limit it. The hon. gentleman must know what would happen in the case of cancer if you tried to limit it instead of cutting it out. If it is a cancer, then the only thing to do is to cut it out altogether, but there is scarcely a member on the other side who would be prepared to go that far.

Mr. MOORE: No, there is not.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There is some doubt about their sincerity when they suggest that racing should be controlled at the present time. What has been said on this vote is like what has been said on other votes. They are more concerned about having a waddy to beat the Government with than they are about the morals of the people outside.

Mr. MOORE: You are wrong.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I admit that there is room for much difference of opinion on this question of racing, indeed, quite a variety of opinions have been expressed by hon. members on this Committee. The hon. member for Maryborough took up the attitude that, so long as it did not affect him, he was entirely unconcerned about the effect it had on the people. I cannot take up that attitude. (Hear, hear!) I cannot get away from the fact that I am to a certain extent responsible for what takes place in the community. We are all to some extent responsible for the conduct of the community in which we live, and we should help by our example as well as by precept. If we cannot make people better by Act of Parliament, then what are we here for? Is not that the whole sum and substance of our legislation? If everybody did the right thing, there would be no necessity to pass any legislation at all. We are told that in olden days every man did what was right. If every one did what is right to-day, there would be no necessity for legislation, and no necessity for policemen. What are we trying to do every day in the week? We want to try to do the right thing, and we pass legislation and place it on the statute-book in order to make people do the right thing. We are always trying to make people

Mr. Winstanley.]

do good, and that is why we pass legislative enactments. I am opposed to exploitation in all directions. I am always opposed to the master class exploiting the workers. I am opposed to the worker being exploited anywhere and at any time and under any circumstances. There is no doubt that those who are regarded by some as the cream of the community go to race meetings. We know that Royalty attends race meetings. It is said that racing is the sport of kings. I should say let kings indulge in that sport and support it if they choose, but I do not think it is a wise thing for working men. Perhaps there may be some to whom it will not do much harm, but there are others who I think are unwise to have anything to do with race meetings. They are unwise in spending their hard earned money—and it is hard earned—with very little prospect of getting anything back for it. Some one said that, if the workers stayed away from race meetings and refused to speculate on racehorses, the racecourse would not last very long. There is no doubt that the workers are the people who support racing, and they are the people who are taken down. Some one writing on this subject in Melbourne, said that at the Melbourne Cup there was one "cup" and 10,000 "mugs." There is no doubt about that. Generally speaking, it is the working man who is the "mug." If I could by any means save him from being the "mug" in this or any other matter, my vote would go in that direction; but I doubt the sincerity of the statements of hon. members opposite that they want to do something to help the community and improve its morals, when they just sit idly by when they have the opportunity to act, and when it is a well-known fact that they have tried to prevent this Government during the present session from putting legislation on the statute-book. The Government, like all other Governments, will, no doubt, take steps in this direction in their own time and in their own way, but I am quite satisfied that the real remedy will not be to tinker with it or curtail it. It does seem to me that in Brisbane in particular a number of persons have, in regard to racing, taken the advice of an individual who said in regard to drink, "If whisky interferes with your business, give up your business." It seems that some people have given up their business because racing interfered with it, and have really made racing their business. There is infinitely too much racing in Brisbane for the number of people here and the capital available. There is no doubt that the workers have supported it, and if it were cut out altogether they would find something on which to gamble; but on the other hand the greater the facilities there are for that sort of thing the more will they indulge in it. My vote and example and advice would go in the direction, not of tinkering with the cancer or of poulticing it or of trimming it or of putting some of it out of the way, but of cutting the whole thing out altogether.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): We have been listening for quite a long time to lectures from the other side as to the need for improving racing and for introducing legislation to regulate it, and, if these opinions are held by members behind the Government, does it not appear that the time is ripe for them to take some action? I am not going to appear here as a "kill-joy"—it does not affect me one way or the other—

[*Mr. Winstanley.*]

but I think we might get to some business, and, if hon. members opposite want to amend the racing laws, let them get to work and do it. Some hon. members opposite say that you cannot make men better by Act of Parliament, and they say that some other action is necessary. I would suggest that some hon. members opposite, instead of lecturing us, should get out on to the racecourse on week days and take turns between the races to lecture to the people there on something that might be of value to them and the State. They might get up on boxes and give lectures on dairy farming; they might go to the whisperers and urgers and try to induce them to go in for fowl breeding. I can assure them that they would not need to take any eggs for demonstration purposes; there would be plenty of them there after the first time. (Laughter.) They might induce some of them to take up some useful occupation, and convert them from the racecourse to take up some of the Government farms that the returned soldiers have turned down. Some of them might reckon that they had picked "dead 'uns," but there might be some amongst the punters who would take their advice and grow peanuts; and then, if they had nothing else to eat, we might feed them on union agitators. (Laughter.) I hope that the Government will get to some business of value and in the interests of the State—something on which we can discuss matters of great national importance. I am not going to say that this matter is not important, but the matter is in the hands of the Government, and they seem to know so much about it that there is no need to lecture us any further.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): We have listened to a nice little lecturette from the hon. member for Burnett, but I do not think we should allow ourselves to be lectured as to when we shall speak, what we shall do, or how we ought to deal with the position. When this vote was moved the hon. member for Aubigny tried to get in a statement about stenographers who were forced to do something against their wishes, and the Chairman pulled him up. After that, the hon. member for Murilla made all sorts of wild charges against the Government and Government members, and then, because those charges are refuted and members of the Opposition are shown that they are responsible for the state of affairs which has existed in Queensland for the last fifty or sixty years, the hon. member for Burnett gives us a lecture on how we should restrain ourselves. The hon. member for Oxley, the hon. member for Burnett, and the hon. member for Aubigny advertise that they are the advocates of free speech, and, if they cannot get their say in this Chamber, they are going to Market Square or South Brisbane, where forty or fifty people tell them that they would be doing better by staying in the House. If innuendoes and charges are thrown at members on this side of the Chamber, then I and other members here are going to answer them, and we are not going to allow the Opposition to curtail our rights or "gag" us, or prevent us from speaking when we have the opportunity.

The main discussion on this vote has hinged upon racing. The Department of Justice has certain powers—it deals with totalisator business—but it has not full powers to enable it to curtail racing. Some

hon. members have stated that a curtailment of racing is not going to do much good, and that we must get to the root of things. As has been very aptly pointed out by you, Mr. Pollock, and by other members of this side, we have to know where we stand before we do anything. If it were possible for the Department of Justice to stop racing altogether, I for one would be only too pleased.

Mr. MOORE: You might do it under the Sugar Acquisition Act, as you did at Coorparoo.

Mr. GLEDSON: Perhaps the hon. member has lost some of his "sugar" at racing, and that is why he knows so much about it. I do not know what goes on at Coorparoo or Albion Park or Eagle Farm. I have never been to races at those places in my life. I have been to ordinary miners' sports, where they sometimes run horse races, but that is the limit of my knowledge. We have to consider what power we have, and whether the use of that power would do the thing we intended to do, or whether it would only do harm. I heard the hon. member for

Toowong make a speech in con-
[3 p.m.] nection with betting. I have gone down the streets of Brisbane and seen placards and boards stuck up in lanes. Going in to see what they were I have found that, instead of being bets on races in Brisbane, they related to betting on races in New South Wales and Victoria. The Department of Justice, by reducing racing to a minimum, would not abolish the betting evil; it would be there all the time. Some people at present are wagering that the Opposition will never become the Government of Queensland. They are giving big odds. We cannot stop them doing it, because we know they are likely to win every time. It does not seem to be a gamble; it is a certainty. I hope that the Government will do something to prevent race meetings on ordinary working days. Racing, itself, does not do any harm on off days—holidays and Saturday afternoons. But when races are held on working days they take away from their work men who not only lose their money at the racecourse but also their wages. That is when it should be stopped.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I would like to make a few observations, more particularly in reference to the hon. member for Murilla, who lashed himself into a fury. He, first of all, described racing as an industry, and then he suggested that it should be placed under Government control. It is refreshing to hear the hon. member advocating Government control of any industry. He forgot to tell the Committee that proprietary racing had been established and was in existence in this State when this Government took control of the Treasury benches, and that the Governments which had preceded us had done nothing whatever to prevent it. A question asked by the hon. member for Nundah in this House a fortnight ago elicited the answer that the Sandgate racecourse was transferred, by virtue of permission given by a Tory Government, to the present proprietor and made a proprietary club; so that this Government were not responsible for that.

Mr. GLEDSON: We did not suggest that John Wren paid them anything for it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A good deal has been said to-day about proprietary

racing; but the men who were attacking it immediately switched off on to the evil of gambling and subordinated the question of racing to that of gambling at races. If we are going to deal with the question as a gambling affair, well and good. If it is bad to race on a proprietary course, it is equally bad to race on a club course. I would like the hon. member for Aubigny to remember that.

Mr. MOORE: I do not agree with you, so I do not want to remember it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member admitted that gambling was an evil, but he was not prepared to go to the extent of wiping it out.

Mr. MOORE: I gave you my reasons.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said, "Would you be prepared to wipe out racing in Australia if you had the power tomorrow?" He said, "No." He admitted it was an evil, yet he was not prepared to abolish the evil if he had the power. That is a specimen of the statesmen we would have on this side if, by a political accident, hon. members opposite obtained control of the Treasury benches. Hon. members opposite overlooked the fact that during the last few months the Government have done a great deal to restrict racing. Did we not exercise to the fullest extent our powers to stop night racing? I doubt whether hon. members opposite would have the courage to deal with that question as we dealt with it.

Mr. MOORE: Why did you do it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We had sound reasons for doing it. The public of Queensland are against night racing, and we, therefore, did not permit it. Imputations of dishonesty and bribery were thrown around the Chamber by the hon. member for Murilla this morning. What was the basis of his charge? That proprietary racing is permitted. Let us look at the position. Perhaps the hon. member for Murilla is not aware of the fact that the same officials conduct proprietary and non-proprietary registered meetings in Brisbane; and the committee of the Queensland Turf Club could to-morrow reduce the number of days on proprietary registered courses by one-half, or could cut them out altogether. As the hon. member for Port Curtis and the hon. member for Toowong can tell you, there are members in this House who are members of the Queensland Turf Club. They could exert an influence over the committee. Surely it is not suggested that the committee of the Queensland Turf Club or the members of the Queensland Turf Club are "in the bag"? Yet the position is that, if the members of the Queensland Turf Club so desire, they can reduce by one-half or three-quarters, or cut out altogether, registered proprietary racing in Brisbane. The overwhelming majority of the members of that exclusive body are against the Government. I do not suggest that they are "in the bag," but I say that they can exercise control if they so desire, and reduce racing without any interference on the part of the Government. If everybody took the same interest in racing as I do, the question would solve itself. I am not against racing; I look upon it as a good sport, and I go there occasionally and have an occasional bet. There is no good in disguising the fact that racing is a national pastime in Australia. It does not matter what anybody says to the contrary, it would be absurd to suggest that racing could be abolished in Australia. Nobody but a lunatic would suggest it. It is

Hon. J. Mullan.]

supposed to be the sport of kings. I recognise, however, that you can have too much even of a good thing; and it is quite possible to have too much racing. I am not going to say that we have not too much racing now. I have been giving a good deal of consideration to the question of racing. I have had reports on racing law, and, on the whole of the aspects of the question, from all parts of Australia and elsewhere, and at present I am giving a great deal of consideration to the question. I want to tell hon. members of the Opposition that we are going to deal with this question, in our own time and in our own way. It is not so easy to regulate this question by Act of Parliament as hon. members opposite suggest. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Gregory, there are many difficulties. Who is going to regulate or allocate the days of racing? Is it to be the Government? Is it to be some committee appointed by the Government or the clubs themselves? Whatever method is adopted, suspicion will be cast upon somebody by men with vicious minds. While on the question of men with vicious minds, I wish to refer to the allegation made to-day by hon. members opposite about buying parties, and buying Governments, and buying members. If there is one body of men in Queensland or in Australia who should shut their mouths about buying anybody, it is hon. members opposite.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What have we got to do with it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman knows what I mean. Perhaps I should particularise, in fairness to some of the hon. members opposite.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is a "dud."

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No member of the Country party should talk about buying anybody.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is a "dud." It did not explode.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Drayton to obey my call to order. I can assure him that if he will not do so, I will take steps to compel him to do so.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Thank you. I will deal with the Minister at another time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If the hon. member for Drayton were the only person we had to deal with, our journey through life would be a very easy one. (Government laughter.) The leader of the Opposition this morning made a statement which I regard as an important one, and one which, in my opinion, should get him somewhere if he has the courage. He made a definite charge against this Government by stating that a member of the Tattersall's Club had told him that he had paid ten guineas towards a certain fund in order that certain legislation dealing with racing should not be proceeded with, or words to that effect.

Mr. BRENNAN: Another Wando Vale "stunt."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If the hon. gentleman is a man and has courage, it is for him to prove that charge. He has been for years trying to turn this Government out of office, and here is his opportunity. I am satisfied that the great majority—in fact, I believe the whole party

[Hon. J. Mullan.

standing behind me—refuse to stand for that sort of thing. I am quite satisfied that if the leader of the Opposition can prove his charge, the Government will be destroyed to-morrow. I for one will be included in the number that will not stand for that. Here is the chance, if they want to turn the Government out. If hon. members opposite want a Government of the type that they would create, then let the leader of the Opposition prove his charge.

Mr. MOORE: Prove that a bookmaker told him that he gave ten guineas?

Question put and passed.

COURTS OF PETTY SESSIONS.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

"That £54,348 be granted for 'Courts of Petty Sessions.'"

Question put and passed.

ELECTORAL REGISTRATION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I beg to move—

"That £12,973 be granted for 'Electoral Registration.'"

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): It is very strange, after all the tales we have heard from the Opposition during the session about State electoral rolls, that when the vote comes on, they do not want any discussion.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We cannot get any information.

Mr. PEASE: The charge has been levelled at the Government that there has been no control exercised over the rolls. I have a report dealing with roll work which states—

"This most important phase of our work has progressed during the period under review, and in Mirani, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Mundingburra, Herbert, Cairns, Charters Towers, Queenon, and Kennedy the whole of the rolls have been thoroughly revised and extensively cleaned."

On the one hand hon. members opposite, especially in the Country party, say that the rolls have not been cleansed, and here we have a report saying that the rolls have been thoroughly revised and cleansed in the electorates mentioned. The report further states—

"This has necessitated the removal by objection or by transfer of, approximately, 4,500 names of persons who appear on the rolls stated."

The report further states—

"In addition to electorates named the same work has been performed in Gregory, Flinders, and Burke electorates, in the latter of which we have on hand at present some 2,000 names for removal."

It will be news to this Committee to know that some 2,000 have to be removed from the Burke electoral roll. The report goes on—

"Apart from deletions stated, applications for new enrolments have been treated with from all centres in satisfactory numbers."

The report I am quoting from is not the report of the department, but it is a report by the Country party. These hypocrites come into this Chamber and say that the rolls have not been attended to.

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

Mr. PEASE: I withdraw it. The criticism in connection with the rolls, as I have shown by their own report, is absurd. They come into this Chamber and say that the rolls have not been dealt with, but according to their own official—a man whom they pay—some 2,000 names are listed for removal from the Burke electoral roll. Certain circulars are sent out into different electorates. Those circulars were discussed last session. You, Sir, referred to the matter this session. The circulars are sent out by the Country party. I wish to draw attention to the close of the circular—

“Failing immediate attention an objection to your name appearing on roll will be lodged, and your neglect to attend to the matter leaves you liable to a penalty.

“(Signed) H. G. BRADLEY,
“Organising secretary.”

In addition to Mr. Bradley being organising secretary of the Country party, he is also on the executive of the Country party, and I charge the Country party with an attempt to intimidate the electors in this matter. They sent out claims already filled in—I have one of them here—and the point I want to make is that these claims are to be returned to the Country party in Townsville, and they deal with them. How will they deal with them?

Mr. MOORE: They will be finalised.

Mr. PEASE: What guarantee have we that they will be finalised? Now a black list was sent out. The employers were asked to send in a list of names and were told to mark the political opinions of those men, and, if a claim came in from a man whose name was marked with a cross, what would they do with it? Do you think for one minute that it would be finalised? The charge of intimidation of the electors by the Country party is clearly proved by this circular. It is an absurd thing that they should handle things like this. The people do not understand the question. They think that this Mr. Bradley is speaking for the department. If they find that there is the slightest doubt in the minds of those people that they are going to vote in favour of the Labour party, that is the end of the claim. In March, 1920, Mr. Bradley was issuing circulars and other literature which were signed by him as organising secretary for the National Political Union of which the Northern president was Mr. E. G. Garbutt, and the publicity agent was John H. C. Sleeman. To-day we have Mr. Garbutt on the executive council of the Country party, and associated with him are Mr. J. P. Peterson, chairman, W. F. R. Boyce, secretary, R. H. Edkins, J. A. Austin, W. G. B. Batchelor, J. W. Newberry, A. J. Macdonald, C. V. Hives, E. G. Parnell, A. Gray, and J. W. Fletcher, M.L.A. To-day Mr. Garbutt is the Northern president of the Country party, and he is also director of the Queensland Probate and Insurance Company, with John H. C. Sleeman as publicity manager. Mr. Bradley is organising secretary of the Country party, and he is to get £100 bonus for every Northern seat captured from the Labour party in addition to a big salary and expenses.

Mr. VOWLES: How do you know that?

Mr. PEASE: I know it is a fact. It has been stated publicly. Messrs. Garbutt, Bradley, and Sleeman were the men who controlled the whole of the Northern elections, and money was poured out like water. The expenses necessary in thus attending to the rolls are very great, and I would like to know where the money is coming from. These people have got men in every district in Queensland from Mackay north, and from Mackay south they have also men on the job. Who are paying for these men? One man travels throughout the Herbert electorate and he does nothing else but visit all these places and he gets a salary and expenses, and all he has to do is to remove names from the roll. In this report, in connection with the money to pay these men, it is stated—

“That a levy struck by the Graziers' Association on their members was conflicting, but arrangements have been made to adjust this.”

I claim this links up the Country party with the Graziers' Association, and they must accept responsibility for what has been done by the Graziers' Association and their paid agent, Mr. Edkins. The leader of the Opposition stated in a previous debate that the Country party had no funds. It is officially stated that the annual revenue of the Townsville branch of the Country party is £3,500. Mr. Bradley was challenged publicly to disprove this, and the man who challenged him offered to pay £10 10s. if it could be disproved. Mr. Bradley was silent because he could not dispute it. The man happened to be a paid official, and he knew all about it; yet the leader of the Opposition told us that they had no funds. Then we come on to this levy struck by the graziers. It will be news to this Committee to know that the fund a few days ago amounted to £34,000, and it might, too, astonish this Committee to know that the balance-sheet shows an expenditure of £3,000 not so very long ago. The other day the leader of the Opposition washed his hands of Boyce, Garbutt, and others. He may have washed his hands, but the stain remained, and this stain is going to remain on the Country party. Does he wash his hands of the hon. member for Townsville, who was a member of that organisation? Does he wash his hands of the hon. member for Port Curtis, who is a member of the executive?

Mr. FLETCHER: No. I was representing someone else.

Mr. PEASE: I will prove that you are.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I will ask the hon. member to connect his remarks with the vote.

Mr. PEASE: At this meeting one of the chief matters dealt with was the question of electoral boundaries and the electoral rolls, and the main object of the meeting was to wipe off the electoral rolls the names of those who were supposed to be supporters of this Government.

Mr. BRAND: No.

Mr. PEASE: At the council meeting of the Primary Producers' Union held in Brisbane the following resolution was carried:—

“That this council appreciates and approves of the resolutions passed by the parliamentary Country party as submitted by the leader of the Opposition, and recommends that the executive council take all steps necessary in the matter.”

Mr. Pease.]

Mr. Peterson, president of the Primary Producers' Union, and chairman of that meeting, was also chairman of executive council of the Queensland Country party, and Mr. Boyce, one of those who approached the Premier, is organising secretary of the Primary Producers' Union, and he is also one of the executive councillors of the Country party, and in his report he states—

“Our parliamentary strength has increased during the year from nineteen members to twenty-four (Green, Jones, Peterson, Fletcher, and Elphinstone).”

Mr. Edkins was a delegate at that meeting for the United Graziers' Association, and he is also one of the executive. Mr. Fletcher, member for Port Curtis, was present at that meeting.

Mr. FLETCHER: Representing someone else.

Mr. PEASE: As a member of the executive. The leader of the Opposition was also at that meeting.

Mr. MOORE: What was the date of that meeting?

Mr. PEASE: I will tell you. I will let you see the minutes. The report further says—

“‘A crisis in the State's affairs may develop.’ It was decided to ‘take all steps necessary.’”

The matter was discussed of wiping names off the rolls, and also the question of electoral boundaries. There were a good many parliamentarians present. I ask the leader of the Opposition—is he going to wash his hands of all those men who were present? What was the state of affairs that was expected to develop?

Mr. VOWLES: I rise to a point of order. First of all, is the hon. member in order in dealing with such matters as minutes on a vote such as this? Secondly, if he says I was present at any meeting that discussed the question of wiping people off the roll, I tell him those minutes are false.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Herbert is quite in order in reading extracts from any minutes so long as he connects his remarks with the subject-matter under discussion, and so far he has done that.

Mr. PEASE: Why was it necessary to discuss the question of deleting names from the electoral rolls? Why was it necessary for the Country party to find big funds to pay agents to go throughout this State with the sole object of wiping names off the rolls?

Mr. VOWLES: Do you say that I was present at the meeting when that was discussed?

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Of course, you were.

Mr. PEASE: Just fancy 4,500 being wiped off the roll! I charge members of the Opposition with deliberately attempting to wipe off the rolls of Queensland the names of the supporters of this Government. I charge gentlemen controlling the Opposition with finding funds to wipe names off the rolls to break up this Government. They are trying to do things, so far as [3.30 p.m.] Parliament is concerned and so far as things outside Parliament are concerned, by sending papers with these questions to people who do not understand the questions, and who think they are officially authorised to do such things. It is all very well for the leader of the Opposition to wash his hands—like Pilate. By the time

he finishes washing his hands he will have washed his hands of every member sitting behind him, including himself. They must accept the responsibility of the men higher up, who are finding the funds to do these things. If there is an attempt to bribe members of this House, where is the money coming from?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PEASE: The whole question depends on roll work—the first item in their report is roll work—because they realise how necessary it is. If that is the first item of their report, it distinctly proves what crisis they talked about. What crisis was it? It could only be an election. How can they get the benefit of these names being struck off the rolls if not at an election? Why was this meeting held? Because a crisis might develop, and to take all steps necessary. That fund was necessary to have the names taken off the roll, to pay men to go through every electorate in the far North and strike off names from the electoral rolls. The developments which have taken place lately all point to one thing.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What is the crisis referred to?

At 3.35 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. PEASE: An election crisis. The crisis was also an attempt to win over the Premier. Who instigated all the newspaper talk in connection with the matter? They justify the approach that was made to the Premier. The Northern Country party, when this report was discussed, communicated with Mr. Garbutt and he admitted the fact that he had had an interview with the Premier. The only thing they deplored was that the thing was made public, and the only thing they deplore now is that it is still being made public. The whole thing proves that these gentlemen control the party opposite. The leader of the Country party attends these meetings and then comes here and washes his hands. We have to stand up for all the meetings our people hold. Hon. members opposite twit us here about the meetings our party hold. We stand up to them and are not ashamed of them. The leader of the Opposition is present at these interviews when all these things are done. He takes part in the deliberations, and then he comes here and says he washes his hands of them. I say that he cannot wash his hands. If he washes his hands he washes the hands of his party. The hon. member for Port Curtis, Mr. Garbutt, and the hon. member for Townsville are the men we have to fight. The men I have had to fight in my electorate are Bradley, Garbutt, and Sleeman up to now. At the first election I contested the leader of the Opposition came up and took part in the campaign. He said that we stuffed the rolls and put a lot of railway men on the rolls. He said that they were going to contest the election; but when they got the roll down to bedrock they found they could not contest the election. We fought that election with clean hands, so far as the rolls were concerned. The Australian Workers' Union did not send circulars to their supporters and say, “Send back these official claims, completed, to the Australian Workers' Union office and we will deal with them”; but the Country party do that, and what is being done there is being done in every part of Queensland. They have no right to get hold of these claims. I consider it is illegal on their part to have men going

[Mr. Pease.]

round making unfortunate people who do not understand the question fill up the forms.

