Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 9 OCTOBER 1924

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 9 OCTOBER, 1924.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 10 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

TENDERS FOR LOCOMOTIVE ENGINES—REFUSAL OF CLYDE ENGINEERING COMPANY TO ACCEPT CONTRACT.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Has the Clyde Engineering Company refused to accept the contract for the construction of thirty locomotives required by the Railway Department?

"2. What (if any) are the reasons given for such refusal by the above-mentioned company?

"3. What are the intentions of the Government in regard to the construction of the thirty locomotives?

"4. How many tenders were received for the construction of the thirty locomotives?

"5. Who were the firms who submitted tenders?

"6. What were the prices submitted by the respective firms?"

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

"1 to 3. The tender of the Clyde Engineering Company has been accepted by the Government.

"4. Nine.

"5 and 6.—

	£
Clyde Engineering Works (16½ months)	166,920
Evans, Anderson, and Phelan (28 months)	194,700
Victorian Railways (18 months)	202,050
Walkers Limited (20 months)	205,530
Perry Engineering Company (25½ months)	214,500
Gilbert, Lodge, and Co. (9 months)	222,840
Thompson and Company (20 months)	239,000
Kitson Company (10¾ months)	203,170
North British Loco. Co. (5¼ months)	187,500 "

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT ON ACCOUNTS OF EGG POOL BOARD.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"Seeing that a report on the accounts of the Egg Pool Board is not contained in the Auditor-General's report—(1) When is such report likely to be finalised, and (2) will it then be made available to members of this House?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Euchum*) replied—

"This report is delayed owing to the illness of the Audit Inspector, who was engaged on the work."

SOURCES OF SUPPLY OF STATE BUTCHER SHOPS.

Mr. BELL (*Fassifern*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. From what source or sources are the State butcher shops obtaining their meat supplies?

"2. What is the approximate cost per lb. from each source?

"3. What are the prices charged the public?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) replied—

"1. From purchases in open market and from State stations.

"2 and 3. Both cost and retail prices vary from week to week in accordance with the state of the market. Full information in regard to the activities of State butcher shops is contained in the Trade Commissioner's annual report recently issued, pages 11 to 14, and the honourable member will note that on the prices charged to the public a profit of one-fifth of a penny per lb. has been made since the inception of the business."

EXPENDITURE OF AGENT-GENERAL'S OFFICE FOR "CONTINGENCIES" AND "INCIDENTALS."

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Premier—

"What was the expenditure of the Agent-General's Office, included under the heading 'Contingencies' and item 'Incidentals,' during each of the years 1912-13 to 1914-15, inclusive, and also the years 1918-19 to 1923-24, inclusive?"

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

"The information will be obtained."

EXPENDITURE IN CONNECTION WITH RESIGNATION AND RETURN TO QUEENSLAND OF LATE AGENT-GENERAL (HON. J. A. FIHELLY).

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Premier—

"1. What expenditure was incurred by the Government in connection with the resignation and return to Queensland of the late Agent-General (Mr. J. A. Fihelly)?

"2. What are the principal items of such expenditure?

"3. On what date did Mr. Fihelly cease to draw the salary of the position of Agent-General?

"4. From what date did the payment of such salary to the new Agent-General commence?"