Mr. MOORE: Do you say that we have no right to get claims filled up?

Mr. PEASE: I say that you have no right to do what you are doing. It is part and parcel of what is going on. The attempt to bring over the Premier and everything else was entirely linked up with the "faking" of the rolls. The hon. member for Gregory pointed out that hon. members opposite sent circulars to squatters and told them to mark off those they could not trust to vote against Labour. I know what is going on in the Herbert electorate. I know that men are being paid to go round week after week to wipe men off the roll. The hon. member for Port Curtis is part and parcel of this scheme, because he attends these meetings. The hon. member is not man enough to stand up to what he does; he says he represents someone else. What about the hon. member for Townsville? He represents Messrs. Bradley and Garbutt. All these men are doing roll work. It is the first thing mentioned in their report. The roll work being done proves that the crisis which was expected to develop was the election. I say that the position is absolutely disgraceful, and the people of Queensland will not stand for it. The people will give hon. members opposite an answer. I charge hon. members opposite and their junta who control the position—these Primary Producers' Union people, these grazing people, with their £34,000 fund—with deliberately attempting to corrupt the electoral rolls. I say they have no right to do it. Hon. members opposite are not game enough to stand up to what they do. They ask Government members to accept responsibilities for what people over in Russia do. We ask hon. members opposite to accept responsibility for what they do themselves. The leader of the Opposition says, "I wash my hands." As I said before, Pilate washed his hands, but the stain remained; and the stain remains on the Country party. What are they doing now? In the South they are talking about changing their name to the Progressive party, because the name of the Country party absolutely stinks. The leader of the Opposition will wash his hands of the name of the Country party directly, and he will be a progressivite at the next election. In my electorate the people are astounded that there is not to be an election. They were told there would be an election in November and to have the rolls examined in readiness for it. Everyone knows that. It is common rumour. The candidate who has been selected to oppose me in Herbert has been living in Innisfail for the last two months; before that he was living in Ingham. He said they were sure that there was going to be an election, and they were going to get the rolls ready. Why do they take our supporters off the roll if they can and intimidate them by these circulars? These circulars were sent to me, and I was asked if they had to do it. I wired that every elector should have the right to work in another part of the electorate without having his name taken off the roll. A man may work at Innisfail this year, and then go to Babinda and Cairns to look for work next year. These people have an expert system. A man may be working in Townsville one week and may go to Babinda to look for work next week, and these people know it through the system which they have

in operation. The man is told, "You must take your name off the Herbert roll and get on to the Eacham roll, because you are in Babinda." That system costs a lot of money, and it is going on all over Queensland. Hon. members opposite try to tell us that there is nothing being done to the rolls in order to mislead us. The leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Port Curtis, and the hon. member for Townsville attend meetings in Brisbane, where these matters are brought up, and at the head of the report we find, "Roll work. Get the rolls up, because there is to be an election." What about the attempt of the junta of hon. members opposite to win over the Premier?

Mr. VOWLES: Do you say that I had anything to do with those minutes?

Mr. PEASE: I will give you the minutes. I am not like you, saying that my grandmother's sister's aunt told me that ten guineas were contributed by someone to have a Bill withdrawn. I charge the leader of the Opposition with being controlled by the funds of the graziers, amounting to £34,000.

Mr. VOWLES: I say you are a liar!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the leader of the Opposition will withdraw that.

Mr. VOWLES: It is absolutely untrue, and he knows it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the remark that he made.

Mr. VOWLES: I suppose I have got to do it. I will withdraw it because it is the parliamentary procedure to do so.

Mr. PEASE: I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition if that matter was not discussed at the meeting?

Mr. VOWLES: What meeting?

Mr. PEASE: The meeting of the Primary Producers' Union.

Mr. BRAND: What was the date of the meeting?

Mr. PEASE: I want to know if the leader of the Opposition will admit that he was present at that meeting of the Primary Producers' Union when the council passed a resolution expressing appreciation of the resolutions passed by his party. I charge them with striking off the rolls the names of Labour supporters. This sort of thing costs a lot of money. They follow Labour supporters from town to town and try to bluff them off the roll.

Mr. BRAND: Why don't you say that outside?

Mr. PEASE: I am game to say it outside. I am game to say it in the Market Square to-night if you like. Yet the leader of the Opposition washes his hands of all these things like Pilate did. It is like Satan taking the Founder of Christianity up the mountain and telling Him to do certain things and He could have all the kingdoms of the earth. These people go to the Premier and ask him to sell the Labour party. Hon. members opposite want government by wealth for the wealthy. It will be a bad day for Queensland when the machinery of government passes into the power of those who are out to exploit the people. It will be a bad day for Queensland if that sort of thing occurs. These people have £34,000 to spend in order to secure the reins of government. We are

Mr. Pease.]

not going to appeal to the electors when hon. gentlemen opposite want us to appeal, but when the members of this party and the Premier decide. When we do appeal. I do not think that the people will stand for the sort of thing that I have just read out. We know that all this power of money is behind the Opposition; yet they say that John Wren is trying to buy the Government. We have the evidence that they held their meeting, because it appears in the "Daily Mail." I have the list here, and I see there were a good many parliamentarians present. The hon. member for Burrum, Mr. Brand, was there. Hon. members go down Queen street and go into a meeting and get amongst things of that sort, and then they come here and say they wash their hands of it altogether. Yet they say that John Wren is spending money to buy Government members! I think I have proved that members opposite are the people who are controlled by a junta outside.

Mr. BRAND: John Wren spends £36,000 a year in tips.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): Is the hon. member for Burrum in order in saying that John Wren spends £36,000 a year in attempting to buy Government members? The leader of the Opposition called the hon. member for Herbert a liar just now. If the hon. member for Burrum makes that charge, I have no hesitation in calling him a liar.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Do I understand that the hon. member for Burrum inferred that Mr. John Wren spent £36,000 a year on Government members?

Mr. BRAND: I said that John Wren spends £36,000 a year in tips.

Mr. PEASE: The balance-sheet shows that the sum of £3,000 was withdrawn recently. The leader of the Opposition said that a crisis was developing, but the crisis has not developed in the way the leader of the Opposition thought it would. Another crisis is developing in a more astounding way than that. Yet the leader of the Opposition comes here and poses as a political purist. The American Tammany party never attempted to do any such thing as that. They never interfered with the rolls. During the Herbert election money was poured out like water. There were thousands of pounds paid out in my electorate in trying to defeat me and defeat the Labour party; but the people of Herbert realised the position. I never thought I would win the election because of the power of wealth that was against me. The people, however, realised the position and returned me. The leader of the Opposition washes his hands of these people outside. How can he wash his hands of them when he attends the meetings? If we attend any meeting of the Australian Labour party, hon. members opposite mention it and we stand up to it. When the Premier attended a certain meeting to decide certain questions affecting the whole of Australia, we had to stand up to it, and we are willing to stand up to it every time.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I think this is an important vote. It is rather a queer thing, seeing that members of the Opposition have had so much to say about stuffed rolls within the last few years, that now they suddenly discover that there is nothing interesting in this vote for them to talk about.

Mr. BRAND: It is more interesting to listen to you stonewalling.

[*Mr. Pease.*]

Mr. POLLOCK: I have some suggestions to make, and I hope that some adjustment will be made in the Gregory electorate as a result of my remarks. The Gregory electorate is the largest electorate in Queensland. There are sixty polling-booths in that electorate, some of which are from 30 to 300 miles away from the nearest railway station. One of them is 500 miles away from the railway. It is almost impossible for a Labour candidate to appoint scrutineers on stations at election time. There is always the manager of a station with his wife, governess, bookkeeper, and so on, and it is an easy enough matter to get a presiding officer. It is easy enough for our opponents to get scrutineers, but it is difficult for a Labour man to get a presiding officer or a scrutineer who is of his way of thinking. I am not satisfied with the method of controlling elections adopted by the Department of Justice. I am not going to say it is their fault. I believe a system can be devised that will be an improvement on the present system. To-day the votes are placed in the ballot-box. Remember that the Labour man has to do without a scrutineer, because the average working man on a station, even if he has Labour sympathies, is not prepared to act as scrutineer when he knows that there is a chance of getting the sack next day. No one can prove victimisation. It is a poor sort of employer who cannot find a reason for dismissing a man.

Mr. J. JONES: Do you know of any cases?

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not say that it applies to every station.

Mr. J. JONES: Do you know of one?

Mr. POLLOCK: I cannot prove one. I am fair enough to say that. But the hon. member for Kennedy knows that cases have occurred where men have been discharged for taking an active part in elections.

Mr. J. JONES: That applies to all parties.

Mr. POLLOCK: Having established the admission that these things do take place, and that men who act as scrutineers are dismissed for that reason by pig-headed men managing stations, it is very obvious that any man who takes on a job as scrutineer for a Labour man on a station where the boss is a firm Nationalist or Country party supporter takes a chance. It is not often that I care to ask men to take such a chance. It is a big thing to ask a man depending on work on a station openly to declare his politics, particularly if I am doubtful about the sort of reception he is going to get after the election; and, in many cases, because I have not had the necessary money—in spite of all this money which is said to be coming from John Wren and others, according to hon. members opposite—I have had to dispense with scrutineers on twenty or thirty stations. The result is that the election there is left in the hands of my opponents.

Mr. LOGAN: How did you fare?

Mr. POLLOCK: I was beaten by 100 votes in the group where I had previously a three to one majority, and it was not because of waning popularity. That is the reason why I approach the matter in this Chamber, and I will tell hon. members how I believe the thing is worked. I do not say that it is done in a wide-spread way, nor do I accuse every man managing a station of doing it. I believe that a good many of them, fortunately, are above that sort of thing, but we cannot have fair

elections when we leave the door open to unfair tactics. I am not growling about individuals; I have not a case I can prove, but I know that something is wrong. Supposing the manager of a station is acting as scrutineer for my opponent and the book-keeper is presiding officer, and I have no scrutineer. The ballot-papers are supposed to be locked up and not touched by any of the parties concerned and then forwarded to Winton or Cloncurry, or some other place, as the case may be. There they are emptied into a heap and mixed up and counted. What guarantee have I that those two men, opposed to me in politics and without any check, have not taken out every one of those papers—they cannot mark them for my opponent—and made the votes for me informal? I did not have very many informal votes, fortunately—not so many as I expected—but I believe it was done; but, whether it was done or not, the fact remains that it can be done. It is the duty of the Government to see that there is a fair election—that is all I want. I do not want any start from any other candidate. I think I can win with a fair start at any time, but there are other men who are not so fortunately situated as I am. The Attorney-General himself has a seat in which he will sometimes find it difficult to get scrutineers, and he must know that there is nothing to prevent anybody from tampering with those ballot-papers and making informal the votes for the Labour party, and, when they are all brought in from forty or fifty places and counted, who is to say where they came from?

Mr. LOGAN: That can only happen in a three-cornered election.

Mr. POLLOCK: Not only in a three-cornered election. They have quite a number of informal votes in an ordinary election.

Mr. BRAND: Do you want a Labour presiding officer?

Mr. POLLOCK: No, although there would be nothing wrong in that.

Mr. BRAND: We do not quibble about Labour presiding officers.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not quibbling about them, provided I can secure scrutineers. I think that, in order to secure absolutely fair elections, where it is impossible to secure scrutineers without fear of victimisation, the expenses of scrutineers should be paid. I put that forward as a serious suggestion, not because I want any political advantage, not because I want to avoid spending money—because I could not secure them anyhow—but to ensure that there will be nothing wrong with the voting. I am not asking for a start or any unfair advantage. I am only asking for a fair vote and a fair counting of the vote, and I do not think any man should ask for any more or any less. Without wishing to make my innuendoes at all, I want to say that most hon. members opposite are better off financially than members of the Labour party. We know that a large amount of money is subscribed from various sources, and that their organisations are always in possession of plenty of money.

Mr. BRAND: You get more than we do for fighting an election.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the hon. member had a telescope, he would be at liberty to look at my banking account, but, first of all, he would have to find it for me. I get the

shillings and pence and the half-crowns of the working people who support me for what I can give them if returned as a member. What other money does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. J. JONES: You get it from the head office of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. POLLOCK: There is an impression abroad that members on this side do get election funds from somewhere. I do not remember getting any money except the occasional pound of the hard, old "battler" from Urandangie, or Boulia, or some such place, who cheerfully gives it for the sake of getting a fair return in the shape of administration by a Labour Government. Occasionally a few shillings are subscribed by the men and women in the principal towns of the electorate, but beyond that there is no money for Labour candidates, at any rate, not for me, and, that being the case, I think that in big country electorates—I do not say in every electorate—consideration should be given to Labour members, and, where it is impossible to get Labour scrutineers on stations without fear of their being victimised, a member should be permitted to send out men at the expense of the department.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): The hon. member for Herbert has brought forward the minutes of a meeting of the executive council of a body with which I am connected. He cannot give the date.

Mr. PEASE: Yes, I can.

Mr. VOWLES: He gave the Chamber to understand at the beginning of his remarks that this meeting was called for the purpose of dealing with the question of taking names off the rolls and the prospect of an early election, and he tried to connect that up with a certain incident which has been

[4 p.m.] referred to affecting men now before the court. I find that I have attended two meetings this year. One was in January—I do not know the date. That is the only occasion when the hon. member for Burrum attended a meeting that I was at.

Mr. PEASE: You must have a very short memory if you cannot remember a meeting which discussed such important things.

Mr. VOWLES: I have not attended a meeting where questions were not asked regarding the condition of the rolls. The hon. member tried to connect up recent incidents with an early election and something about juggling with the rolls.

Mr. PEASE: The juggling with the rolls I have proved from your own report signed by Bradley.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member has proved it to his own satisfaction. He tells us that I and other hon. members of this party are dominated by outside interests. He quotes balance-sheets of organisations in which we are not a bit interested. I wish we did have those funds.

Mr. COLLINS: Who is paying the organiser in my electorate?

Mr. VOWLES: I know nothing about the various electorates. Every electorate looks after its own interests, and so does every district.

Mr. COLLINS: I would like to know where the funds are coming from.

Mr. VOWLES: So would I. I would like to get my hands on that mysterious

Mr. Vowles.]

sum of £3,500 which is so much talked about. There is a suggestion that £3,500 was recently taken out of the funds of the graziers, as disclosed by that balance-sheet. Why was that suggestion made? Surely anybody can read between the lines. There is a veiled suggestion that that is the money referred to in the case that is now sub judice. If that is so, let me tell the hon. member that he knows a lot more about it than any of us.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): The hon. member for Herbert, and every hon. member in this Chamber, should know that no parliamentarian, outsider, or organisation, can remove the name of any man or woman from the rolls of this State.

Mr. PEASE: That is not the charge I made. I said that an organisation got hold of the cards and did not complete them.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is the charge which the hon. member made. No one can get the name of any man or woman off the roll unless with the connivance of the officers of the Electoral Department. Does the hon. member suggest that those officers would connive at anything of that kind? It is perfectly within the rights of any member of Parliament or any organisation to send in the names of people who, it would appear, should not be on the rolls they are on. What is done when the names are sent in? Are they taken off the roll? We know quite well that they are not.

Mr. HARTLEY: The names never get in.

Mr. TAYLOR: Proper inquiry is made before the name of any man or woman is taken off the roll. If he or she has a right to be on that particular roll, the probability is that the name will remain on the roll. Hon. members opposite know that a question was asked in this Chamber a short time ago by the hon. member for Townsville with regard to the names on the Townsville roll. Do hon. members opposite say that those names should remain on that roll? Is there anything wrong in an organisation taking action to see that people shall be on the roll for the electorate in which they reside? Because a man is a week or a fortnight out of his electorate, no one here would say that his name should be taken off the roll. What were the facts in Paddington at the recent by-election? The State roll showed the names of 1,650 people who were supposed to be residing in the electorate; and, by a comparison with the Federal roll, 90 per cent. of those people were found to have removed to other electorates.

Mr. BRENNAN: Did they all vote?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not saying that they voted.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That statement proves nothing; they may be correctly on the State roll, nevertheless.

Mr. TAYLOR: If they are correctly on the State roll, they are incorrectly on the Federal roll.

Mr. POLLOCK: Quote the number of cases of dual voting.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not think there are many cases.

Mr. POLLOCK: What is wrong if there are not many cases of dual voting?

[*Mr. Vowles.*

Mr. TAYLOR: If a man is resident in my electorate for six, eight, or nine months, he has a right to be on my roll, and not on the Townsville roll. All I ask is that he shall go on the roll for the electorate where he is domiciled.

Mr. POLLOCK: Whose fault is it if he does not?

Mr. TAYLOR: In discussing electoral matters previously I have said that more responsibility should be thrown on the individual voter. I would like to see organisations cut out of this business of finding who are on the roll and who are not. What does our Elections Act say? It says that "After an election, notices are to be sent out to every voter who has not turned up at the poll, asking the reasons for not voting."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was done in Paddington, and prosecutions followed.

Mr. TAYLOR: It has been done here and there, but it is not carried out in all the electorates. If those notices were sent out and no replies came in answer to the queries, the office would know the reason. All we ask for is a clean electoral roll; we do not want any favours or anything of that kind. The hon. member for Gregory was careful in his remarks to say that scrutineers should be provided if the Labour candidates were unable to provide them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I said that their expenses from the nearest town ought to be defrayed.

Mr. TAYLOR: For Labour candidates.

Mr. POLLOCK: I was only speaking for myself.

Mr. TAYLOR: If such a system as that were introduced, I think we would find that we would have to pay for scrutineers everywhere. A scrutineer is allowed into the booth on behalf of the candidate only as an act of courtesy.

Mr. POLLOCK: No, he is there by right.

Mr. TAYLOR: Call it "by right" if you wish; still he is not provided for. There will always be difficulties, but I would not like to think that many men would act in the manner suggested by the hon. member. I think he said that he did not think there were many; but, the opportunity was there. Where a candidate was unable to provide for a scrutineer on some outback station, could not the difficulty be got over and the identification of the ballot-paper made complete if, instead of the ballot-papers being sent to the central organisation or some particular polling booth and emptied into a heap, they were counted on the station.

Mr. POLLOCK: That was why the group voting system was instituted—so that people could not be victimised. If there are six men on a station and five vote Labour, it leaves the way open for victimisation.

Mr. TAYLOR: It might lead to abuse. It seems to me that, if men lay themselves out to do these things, try as we may we shall not be able to prevent them. I have always been satisfied with the returning officers at any election that I have contested. I have never raised any objection. I have never said that any man should be removed or that any man should be given in charge. The Labour officials at the poll have never been objected to by me. Greater responsibility should be thrown upon the individual voter. If he removes from one district to another for a

nonth or two, and is likely to remain there for a certain period, then it is incumbent upon him to send in his change of address with full particulars to the Electoral Office. If that were done, all this talk we have heard this afternoon about roll-stuffing would probably not occur. Every political organisation and every political party, be it Nationalist, Country, or Labour, tries to raise all the funds it possibly can in order to fight and win elections. If it is right for one party to do it, surely it right for another. If one party can get more money together than another, it does not necessarily follow that they are going to win the elections. What was done at one of the Labour conferences? The hon. member for Herbert knows that they made a compulsory levy on all the unionists of Australia, to start what? Political papers. By that levy I think they expected and hoped to get somewhere between £250,000 and £300,000. Hon. members opposite talk about the money raised by organisations on this side of the House as if it was a crime; but they are doing exactly the same thing throughout Australia to-day. Let us be fair in our criticism one with the other. Let us be honest in our dealing one with the other, and let us play the game. That is all that is wanted. If we can get clean rolls, that is all we require. Assistance should be given by every person to see that the rolls are clean. Unfortunately, as I have instanced, we find that in connection with the Paddington by-election there was a difference of 90 per cent. between the Federal and State rolls with respect to persons who had removed from that electorate to other portions of the State. I do not think it is fair that that should be allowed to continue. It has been suggested that we might have one uniform roll. That might not get over the difficulty; but, at the same time, I think that the difficulty is one that can be considerably modified, and I do not see any reason for the remarks of the hon. member for Herbert with regard to certain action being taken by members in North Queensland in order to get clean rolls. He said that they should not be supplied with the forms. Any organisation can go to the Electoral Office and say that so many forms are required, and they can get them and send them out and have them filled in. Sometimes they may be returned direct to the Electoral Office and sometimes to the organisation. He is not going to make me believe that many of them are kept back—that is too serious a matter. A man's name cannot be taken off the roll unless he signs a form to that effect.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): I understand the hon. member for Herbert was not referring to names already on the roll but to new applications for enrolment—that is to say, names that have not been on the roll previously. He referred to the report of the Country party, which states—

“We have on hand at present some 2,000 names for removal. Apart from the deletions stated applications for new enrolments have been treated from all centres in satisfactory numbers.”

Mr. MOORE: That does not say that those names have not been on rolls before.

Mr. BRENNAN: It is in connection with the change of names that there may be great abuse. I think the law should be altered in connection with persons who are appointed to organise or canvass the electorates. These

persons should be compelled to register at the clerk of petty sessions' office or the nearest electoral registrar's office. They should have a book in which they should enter from month to month the names they have dealt with during each month. That would be some protection to the people who trusted the canvassers, and who considered them *bonâ fide* canvassers, who called at the door for the purpose of transferring their name to another roll or for the purpose of enrolling them for the first time. They should be compelled to keep that book in accordance with regulations, and they should be compelled to take it to the clerk of petty sessions' office once in six months for the purpose of having it checked with the rolls. Imagine the Northern Country party having eight men, and paying them £7 a week and £3 a week expenses, which means £80 a week or £5,000 a year for organising in North Queensland alone. The Labour party do appoint an organiser. We have Mr. J. S. Collings. He receives a salary and expenses. What for? He addresses meetings in the different centres, and he is the only organiser for the Australian Labour Party in Queensland. We could not afford to pay eight organisers in North Queensland alone such high salaries just to get names on the roll. We know that there are very few cases of duplicate voting. We know that it is not a question of getting the names on the particular rolls, and that it is not a question of stuffing the rolls, but that it is a question of plucking the rolls. When you start plucking the rolls the people find, when they come along at election time, that they have no votes at all, although they believed that their names had been put on the roll. How do we know that an objection does not come in that a person has left the State? They can keep back applications for transfer and not file them. A man's name can be struck off the roll by the electoral registrar, as happens very often. The fact that people are allowed to go round and take applications for transfer is a very dangerous practice, and I think the Minister should have some regulations of a stringent character drafted to deal with that matter. The Northern Country party would not have organisers out if they were only out for the purpose of having the names correctly on the rolls. Little would they care whether 2,000 names were taken off the Townsville roll and put on the Mundingburra roll. They are doing it for other purposes. Hon. members opposite are not actuated by honest purposes. Why, the graziers inflict upon themselves a taxation of £24,375 a year for electoral expenses. You have the insurance companies, the Tramways Company, and other big combines and monopolies who have money to burn. Our opponents have money to burn. They say that they do not know anything about the funds outside. I wish I could say that I had six organisers in my electorate organising for Labour, and I did not know anything about them. Hon. members have their masters outside this Chamber, and, when they are told by their masters that they have to do so and so in this Chamber, they have to do it. Of course, they know nothing about it, because they are not permitted to know. The hon. member for Port Curtis says he knows nothing about Garbutt. Here is the gentleman's photograph (holding up a group photograph) with Garbutt, taken this year, and yet he denies he had anything to do with it. Why is his photograph there? Why does he deny having anything to do with

Mr. Brennan.]

it? We, as a party, must be particularly careful. We owe a duty to the workers outside to protect them, and we will protect the democracy of Queensland in the most vital way. What is a more vital way than having their names on the electoral roll? If we do not check the intrigues of outside capitalists supporting Opposition members in this House—

Mr. KERR interjected.

Mr. BRENNAN: Of course. You were a Labour man at one time.

Mr. KERR: Never in my life.

Mr. BRENNAN: I do not blame the hon. member; he has to do as he is told. We have to do as we are told, because, before we come into this House we sign a platform, and that is our contract with the workers. Hon. members opposite have no platform at all. They come in here and take their instructions from day to day. Why, the Nationalist supporters used to come into the lobby, and when the Liberal Government were moving the second reading of a Bill they were told to withdraw it. We are endeavouring to put our platform into execution. We owe a duty to the people outside who put us here, and unless we check the conduct of our opponents outside the House in employing agents and canvassers to do certain things to the electoral rolls, what is the good of a franchise at all? What is the good of a franchise to us if they can "jolly" with it outside? We should be careful in seeing that we do the right thing to the workers outside. We know very well that our opponents have been most active in the matter of taking names off the rolls. I know what the reason is. They have said they were expecting an election. It all depends on what they meant by their expectations. They expected to defeat this Government. What are 4,000 or 5,000 votes if they are properly handled by the unscrupulous persons they employ? They employ the highest intellectual people they can get. The men outside are far superior in craft and ingenuity to hon. members opposite. Their friends outside would not say the things about this party that members inside say. They do not say them because they could not prove them. I hope the Attorney-General will see if some regulation cannot be immediately framed, or some Bill passed in this House, to prevent these canvassers going round taking names off the rolls. We should prosecute any crowd of persons who are engaged in taking names off the rolls. All such applications should be made to the nearest constable, and unless that is done the workers of this State will be badly treated.

Mr. FLETCHER (*Port Curtis*): To what depths has the House descended when such a speech as that delivered by the hon. member for Herbert is permitted? It is a disgrace to himself and to his electors, and such a speech should not be tolerated. The hon. gentleman has enough education and experience to know that the deductions he drew from those minutes are absolutely incorrect, and that his charges are absolutely unfounded. The minutes were apparently secured from the same source from which other minutes were secured, and it is not honourable to come here with minutes of private meetings and twist and turn them to suit his own ends for electioneering purposes.

Mr. PEASE: Were you at that meeting?

Mr. FLETCHER: There is nothing in those minutes that is in any way harmful.

[*Mr. Brennan.*]

The hon. member did not give the date, and he inferred that the leader of the Opposition was there, and he tried to reflect on the leader of the Opposition because he was there and supported the minutes. Suppose the leader of the Opposition was there, is there any harm in that? None whatsoever. So far as I am concerned, I will stand up for anything I do at any time. I am not ashamed of anything I do. The hon. member has endeavoured to connect me with these charges. I only wish I were opposed to the hon. member at election time. I would consider that I was doing a great service to the country in defeating him, because I could defeat him easier than I could defeat anyone else if he followed such tactics. The hon. member has tried to reflect on members on this side when he knows from his own experience that what he has stated is absolutely untrue.

Mr. PEASE: I do not deny a thing I do, like you do.

Mr. FLETCHER: He tries to make out that we are following dishonest practices in regard to the rolls.

Mr. PEASE: So you are.

Mr. FLETCHER: There are thousands and thousands of names on the rolls in Queensland of people who do not exist or people who have gone from one electorate to another electorate. At the last election there were 700 names on the roll for my own electorate which ought not to have been there. Is it not the duty of any organisation to make an effort to remove such names? How are you going to get names removed from the rolls unless you have an organisation and have men going out through the country trying to find out whether men whose names are on the roll exist at all? How are you going to pay the organisers' salaries unless you have money to pay them? We are doing it in the interests of the country and in the interests of clean rolls. I do not say that any of these people vote at election times, but there is a danger of it; and if the Attorney-General had done his duty, there would not be any of this trouble to-day.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am doing my duty now. That is why I put the police on.

Mr. FLETCHER: The hon. gentleman has been negligent of his duty. The hon. member for Herbert made a great song about the finances of a certain party. I do not know anything about the finances. So far as I am concerned, there is very little money indeed. Money is not the thing that wins an election. I do not want more than £100 to win an election, and when the hon. member says that tens of thousands of pounds are put in by the people controlling us, I say it is a downright untruth. We come into this House to do our duty, and when we get the opportunity we will do it. I cannot believe, if the hon. gentleman publishes his speech throughout the Herbert, that the people of the Herbert will stand for him; and if I can do anything to defeat a man like that at election time, it will give me great pleasure in the interests of the country to do so.

Mr. HARTLEY: He twisted your tail, all right.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): With regard to this roll-cleaning campaign of the Country party and the enormous funds which they have available for this purpose, and the

number of whisperers or organisers they are employing, and also the reports of the progress they are making in regard to my own electorate, I wish to say that I have been following closely on their trail for the last six months, and they are adopting some low-down methods to bring about the defeat of the hon. member for Burke. I am satisfied that intelligence in the long run will count for more than the trickery of their paid whisperers, and I shall be here for a long time yet. During my visit to the electorate I found that they were making the attempts stated by the hon. member for Herbert in connection with roll-cleaning. In addition to that, but in a lesser degree, the same work is being performed in the Gregory, Flinders, and Burke electorates, and they have at present some 2,000 names for removal.

At 4.30 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, and of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 30th August, I shall now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

The resumption of the Committee was made an Order of the Day for a later hour of the sitting.

QUESTIONS.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF MAIN ROADS BOARD.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. What has been the revenue received by the Main Roads Board—(a) Government appropriation; (b) other sources, and from whom, as at 30th June each year, since appointed?

"2. What has been the expenditure—(a) management and clerical; (b) bridges and culverts; (c) road formation and ballasting?

"3. What length of road has been ballasted?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*), in the absence of the Secretary for Public Lands (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*), replied—

"1 to 3. The information will be contained in the annual report of the Main Roads Board, which I hope to table within a few days."

STATE INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR INDUSTRIAL DISEASES IN MOUNT MORGAN DISTRICT.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*) asked the Attorney-General—

"1. What amount was collected in premiums by the State Insurance Department in the Mount Morgan district during the financial period, 1918 to 1922, for industrial diseases purposes?

"2. What amount has been disbursed by the State Insurance Department during the above period to—(a) sufferers from miners' phthisis or other industrial diseases; (b) dependents of the above?"

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

"1. £24,275 16s. for mining diseases.

"2. Presuming the hon. member's question 2 refers also to the Mount Morgan

district, the answer is: £9,412 10s. 7d. paid and £13,836 15s. yet to be paid in instalments (total, £23,251 5s. 7d.) to sufferers from mining diseases and their dependents."

CLOSURE OF POLICE COURT IN SOUTH BRISBANE.

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*) asked the Attorney-General—

"1. From what date was the Police Court at South Brisbane closed?

"2. What has been the saving, per annum, on account of such closure?

"3. What extra cost, if any, has been incurred per annum in conducting Police Court proceedings at Brisbane from the transfer up to the initiation of the Magistrates Court?

"4. What number of officers were transferred on account of the closure?

"5. Have any additional officers been needed at the Central Court? If so, how many?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

"1 to 5. This information is being obtained."

OPENING OF NEW SOUTH WALES MARKET TO FAT CATTLE FROM QUEENSLAND.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS (*Pittsworth*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"In view of the fact that the price of prime beef is from 10s. to 15s. per 100 lb. higher in the Sydney market than in Queensland markets, which means an advantage on a 700-lb. bullock of from £3 to £3 15s. to the grower, will he—

(a) Get into touch with the New South Wales Government with a view of arranging a conference between the Stock Department of New South Wales and the cattle committee of Queensland; and

(b) If a conference can be arranged, permit Mr. Cory (Chief Inspector of Stock) to accompany the Queensland cattle committee to such conference; and

(c) Allow Mr. Cory to make all information available to the conference, and to assure the conference that cattle, after being twice dipped at the border, can be safely trained or otherwise removed to the Sydney market, such cattle to be only fat cattle for immediate slaughter?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) replied—

"A conference on the meat industry has been called by the Minister for Customs to meet in Melbourne on the 19th instant, at which an endeavour will be made to bring the subject referred to by the hon. member before the conference."

APPLICATION FOR SCHOOL TEACHER AT MERAWA.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*), in the absence of Mr. Morgan (*Murilla*), asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"Will he again consider the application of parents for a school teacher at Merawa, and appoint one on the condition that, should the average attendance fall below nine, the school to be again closed?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*) replied—

"I regret that, as the prospective attendance of children of recognised school age who could be depended upon to attend regularly is only ten, I am unable to approve of the reopening of the school at present; but I will give the matter favourable consideration as from the beginning of the new school year if there are, at that time, not less than nine children of school age who can be relied upon to attend with regularity and punctuality. When application was made for the establishment of this school the number of prospective pupils was given as fourteen. The school was opened on the 19th September, 1921, and was closed, on account of small attendance, on the 2nd June, 1922. The enrolment and average attendance for each month that the school was open were as follows:—

—	Enrolment.	Average.
September, 1921 ..	9	8.6
October, 1921 ..	12	10.4
November, 1921 ..	12	9.7
December, 1921 ..	12	10
February, 1922 ..	9	8.1
March, 1922 ..	9	6.5
April, 1922 ..	7	4.1
May, 1922 ..	8	5.7

"It will thus be seen that the number (fourteen) of prospective pupils, stated in the application for the establishment of the school as being available, was not at any time enrolled, and that the department did not close the school immediately the attendance fell below nine, but continued it for four months of the current year, so that it might be seen whether there was any likelihood of an attendance of nine pupils being reached. As the attendance did not reach that number, and as the teacher was being paid salary and allowances totalling £188 6s. 8d. per annum, I felt that I was not justified in continuing the school for so small an average attendance. There was difficulty also in regard to suitable accommodation for the teacher. Simultaneously with the closing of the school, and so that the pupils should have some measure of instruction, action was taken to enrol the children in the correspondence tuition classes, which were instituted by me to meet such cases, and which are proving very successful."

FIXATION OF PRICES OF PRIMARY PRODUCTS.

Mr. BRAND (*Burru*), in the absence of Mr. Walker (*Cooroora*), asked the Chief Secretary—

"Will he give a guarantee on behalf of the Government that the Commissioner of Prices will in the future be restrained from interfering with the prices of primary products of this State?"

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

"It would be inadvisable to give the assurance the honourable member desires, for the reason that in many cases the Commissioner of Prices has been re-

quested, by organisations and bodies representing primary producers, to take action with a view to protecting them against exploitation by distributors and middlemen. In these cases the action taken by the Commissioner has been entirely in the interests of the primary producers and the consumers. The honourable member himself realises this, for in his speech in this Chamber on the 29th August last he stated that the Commissioner had done an enormous amount of good in connection with the bacon industry."

PAYMENT OF POLICE FOR ELECTORAL ROLLS ENROLMENT.

Mr. BRAND, in the absence of Mr. Walker (*Cooroora*), asked the Attorney-General—

"1. Is it a fact that members of the Police Force are now engaged upon the work of securing new enrolments on the State electoral rolls, and are paid 2d. per head for city electors and 4d. per head for country electors?"

"2. Are they paid for supplying information necessary for the deletion of names from the electoral rolls?"

"3. What expenditure has been incurred on this account to present date?"

"4. When was this system of payment of piecework rates first instituted?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

"1 to 4. I will furnish the information when the vote 'Electoral Office' is under discussion at a later hour."

BILL FOR RENAMING ELECTORATES.

Mr. BELL (*Fassifern*) asked the Attorney-General—

"1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce this session the 'Renaming of Electorates Bill'?"

"2. Will the Bill confirm the names specified by the Electoral Commissioners, or will it make other provision for the naming of the districts as now adjusted?"

"3. Will the name 'Fassifern' be restored to my district?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied—

"1. Yes.

"2 and 3. These details will be disclosed when the Bill is introduced."

OPENING OF MUNBILLA-MOUNT EDWARDS RAILWAY.

Mr. BELL, without notice, asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Will he inform the House when the last section of the Mumbilla-Mount Edwards Railway will be open for traffic?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"In about a month's time; probably 7th October next."

BRITISH IMPERIAL OIL COMPANY'S TRAMWAY AND WORKS BILL.

INITIATION.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee

of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to authorise the British Imperial Oil Company, Limited, to construct, manage, maintain, and work certain lines of tramway and certain pipes conduits, and other works in, along, over, under, and across certain public roads within the Shire of Toombul, in the State of Queensland; and for other consequential purposes."

Question put and passed.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—FIFTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

ELECTORAL REGISTRATION.

Question stated—

"That £12,973 be granted for 'Electoral Registration.'"

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): I was pointing out at the adjournment that the Country party pointed out in their annual report the number of names they had ready for removal from the Burke electorate. I would like to know from hon. members opposite who is finding the money for the removal of those names. Who is finding the money to support the great number of organisations throughout Northern Queensland? I know that claims are being sent out by Mr. Bradley, the organiser, advising electors to get off the rolls, and telling them, if they do not change their names on to other rolls, application will be made to the court for the removal of their names. This sort of thing has been going on for quite a long time. They are endeavouring to strike as many workers off the roll as they possibly can.

Mr. FLETCHER: Non-existing workers

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. gentleman has disfranchised the whole of Port Curtis; I do not want to disfranchise the Burke electorate. I am prepared to stand up before every elector there, and I object to the trickery of the Country party and their organisation.

Mr. FLETCHER: You are twisting it. There is no trickery.

Mr. RIORDAN: If I twisted like the hon. member for Port Curtis, I would be a corkscrew. He twisted before he had been in the House twenty-four hours, and left the Nationalist party to go to the Country party; and, because he was not elected deputy-leader of the Country party, he sits like a big boy sulking on the back bench. The hon. gentleman will find after the next election that he will have to seek another occupation. I consider it is a dangerous practice to allow Bradley or anyone else to remove names from the electoral rolls. If any person removes names from the electoral rolls, he should be prosecuted. This is a matter that should be inquired into by the Department of Justice. Members of the Government party should not stand for the action of outside organisations in trying to disfranchise the electors. We know that the Country party get their revenue from the Pastoralists' Association. I am satisfied that vested interests will always fight the Labour party. I have no objection to that. I know that the workers in my electorate contribute a few shillings each at election time to assist

me in my election campaign, but I always acknowledge it. But hon. members opposite will not stand up for the crowd who contribute to their fund. They are always repudiating the crowd who are responsible for their campaign funds. They do that because they think they can gull the workers into supporting them. They come here and shed crocodile tears in the interests of the working classes; yet during all the years when they supported the Government on the Treasury benches they never brought forward one Act to assist the working classes of this State.

Mr. MOORE: Nonsense!

Mr. RIORDAN: When the Labour members tried to introduce an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act, hon. members opposite would not support it. In decency, they did eventually put it on the statute-book; but what is the good of putting an Act on the statute-book if you do not put it into operation and administer it? I know that the Opposition and their supporters outside will use any means to defeat the Government. They are not particular as to the means they adopt to do that. We heard hon. members opposite repudiate Garbutt, who was doing their work for them outside. Not only have they got organisers in the Burke electorate, but they have got two organisers* for the Country party in Cooktown. Who are paying these men their wages and their high travelling expenses in North Queensland?

Mr. GREEN: The districts themselves.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. member says it is done by the districts themselves. When a disgruntled or dissatisfied public servant has been dismissed for being dirty enough to bring some false charge against the Government, the Opposition usually appoint him to a job as organiser. We know that Andrews was sent up to Cairns just when there was a possibility of an early election. That was the time when negotiations were going on to try and buy the Premier. We know that they fell into their own trap. Then they come here and wash their hands of the men who have been supplying them with their funds. They dissociate themselves from the organisation outside. They do certain things to put in the front window and keep other things in the back room. We know that Edkins was sent up to Longreach as an organiser last year, and in a speech there he pointed out that they had been able to effect a saving to the employing class of £30,000 in wages last year. In what way? By robbing the workers—by taking it from the worker.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will correct his remarks with the vote before the Committee for "Electoral Registration."

Mr. RIORDAN: I am connecting my remarks by showing where the funds come from to get these names struck off the rolls. The Opposition expected something quite recently. They had banquets prepared in North Queensland. They had made arrangements for one in Townsville. They thought they had effected their purpose. They thought they would get us to the country while they had 2,000 electors struck off the roll in the Burke electorate—(interruption)—but they miscalculated. If members on this side were to play the low-down methods

of their party, hon. members opposite would, no doubt, have effected their purpose. Had Mr. Theodore deserted this party and the people who sent him here and gone away with the following he was supposed to have who were deserting Labour, they would have got what was left of the Labour party to the country at an unfavourable time when the workers of the State were all wiped off the rolls. The hon. member for Gregory read out a circular which was sent to the managers of stations asking them to send in the names of persons on the rolls who had left, with their political opinions and information as to where they were going. When those cards which Bradley sends out are returned with a tick against their own pure merinos, those without ticks never reach the electoral office; they go into the wastepaper basket—thousands of them. Hon. members opposite are now trying to disown the leaders of this organisation, and in giving the lie back to the hon. member for Burrum I was only using the language of the leader of the Opposition when he called my friend the hon. member for Herbert a liar. That is the only reply they have to make to these things. We have heard members on the Opposition benches get up, speaker after speaker, and put their case and send out their statements through "Hansard" without any denials from this side; but when the party on this side have put up speaker for speaker on this occasion, they have sat like a lot of sulky boys and said that the Government do not want them to get on with the Estimates. We are getting on with the Estimates, and if we are getting on slowly, it is their own fault, because the leader of the Opposition knows that his own party would not be muzzled and he lost control over them. We have certain rights here, and I, for one, am going to expose the tactics adopted by these gentlemen. Travelling through an electorate so extensive as the Burke electorate, with an area of somewhere about 72,000 square miles, costs something, and I met not only one organiser there but quite a batch of them. One gentleman told me that he was going to conduct his campaign in an aeroplane with Mr. McMaster, but Mr. McMaster was defeated at the plebiscite, and I do not know what he is going to do now. I am satisfied that, when the numbers go up, I shall have the drop on my opponent, at any rate.

Mr. VOWLES interjected.

Mr. RIORDAN: The Country party will have the crash from the 'plane. No doubt they have had a crash since that "no confidence" motion and the cat got out of the bag.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: All your plans were "duds."

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. member is passing almost every day looking after his plebiscite in Lockyer. He is one of those gentlemen who have been squealing ever since the redistribution of seats.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Rightly so, too.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. member has been very busy in Lockyer, and he is seeing that no names are struck off the rolls there, especially those of farmers. I would like the Minister to take some action with regard to these cards that are going all over North Queensland. They put fear into people by threatening them with prosecution. Many persons do not know who Mr. Bradley is,

[Mr. Riordan.

and they think it is a genuine electoral office notice, and they become alarmed. Some of them have ridden many a mile to the nearest police station to see what is wrong. A man living in Eacham electorate went across to Ortona, a couple of hundred miles, to remove a boiler, and left his wife and children, who were going to school, in the Eacham. He was away only about a month when he got a card telling him that if he did not change his name to another roll he would be prosecuted. Of course the man was wise to that, and he handed the card over to me and left his name on the Eacham roll. But the other side objected at the revision court, and if those fellows can bluff those in charge of the revision court they will do it. It causes me a good deal of expense in following these paid gentlemen round and trying to keep the electors of the Burke on the roll. I think it is very unfair tactics in a large electorate like the Burke, where there are very great distances between some of the places of employment, to allow this trickery to go on—and it is nothing else but trickery. I think the hon. member for Townsville, who knows Mr. Bradley, might whis-

[5 p.m.] per in his pink ear, because I do not think the hon. member will stand for this kind of thing. I am quite satisfied that the police are quite capable of doing this kind of work without the aid of Mr. Bradley. The thought passes through my mind that the hon. member for Townsville is one of the executive of the Country party. I am more than surprised at his standing for this sort of thing. It is no good hon. members coming here and washing their hands of the thing; they are putting many hard-working people to great inconvenience through sending out this threat to try and get them struck off the roll and disfranchised at election time. I hope that the Department of Justice will see that justice is done by the electors of Queensland; I hope it will see that, before anyone is struck off the roll, evidence is produced by these touts and whisperers that the man is on another roll. I would have no objection then to his name being taken off. I do not think the name of any man should be taken off the roll until it is on another roll or until they have proved that he is dead.

Mr. J. JONES: Supposing a man leaves Queensland?

Mr. RIORDAN: If he has no intention of returning, he will be struck off. The hon. member may know of an isolated case to the contrary. I know of a case of a man who never left Queen street, Brisbane. His name was taken off the roll, and he was summoned for not having his name on the roll. I know of another case of an old-age pensioner who resided in the Army Home at Red Hill and who had never been out of there. He had his name put on the roll. When he witnessed the signature on another man's claim card he was informed that his name was not on the roll. The police can easily erase names from the roll; but it is not the function of Bradley, the organiser of the Northern Country party. The hon. member for Kennedy says that he contributes to the election fund by way of levy on his stock. I admire the hon. member; he is honest, and stands up to it. What I object to is hon. members washing their hands of Bradley, Sleeman, and these people who conduct

their Northern campaign. The hon. member on the back bench, the hon. member for Kennedy, is like me—he is only a pawn in the game. The people with whom Bradley, Sleeman, and Co. are engaged are those on the front Opposition bench.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Government are spending £500 a week now on a political council.

Mr. RIORDAN: I know what the hon. member is getting at; he has a "bee in his bonnet." The Government are trying to emancipate the class that has been down-trodden for the last fifty years as the result of legislation of hon. members opposite. I am not going to discuss that question with him. He will have a busy time until his plebiscite is over, and I will leave him until he has settled his differences with his friends.

Mr. EDWARDS: If he wins the plebiscite, he is "home and dry."

Mr. RIORDAN: I am not going to regard the hon. member for Nanango as a prophet; he has to get over his difficulties with "Bob" Hodge. (Laughter.) He will have no start on "Bob" this time; he will go off the same mark, and he will have to watch that his rolls are all right.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am willing to give you a start.

Mr. RIORDAN: Let the hon. member come along with me and I will give him a start. He will have to go every inch of the way with me, though I admit that, when it comes to roll-stuffing or disfranchising people, the hon. member might give me a big start.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*): I had not intended speaking in connection with this vote or any vote on the Estimates. Throughout this session members of the Opposition particularly have been subjected to innuendoes and insinuations from hon. members sitting on the Government benches—innuendoes and insinuations which, I venture to say, are unworthy of any gentleman in this community. If the political and public life of this State has degenerated to such a condition as would appear to be evidenced by what has taken place in this House during this session, it is a sorry condition for this State to be in. The actions which have manifested themselves throughout this session will not have the effect of attracting to Parliament men who will tend to place it on a high plane—men who will develop the State and bring about in the minds of the people a feeling of respect for Parliament. I do not stand for anything dirty in connection with the electoral rolls, whether done by the Government, by the Opposition, or by any organisation. If any hon. member opposite can prove to me that an organisation with which I am connected, or behind which I am standing, has been guilty of deliberately attempting to deprive men of their votes and to bring about unclean rolls in order to get an unfair advantage at any election or in any electorate, I have no hesitation in saying that I will not only dissociate myself from such an organisation, but I will never run again under the banner of such an organisation.

Mr. RIORDAN: How do you account for this annual report?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You ought to sack Bradley and Co. straightaway.

Mr. GREEN: If the Minister can prove to me that anything they have attempted to do has been done with the purpose of acting unjustly towards any elector of this State or any electoral division, I am quite prepared to wash my hands of the whole affair and of politics in Queensland.

Mr. PEASE: You had better do it now.

Mr. GREEN: I am not prepared to do it now, because I honestly and conscientiously believe that that was not the object. I have seen some of the circulars that have gone out—I have some particulars here which I did not wish to give to the House, but which I feel compelled to give now. I cannot read into the before-mentioned circular an attempt to deprive unjustly any man of his electoral right. I trust that hon. members opposite will try and realise that there is a certain amount of self-respect, a certain amount of honour, a certain amount of justice, incorporated in those who are sitting in opposition, representing a large number of the electors of this State. If the opinion of the Government concerning the Opposition, or the opinion of the Opposition concerning the Government, has got to such a low state, it is a sorry day for this State.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Do you think that it is a fair thing to send circulars to stations asking the managers or the owners thereof to give a list of their employees and a statement of their respective political views as far as they know them? What can a party who do that have in view?

Mr. GREEN: I am going to read that circular in a minute, and I am going to leave the clauses in it for the judgment of any fair-minded person. I think hon. members will agree that there is a certain amount of justification, or a certain amount of reason, for our feeling that we should exert ourselves to see that no man is deprived of a vote. It is only a fair and just thing that, if a man removes from one electorate to another and resides in that new electorate for some years, he should get his name on the correct roll. I think the Attorney-General will agree that any self-respecting man would take that course.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am sorry to say that your Townsville organisation tried to wrongly remove names from the roll, as our officials prove by the documents I have here.

Mr. GREEN: I would like to see those documents so that I could get an explanation from the organisation concerned. I did not intend to say anything with regard to the insinuations that have been thrown out during this session. I have tried to treat them with a certain amount of contempt. I was quite content to go, not only to those who had supported me in Townsville for so many years, but also to go amongst those who had opposed me, and place my exact position before them. If those electors feel that I have done anything to disgrace my position in this House, or to lower the standard of political life in this State, I am quite prepared to abide by their judgment, whether they be my opponents or my supporters. I do not know if any other circulars have been sent out, but I only have the one which was mentioned by the hon. member for Gregory, concerning which he asked the Minister a question. In reply, the Minister stated that, not only was an attempt made to take names off the roll, but an attempt had been made to deprive men of

Mr. Green.]

the right to vote. This circular is issued by the North Queensland division of the Country party. It states—

“URGENT!

“Queensland Country Party,
(Northern Division),

“Townsville, 23rd June, 1922.

“Dear Sir,—The rolls that have been compiled for the new electoral boundaries, recently laid down by the Commissioners appointed by the Theodore Government to give effect to the Redistribution of Seats Bill, have just come to hand, and a hurried inspection shows them to be in such a deplorable condition that my council hasten to warn you of the position.”

Mr. PEASE: How do they know that they are our supporters?

Mr. FLETCHER: Let the hon. member read the circular.

Mr. PEASE: I was not given a chance.

Mr. FRY: Don't be a “kid” all your life.

Mr. WILSON (to Mr. Fry): He is a better man than you will ever be.

Mr. FRY: I am not a fat fool like you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Kurilpa to withdraw that remark.

Mr. FRY: In deference to the hon. member I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope hon. members will allow the hon. member to continue his speech. The interjections must be very disconcerting to him. I again appeal on behalf of the “Hansard” staff, who have complained to the Speaker and to myself about the difficulty of correctly reporting hon. members. I appeal to hon. members again for the sake of “Hansard” to be a bit indulgent, and allow hon. members to deliver their addresses.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GREEN: The circular continues—

“Already we have found the names of many hundreds of our supporters transferred to electorates other than the one in which they reside, and added to this is a large list of names of persons who obviously have been wiped off altogether. The position is so serious that we believe many thousands of electors will be totally disfranchised through the errors and omissions that have taken place, and these supporters will find on polling-day that their names are not on for the electorate for which they are entitled to vote.

“To avoid the consequences which will surely follow the return of a Government responsible for such a state of affairs, my council are determined to fight to have all properly enrolled, and, to carry the work out, intend to put on a special staff at Charters Towers and Townsville to treat with the matter. Charters Towers will handle the Western electorates, whilst Townsville will do the coastal. The job is a tremendous one, and your help is needed to make success possible, and as we fear an early election there is no time to be lost.

“The appended questions please answer and return in envelope enclosed, and we will check all the information you give. If we find the names you send are

[Mr. Green.

wrongly enrolled or omitted, we will immediately fill in cards to correct the matter.

“In conclusion, we ask you to attend to this matter at once, and help the Country party force clean administration and secure your enrolment. In treating with the list of employees, put a tick opposite the names of those you think are our supporters, to enable us to compile a return to place before Parliament showing the extent of the victimisation. All you say will be treated as confidential.

“Help us help you get sane Government.

“Yours faithfully,

“H. G. BRADLEY,

“Organising Secretary.”

Mr. PEASE: That proves our case.

Mr. GREEN: That is the only literature I have received. The only roll I am concerned about is the Townsville roll. I am concerned, not only as representative of Townsville in this Chamber, but as mayor of the city. We recently took a ballot in connection with a certain loan in that city, and the officials at the Town Hall stated to me, in connection with the three rolls dealing with Townsville, Mundingburra, and the new Kennedy, that many of the old residents—many of them railway workers, some of them living in Macrossan street, Townsville—had their names omitted from that roll without being placed on any other roll. Section 19 of the Elections Act states—

“Any person entitled to vote shall have his name placed upon the roll for the district in which he lives.”

The Attorney-General once admitted that, when a person removes from one electorate to another for any length of time, it is only right that he should have his name transferred to the correct roll. That is all I am asking.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is where the hon. gentleman's organisation does not play the game. His organisation at Townsville and elsewhere has been busy getting names off the rolls.

Mr. GREEN: I do not stand for that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Your organisation does.

Mr. GREEN: I have mentioned some names in this Chamber before. I do not like being personal, and I think every hon. member will admit that I try to avoid personalities as much as I can. I asked a question as to whether certain names had been removed from the Townsville roll, and whether they had been placed on another electoral roll, while at that time they were still on the Townsville roll. One of those gentlemen was the hon. member for Mundingburra himself. I know that, according to the Act, the hon. member has a right to be enrolled on the Mundingburra roll, because he is the representative of that electorate. In all fairness, and in all justice and honour, I contend that is the roll on which the hon. member's name should be. There is only one deduction that you could draw from that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The name is on the Mundingburra roll now.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister said he would make inquiries, and I am pleased to hear him

say that the name has now been placed on the proper roll. I appreciate the action of the hon. member for Mundingburra in recognising the position. Then let us look at and fairly consider the following:—

“ 3224 McSherry, James Joseph, Sturt street West, carpenter.

“ 3226 McSherry, Laura, Sturt street West, domestic duties.”

These people have all resided in Ahearne street for some years. McSherry was secretary of the Workers' Political Organisation for the Townsville and Mundingburra electorates. They have been living outside the Townsville electorate for some years, yet they absolutely refuse to have their names taken off that roll. When the injustice of the case was pointed out to them, they said deliberately that they refused to go off the Townsville roll and on to the correct roll, and that they remained there for the deliberate purpose of voting against the present member for Townsville.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You know they cannot do that.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: But they did do it.

Mr. GREEN: All I am asking is that we get a fair deal. That is all the organisation are asking for. If we obtain clean rolls, then I say all honour and credit to the party that beats us; but let us be beaten fairly and squarely.

Mr. PEASE: You refer in that circular to the disfranchisement of electors. The leader of the Nationalist party says that you cannot disfranchise.

Mr. GREEN: I will deal with that in a minute. Then take these names—

“ 1284 Everson, Agnes, Morehead street.

“ 1285 Everson, Edward, Morehead street.

“ Edward Everson was secretary of the Seamen's Union and went to Brisbane. He is on the Southern Federal roll, but he still remains on the Townsville roll.

“ 3986 Ryan, Annie, Mansfield Hotel.

“ 3987 Ryan, Arthur, Mansfield Hotel.

“ 3989 Ryan, Cornelius J., Mansfield Hotel.

“ 3991 Ryan, Eileen, Mansfield Hotel.”

They refused to go off the Townsville roll, though they have gone to Cairns and have taken a farm in the Cairns electorate and are permanently residing in the Cairns electorate.

Mr. RIORDAN: You have not given them time. How long is it since Con. Ryan left Townsville?

Mr. GREEN: Between six and seven months ago.

Mr. RIORDAN: He was in the Mansfield Hotel at the beginning of the year. He left four or five months ago.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member for Burke will agree that Con. Ryan knows more about the electoral rolls than I do. He has been closely identified with political matters in North Queensland for many years. In all justice and all fairness, these names should be put on the correct roll. If he is entitled to remain on the Townsville roll, let him remain there. If I am beaten for Townsville in a fair way, I do not mind one iota. It does not worry me in the least; but all I ask is, “ Let us have a fair, square, and clean go, and let the best man win the contest.” Con. Ryan was one of the Labour organisers and

was closely identified with the Labour movement.

Mr. RIORDAN: He has not been an organiser for eight years.

Mr. GREEN: He was an organiser. Now we come to another case in regard to which the Minister said he was making inquiries. The particulars are—

“ 1702 Kelly, licensed victualler, Brandon. He was struck off the 1921 roll as he had left Brandon for Brisbane, and afterwards he went to Charleville and then returned again to Brisbane, where he still resides. Later, in 1921, although he never returned to the Bowen electorate, he was reinstated.”

I have been told—I hope it is not correct—that was done under the instructions of the Minister for Justice. I hope that is not so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I never heard of the gentleman before.

Mr. GREEN: I am pleased to have that denial from the hon. gentleman, because that is the information that was supplied to me concerning that man.

“ With regard to the Charters Towers roll we have—

1284 Hayes, Margaret, Metropolitan Hotel, housewife, 15th November.

1286 Hayes, Thomas Augustine, Metropolitan Hotel, licensed victualler.

“ They were omitted from the 1921 Charters Towers roll, owing to having left and taken the Government refreshment-rooms at Homestead, but were reinstated on the July and September supplements. The Federal roll shows them as living at Homestead for about three years, but they refused to enrol for the Kennedy State electorate, which they were in before redistribution. Now they are at the Ravenswood Junction refreshment-rooms, and still refuse to be taken off the Charters Towers roll.

“ These people were most defiant in this respect, and stated they intend to remain where they are at present.”

That is not fair, it is not just, and it is not honourable. I do not care whether they support members on this side of the House or members on that side of the House. Let us be fair and square and clean in all our dealings as far as we possibly can. These are but a few significant instances.

Mr. PEASE: You chase an elector from the North all over the South and West, and then you say you have no funds.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say we had no funds in the North.

I want to refer now to the redistribution that took place. Under the redistribution the boundaries of various electorates were altered, and the Townsville boundaries were altered. The Attorney-General will acknowledge that I never made the slightest objection to the alteration in the boundaries. If the Commissioners thought it was the correct thing to do to alter the boundaries as they have done—

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They did not have any say in it.

Mr. GREEN: I must admit that I had the opportunity, but I did not protest. It was in their hands and in the hands of the Government, and, if they desired to alter the boundaries as they did alter them, then I am quite prepared to stand by it. But the new rolls came out for the new electorates and I have

Mr. Green.]

definite instances where persons miles away from the boundaries of the Townsville electorate and who were never on the Townsville roll are now on it, where individual families are picked out and placed on the Townsville roll and the rest of the people in the same street are not on the roll.

Mr. PEASE: My opponent lives outside the electorate, and his name is still on the roll.

Mr. GREEN: All I know concerning this circular is that the organisation are making an effort to remove these names and put them on the right rolls.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will guarantee that you will have a clean roll at the next election, and so will every other hon. member.

Mr. GREEN: I am very pleased to hear it. We have the same thing at Magnetic Island, 7 miles away. Magnetic Island was never in the Townsville electorate, yet the individual names of families are picked out and put on the Townsville roll, whereas other residents living adjacent are on the correct roll—the new Kennedy roll. It is almost inconceivable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am afraid you are going on the exaggerated statements of that organiser.

Mr. GREEN: I am going on what I have seen.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Have you made representations to the department in the matter?

Mr. GREEN: I am not doing that work. As the Secretary for Railways knows, I was not going to speak on this matter but intended dealing with it in another way, but we have had these innuendoes. I have sat under them for the last four or five weeks and remained silent, and I felt this afternoon that, in justice to myself, I had to speak concerning them.

Mr. PEASE: Your own officers reported at the last election that hundreds of railway workers should not be on the roll, and those men were working there at the time.

Mr. GREEN: I know nothing about it.

Mr. PEASE: You have to stand up to what Bradley does.

I am going to stand up for what is a fair and square deal to everybody, and that is all I ask for. It is inexplicable to me why these things are done. I take it that the organisers naturally feel that these things have been done deliberately, and [5.30 p.m.] in justice and fairness to the party they have been paid to represent, they are trying to have the correct thing done. I have placed the matter fairly before the Committee. All I ask for is a fair and straight go, and, if the Government win under those conditions, then more power to them.

Mr. COLLINS: (*Bowen*): I have read this report of the Country party organiser, Mr. Bradley, who is well known in my electorate. I do not mind how many organisers they send into my electorate, as I shall still be able to retain the seat. Ever since I have been returned for Bowen, they have done their very best to defeat me through their organisers. Talk about innuendoes! They do not make innuendoes, they tell lies. They talked about my being in receipt of £1,000 a year.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Everyone else has had to put up with it.

[*Mr. Green.*]

Mr. COLLINS: One of the organisers is a gentleman named Griffin, of Proserpine. He is on the job all the time. It is no use the hon. member for Townsville saying that the organisation belonging to his party is not out to remove names from the roll.

Mr. MOORE: Names that ought not to be on.

Mr. COLLINS: The difference between the Labour party and the party which the hon. member for Townsville is associated with is that the Labour party always endeavours to put the names of workers and other people on the roll.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: We put on the roll the names of men of all classes.

Mr. COLLINS: It seems that we have now in the North an organisation which has been able to remove over 4,000 names from the roll in certain electorates. It is as well to read some of this report—

“ROLL WORK.

“The most important phase of our work has progressed during the period under review, and in Mirani, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Mundingburra, Herbert, Cairns, Charters Towers, Queenton, and Kennedy the whole of the rolls have been thoroughly revised and extensively cleaned.”

I maintain that it is the duty of the electoral officer, and not of an organisation over which the Government have no control, to revise the rolls. Let me read on—

“It has necessitated the removal, by objection or by transfer to other electorates, of approximately 4,500 names of persons who appear on the rolls stated. In addition to electorates named, but in a lesser degree, the same work has been performed in Gregory, Flinders, and Burke electorates, on the latter of which we have on hand at present some 2,000 persons for removal and apart from the deletions stated. Application for new enrolments have been treated with from all centres, in satisfactory numbers.”

I do not suppose that the Opposition claim that this is a secret document. I presume it has been sent broadcast to the different organisations in the electorates mentioned by me. It is quite clear from that document—it is no use the hon. member for Townsville denying it—that the avowed object is to remove names from the roll; but it is not their business at all to remove names from the roll. It is the duty of the Government to keep a clean roll, and not of outside organisations such as the Country party organisation. They boast that they have removed 4,500 names from the roll.

Mr. MOORE: They do not; they say they are ready for removal.

Mr. COLLINS: My opinion is, if I may use the expression, that there are tons of money behind this. Hon. members opposite have any amount of money behind them to employ these organisers. Mr. Bradley is well known in the North. Mr. Hardy was also organising in the Bowen electorate, and used to go round in a motor-car. Therefore, they must have had funds to pay for the motor-car. It seems to me that they are trying to move heaven and earth to get rid of Labour representatives in the North. It is nothing new; it has been going on all the time, but it has not succeeded. It is

true that, as the result of accidents, they came out for the new electorates and I have have succeeded in winning Kennedy and Townsville, but it is quite uncertain whether the hon. members for those electorates will be returned at the next election, notwithstanding their organising work.

Mr. FRY interjected.

Mr. COLLINS: I am inclined to ask someone to remove the hon. member from the House. I would like to see some good man contest Kurilpa with him.

Mr. FRY: I would like to fight you in Kurilpa. Come on!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: The political views of the hon. member are a mystery to me.

Mr. FRY: They are honest.

Mr. COLLINS: Don't talk about honesty.

Mr. FRY: No, you would not understand it. That is why I want to talk about it.

Mr. COLLINS: Does the hon. member accuse me of dishonesty?

Mr. FRY: I do not; I say that you would not understand it.

Mr. COLLINS: I know more about honesty than the hon. member.

Mr. FRY: That is your own statement; it is not backed up by much evidence.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member for Burke described the position of the Opposition right up to the hilt when he dealt with the report of the organiser. I was informed that my opponent went to Townsville to attend a banquet. When he returned to Proserpine, the people there said that he looked a very sorry man. They were going to celebrate the success of the no-confidence motion, and had everything ready for the new Government to take possession of the Treasury benches. That is the statement that has been sent down to me. I have no doubt he met with great disappointment after spending his cash in going to Townsville to jubilate over the downfall of the Labour Government. I do not know how the thing misfired; I will leave it to hon. members opposite to explain that. They must have been well organised, as everything was going along beautifully, and they were arranging to hold banquets to jubilate over the downfall of the Government. I am inclined to think that they will have to wait a long time indeed before they will be able to jubilate over the downfall of this Government. It should be the duty of the Electoral Department to see that every man or woman who is eligible is placed on the roll. It should be the duty of every Government to make it easy for people to get on the roll and hard for them to be taken off. I might inform the hon. member for Townsville that under the old Tory regime, when I was nominated as a candidate for Burke in 1909, I was notified that I had left my home in Gympie. That was the method under the good old Tory regime. They knew that I was only temporarily absent from my home and that I was the selected Labour candidate for Burke, but they marked me as "left" to try to injure me in the Burke electorate. The hon. member for Burke can corroborate what I say, as he was in the district at the time. The hon. member for Townsville said that all they wanted was to be treated fairly. It is some-

thing new for the party he is associated with to be fair. They always tried to make it hard to get on the roll and make it easy to remove names from the roll.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): The hon. member for Bowen has borne out my contention that he should be honest in his criticism and honest and just to hon. members sitting in this House. He would lead the people to believe that we were all dishonest. Hon. members opposite talk about playing the straight game. That proves conclusively that they know something about the crooked game. Whilst I have been sitting listening to the debate I could only come to one conclusion, and that is that hon. members on the Government side were trying to prove that the electoral officers can be got at. Unless that is so, there is nothing in their contention about names being taken off the roll. No organisation can take a man's name off the roll, and no organisation can put a man's name on the roll. That is the duty of the electoral officers. It is a shame that hon. members on the Government side should be allowed to continue in this way to cast reflections on public servants.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You know that is not true.

Mr. FRY: No hon. member of this Committee can take anyone's name off the roll, and neither can any organisation outside. That is the duty of the electoral officers. If the charges made by hon. members opposite are correct, then the electoral officers must have been got at. I am surprised that the Attorney-General should sit there and allow his supporters to criticise public servants in this way. I never expected that Parliament would get into the position it has got into. I never expected to hear the class of language that is used here. If I went into Queen street and picked out seventy-two men from the street corner, they would be able to conduct the affairs of the State better, or equally as well, as they are conducted now.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman is aware of the serious nature of his remark. I am surprised at the hon. member for Kurilpa, who I understand, has delivered a lecture on parliamentary procedure, making use of such language. It is laid down in the twelfth edition of "May"—

"It is obviously unbecoming to permit offensive expressions against the character and conduct of Parliament to be used without rebuke; for they are not only a contempt of that high court, but are calculated to degrade the Legislature in the estimation of the people."

I hope the hon. member will restrain himself and not make any reflection on Parliament, which, he must see himself, he was doing just now.

Mr. FRY: I admit that I went further than the Standing Orders allow me, and made a mistake when I stated seventy-two. What I wanted to point out was that I could get seventy-two men in Queen street who have got just as much brains as the seventy-two members of this House. I do not think I am casting any reflection on Parliament by giving that credit to seventy-two men in Queen street. I hope that Government members will not cast any more reflections on public servants. They make statements and

Mr. Fry.]

charges that the organisations outside put names on the roll and take them off when that can only be done by the electoral officers under the control of the Minister. It is the Minister's duty to see that the department is run on correct lines. I did not intend to speak at all, and I only rose for the purpose of defending the electoral officers. It is the duty of the Minister to defend his staff from the statements made by his supporters.

* Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*): The position with regard to the rights of nomadic workers is a very serious one. I know the position so far as North Queensland is concerned, because I was a union official for years in the North, and I know the tricks that the Country party get up to when they are dealing with the names on the roll. They can do more effective work with the Federal roll than they can with the State roll, because the State Elections Act makes it pretty clear that, before a man can be struck off the roll, he must be placed on some other roll. I am not going to charge the Country party with striking names off the roll, but I am going to suggest to them that a better method for them to adopt is to put names on the roll. The Northern Country party sent out a circular to the Eacham electorate, and the man who signed that circular called himself "Rolls Officer." What does that mean? Does it not imply that it is some Government official who is sending out that circular? It is not fair to send out a circular in this way. This is what one part of the circular says—

"For this purpose I enclose you the necessary form filled in as far as possible, and ask that you will fill in answer to question No. 5, sign same, and have your signature witnessed by an elector. On completion, please return to P.O. Box 259, Townsville, when same will be immediately lodged on your behalf."

Why should the elector at Eacham forward his claim back to "P.O. Box 259, Townsville?" They did not tell the elector that that was the post office box of the Northern Country party. Why should these claims go back to any man signing himself "Rolls Officer?" Is not that trickery of the worst type? Is it straightforward? No. It is not honest and it is not straightforward. This does not apply very much to the metropolitan or town electorates, but it applies greatly to people living in the country electorates. This is how another portion of the circular reads—

"Failing immediate attention to this matter an objection to your name appearing on Eacham roll will be lodged, and in conclusion I have to advise you that your neglect to attend to the matter leaves you liable to a penalty."

That is a deliberate misstatement, because there is nothing in the Act which states that a man must do that. Why should an elector send his claim to an officer of the Country party? Why does he want these claims? It is only trickery. I well remember the early nineties, when the Government altered the electoral boundaries in order to get men's names off the roll. There were about 100 men in the Eulo district working on a dam, and the electoral revision court boundaries were altered. These men were then notified that they were outside that

electoral revision court division, and they had to appear in another town to answer as to why their names should be retained on the roll. It was impossible for them to do that, so their names were struck off. Immediately afterwards the boundaries were again altered bringing that portion of the district within another electoral revision court division. These were the tricks that were tried in those days. We know now how Bradley got his information. He learnt this trick from some of the officers of the old days. I remember attending the revision court on one occasion, and they wanted an agent to swear that a person who was on the roll was at that particular spot on the day that the sittings of the court were held. Perhaps that person would be 100 miles away from the court, and it would be impossible to swear that at that particular moment he was in the electoral district, and therefore his name was struck off. These organisations are getting back to the tactics which they adopted in those days, and it is to be hoped that the Government will amend the Act to the effect that nobody but the electoral officers shall use the designation of "Rolls Officer," and provide a penalty for anybody who requires a person to send back a claim to anybody but the electoral registrar for the district.

Then again, supposing that those cards were returned to Townsville on the eve of the issue of the writ and had to be forwarded to Eacham. It would be too late, and those persons would be disfranchised. It is done for the one purpose of trying to intimidate people and keep them off the rolls. We know that they would strike them off the rolls if they could, but these methods are even better, because they never get on the rolls. I have here a report of a meeting of the Northern Country party, at which Mr. Garbutt presided, and those present included Messrs. E. A. Hatfield, Campbell, and several others. I find that a telegram was received from Messrs. Green and J. Jones, M.M.L.A. I do not know whether the contents are true, but here it is—

"The following telegram was received by Mr. Garbutt from Mr. W. H. Green and Mr. J. Jones during the course of the above proceedings:—'Greetings and every good wish for successful conference. Absolutely imperative maintain intense organisation Northern Queensland; electoral roll should be particularly watched. Northern Country party's programme should particularly safeguard Northern interests and stand for Northern progress, and be founded on broad democratic principles, meting out justice and fair play to all sections of the community. Upon such basis as this, feel confident we can win majority Northern seats next election.'

The date of that conference was 2nd November. In view of the progress that the Country party organisers were making, I want to know why they drew their special attention to the rolls, more especially when cards had been sent to Eacham and were asked to be returned to Townsville. If those people were doing their work well, I do not suppose there was any necessity to wake them up to more strenuous efforts. I have no objection to their putting on the staff, and I do not know that any member of this party has. If we had the funds we would put on a staff, too, to watch our interests,

[*Mr. Fry.*

but unfortunately we have not, and we have to depend on the voluntary work of the workers in our electorates.

The members of the Opposition talk about innuendoes, but a greater innuendo could not have been made against anybody than that made against me by Mr. J. H. C. Sleeman on the eve of the last State election. It was very carefully worded in such a way that a reader could draw the inference desired, although the writer was not prepared to make the plain statement. He thought he would get in just in time, but I replied to him next morning, and I am satisfied that he was not prepared to come back again.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Who was that?

Mr. DASH; Mr. Sleeman, the publicity agent. I think everybody in Townsville knows him, although I do not think I would know him if I saw him in the street to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN: A very capable man.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I hope you do not stand for his methods.

Mr. MOORE: We do not stand for the methods of the men you employ.

Mr. DASH: I want to be fair to Mr. Sleeman. He is a very able writer or penman. He can write the most scurrilous, dirty articles that any man can write, and at the same time he can write most glowing articles. I have no complaint to make as to his ability as a journalist or writer, but if the Opposition want fair and clean tactics, let them adopt them, and we will fight them fair and square all along the line. We have never had a fair "go" from the Press during an election. All sorts of innuendoes and statements are made. In the Townsville "Bulletin" only a few issues ago, the answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Mirani of the hon. member for Gregory was attributed to the Premier. If that is fair, I do not know what the Country party would call fair.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): The hon. member for Mundingburra has said that there is no penalty if an elector does not get his name transferred from one roll to the roll of the district to which he removes. When a man leaves his electorate and fails to get on another roll he is liable to a penalty. The Act provides—

"Any person who is entitled to have his name placed on the roll for any district, whether by way of enrolment or transfer, who fails, within a period of twenty-one days after having completed one month's residence within the district to deliver or send to the Electoral Registrar for that district a claim in proper form, duly filled in and signed, shall be liable for the first offence to a penalty of 10s., and for any subsequent offence to a penalty not exceeding £2."

The organisation desires to have clean rolls, and when a man has left one district he has to get his name on the roll of the district where he is living, and they are perfectly right in endeavouring to do that. It is unfair to keep men on a roll when they have gone away from that district. The Government's own Act shows that, when they leave one district and go and live in another district, they have to get on the other roll.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Do you mean to say that if a man goes to look for work he has to get off the roll?

Mr. MOORE: He has if he is living in another electorate. I am not talking about men who go and look for work.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A man may get temporary work.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister should be able to administer his own Act. If a man goes out of one district and takes up his residence in another, why keep him on the old roll?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He has to transfer only when he takes up his *bonâ fide* residence there.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): There is a very big difficulty in persons on the borders of the new electorates knowing in which electorate they are situated. I have been round a little lately, and it is most difficult to determine which electorate people are

[7 p.m.] in. Unless things are handled very carefully, when the next election comes round, farmers who are living on the borders of electorates will find that they have been enrolled for an electorate other than that in which they reside. That is the opinion of the people themselves; they do not realise where the boundary lines are. There ought to be community of interest. There does not seem to be any community of interest whatever. Take Brookstead, in the Cunningham electorate, or, rather, that which is called Drayton at present. It goes into Dalby. I do not know the exact distance from Dalby, but it must be 40 or 50 miles. It is really a farming district of Pittsworth. Take Wyreema, within 7 miles of Toowoomba. What community of interest is there between those electors and those up near Warwick? The kindest and most charitable thing that can be said about the redistribution is that it is a political bungle. I would not be one to hold the Commissioners responsible for a job like that.

Mr. W. COOPER: The hon. gentleman was the first to go and see the Commissioners.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Commissioners should not have been interfered with. No one should have been allowed in the room. If there has been no political interference, then the work of the Commissioners stamps those men as utterly incompetent to carry out their business. The most charitable thing one can say is that they were not responsible, and that it is a political bungle. That is what the people of Queensland believe.

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): So far as I can understand, the hon. member for Drayton was the first to go to the Commissioners for the purpose of getting his electorate fixed up in the manner in which he wanted it done.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I went down the same as every other hon. member did. They should not have been allowed to go.

Mr. W. COOPER: I refused point blank to have anything to do with the outlying boundaries. I said that, if I could not win the Rosewood seat without interfering, somebody else could have it. I am not going to sit in this Chamber and listen to hon. members saying that the redistribution of seats was a political bungle. Nine out of every ten members went to the Commissioners to give instructions to them so that they could get the very best from the Commissioners.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: 24,000 farmers were disfranchised.

Mr. W. Cooper.]

Mr. W. COOPER: Nonsense. The charge made by the hon. member is only in keeping with other charges made by hon. members opposite. They have endeavoured to cover their own tracks by making charges against the Government. We know perfectly well that, prior to the redistribution of seats, hon. members opposite claimed that it was necessary to bring about such a redistribution in order to give the people of Queensland equality of representation in this Chamber. Now, after it has been done and because hon. members opposite are devoid of any other charge, they come along and say that the redistribution was a political bungle. Just imagine the leader of the Opposition moving a want of confidence motion in this Chamber three or four weeks ago, when we now see every hon. member opposite on the defence!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Fancy the Premier asking the leader of the Opposition to move the motion!

Mr. W. COOPER: Such disgraceful proceedings on the part of the Opposition have never been known in the history of any Parliament. If the people of Queensland return that party again to power the two State institutions that I have in my electorate would not hold one quarter of the people who should be in them. As soon as "Hansard" is distributed throughout the State disclosing the arguments and the charges and the whole record of hon. members opposite, instead of their being returned to power, there will not be five of them left.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): During the afternoon I was highly amused to see the hon. member for Port Curtis lash himself into a white fury because this party had criticised the actions of his party in attempting to manipulate the rolls. Apparently the hon. member scorned the idea that they would do such a thing, yet in the same breath he admitted that they were sending men out for the purpose of getting names off the roll. I think he said that there were 700 in the Port Curtis electorate who did not record their votes. That may be quite true, but it does not prove that those men were not entitled to be on the roll. It might simply prove that they were outside the electorate at the time of the election. It could easily have been ascertained by an application to the Electoral Registrar how many of those people who did not vote were not entitled to be on the roll. It would be a simple matter to find that out. They were probably living in scattered portions of the State, and therefore did not record their votes, and no doubt a number of notices were sent out asking for the reason why they did not record their vote. I know the same thing happened in my electorate. Quite a large number of people did not record their votes, and things were made pretty uncomfortable for me after two or three weeks by people calling and asking if the Government were going to institute proceedings because they had not recorded their votes, and letters appeared in the papers saying that these people could not be found—that their names were on the roll, but that they were fictitious names and had no real existence. It simply shows that a lot of people are careless as to whether they vote or not. The leader of the Nationalist party stated that at the late by-election there were 1,500 names on the roll—I presume he meant the Paddington roll—more than were shown off the Commonwealth roll. That does not

show that they were not entitled to be on the roll. Most likely the Commonwealth roll was manipulated. I have no hesitation in saying that there has been ceaseless scrutiny in connection with the Commonwealth roll for the last year or so. They are absolutely keen in the Commonwealth Electoral Office to remove names as soon as they get anything like the semblance of an excuse for doing it. What is the system by which the Commonwealth roll is altered from time to time? One of the worst systems that can be in operation. The postal officials go from house to house delivering letters, and they get 1s. for every name they put on the roll and for every name they give notice to have cut off the roll.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS: That is not correct.

Mr. HARTLEY: Perhaps the rate is tumbling. Perhaps the supply has exceeded the demand since I inquired, but I think my statement will be found correct. I got it direct from the collector. Whether he thought he was not getting the award rate or not, I do not know. I simply state the fact as it was stated to me by a postal collector. The point I wish to make is that the collector is not keenly interested whether he gets a person put on the roll or taken off the roll. What he is interested in is the fact that he gets an extra bonus at the end of the year by reporting as many names as he can either for enrolment or erasure. If he happens to go with a letter to residents in the locality—and they may have been residents for many years—and they do not answer the door because they do not happen to be at home, he makes a note in his notebook and reports them as absent, and the Commonwealth roll is manipulated accordingly, and their names are struck off. In every Commonwealth electorate there are dozens, and even hundreds, of people who have never been out of the street for which they are enrolled for eight or ten years, and sometimes longer, and their names have been taken off the roll. That is the way the names are put off, and that is the reason why there is such a disparity between the names on the Commonwealth and State rolls. I think the Electoral Office should exercise keener supervision with regard to the State rolls, and that greater facilities and information should be placed at the disposal of all electors to have their names put on the roll, or to enable them to apply, when they have resided long enough in the place where they live, to be put on the roll for the new electorate. In that way a certain amount of duplication which has taken place in connection with the State roll would be avoided. I want to tell the hon. member for Port Curtis, after all the wild fury and annoyance he expressed this afternoon, that the Denham Government, which he came in here pledged to support, not only attempted to keep men off the roll, but actually sent up special instructions from the Brisbane office, and subsequently sent up an officer to try and get as many names off the roll in Rockhampton and Fitzroy electorates as he could.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Why should you follow such a bad example?

Mr. HARTLEY: I am not following a bad example; I am simply reminding the hon. member of these sins, to encourage him to repent and do better in the future. I happen to know this, because, although I was not in the forefront as a possible candidate, I was employing the spare time

[*Mr. W. Cooper.*]

the capitalistic crowd had given me—they gave me a lot of spare time, and I used it well.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You did not feel like working for nothing.

Mr. HARTLEY: I worked three months for nothing. The political crowd and the capitalistic crowd at that time had me just about on the scrap heap, so far as getting work was concerned, and I put in three months as an honorary electoral organiser for the Labour movement. I canvassed the biggest part of the electorates of Rockhampton and Fitzroy. The first thing I did was to make myself acquainted with all that could be done under the Elections Act. I happened to find out that this letter of instructions had been sent up, and I noticed that a certain number of names were marked in the official roll with an inquiry mark, and I asked the reason for it. I do not know whether it was through an oversight, or whether they thought I had not enough gumption to see through it, but they gave me the list that had been sent up from Brisbane with the various inquiries marked on it. Some names were marked with a query, some were marked "deceased," and others as having left the district so many months. I went through the list very carefully, and then went round the electorate and interviewed the people, and found out that they were people who had been resident there for six or seven years, and had never been absent a week from their homes; yet their names in the list from the Electoral Office—not from an organisation—had been queried, or the official had been instructed to mark them off. Fortunately, I was able to put them up to what was happening, and in many cases obtained their authority to go into court and see that their names were not struck off. A lot of names had been struck off, but we got claims and put them on again. I daresay, if I had not been as active and keen as I was on that occasion, the hon. gentleman's party would have won the Rockhampton and Fitzroy seats at the 1915 election. So whatever the hon. member for Port Curtis and other hon. members say, they cannot support it by evidence. These are things that all parties have been guilty of. It is no use hon. members opposite trying to pose as Simon Pures, and declaring that they only believe in what is absolutely right and proper at election times. I regret the tactics which have been adopted by the organisations behind the party opposite, because they are so glaringly bad that they give a bad tone to everything connected with politics. It is evident that the Opposition realise that they are fighting in the last ditch, and they will use any methods, scrupulous or unscrupulous, and use any weapons, fair or unfair, to down this Government. I want to say to the Minister in charge of the Estimates that he cannot be too keen in his scrutiny, and the officers of the Electoral Department cannot be too careful in preventing any insidious work being accomplished to the detriment of this Government in the Electoral Office by the agents of the party opposite.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): We cannot sit silently by and listen to the charge that our party organisations are mixed up with anything wrong in regard to elections. I say that the party has no knowledge of any wrongful actions of the organisation at the present time. If hon. gentlemen know of

any, it will be helpful to the State should they let us have that information.

Mr. BRENNAN: You have heard it here all the afternoon.

Mr. CORSER: I can assure this Committee that neither this party nor our organisations, so far as we are aware, have done anything to the discredit of the party, and they have no intention of doing anything of the kind.

Mr. COLLINS: Don't repudiate your organisation.

Mr. CORSER: I do not repudiate our organisation. I say that, if we cannot get into power by fair means, we do not want to get into power at all.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: You do not believe that.

Mr. CORSER: I do believe it. I am quite satisfied we are going to get into power by fair means.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You do not realise that.

Mr. CORSER: We have always realised it. So fair were we as a Government when we were in power, and so fair were our electoral rolls, that it enabled hon. members opposite to get into power with a majority of two to one.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was an accident on your part.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman is quite correct in that; the people have since realised that it was an accident. It has certainly been an accident for the State, and the hon. gentleman will know when the next election comes around.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You passed compulsory voting and the people returned us with a majority of twenty.

Mr. CORSER: Now the people are going to vote you out.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You have been saying that for the last seven years.

Mr. CORSER: Give us the opportunity now and we will show you. Reference has been made to the Federal roll. I think that it would save a lot of trouble if we had one roll for both the Commonwealth and State. We could have one clean roll then, and the people could be enrolled for one electorate and one electorate only. That is what the Opposition are out for. We know the possibilities of a clean roll, and we have not got a clean roll in the State to-day.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It would need to be better than the Federal roll.

Mr. CORSER: The Federal roll is a clean roll. You want a roll that suits your party.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I can prove that the Federal roll is not a clean roll.

Mr. CORSER: You can claim to prove anything. You cannot prove that you are correct in your arguments.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I can, on official statements.

Mr. CORSER: I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot. Under the Federal system it is possible to have a clean roll and to have people enrolled for the electorate in which they live, but the State Act, unfortunately, makes enrolment on several rolls possible.

Mr. Corser.]

There is no compulsion that the elector shall say in his application form on which roll he was last enrolled, and till you get that information you are not going to have a clean roll.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is not true. Under our system you cannot be on two rolls at the same time. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. CORSER: That is wrong. The Minister must be a very innocent man to make that statement, but I am inclined to think that he is trying to hide behind it the real truth. If a claim form is sent in by some individual in South Brisbane who previously lived in Toowoomba, and whose name is on the Toowoomba roll and he does not say that he was on the Toowoomba roll, his name is placed on the South Brisbane roll and it remains also on the Toowoomba roll. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Townsville, certain persons were on three rolls. There is nothing to stop it. I ask the Minister to indicate the machinery by which people can point this out and have those persons removed from the rolls on which they are not qualified to be enrolled.

There is another thing which makes it possible to have an unfair roll, and that is what I am cavilling at more than anything else. The only amendment moved by the Opposition to the Act of 1915 provided that the witness to the signature on a claim form should state the electorate on which he himself was enrolled. Since 1915 the Government have deleted that safeguard, so that the names of witnesses do not count for anything, because you cannot trace them. The Act merely provides that he shall be an elector of the State, and an organiser of any party can go into the Northern or Western parts of the State—Cloncurry, for instance—and enrol men, whether they are qualified as electors or not, and witness their claim forms as "John Smith." Of course, there is a "John Smith" on some roll, and you cannot trace him or prove that it is only a fictitious name. Those men have their names put on the roll, and there is no safeguard in the Act against that sort of thing. These are the things which we say go to make a "crook" roll.

The statement that the Commonwealth authorities pay 1s. or less to postmen for putting people on the roll or taking them off is not quite correct. Postmen are rewarded for notifying changes of addresses of people who have not fulfilled what is required of them under the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: "Electoral scalpers!"

Mr. CORSER: Hon. members opposite do not even need "scalpers;" a "proxy" does it for them. The Federal Government are trying, as far as possible, to compel people who change their places of residence to become enrolled for their new electorates, and also to have their names erased from the rolls of the old electorates. That is all we desire. Hon. members opposite want to leave the names of their friends on half a dozen different rolls. On the [7.30 p.m.] 1918 compilation there were about 60,000 more names on the roll than there were adults in the State; and the Act has not been amended since. Why not provide the machinery to enable us to secure a clean roll?

Mr. HARTLEY: To have what you call a clean roll?

[Mr. Corser.

Mr. CORSER: A clean roll such as hon. members found when they were returned to power.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Labour supporters off the roll and your own on?

Mr. CORSER: That is the claptrap which electors get from the kerosene tins from hon. members opposite—that hon. members on this side want to take everyone off the roll unless he is an anti-Labour supporter. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. In 1915, the last roll prepared by an anti-Labour Government enabled hon. members opposite to secure possession of the Treasury benches with a two to one majority.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Our policy and your record enabled us to get into power.

Mr. CORSER: The policy which hon. members preached—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Which we carried out.

Mr. CORSER: Which they promised to carry out and then threw out. My one desire is to see that we have a clean roll, and to ensure that every individual is enrolled, and for one electorate. That is all we want. We are not going to get it, apparently, from this Government, who not only have the rolls prepared according to their wishes, but have taken away four country constituencies and—as the hon. member for Drayton correctly stated—disfranchised 24,000 people.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): The hon. member for Burnett has said that he and his party stand for a clean roll. I would like to ask him to which party does he belong?

Mr. CORSER: The Country party—and I am proud of it.

Mr. PAYNE: Does the hon. member belong to the Northern or the Southern Country party?

Mr. CORSER: I belong to the Country party.

Mr. PAYNE: Does the hon. member recognise Mr. Lodge, who has been an organiser out in the West for two and a-half years—does he own him?

Mr. CORSER: Ask the organisation.

Mr. PAYNE: Ever since the last general election Mr. Lodge, who ran against Mr. Hartley in the Fitzroy electorate at the last election, has been an organiser. At every electoral registration centre in the Mitchell electorate, he has deliberately put in bundles of names that he said should be taken off the roll. It happened to be in the electorate, and I found that a deliberate attempt had been made to take off the roll the names of people who had been resident there for ten or twelve years, and who had never been out of the electorate. In every case those men had voted Labour. At a public gathering I explained the provisions of the electoral law, and I told them that neither Lodge nor anyone else could hand in their names to be taken off the roll unless he planked down 5s. with each name; and, if he failed to establish the necessity for taking them off the roll, that 5s. would have to go into Consolidated Revenue. Lodge deliberately tried to mislead the electoral registrars in country electorates regarding the provisions of the State electoral law. I want a clean roll. I do not want on any roll in Queensland the name of any man or woman who is not entitled to be on. If I

could not win my seat on a clean roll, with every man enrolled who was entitled to be enrolled, I would not want to be here at all. At every election that I have contested, even of late years, I have found that quite a number of people who have been living in Longreach for fifteen or twenty years have had their names taken off the roll. How is that?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That happens all over the place. It happened in my electorate.

Mr. PAYNE: There has never been in Australia a party which has done more to "fake" the rolls than the party represented by members opposite, or their class. Go back twenty-five or thirty years—the class which they represent in this House to-day has done the most damnable things in connection with taking the names of people off the roll. I am sick and tired of listening to hon. members on the other side talking about the rolls being stuffed. I do not stand for the stuffing of the rolls, and I know that the Government do not stand for it either. We pin our faith to a clean roll. Take any electoral roll in Queensland—I do not care where it is—run your eye down the list, and you will find that at least 80 per cent. of the names are those of workers who work either by hand or brain. The Labour party during all time has said that once this working-class movement became class conscious enough, once the workers became sufficiently organised, it should not be necessary for any honest Labour man to go out on a platform and say a word in order to be returned to this House. We still say that. All we want is a clean roll. At the next general election, unless great care is taken, it will be found that the names of Labour supporters have been taken off the roll. Lodge has been travelling round the whole of the Mitchell and Barcoo electorates. He has deliberately put in to every electoral registrar the names of quite a number of men, and has tried to bluff them that those people ought not to be on the roll. That is one of the Country party's organisers. The party opposite believe in a dirty roll. (Laughter.) For the last thirty odd years they have known perfectly well that, unless they manipulated the rolls of this State, unless they did something to bamboozle the workers, they could not get a seat in this House.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): When I spoke a short while ago about 24,000 farmers being disfranchised, I took it on the average of four electorates of 6,000 each. My electorate contains 6,000 names.

Mr. RYAN: You haven't got an electorate now.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I was elected to represent a certain number of people until the end of this Parliament. No engineering on behalf of the Electoral Registration Department can take away my right to represent those people. The hon. member for Rosewood, in claiming to represent Lowood, makes a very big mistake. Mr. Nott, the hon. member for Stanley, represents Lowood.

Mr. W. COOPER: He does nothing of the kind.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He received the votes of those people to represent them for three years. No manipulation on behalf of the Government or of the Electoral Registration Department can take away that right.

The votes of the people give the right to a man to represent them—not the transfers of the Government or of the Electoral Registration Department.

There is some suspicion that there was collaboration between the Premier and the Department of Justice in regard to the manner in which the leader of the Opposition was induced by the Premier to table his want of confidence motion. It was quite evident to us, from the undercurrent that was going on, that the Premier wanted that want of confidence motion to come on at a certain time to coincide with certain things that were going on outside.

The PREMIER: I knew it was coming on.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Premier practically asked the leader of the Opposition to bring that motion on on a certain date. He not only asked it, but he came over here and, in my hearing, he asked the leader of the Opposition something about the matter. Certain things were going on outside which were going to bring about certain things on the date that the want of confidence motion was to be moved.

Mr. DASH: It did not happen, though. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Premier has disgraced the officers of the Justice Department by asking them to act as spies.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in saying that the Premier has disgraced the employees of a Government department. I ask him to withdraw and apologise to the Committee.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I withdraw it, and, if you think it necessary, I will apologise. But the Premier had no right to ask the officers of the Department of Justice to act as spies and write shorthand notes in the dark. The Premier wanted the want of confidence motion to come on at a specified time. The people are discussing that matter outside with a great deal of fervour and a great deal of suspicion.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. member for Burnett said that the Elections Act would not permit them to have a clean roll, and that he wanted an amendment of the Act in order to permit that to be done. I was speaking just now about a little bit of work I did at one time, and I have looked through "Hansard" to refresh my memory. What this little bit of the past reveals is rather enlightening. It shows what the Government did at that time. That Government was supported by the hon. member for Burnett. The Opposition say they want a clean roll, and they want a clause put in the Act to enable them to get it. The hon. member for Albert was Home Secretary at the time, and he must accept the responsibility for the tricks that took place. He must take the responsibility for all sorts of things that were done. In September, 1914, I wrote to the late Senator John Adamson, who was then a member of this House, stating—

"1. I have to report that at the court held on 2nd October, 1914, 165 claims were rejected on various grounds.

"2. That of 773 new claims sent in for the Fitzroy electorate, 165 were rejected, or one claim rejected in every five.

"3. That in the Rockhampton electorate, of 629 new claims sent in 114 were rejected, or one in every five and a-half new claims.

Mr. Hartley.]

"4. These claims, with the exception of ten of them, all entitled to be received and accepted had they been correctly filled in."

That was an old trick that they played with Labour electors. It did not matter to what party the man belonged, whether he voted Labour or any other way, he was always told, "I will fill in the claim." These were some of the things they did in filling in the claims. Any Labour man who allows anyone to fill a claim in for him other than his own known agent is a fool. But the electors are waking up. You cannot catch them in that way now. Those are some of the tricks they played on the old Labour electors. The letter further states—

"5. The chief causes of the rejection were as follows:—

(a) Twenty-eight were rejected for the failure to answer, or the incorrect answering, of question No. 6—viz., 'What was the date of your birth?'

Their ages would be probably set down as twenty, and the returning officer or the electoral registrar would probably disallow their claims. The letter further states—

"(b) Ten were rejected because no answer was given to question No. 10, viz.: Have you bonâ fide and continuously resided in Queensland for the last twelve months?"

Very often the applicant said that he was native-born and had never been out of the State, but because he did not answer that question his claim was rejected. The letter further states—

"(c) Thirteen were rejected because they gave no answer to question No. 11, viz.: If so, in what place?"

"(d) Seven were rejected because no answer was given to question No. 12, viz.: If you are not a native of Queensland, when did you arrive in this State? The answer given to question No. 7, viz.: What was your place of birth? showed that most of these applicants were natives of this State.

"(e) Four claims were rejected because no answer was given to question No. 13, viz.: If you are not a native, by what means did you arrive in this State?"

Notwithstanding that the answer to the question as to what was the place of their birth showed that they were born in the State. The letter further states—

"(f) Fifteen were rejected because no answer was given to question No. 14, viz.: Have you bonâ fide and continuously resided in this electorate for the preceding twelve months?"

The claim showed that they were born in Queensland. Those were some of the tricks put up by the agents of hon. members opposite professedly with the object of cleansing the roll. They talk about amending the Act so as to enable them to cleanse the roll, but they only want to prevent men getting on and, where possible, to take men off. I am quite sure nobody is going to be fooled by the cry of the hon. member for Burnett or anybody else.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): In connection with this vote there have been some insinuations by hon. members opposite that this party is not prepared to maintain a clean roll. This party has always stood for a clean roll, and

[Mr. Hartley.

has always desired it. We are determined that every eligible person in the State shall be entitled to a vote at the elections. That is a fair thing, and no party can complain if we endeavour to secure that.

Mr. GREEN: On the right roll.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, on the roll for the district in which he is entitled to vote. The hon. member for Burnett made a wild statement.

Mr. CORSER: It was not a wild statement.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman seldom makes any other sort of statement. He made a wild statement in which he suggested that a man could be on one, two, three, or a dozen rolls.

Mr. CORSER: I said there was nothing to stop him.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That shows how irresponsible are the statements continually made by that hon. gentleman, and how totally incapable he is of understanding the electoral machinery of this State. For the information of that hon. gentleman, and perhaps other hon. gentlemen opposite, I shall state the procedure of the Electoral Office, as set out by the officials of the Electoral Registration Department in connection with enrolment, erasure, and transfer. I do it in the language of the officials themselves, so that there will be no mistake as to what is done by the Chief Electoral Officer and his officers. Here is the procedure, and it shows that the hon. gentleman is utterly wrong in his statement—

"Claim cards are filled in by electors and are forwarded to the electoral registrar of the district or division in which the elector resides.

"The electoral registrar, after being satisfied that the claim is in order, and that the elector is not already enrolled on his roll, enters the name and particulars of the elector's enrolment in his official roll, and after having acknowledged the receipt of the claim and issued an advice to the electoral registrar of the electoral district (if any) in which the elector was previously enrolled, forwards the claim to this office.

"On receipt of the claim at this office the cabinet index is checked, and if it is found that a card showing a previous enrolment is in the index, that card is withdrawn and the new card is placed in the card index.

"The official roll in this office of the district for which the elector was previously enrolled is then checked to see that the entry on that roll has been erased as a result of the advice sent to the registrar of the old district by the registrar of the district for which the elector has newly enrolled.

"If the name has not been erased then this office issues a notice of erasure to the registrar of the district for which the elector was enrolled prior to his new enrolment.

"As many members of Parliament assume that electors can claim enrolment for a number of districts without being removed from the roll for the old district, the definite statement can be made that, providing an elector gives the same name and particulars on his new enrolment as he gave on his previous enrolment, his old entry is, and can be traced,

in this office and his old entry is removed. The fact that the elector states that he was not previously enrolled, or gives an incorrect previous enrolment, is not material."

So long as he signs the paper. We have a card system. We have in the Electoral Office in Brisbane—and I invite hon. members to inspect it for themselves—a system of recording the name of every elector registered for enrolment in the State. The fact is apparent from that explanation, which can be verified, that it is impossible, except by sheer accident, to have anything such as the duplication or triplication suggested by the hon. member for Burnett in his usual wild statement.

The hon. member for Gregory referred to some of the difficulties with which members in country districts have to contend, particularly in connection with group voting and in connection with securing a proper check on, say, the manager and bookkeeper at the station, who usually runs the show. I sympathise with the hon. member for Gregory in that regard, as my own electorate is similarly situated. All I can say is that I will go fully into the suggestions made by him and endeavour, before the next elections, to solve the matter in a manner satisfactory to me, to him, and to the country as a whole.

The hon. member for Windsor made a suggestion as to the inflation of the Paddington roll at the last by-election. He pointed out that there were 1,650 more electors on the Paddington roll than were enrolled on the Federal roll for that district. That can be easily explained. Prior to the Paddington election, as is the case prior to all elections, an intensive canvass was made by the police, with the result that 1,100 names were put on that roll within six or seven weeks; at all events, within two months of the election. The Federal people did not have a canvass, consequently names which might have been on the Paddington roll immediately prior to the election were not on the Federal roll at all, and the difference between 1,100 and 1,650 in all probability were not on the Federal roll, although they should have been on it. It is difficult, as most hon. members are aware, to know who is on the Federal roll to-day, because you cannot get a Federal roll unless you go to the Federal Electoral Office and inquire for it. There is no such thing as a roll posted in a public place indicating who is on the roll and who is not. All the Federal rolls to-day are obsolete. In fact, they have not printed one for a considerable time, and they only print them when it suits them.

I want to refer particularly to certain remarks made by the hon. member for Townsville in reply to the statements made by the hon. member for Herbert in connection with the Northern Country party's organisation. I stated early in the session that a deliberate attempt was being made by the Northern Country party to disfranchise electors, and I reiterate that statement to-night. We have machinery for the enrolment of electors, and that organisation has practically attempted to usurp the functions of the State officials, and has done it in a way that is not to its credit, and is not calculated to make for a clean roll, but rather for a roll that would be in the interests of its particular party.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You mean they are looking after their party and you are looking after yours.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member for Gregory earlier in the session referred to and quoted a circular issued by the Northern Country party, which circular was read by the hon. member for Townsville this afternoon. Anybody reading that circular will know that it is not animated by a desire for a clean roll. It is a pure desire on their part to get on the roll as many of their friends as possible, and to get off the roll as many as they can of ours.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is the true position, because in the circular, which was sent out to the managers of stations, selectors, and others, they clearly ask when the returns of these men are sent in to have a mark placed opposite the names of the men who are supposed to be supporters of the Country party. For what purpose? For the purpose of exercising their right to leave names off the roll.

Mr. GREEN: Just to get an idea of their strength. (Government laughter.)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I just want to refer to the tactics employed by the Northern Country party. Through ignorance or worse, they assume that the State and Federal rolls are compiled on the basis of the same Act, which is totally untrue. And because a man is wiped off the Federal roll, they conclude that he ought to be wiped off the State roll. If we follow the Federal

roll to-day and remove from the [8 p.m.] State roll those who do not appear on the Federal roll we would have tens of thousands of electors disfranchised. Here is a sample of one of the letters sent out by the Northern Country party, and I leave it to hon. members themselves to decide whether it is not a deliberate attempt to deceive an elector—

"Northern Country party,
Townsville, 26th July, 1922.

"Mr. Leslie Brown,
Fireman,
Leigh street,
West End.

"Dear Sir,—You have made no reply to mine of 8th May, 1922, and as I have lists of all enrolments to 30th June, 1922, I am, I think, justified in concluding that you refuse to enrol for the electorate you reside in. I am, therefore, on 1st August, applying to the Electoral Court to summons you before them. The Browns on the Townsville division of the Kennedy are "Frederick Albert," "Pauline Rachel" and "William Joseph," an enrolment of 16th June, 1922. The matter is yours, and I shall produce evidence that you made your Federal transfer to Leigh street on 21st December, 1921."

What are the facts? This officer of the Northern Country party writes that letter on 26th July. As a matter of fact, this man had transferred to the proper roll four days earlier, on 22nd July, and, if they had taken the trouble to inquire, they should never have sent in that letter at all. It shows the bluff to which they resort. They say they are going to summon this man before the Electoral Court. The Electoral Court was abolished in 1915, yet they are bluffing the electors

Hon. J. Mullan.]

and leading them to believe that there is some judicial tribunal to which they can be summoned, and which will send them to gaol for misconduct. That shows the bluff to which they are resorting to get electors to comply with requests which would lead to disfranchisement. I have a sheaf of letters in a similar strain, sent to people, and charging them with offences of which they are entirely innocent, and frightening the lives out of people who were not up to the tricks and the tactics which that party employ. The Federal and State enrolments are based on different Acts, and the officers of the Northern Country party must be aware of that. If they are not aware of it, they are not worth their job. They are supposed to do something in connection with the Federal as well as with the State rolls. I just want to show the difference between the Federal and State rolls in connection with enrolment, which will show how electors could be disfranchised if they were to accept the Federal rolls as the standard for enrolment. The Federal law and the State law differ materially in connection with enrolment, and with objections made. It is well that that should be understood. The Commonwealth Electoral Act, section 55, provides—

“When an objection is made by or lodged with a divisional returning officer, the divisional returning officer shall forthwith give notice of the objection to the person objected to. The notice may be in the prescribed form, and may be served by being posted to the place of abode for the time being of the person objected to, if that place of abode is known to the divisional returning officer, or, if it is not known to the divisional returning officer, then to the place of living as appearing on the roll.”

Here is a very important point. Subsection 4 of section 55 of the Commonwealth Act provides—

“An objection on the ground that a person does not live in the subdivision for which he is enrolled shall be deemed not to be good unless it alleges that the person objected to does not live in the subdivision and has not so lived for the one month last past.”

So we see that under the Federal law, if a man has been absent for one month from the subdivision for which he is enrolled, he may be disfranchised. The Northern Country party assume that because an elector is removed from the Federal roll, he should also be struck off the State roll, which is wrong. Section 57 of the Federal Act provides further—

“The divisional returning officer shall determine the objection forthwith on receipt of the answer of the person objected to, or if no answer is received within a period of twenty days after the posting of the notice, then after the expiration of that period, and if it appears that the person objected to is not entitled to be enrolled on the roll in respect of which the objection has been made, the divisional returning officer shall direct the Registrar to remove the name of such person from that roll.”

So that, if a person removes from one subdivision to another within a Federal electorate, even if he never leaves the electorate—if he only moves to the opposite side of the street, so long as he is moving from one

subdivision to another—he is struck off the roll. Do hon. members opposite stand for that? Do they think because that system applies to the Federal electorate, that it should apply to the State electorate? It is because I do not stand for that that I do not stand for the tactics of the Northern Country party which, when a man is removed from the Federal roll, immediately attempts to wipe him off the State roll. There can be no mistake under our State roll. There are only three ways in which a man can be removed from the roll in the State, and it is well that hon. members and the people outside should know that. They are—unless the State elector has secured enrolment upon some other roll; unless an objection has been lodged on account of the elector having left the State; and unless an elector has died. That provides that it is impossible to disfranchise an elector, and it is far better to adopt that system, and even run the risk of someone being on the roll who should not be there—although I do not stand for that, and will do everything possible to prevent it—it is far better to risk somebody being on the roll who should not be there than that thousands should not be on the roll who should be there.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In connection with the Northern Country party I have a few more observations to make.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It seems to trouble you a lot.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am doing the hon. member for Townsville the compliment of dealing with this matter. The hon. member said he wanted the facts, and I am trying to give the facts as fairly as I can. He made certain complaints against the Electoral Registration Department this evening. I am sorry he did not make those complaints to me, as I would have given them my earlier attention. The hon. member made some complaints about men who were not resident in the locality still remaining on the Townsville roll.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And they refused point blank to come off.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I stand for a man having his name on the roll for the district in which he resides, or where he has his bona fide occupation. That does not mean that because a man leaves his home temporarily to look for work, he should be struck off the roll; yet that is what the Northern Country party have been doing. As soon as a man leaves Townsville, Charters Towers, or Cloncurry looking for work elsewhere, there is a notice sent out telling him that he will suffer certain pains and penalties if he does not take his name off the roll and put it on the roll for the district in which he temporarily resides. I have received many letters from people living in the North complaining to me that, when they go away temporarily from home looking for employment, they get these letters from the Northern Country party telling them they must put their names on the roll for the district where they are then living, and where they are looking for temporary employment. I hope hon. members opposite do not stand for that, and will not take exception to my drawing attention to the tactics employed by their organisation outside.

Mr. J. JONES: We have only heard one side of the question.

[Hon. J. Mullan.]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No doubt, inquiries will be made from their organisations to see if my statements are justified or not. If my statements are not justified, then hon. members will have an opportunity of refuting them elsewhere.

Mr. FLETCHER: Don't your organisers adopt the same plan?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. I will not stand for my organisers or my party doing anything to disfranchise anybody.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FLETCHER: Don't you know that, when new electors come into an electorate, they are put on the roll? New electors coming into Port Curtis are putting their names on the Port Curtis roll.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If they live in the electorates for the prescribed time they are entitled to have their names on that roll.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am not complaining about that, but why should not the Northern Country party do it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They should keep within the law—that is all we ask. I will show later that we are going to insist that they shall keep within the law. I am going to quote from the statement made by the Principal Electoral Officer dealing particularly with this question at Townsville, and verifying the statements I have made that attempts have been made by this office to disfranchise electors.

Mr. WARREN: Why don't you prosecute them?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They were cunning enough to keep outside the ambit of the Criminal Code, but they will have to be careful if they adopt that attitude all the time.

Mr. FLETCHER: You said they were outside the law.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: This is the statement made by the Principal Electoral Officer—

“The Northern Country party organiser recently made certain statements about the scandalous state of the Northern rolls, but the matter referred to by him had already been dealt with by this office.”

I draw the attention of the hon. member for Townsville to those words, because it shows that the grievances submitted by him had already been attended to. The Principal Electoral Officer goes on—

“The complaint was greatly magnified, and on examination it showed that 140 names out of a total enrolment of 14,425 names on the Townsville, Kennedy, and Mundingburra rolls had, as a result of the alteration of the boundaries of those three electoral districts, been retained on the wrong rolls. These errors have now been rectified, and the electors concerned will be enabled to vote for the districts in which they reside.

“Although a complaint was made by the organiser of the Northern Country party in this matter, that official has frequently caused lists of names to be submitted to this office in which were numbers of names of electors which were stated to be ‘duplicated’ on the rolls. It was found that in a great many cases

the Country party organisers had made a mistake in saying that the entries were ‘duplicates.’

“If this office had acted on that information the matter would have been more serious than the one complained of, as electors would have had their names wrongly removed from the rolls.”

There we have an official document written by the Principal Electoral Officer stating that if he had followed the suggestions of the organiser of the Northern Country party certain electors would have had their names wrongly removed from the roll. That is not my statement. It is the official statement.

Mr. FLETCHER: There is no argument in that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I want to point out another important thing. I stated earlier in my remarks that it was not advisable—in fact, it was wrong—to base any enrolment upon the Federal roll, because I considered the present Federal electoral roll was not up to date, but was obsolete. Taking the Federal roll as it stands to-day, I am sure that if there were a Federal election to-morrow, then tens of thousands would be disfranchised. I want to prove that statement. This is what the Principal Electoral Officer says—

“The Commonwealth electoral roll shows that there are 388,000 electors in Queensland, whereas at the Federal elections in 1919 there were 391,000 on the roll, showing that the 1921 Federal enrolment had decreased by 2,358 votes.”

According to the Federal roll there were 2,358 votes less than there were two years earlier, although there was a considerable increase in the population. As a matter of fact, the population increased by 49,780 in that time.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Would that not be due to the absentees at the war?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. There were 2,358 voters less, although the population in the interval had increased by over 49,000. Surely that is convincing enough to show that it is wrong to work on the presumption that the Federal roll is a clean one?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It might prove that there were too many names on the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER: It might prove that you are wrong on your figures.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said that this party stood for a clean roll. I also said that we stood for everyone who is entitled to vote at an election enjoying that right. In order to circumvent the tactics that are being employed by certain organisers to disfranchise electors, we have adopted a system which must commend itself to every fair-minded man. I am now giving the hon. member for Townsville the information he asked for some time ago in connection with this matter. We have now adopted a plan by which the police are to be responsible in every electorate for the collection of names for the State rolls. It is not to be a mere spasmodic affair just before an election, but it is to go on all the time. The police in each locality where they reside will have imposed on them the responsibility of collecting names for the roll. They will not only collect names for the roll, but they will furnish the Principal Electoral Officer with such information as

Hon. J. Mullan.]

may be required by him to keep the rolls all the time in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: That has always been done.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Undoubtedly, his duty will impose on him the obligation of not only enrolling electors, but also of reporting to the registrar all the information that may be required to keep the rolls in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: That is quite right.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am glad to hear that that has the concurrence of all parties in the House, and in view of that statement I hope that the Country party will call off their dogs. They cannot now continue to canvass on the plea that they want to give people votes. In the first place, this obligation will be imposed on the police, but when it is reported that it will be inconvenient for the police to collect names in remote parts of the electorate, such as Birdsville, the obligation will be imposed on itinerant teachers, industrial inspectors, or any other Government officer who is passing through. That is the most complete system that has ever been adopted in the State for the registration of electors, and one to which hon. members in this Committee can take no exception. I do not think there is any more to say on this vote except that, if any party in the House takes exception to anybody's name being on the roll, he can, under section 31 of the Act, upon lodging a deposit of 5s., in a clean and gentlemanly fashion, make application to have it removed; but I believe that at present there is no ground for complaint.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The Minister, in answering those who criticised his department, referred to "members, in their ignorance" —

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I did not apply that to the hon. member.

Mr. CORSER: Well, I shall refer to him as "our learned friend," just to show that there is no ill-feeling. (Laughter.) The Minister has gone a long way in an attempt to show that our contention is incorrect that the Act permits not only of duplications but also of the enrolment of persons who are not qualified. He has evaded one point I made. In 1915 the Government agreed to only one amendment moved by the Opposition, to the effect that an elector witnessing a claim shall—

"Record his electorate after his name."

Since then the Government have passed an amending Act, wiping out that provision, and I want to know from the Minister how he can trace that claim form, seeing that the witness has not to specify from what electorate he comes. He says that the electoral officer satisfies himself as to the bona fides of the claim. How can he do that if the witness does not specify the electorate for which he is enrolled?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Look at the card—It says, "Elector of the electoral district of —"

Mr. CORSER: How is it possible to compare the signatures?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Go down and have a look. Have half an hour with Mr. Cole, and you will not say another word about the system.

Mr. CORSER: I will go down and have a look at it.

[*Hon. J. Mullan.*]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And I invite criticism after you come back.

Mr. CORSER: If the Minister is correct, how could the person mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville get on three rolls? There are others, and there always will be. Hon. members opposite said that the old Act provided that their supporters could be taken off the roll too soon, but in the Maryborough petition the Government practically apologised and asked that the proceedings should be discontinued. The Labour party did not go on with the matter because there were some thirteen names of persons who had voted Labour although they were enrolled on other rolls as well as the Maryborough roll, showing that their arguments now are a mere electioneering stunt. Hon. members have complained that under the Act of the past Administration the opponents of Labour were kept on two or three rolls and that Labour men were not, but that petition was practically cancelled because Labour voters were on two rolls. If Labour supporters could not get on the rolls, where did they get their supporters to put them into Parliament? Their arguments are too ridiculous, there is too much make-believe about them, too much talking to the electors, too much trying to make out that the Opposition do not want people who are opposed to them to have the franchise. We do not want people on the rolls two or three times. All that we are asking for is a clean roll.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You have never had a cleaner roll than under our administration.

Mr. CORSER: It may be clean according to the definition of the Government, but I think it would be a good suggestion to insert in the Elections Act a definition of what a clean roll is.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What definition did you put in the new Elections Bill that was to alter the franchise?

Mr. CORSER: I know of no new franchise and no member of the Country party ever heard of a new Elections Bill. Such a suggestion only makes me think that a lot of that stuff was concocted by opponents of the Opposition. No such thing was ever suggested or breathed by us, and it was only invented to cause suspicion outside. No member of the Opposition would tolerate anything but the principle of "one adult one vote." Our organisation has never made any other suggestion, and our platform is clear. It provides for, "One adult, one vote." We have heard a lot about our organisation. Our organisation is open enough to allow people to come along and make what motions they like. They are not necessarily carried.

Because a man might move a [8.30 p.m.] motion, that does not say that the organisation is going to provide anything wrong in connection with the franchise. We do not say that a lot of Government members subscribe to things which have been said at communistic conferences.

I am sorry that the vote is going through without a promise from the Minister that he is going to bring in a Bill which will satisfy the whole House. A committee of the whole House should be appointed to bring in something which would satisfy the whole House. If we did that, we would have a better election law—not a political one.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): I would not have touched on this vote, particularly the aspect dealing with the rolls, had it not been for the fact that history happens to have a very awkward knack of repeating itself. It is as well for the Committee to know that history does repeat itself. After all, hon. members of the Opposition to-day are only the product of their forefathers. We have the system recurring in cycles year after year, or tens of years after tens of years, and it hobbles up again. It is the same family record—the Nationalist party, the Liberal party, and now the Country party. There are the same old attempts to disfranchise the people of this State. When we hear of these things we want to hark back in the records of this House, and show that, after all, this attempt to disfranchise the people is nothing new. We know that to-day disclosures have been made in this House regarding attempts of the Country party. I want to read another disclosure, made in this House quite a number of years ago, to show that the products of those people are still in this Chamber. It goes back quite a long way; so does their history. The trouble is, they never want to look at it; but we want to keep dragging it up to show the people that they are the product of those who tried to disfranchise people of this State. In the year 1895, in this very same House, Mr. Glassey—then a member of this House—went so far as to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to a thing which is precisely on all-fours with what the hon. member read out to-day regarding the Northern Country party. We find that a circular was circulated broadcast by a Mr. Bulcock—thank God, he is no relation to our friend from Barcoo. (Laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

At 8.38 p.m.,

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. WEIR: It was entitled "Bulcocking the rolls." I think we might call this latest attempt, "Greening the rolls." We had Mr. Glassey reading the circular in detail. After he had outlined the section of the Act with which the circular deals, he went on to the interesting part—or the meat—of the circular, which was circulated by Mr. Bulcock to the various Government officers of the day—the same people who are in the eye of the public to-day—the same people, I might say, who are looked on by all sections of the community to do the fair and honourable thing—and who do the fair and the honourable thing if a decent Government will allow them to do their work decently. I say "decent Government." I have heard insinuations to the effect that certain people have been appointed for political purposes. All the members of this Government, in my opinion, take the same view as I. In my electorate the returning officer happens to be an old Tory. Nobody objects, because he happens to be also an honest, honourable man. He can rest there as long as he likes; it does not matter to me. My one condition is that he should play the game always. I know, and everybody else knows, that, if he did cast a vote, it would be cast against me. The man has a perfect right to cast a vote as he likes. All I ask is that he stick to the intentions of the Government and do the honourable thing on election day. He has done it, and he can

stay there so far as I am concerned. This is the attempt which was made in those days to get at men like that—public servants. Those were the people who were then controlling the Government, and those are the people who have the barefaced effrontery to ask the public of Queensland to-day to forget that they are the product of their forefathers, and to let them get back to handle the reins of office and do what their forefathers were prepared to do. The public are not silly enough. It will be noticed, in the wording of this circular and in its intention, that there is a complete similarity to the wording and intention of the circular which has been read in the Chamber to-day. It reads—

"As we are anxious to have the rolls purged of all names that are not entitled to be thereon, we have taken the liberty of requesting our friends to try to assist you by forwarding you such information as they may be in possession of, and hope it will be of service. As there appears to be some misapprehension as to the way in which 'claim forms' should be made out, we have issued an 'example' which may help to save the time in your office, and we have taken the liberty of sending you a copy."

That sounds very like the Northern Country party's circular. I would not be surprised if those gentlemen had got hold of this and tried the same old joke, hoping we would not be up to it—just as they did in 1895. The members of that day held the House up on this question. Mr. Morgan—afterwards Sir Arthur Morgan—dealt with the situation from the point of view that appeals to me most strongly. He said, "Let us exonerate Mr. Bulcock"—as we say, "Let us exonerate the Country party organisers." I say definitely, let us exonerate the man who is earning his crust in doing that contemptible work. After all, he is only one of our class who has gone astray. Let us put the responsibility on the shoulders where it belongs. Let us point with scorn to the people who would use their money to contaminate these good people. That is what Mr. Morgan did in the early days. He said—

"Now, while I believe that Mr. Bulcock is guilty of no unbecoming or unworthy conduct, I am not so sure that some of the 'friends' to whom he alludes, and whose aid he invokes in the different districts of the colony, will be quite scrupulous as he is; and that is where the danger comes in.

"The Premier: What friends are mentioned in this circular?"

"Mr. MORGAN: 'Our friends' is the phrase used in the circular."

"Our friends" of that day are "our friends" of the present day—the progeny of their forefathers, and branded for the same contemptible tricks.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): We can congratulate the Minister on having spoken in one direction, but he is not to be congratulated altogether upon his contradictory statements. I am rather sorry that he was not in the Chamber earlier in the day when the debate waxed warm. Had he been, he might have been successful in saving the Committee from the unfortunate position of having to listen to a great deal which was said this afternoon.

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have been here all day; I have never been out of the House

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. gentleman should have risen earlier than he did. I am glad he took up the cudgels for his department when he did, late in the day though it was. Had he done his duty, had he explained the *modus operandi* of things in general in connection with election matters, we would not have had to submit to several speeches which have been made to-day.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member should be aware that the usual practice of the Minister is to hear grievances and then to reply.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am quite aware of all that. We are also quite aware that in these days Ministers speak not only at the end but many times during a debate. If the Minister listened to speeches like that delivered by the hon. member for Herbert, he should have risen in his place, chastised that hon. member, and told him that the department was quite able to watch its own affairs. In his earlier remarks the Minister stated the procedure of the Principal Electoral Officer, and outlined in general the course which was pursued. Finally, he made the statement that it was impossible to disfranchise an elector. We had the hon. member for Herbert distinctly stating that organisers had been at work in the North, and he indicated, if I understood him correctly, that they had met with some degree of success, not only in putting men on the roll but in taking them off. You see the absolute contradiction of things. That is why the hon. member for Kurilpa this afternoon charged the Government with not standing up for the department. We have been told all night that it is impossible for men to succeed in doing what the hon. member for Herbert and the hon. member for Mitchell and many hon. members have said to-day can be done. The Committee are extremely relieved to learn that all that was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Herbert in particular, and by others, was simply beating the air.

Mr. DASH: It was not, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They were simply beating the air, and there was no business in it.

Mr. DASH: Tell us about the Warwick elections a few years ago. That is more in your line.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I can do that. The hon. member for Herbert indicated that the men could do what he suggested with almost perfect ease. It is a big relief to know that the officers of the department are acting as they are. Any man conversant with the ordinary cards having to do with enrolment and the erasement of names, must know that to carry out the purposes which the hon. member for Herbert suggested was being carried out was almost an impossibility.

Mr. RYAN: What rot!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I stand by the department and say that it cannot be done. The other side say it can be done with perfect ease. We know that it is not being done. It is an exceedingly cheering fact to know that this work is to be placed in the hands of the police, who will give incessant attention to the registration of names, and

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

will note the removal of electors. We on this side of the Committee have reiterated that we are out for a clean, pure roll. Every man and woman in the community can exercise the franchise, and should have the right to record their votes. So far as I am personally concerned, and so far as my party is concerned, unless we are returned by an absolute majority of the people, we have no desire to be on the Treasury benches. It is well known that the present Government are not holding office as a result of enjoying the confidence of the majority of the people; but we are out all the time to see that every man and woman exercises the highest function of citizenship. We know it is possible in this land for every man and woman to have a vote. This party cares not to what party a man or woman belongs.

Mr. COLLINS: Which party do you speak for?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I may be called a Nationalist, but I am associated with the anti-socialistic party in order that the country might be relieved of the unfortunate occupants of the Treasury benches. We on this side of the House are not out to serve any section. We are not like the Labour party. We do not say to any particular section of the people, "We will serve you; your cause is our cause, and no other cause is our cause." We are out to serve the man on the land, the labourer, the merchant, and every man who will come out and work for this community and make it what it should be. Our ideal is not a narrow and craven one. It is a big, broad, bold ideal, which is to do good for this community and to grant every man that rare privilege which every man and woman in a British community should possess, and that is the high enjoyment of citizenship by the exercise of the franchise.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): The hon. member for Warwick gets up here and tries to misquote the hon. member for Herbert. I do not know whether he has followed him closely.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him by the Standing Orders. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): The hon. member for Warwick did not seem to grasp what the hon. member for Herbert said and what I said in regard to this matter. The annual report of the Northern Country party was very definite. It states—

"This necessitated the removal by objection or by transfer to other electorates of approximately 4,500 names of persons appearing on the rolls stated."

There is no use getting away from that. The electorates mentioned were Mirani, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Mundingburra, Charters Towers, Herbert, Cairns, Queenton, and Kennedy. The report goes on to state—

"In addition to electorates named, but in a lesser degree, the same work has been performed in Gregory, Flinders, and Burke electorates on the latter of which we have on hand at present some 2,000 names for removal and apart from the deletions stated."

What is the use of the hon. member wanting to deny that statement? When I asked the hon. member for Warwick, by interjection, which party he belonged to, he said he belonged to the anti-socialistic party; or, in

other words, he identifies himself with the Country party and the Northern Country party, who have taken the necessary steps, according to their own annual report, for the removal of 2,000 names from the Burke electoral roll, in order to try and defeat the hon. member for Burke. They have got as much chance of defeating the hon. member for Burke as I have of reaching the planet Mars. It is just as well that they realise that. I am very pleased to get that admission from the hon. member for Warwick. Practically they are all one party, and whatever may happen to the Country party, we know that those on the back benches are associated with the Country party.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): We are all very gratified to hear the Minister tell us that there will be a continuous checking of the names of electors in the various electorates in Queensland. Anyone who is at all conversant with the constituencies, particularly with the metropolitan constituencies, must realise the necessity for that. The transfers and removals that are continuously going on want to be continuously checked and continuously looked after. I hope the intentions with regard to that work are carried out. With regard to the polling on election day, I do not know whether the Electoral Registration Department has a system by which a return is made of those electors who go into the booths and find their names not on the roll. If they have no system by which that is done, it would be a good thing for the presiding officers to send in a return of the names of individuals who come along to vote at election time and find their names not on the roll. I also think that the Act should be carried out, and that all persons who do not turn up to vote on election day should be sent the ordinary notice and asked to state the reasons why they have not recorded their votes. We do not want an unclean roll in any shape or form, nor yet do we want to disfranchise any person in the State, no matter what hon. members on the opposite side may say in that direction. We do not stand for that any more than they do. All we want to see is that the persons who vote shall vote for the electorate in which they are domiciled. I have visited the Electoral Registration Office, and I have nothing but the highest praise for the way in which the work is carried out in that office.

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): I listened to the explanation of the leader of the Nationalist party, who stated that the Nationalist party did not stand for anything but clean rolls. Judging from what has been said on the other side, the inference is that members on this side of the Chamber stand for anything but clean rolls. As a matter of fact, there is no member on this side who wants anything but a clean roll. The charge that has been made by the hon. member for Herbert was not that these organisers were travelling through the various electorates in the North endeavouring to take men off the roll, but that it was possible for these organisers to go round, find out the new arrivals, get them to sign claims, and then see that they never got to the electoral registrar. That is quite possible. We do not want that sort of thing, and I feel sure that hon. members on the other side, particularly the leader of the Nationalist party, do not want that either because it cuts both ways. It may happen that some of their own supporters will be cut off the roll in

that manner. If hon. members opposite are charging the people of Queensland—and they have charged them—with using fraudulent means to get on the roll, or if they are charging them, as hon. members are inferring, with voting twice because their names happen to be on two rolls at the same time, then they are doing something wrong, and they are putting a stain on the characters of the honest voters of Queensland. They have no right to make those charges. We have instances where men leave their homes in Brisbane and other places and go up North to seasonal occupations, and they have the right to retain their names on the roll for the district in which their wives and families live. I say without fear of contradiction that the electors of Queensland are too honest in 999 cases out of 1,000 to endeavour to vote twice. Hon. members opposite cannot produce one case where there has been double voting by any elector in the last election or in any previous election. If that cannot be proved, then hon. members are doing something wrong in charging the electors with attempting to have their names on two rolls for the sole purpose of recording votes in two different electorates. We have only to go back to the early days and see the records of men who held the same political views as hon. members opposite. I can prove where they sent horsemen from Brisbane up to Warwick and all round the Downs. They rode round to every polling-booth on the Downs and voted, and they boasted how they had defeated McIlwraith or how they had defeated Griffith under those conditions. I do not desire to say any more, as I understand the Attorney-General wishes the vote to go through. I feel sure that you, Mr. Kirwan, have had enough of it, and I am absolutely certain that the Opposition have had quite enough of it.

At 8.50 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): I desire to go a little further into the matter referred to by the hon. member for Townsville, who now attempts to disclaim that his party stand for anything but what is fair and just, notwithstanding that it was proved that his organisation is spending £5,000 a year in the Northern electorates on organisers and canvassers to put the rolls, as they say, in order. Now, I want to know what they are worrying about. According to the report of the Country party's first annual conference, the following telegram was received by Mr. Garbutt from Mr. W. H. Green and Mr. J. Jones:—

"Greetings and every good wish for successful conference. Absolutely imperative maintain intense organisation Northern Queensland electoral rolls should be particularly watched."

Mr. EDWARDS: What is wrong about that?

Mr. BRENNAN: It is not for you people to say if there is anything wrong. It is for the people of Queensland to say what they think of your action. I will give you something more. The report further says—

"During the year the organisation has continued to supply Northern newspapers with three articles a week."

All these things go to show one great conspiracy on the part of the Northern Country party who, after all, are the masters of the Opposition. The Opposition must carry out their dictates, because they have the money.

Mr. Brennan.]

The hon. member for Warwick spoke very feelingly about having the electoral rolls purged. I supposed he would. I remember at one time the electoral rolls were in such a state—I do not say he had anything to do with it—that on the day of the election it was proved in the Warwick election petition in Furness and others *v.* Barnes, forty-eight men were taken over the boundary into Mr. C. E. McDougall's property, and the whole lot dug two holes, and they were supplied with beer, ham sandwiches, and other things, and went to sleep after 8 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. EDWARDS: Were you there?

Mr. BRENNAN: I saw them. I saw that happen in Warwick at the time of the Warwick election, and that shows how dangerous it is to have an electoral law which is not democratic. All we want is compulsory voting, because we rely on the common sense of the people. The only thing militating against us is the unfair attitude of the Press. A true report of what takes place here does not get to the people through the Press. We have not the [9 p.m.] money at our disposal to buy newspapers. When we were trying to get a newspaper, hon. members opposite started to abuse us. We must insist on seeing that the rolls are kept clean, and that every adult in Queensland entitled to vote should have his or her name put on the roll.

Question put and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £2,242 be granted for ‘Friendly Societies.’”

Question put and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £650 be granted for ‘Parliamentary Draftsman.’”

Question put and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £2,345 be granted for ‘Public Service Superannuation Board.’”

Question put and passed.

SHERIFF.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £7,882 be granted for ‘Sheriff.’”

Question put and passed.

STAMP DUTIES OFFICE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £11,370 be granted for ‘Stamp Duties Office.’”

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURTS.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £15,494 be granted for ‘Supreme Courts.’”

Question put and passed.

TITLES.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

“That £18,925 be granted for ‘Titles.’”

Question put and passed.

THE TREASURER.

TREASURY.

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

“That £56,248 be granted for ‘Treasury.’”

There is a decrease of £9,632 in this vote. There is a small decrease of £132 in salaries. There is a decrease under the item of “Contingencies” of £9,500. There is a decrease of £10,000 on the amount of £50,000 provided last year for “Commission, exchange, etc.”

Question put and passed.

ANALYST.

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

“That £7,328 be granted for ‘Analyst.’”

Question put and passed.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS.

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

“That £3,847 be granted for ‘Harbours and Rivers.’”

Question put and passed.

LAND AND INCOME TAX.

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

“That £54,683 be granted for ‘Land and Income Tax.’”

Question put and passed.

MARINE.

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

“That £69,641 be granted for ‘Marine.’”

Question put and passed.

MARINE BOARD.

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

“That £2,845 be granted for ‘Marine Board.’”

Question put and passed.

PRINTING OFFICE.

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

“That £165,673 be granted for ‘Printing Office.’”

Question put and passed.

STORES.

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

“That £7,957 be granted for ‘Stores.’”

Question put and passed.

WATER SUPPLY.

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

“That £22,070 be granted for ‘Water Supply.’”

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The administration of the Rights in Water and Water Conservation and Utilization Act comes under this vote, and I desire to point out that the Act might be amended to some extent in the interests of those people who have a water frontage. It is not defined clearly in the Act as to what are the rights of such owners regarding the clearing of noxious weeds. Under a definition given by the Government through the Department of Justice, the selector is liable to clear weeds right to the edge of the rubble, sand, or gravel.

The TREASURER: That was the interpretation of the Act passed by the Kidston Government. There will be an amending Bill this session, I hope, dealing with irrigation.

Mr. CORSER: I trust that there will be. I hope that there will be an amendment of that Act, because the new interpretation has only been put on it since this Government came into power. I hope, in connection with the opening of the Burnett lands, that we shall find that, when the Government open the blocks, they will see that water is provided for each holder of land if it is possible to do so. It is no good putting people on the land if you do not provide them with water, because, if they go in for dairy farming, they will want water for their stock. A selector cannot afford to spend all his money in finding water, and he has quite enough hardships to contend with now without having also to provide water. The Premier will be well advised if he sees that each occupier of land is provided with water.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): A matter that is concerning the people of Toowoomba very much just now is the proposal to dam Lockyer Creek for the purpose of providing water to Toowoomba. I understand that the people of Rosewood and other places, as well as the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board, are interesting themselves in this matter.

The TREASURER: The Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board have certain rights.

Mr. BRENNAN: I understand that a report is to be obtained on the advisableness of damming Lockyer Creek. I hope that the report will be a favourable one, because it will be a wonderful thing for Toowoomba. It will also have an effect on the weather conditions.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): I would like to have a word or two on this vote. This matter of water supply should be given a good deal of consideration. The Water Supply Department is doing good work in connection with putting down bores in the country districts,

but I think that the administration of the bores might be transferred to the Department of Public Lands. The Water Supply Department deals with harbours and rivers, and functions differently to the people engaged in boring operations. It is necessary, in regard to people taking up small areas of land, that, if we want to make closer settlement a success, we should see that provision is made for supplying those settlers with water. (Hear, hear!) I think that a policy for supplying the settlers with water for their stock is just as essential in connection with our settlement as a railway policy. (Hear, hear!) If the Government will give consideration to this question, it will be money well spent. The bores which have already been established are working successfully. I had the opportunity of travelling through the Balonne electorate, and I found that the Water Supply Department are doing excellent work in that district with the bores which they have put down. I travelled from Cunnamulla through Bollon to St. George, and it was a pleasure to see the beautiful bore stream, with the sheep and other stock watering along the drains. We know it is impossible for a man with small capital to settle on the land if he has to pay for an artesian or sub-artesian bore himself. He must have a pretty big banking account to enable him to do that. The Treasurer has already done a good deal for the settlers of this State in connection with the water supply policy of his department.

Mr. J. JONES interjected.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. gentleman is only concerned about the Queensland Meat Export Company and the Gulf Pastoral Company. He evidently thinks that people should be allowed to go back to the old blackfellow days. The hon. member for Kennedy is still living in the dark ages. I think that we should get away from the big ranches, and go in for smaller areas, so that we will see many homes being built, and with little children running round the selections and helping to build up a virile white population. The best way to do that is to have a water policy running along with our railway policy. (Hear, hear!) Water should be found for the people just the same as the railways are provided for them. The Government would then get a quick return for the money spent. The selector would far sooner pay more rental if he is supplied with water.

Mr. J. JONES: He is rackrented enough now.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. gentleman has got rackrenting on the brain. It is just as well that his seat was cut out under the redistribution, because this thing is beginning to prey on his mind, and it will mentally affect him. The hon. member is not a bad sort of “chap,” and after the next election he will get back among his cattle, where he will be happier than he is to-day.

Mr. J. JONES: No hope.

Mr. RIORDAN: It will not make any difference to me, because the hon. gentleman will not be my opponent. The hon. member for Queenon will be his opponent, and he will give him all he wants. I hope the Treasurer will take notice of my remarks in reference to the water supply.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): After hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Burke, one can only come to the conclusion that the

Mr. Edwards.]

well-thought-out intelligent speeches from the Country party have practically converted him and have made him interested in the man on the land.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. member always expressed those sentiments, I would always agree with him.

Mr. RIORDAN: I will have to search myself if you agree with me. (Laughter.)

Mr. EDWARDS: I quite agree with the remarks put before the Committee this evening, because water supply is one of the greatest factors in the interests of close settlement. (Hear, hear!) In days gone by we know that many of the early settlers failed because they could not get water. During recent years, when the deep red soils and scrub soils were cut up in the Burnett and other districts, many of the settlers had to spend large sums of money to provide water as well as feed and clothe their families and get the material necessary for working their country. I know for a fact that in my own district, and I dare say in other districts in Queensland, people are carrying a huge load of debt simply because they have been unable to obtain a water supply. When a drought has struck them, they have had to drive their cattle many miles to water or cart water to them, and in many instances they have lost everything they had. I would suggest to the Treasurer that he go into the matter of obtaining boring plants and give such people the opportunity of providing water on their land in groups, as has been done in other States. It would not involve a great cost on a block of land in the early days. Many districts in the Southern States with which I am acquainted went completely out of cultivation, and the Government had to come to their rescue by providing water, and that water was often provided with very much greater difficulty than would be experienced in Queensland. In many instances they had to carry out water storage works and carry the water many hundreds of miles by gravitation through open drains to the settlers in dry areas.

Mr. COLLINS: Would you mind mentioning where water is carried hundreds of miles? Sixty miles is the greatest I have seen.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will take the hon. member out and show him where it has been carried hundreds of miles. The particular district I am talking about is in the north-west district of Victoria.

Mr. COLLINS: Victoria could not run water hundreds of miles. (Laughter.)

Mr. EDWARDS: I say that it has been brought hundreds of miles to provide water for settlers. It does not run straight—that is, natural. He may get information from New South Wales, or the Agricultural Department may have it to show that the Government came to the rescue of the small settler in many instances by putting down bores. I think that would be a very fine thing in the interests of our own country. There are many places where creeks could be dammed and weirs put across them, and small services run on to the lands of groups of selectors. Anybody who has had to pioneer knows the difficulties with which the settler is beset in obtaining water in his early days. Feed is one factor and water

is another, and, unless they have these, it is impossible for them to prosper as they should. I suggest that this matter should receive very serious consideration, not only in the Upper Burnett but also in other districts.

The TREASURER: It is intended shortly to introduce a Bill dealing with irrigation and water conservation.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman make that statement, because it is a very serious matter to Queensland. If we can get a water supply for our settlers, we should be all right from the point of view of closer settlement.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*): I am somewhat surprised to learn that in North-western Victoria water is brought a distance of hundreds of miles, and I wish the hon. member, whilst he was on his feet, had enlightened me. The only place where I know of water being brought hundreds of miles in Australia is in Western Australia.

I rose to address myself more particularly to the question of bores, as suggested by the hon. member for Nanango. It is an excellent suggestion. I do not know whether the hon. member's knowledge of this question is deeper than his knowledge of irrigation and carrying water in channels for hundreds of miles, but I think that, if he goes into the matter, he will find that many trust bores have been put down by this Government. I know that on the border of my electorate, Coombemartin was cut up in blocks of 5,000 acres, and, in order to facilitate the obtaining of water, which was absolutely beyond the means of the selectors themselves, the State put down a trust bore in a central position. Unfortunately, that position was such as to preclude the watering of certain blocks, but that bore saved from extinction the individuals who took up these blocks. That is not an isolated case. Throughout the length and breadth of the artesian country—I do not know whether the hon. member for Nanango knows that in Victoria they are outside the artesian basin—we have put down these bores, and they are monuments to the forethought of this Government for the small selector. From coming into contact with the operation of these bore trusts, I know that the men who benefit by them are very well pleased, and that those who have not been able to benefit are displeased. I have had a good many communications with small selectors, or groups of selectors, asking me to use my influence to have trust bores put down for them. I am speaking of small men who cannot afford to do it themselves.

Mr. J. JONES: It is about time you did.

Mr. BULCOCK: My sympathy, of course, is always with the small man. I would like individuals who have been unable to secure trust bores so far to have an opportunity to get them, and I would like to deal with the question of water conservation in its application to bores. Some time ago the department issued a regulation to the effect that, where the discharge from a bore was more than the consumption, that bore could be screwed down so that the quantity ejected would be the quantity required. That was done in certain instances in winter, but, unfortunately, when a bigger supply was required in the summer and the screw was loosened, the bore never returned to its original capacity, and it seems to me a very

[*Mr. Edwards.*]

dangerous practice to allow any interference with the artesian water supply. We also have a regulation which prescribes that the water must be run in certain [9.30 p.m.] well-defined open drains. I want to call the attention of the Water Supply Department to the fact that there is the greatest waste of artesian water going on in Central-Western Queensland at the present time, by virtue of the fact that a good many individuals who have put down bores are wilfully allowing the water to run through creek beds where there is a very rapid absorption and big surface for evaporation. There is a big hostility between the squatter—who, by virtue of the fact that he is holding a valuable tract of land, is able to expend a good deal of money in the form of improvements, including the sinking of a bore—and the small selector, who is not able to do so. I know one instance where a certain area of land was taken away from a certain station by the process of resumption. This area, which was alienated from the station, had flowing from it a bore drain carrying water to another part of the run. When the resumption took place the people who originally put down that bore went to the trouble and expense of getting from Brisbane two surveyors to try and survey another track so that they could deprive the selectors of the use of water from the station bore. Under the regulations it is impossible for a man to put down an artesian bore under a certain distance from an already existing bore. If you put them down closely together, you seem to tap the same supply. I have in mind a particular case. One bore was put down on Mayfair and another was put down some little distance away. As soon as they struck water in the second bore, the water from the Mayfair bore decreased by one-half. I recognise the wisdom of the practice of not allowing bores to be put down too close to one another. I recognise also, however, that a good many of the big holdings, rather than allow the water to go to the use of the selector, run it into channels where it can be readily evaporated or soak away. No man has a right to the water lying under the ground, more especially when we remember the fact that a bore has only a definite life—we do not know how long it is; it has been estimated variously at from twenty to thirty-five years; we believe that bores will peter out in thirty-five years. If that is so, it is essential that the fullest possible utilisation should be made of the water from those bores in the dry and arid districts of the State favoured with artesian conditions. I suggest that the time has arrived in connection with the conservation of water, not only for the State to have supervision of where the bores shall be put down, but have some say in regard to the channels along which that water shall run. It is obviously wrong for any man to run channels in such a direction that he can conserve that water for himself, and that he shall be allowed to waste what he cannot use. When a bore is put down by a station, and, in time, selectors take up the land adjoining that station, although the bore may be the property of the station, there is such a thing as "rights in water," and selectors who cannot put down a bore by virtue of the fact that it would be within the nine-mile prescribed limit, should have the right to the water that is flowing from the bore. After all, bores should be national, and not be handed over wholly and solely to a selfish

individual who is not prepared to allow others to participate in the benefits of the trust bore. There is no doubt that the artesian bore has done a good deal for the development of Queensland. Were it not for the artesian waters, Western Queensland—and more especially North-western Queensland—would be in fairly unhappy condition. People are beginning to recognise that the life of an artesian bore is limited, and there is a recrudescence of the old tank-sinking days with the elaborate machinery that is used with it. I am of opinion that, with a definite organisation of the department controlling water with a view, first of all, to getting the greatest possible benefit for everybody from the bore that is already in existence, and, secondly, mapping out and determining the course which the water from any future bore shall follow, we shall get the maximum benefit from that bore—which, after all, is the right of the people. No one creates the water which lies under the surface. Because a man happens to have a lease which entitles him to hold land for a certain period, he should not be allowed, when he puts a bore down, to adopt a "dog in the manger" attitude—sit back on his haunches and yell at the selector, "You have not the use of the water that is brought to the surface; it is our heritage; why should you participate in the benefit?" It requires every possible force to make that man give the selector the benefit he should have under our legislation. I ask, in the interests of the small man who cannot get trust bores, in the interests of the men we are here to protect, that the Government shall take the power out of the hands of the jealous, selfish, big squatting interests, and give to the small selectors some of the water that flows from the bores.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): The hon. member for Barcoo tried to ridicule my statement that water was being carried hundreds of miles by gravitation. He is either trying to mislead this Chamber, or he does not know anything about the place of which he claims to be a native. Take the Lake Londale water supply scheme, carried out to supply the mallee settler with water. I maintain that the water in one direction runs 100 miles in one channel.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is not hundreds of miles.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is only one particular water scheme.

Mr. BULCOCK: You said a water scheme that flowed hundreds of miles.

Mr. EDWARDS: I can safely say that it flows 1,000 miles. (Government laughter.) The water flowing by gravitation on one watershed does not give the settler on the other watershed a supply of water. That is quite sensible to any person. The mallee settlers would have been driven out of the mallee country long ago had the Victorian Government treated them on the same basis as the Labour Government have treated the pioneer settlers of Queensland. I am pleased to see that hon. members on that side are waking up to the fact that it is necessary to give the settler water and look after him in his early settling days.

Mr. BULCOCK: I advocated that long before you came into this House.

Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to show how the last speaker misled himself in reference to the suggestion I made to the Treasurer about supplying water to the small settler. He is speaking about big areas in the West. When he talks about the small settler he is referring to the man owning, possibly, 5,000 or 10,000 acres. The man I am concerned about holds about 160 acres. It is quite impossible to supply him with artesian bore water.

Mr. BULCOCK: Tell me where you will find a man farming 160 acres in the true artesian basin.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not talking about the artesian basin. What I am talking about is putting down bores for settlers where the water is obtainable at shallow depths.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is sub-artesian water. That is the first time you have mentioned sub-artesian water to-night.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Treasurer has sufficient intelligence to understand what I mean. (Laughter.) I am satisfied that the day has come when the Government of Queensland must not only do some window-dressing for the settlers of Queensland, but they must give effect to what I am putting before them to-night in the interests of Queensland in order that the settlers might be able to provide fodder and develop the country in the way it should be developed. If the Government knew the attitude that was adopted by the Victorian Government in the interests of the early settlers of the mallee country, they would do a good deal more for the settlers in Queensland. Many of the settlers came from Victoria with a good deal of capital, and after a few years left the State to go back to Victoria, because they did not receive Government assistance so far as water was concerned.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I desire to offer some suggestions to the Treasurer which might be useful at a later date with respect to the cotton-growing policy contemplated in the Capella district. With all land settlement schemes it follows that water is a general necessity. In that particular district it has been the experience of older settlers that water is only available in certain areas. I suggest that some scheme be arranged with the Water Supply Department and the Department of Public Lands so that a survey can be made to outline the different streams that have already been located by the early settlers by bores existing at the present time, so that, when the land is being subdivided, the surveyors will have an opportunity of as nearly as possible putting the blocks of land in that portion in which the survey determines the stream of water is running underground. If something along those lines is done, a good deal of economy will be effected in the land settlement policy. It follows that in that area which is to be cut up into blocks, if there is no water survey, many areas will be absolutely waterless. You can sink into the earth and find no artesian or sub-artesian water in some portions, with the result that many settlers will take up some blocks of land and expend a good deal of their capital searching for water that is not there. I think also that it is possible for this Government to bring forward a scheme quite apart from the advances made by the Advances to Settlers Department so as to enable many new settlers in connection with some of these big schemes that we have undertaken to use a good deal of their capital

in supplying themselves with stock, implements, and the necessary shelter and equipment for the conservation of fodder. It takes a good deal of capital for a new settler, if he is going to acquire a selection for himself that will be in a fair state of productivity within the first few years. When the scheme is originated bores can be put down at the expense of the Government, and the new settlers will be able to pay off the cost of the bores on easy terms extending over long periods, which I think will be a good investment for the Government and the State generally in the long run. Some suggestions have been made by many of the older settlers in the Capella district that it may be possible to survey many of the new blocks in such a way that the existing bores will supply a group of four, five, or six settlers with water. With a sub-artesian water supply such a scheme will not, in my opinion, be practicable. Most of the settlers in the district will, I think, desire to have their own bore and their own water supply apart from growing cotton and other crops. They will also desire to go in for the construction of small irrigation schemes, such as we see in many of the market gardens throughout the State. I hope the few suggestions I have put forward will be of some benefit, and that it will give the Treasurer something to work upon, and, when the scheme is carried out, nothing will be overlooked. By making the survey of the area in the most suitable way, the least amount of money will be expended and less expenditure will be entailed on the new settlers.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): I would like to offer the Treasurer a little advice on this burning question. I have been over this sort of country. Subterranean waters run like blood in a person's body. We have large and small subterranean streams. Some run for miles and miles. A stream runs from Peak Downs for 50 miles, and windmills are erected all along it. All our great rivers have subterranean streams. Take the Condamine River. That river really carries away only flood water. The real Condamine River runs 40 or 50 feet below the surface. One gentleman asked me how I knew that. I told him, and he said, "Come up and prove it." I did so, and we put down six bores and struck the real Condamine water at a depth of under 60 feet. The same occurs in a very large number of places in Queensland. Only just outside Oakey, which is a very dry area, it is the same.

The TREASURER: In that case it is not much use attempting to dam the Condamine.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You would only dam the flood water. The subterranean streams are always there. Seven or eight bores were put down there to test it, and they have been in use for something like fifteen or sixteen years now, and they still give a large supply of water, and a very large number of cattle are fattened there, and during the years of drought there have been no signs of the water giving out.

The TREASURER: That does not prove that the Condamine in normal seasons flows underground.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It does. The Condamine is only a chain of waterholes in dry weather, like most of our rivers in Queensland, but dry weather does not interfere with the subterranean stream. Even on the Darling Downs we have them, and they give 4,000 or 5,000 gallons an hour. We have one

[*Mr. Edwards.*]

in Toowoomba where they have pumped 25,000 gallons an hour day and night for fourteen years from the subterranean stream. I have always been of the opinion that we are not making the best use of these subterranean streams in Queensland. I am sure that the officers of the department could trace these subterranean streams, and all the creek frontages where these streams are should be reserved.

Mr. FOLEY: Can that method be relied on?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I myself have taken 500 contracts at £40 each and guaranteed 250 gallons an hour, and not 1 per cent. have gone dry, although they have been in use from twelve to fourteen years.

Mr. FOLEY: That is on the Downs. In other places there have been failures.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You get places where the water is deeper, and the people will not go down to it. A great deal of good work has been done by the officials in the Water Supply Department at the present time. They have done a great deal of good for the settlers. I have seen an area in the Burnett district, in the settled district, where you could get water at 40 feet. That area extended for only about half a mile, and to my knowledge you could trace that stream for 8 or 9 miles. The settlers outside that area had very great difficulty in getting water. I maintain that, when that land was cut up, the area along that subterranean stream, where water could be obtained at 40 feet from the surface, should have been reserved. It should have been treated as though it were a river frontage.

Mr. COLLINS: This is the only sensible speech you have made during the session.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We do not know much about our State yet. When the hon. member for Nanango was speaking he mentioned something about running streams. We have creeks in Queensland that run out from the rivers, and we have one creek that runs sometimes one way and sometimes another.

The TREASURER: Not up hill, surely?

Mr. STOPFORD: Double Creek?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Yes. The hon. member knows where this is. Perhaps a little explanation of that is necessary. This creek is in very flat country, and it joins two rivers—the Dee and the Don. If one river happens to be in flood, the creek runs the other way; and then, if the other river is the higher, the creek turns round and runs the other way. Until I saw it I could scarcely understand the reason for the creek running different ways at different times. When we get into the Gulf country, we find creeks that rise and fall according to the full of the moon. The creek I speak of is always running, irrespective of rain. It is running 3 or 4 inches deep over the sand, and is 50 feet wide. It gradually declines until there is no water at all in it, and the cattle and horses gallop down there, scoop out a few stones, and get water. There are some very large streams under the surface, and these streams run faster at the full of the moon, the same as our bores do. It is an official fact that these artesian bores run faster at 12 o'clock in the day and at the full of the moon than at other times. We have a good many peculiarities in connection with our water supply, and I would like to see the Treasurer get the officers of the depart-

ment to mark out the big subterranean streams, which are certainly there. I will give the hon. gentleman one case. I was

going into the railway refreshment-room at Warwick one day [10 p.m.] and a gentleman came and tapped me on the shoulder. (Laughter.) He was in a hurry, and he said, "Can I get water on Lillydale in the Central district." That was about 800 miles away, and I did not know where it was. He said, "You tell me if I can get water on Lillydale, and, if so, I will send a telegram and buy it." I said, "Don't be foolish!" He said, "You know the land all right. You know whether there are any underground streams there." I said, "Yes, there are." This man then went and telegraphed and bought the station merely on my word that there was water underneath, and the results proved that I was right. It would be of advantage to the State if the officers of the department were to map out these underground streams. They may not have had the practical experience which I have had in this matter, but they know sufficient to trace those streams which give value to the Burnett land scheme.

The TREASURER: You are a water wizard. (Laughter.)

Question put and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS.

CHIEF OFFICE.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*): We must all agree, after listening to the speeches of the last few hours that it is very necessary to put down bores. (Laughter.) I beg to move—

"That £55,878 be granted for 'Chief Office.'"

I regret the circumstances under which it devolves upon me to move this vote, the Secretary for Public Lands still being in bad health. The vote does not call for any special comment. As hon. members will notice, there is a decrease of £4,651 on last year's appropriation of £60,509. The reduction is accounted for by the reorganisation of the staff, wages adjustment, and a reduction of the vote for "Contingencies."

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I very much regret that the Minister in charge of these Estimates is not able to be present owing to ill-health, which we all sincerely regret. I do not intend to debate these Estimates at any length. In fact, I do not intend to discuss them at all. My object is, as I stated at an earlier stage of the Estimates, to get on with matters which are of very great importance and which have not been debated on other occasions. If it is possible for us to get through them during the remaining time at our disposal, I shall be very glad.

Question put and passed.

DISTRICT OFFICES.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*): I beg to move—

"That £73,120 be granted to 'District Offices.'"

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): In referring to the different districts over which the land

Mr. Riordan.]

commissioners have control, I would like to point out that land settlement in the Burke electorate, and more especially in the Gulf district, is not progressing as quickly as it should. We have instances of ballots in and around Barcardine and Blackall in which 800 people have balloted for one block of land, while in the Gulf district land settlement is practically at a standstill. There must be some reason for land settlement not progressing in the Gulf district, and I think that one reason is on account of the isolation of that part of the country. Another reason is that the conditions with regard to land settlement in the Gulf district are too hard compared with what they are in districts more conveniently situated. I would like the Lands Department to take into consideration the throwing open of blocks for people who are land hungry in and around the North-western districts.

The argument has been used that the Gulf country will not carry sheep, and that it is unprofitable at the present price of cattle to raise cattle in that district. We know that the cattle industry is in a very bad state just at present, but I am certain that it will carry sheep. We have practical demonstration of that from two selectors who are going in for sheep, and they are doing very well. I hope in the very near future that sheepgrowing will be gone in for on a large scale in the Gulf district. The cattle industry is the chief industry there now, and the big lessees have held their land there for many years at a rental of somewhere on the average of 8s. 6d. per square mile. In the resumptions which have lately been made the small selector has been asked to pay £1 10s. per square mile. I consider that is too high a rent for the Gulf country until such time as there is railway communication there, or until something is done by the State to furnish better conditions for those who are out in those isolated districts. I think every encouragement should be given to increase the population in the Gulf country. I would go so far in this direction as to say that, when any resumptions are made, we should give the land free to those who are willing to go and live there for the next ten years. We could not say that that is differential treatment for one part of the State as against the other, because the Gulf country is differently situated. It is practically cut off from the oversea traffic. The Government are running a subsidised steamer to the Gulf now. There is no railway communication there; and if that steamer was to go off to-morrow, the people living in and around Normanton and Burketown would have to wait from three to six months to get their goods. Any people who go there should be allowed good conditions. We know that fencing-wire is expensive, and it is unfair to charge a selector £1 10s. per square mile, when the previous holders only paid 8s. 6d. per square mile. Quite recently in Cloncurry the Land Court fixed the selectors' rents on the resumed parts of Inverleigh at £1 to £2 per square mile, although the pastoral lessee only paid 12s. 6d. per square mile. It is out of the question to ask a small selector to fulfil the conditions when he has to pay that rent, in addition to buying his fencing-wire and building materials with the present high cost of carriage. If the selector were given his own time and a reasonable rent was fixed, I am sure we would get a good class of settler into that district, and the Gulf would go ahead faster

[*Mr. Riordan.*

than any other part of Queensland. Both the Gregory River and the Nicholson River are favourable for irrigation, and that would enable the people there to make a decent living, if they had means of transporting their produce from the Gulf. Until such time as we get settlers there, there is no possibility of the Government doing anything to provide facilities to open up the ports. I have been endeavouring, through the Premier and the Secretary for Public Lands, to do something for this district. The pastoralists say that the cattle are prime when leaving the holdings to go in to Julia Creek or the railway terminus, but by the time they get into the trucks 80 to 100 lb. of the best of the beef have gone off them. Then they have to be taken anything up to 300 or 400 miles to the meatworks; and when they get there they are bruised, and there is a good deal of waste meat on them. I consider that the method adopted of trucking cattle in Australia is rather cruel. We have doors on the side of the trucks, and we load the cattle truck by truck, each truck holding anything from sixteen to eighteen bullocks. You get one truck loaded and have to shut off the cattle, and you are practically half a day getting eight or nine trucks of cattle loaded.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will deal with that aspect of the question on the Railway Estimates.

Mr. RIORDAN: I am dealing with one of the disabilities of cattle-raising on the lands of the Gulf country, and one of the reasons why our produce does not meet with a favourable market. Land settlement would be the means of opening up that district, and perhaps lead to the establishment of meatworks. We are negotiating to try to get a meatworks going there, and I am satisfied that, when one is opened, settlement will come. I am satisfied that it would be a good idea if the Government considered the expansion of that portion of the State—not that I want differential treatment for Normanton and Burketown, but I recognise the isolation and the difficulties of their people. Those are my sentiments, whether I be in Parliament or out of Parliament. I think they have been long-suffering, and I repeat that the Government would do well to consider giving land free to those people, because the resumed land is not being taken up, and the Government are not only losing the rent they were getting from the pastoralists, but are also defeating their own purpose of getting settlement. For some reason or other land along the Norman and Albert rivers, where small men could go in for land settlement, is being left to the pastoralists. I do not claim that the best of everything should be taken away from the pastoralists, but I think that in making resumptions consideration should be given to the small man, who will be able to use it if it is near a market. Such small men would go in for more than cattle-raising. They would go in for mixed stock raising, such as sheep and cattle, or for a little agriculture. I am satisfied, from the reports I have seen in the different departments, that more than sheep and cattle raising is possible in that district. We know that the land is equal to any in the Western district. There is good Flinders and Mitchell grass there. But for some reason or another, in many cases the blocks which have been thrown open are dry blocks. To put down an artesian bore in the Gulf country to open

up that land would cost from £4,000 to £5,000. That is why I think that the Government should control water in their land settlement policy. I hope that the Secretary for Public Lands will give this matter consideration at an early date. There are many blocks at present open in the Gulf district which men will take up at a reasonable rent, but which they are not going to take up at two and three times the rental that the people next door are getting their land for. A good deal of taxation is collected from the Gulf country, and very little of that money is put back into that district. I am not complaining; I am putting the position before this House for the benefit of those who have not been so fortunate as I have been in going through that district and seeing the opportunities which are offering there for land settlement. I trust that it will not be long before we will see a large white population there, with many happy homes and little children running about.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): The hon. member for Burke this evening has played the role of the candid friend. I am rather sorry that the House was so thin, especially in regard to the Government benches. I think they might have listened, with a great deal of profit, to the very interesting speech just delivered. The hon. member has looked at the question of settlement in the far Gulf country as of vital importance. No country can be considered of any value until it is occupied. I hesitate to think that any man on this side of the House ever expected to hear such a speech as we have just heard from an hon. member supporting the Government—who have laid themselves out to do the most exacting things in connection with land settlement. I am not resenting or objecting to the speech; I am rather glad that it has emanated from the hon. member. We could scarcely have conceived the idea that land should be given free to the people, possibly for a period of ten years. It may be wise to do it; I am not saying that it is. What strikes one is, when huge sums of money were being expended in the purchase of station property, why the Government could not have made use of their vast areas of land, instead of buying extensively and expensively in other directions. It would be well worth the while of the Government—because they alone can take action—to give good heed to what has been suggested by the hon. member. Evidently, land that was occupied has become unoccupied.

Mr. RIORDAN: Large holdings have been resumed.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Large holdings have been resumed; but, on account of excessive rentals those lands are not being applied for again. No good is going to be done to this State by having unoccupied territory. The value of the country is in having it occupied. Fairly long leases should be given because men will have to be encouraged, as they will have to spend money in fencing, securing water, and in making various improvements for the purpose of a homestead. Perhaps in some instances, for the first five years the land should be rent free, provided certain improvements are effected, and for the second term of five years it might carry a certain small rental, with an increased rental for a further term of five years.

Mr. RIORDAN: I have already discussed the sliding scale with the Minister.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am glad to know that the Minister has been interviewed in connection with this matter. Anything that will help the people in the far North and make them contented will certainly be beneficial, not only to the northern portion of the State but to the whole community. I am sure that the Minister will give a fair amount of consideration to what has been suggested. Is it not fair to say that that is a commentary on the actions of the Government in other directions? We must realise that rent is on the excessive side, and, if it is fair to give consideration to the far North, surely, in the places nearer at hand, where the people are having extreme burdens placed upon them, consideration should also be given in the matter of a reduction of rent.

Mr. RIORDAN: There is no comparison between the Gulf districts and districts inside, near the railways. The Gulf district is an exceptional district.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Most men like myself are at a great disadvantage when we do not know anything about the country. It is an exceedingly pleasing thing to listen to a man who does know something about the country. If what the hon. member says regarding the Gulf country can be confirmed, this side of the Committee is not going to show any great objection to carrying out the hon. member's purpose.

Mr. BRENNAN: No man should come into the Chamber without knowing the whole of Queensland.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I do not agree with much that the hon. member says, but I do agree with him in that statement. We are very much in ignorance of our own land. It is pleasing to know that one man does know something about it. I am convinced that he does. I am sure this side will be found favourably disposed to help the Government in the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We are pleased to know that the hon. gentleman has adopted a new attitude towards this Government. (Laughter.)

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I have indicated that this should be done for the benefit of the State, and so long as the Government do things for the good of the State it will surprise them to find the amount of support that they will receive from this side of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Burke. It is a good many years since I was in the Gulf country. At the time I visited the Gulf it was very active. The Croydon goldfield was certainly going back a little, but the cyanide process had been introduced, and a fair amount of business was being transacted in Croydon and Normanton. Unfortunately, since then, mining has gone down in Croydon, and Normanton is not now the town it was. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Burke said—that the people up there who are willing to take up that land should get it for ten years without any rent at all. We have talked a good deal lately about a white Australia, and about settling the outposts of the Empire. There should be differential treatment given to the people who are prepared to settle in the Gulf country. They are entitled to very much better treatment than the people in the South of Queensland

Mr. Taylor.]

and also a great many people in the West of Queensland who have got railway communication and social comforts which are denied to those people who settle in the Gulf country. I do not know that anything is too good for the men and women who are prepared to go out and risk their lives and their health in that part of Queensland. We cannot expect men and women to go into that part of Queensland unless Southern Australia is prepared to compensate them for the work they undertake. They are undertaking a big national work in endeavouring to hold that country from the coloured races so close to the shores of Northern Australia. They live a very free life, but they live a life of isolation. In the cities here we are accustomed to three or four daily papers and weekly papers, and all the amusements which we can crowd into a week are crowded into a week. When I visited the Gulf, Mareeba was the terminus of the railway, and it took us six days to travel from Croydon to Mareeba by coach, and yet in those isolated places you found men with their wives and families who were willing to isolate themselves and take charge of the changing places for Cobb and Company's coaches, and they never saw anything at all for the whole week but one coach. Of course it will be a long time before agricultural crops of any kind will be produced there other than what are required for local consumption.

The TREASURER: At least cotton could be grown there.

Mr. TAYLOR: Cotton could be grown there to great advantage. If we are going to produce sheep and cattle in that country, and if we hope to establish meatworks there, we should certainly have to see that the conditions under which the people live are infinitely better than they are at the present time.

At 10.30 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, I shall now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

The resumption of the Committee was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

WATER POWER BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable to introduce a Bill to make better provision for the utilization of water for the purpose of generating and providing electrical energy and water power, and for purposes incidental thereto and consequent thereon.”

There can be no doubt about the value of such a Bill as this. It has been said in the past that no country can become industrially great unless it is possessed of and develops its iron and coal resources, and to that might be added its resources in the way of power obtained by means of hydro-electric schemes. Great development has been made in countries which have developed hydro-electric schemes, such as Norway and America, and progress has taken place in Tasmania under a hydro-electric scheme of

[Mr. Taylor.

a very comprehensive nature. The Bill provides for development in Queensland, where wonderful resources exist, and sets out the means by which water resources can be controlled. It provides for the establishment of boards to develop the supply of electrical energy for lighting and power purposes. There are three methods by which boards may be appointed under Orders in Council, namely—

“By the appointment of a local authority or joint local authority or a water authority having jurisdiction within the area or some part thereof to be the Water Power Board;

“By the appointment of the members of the Board by the Governor in Council;

“By the election of the members of the Board by the electors of the area entitled to the parliamentary franchise,”

and so on. We propose to develop this by making use of machinery of Government provided by the local authorities. I do not think that there is much of a controversial nature in the Bill.

Mr. VOWLES (Dalby): I would just say that we all realise the necessity of utilising water for the purpose of generating electrical energy. I shall reserve any remarks I have to make until I see the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: I beg to move—

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

Question put and passed.

The second reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

PRIMARY PRODUCTS POOLS BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, Eacham): I beg to move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide for the constitution of Boards representing growers of specified commodities and to confer powers on a Board so constituted with respect to the marketing of the commodity for which it has been constituted, and for other consequential purposes.”

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I beg to move—

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

Question put and passed.

The second reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.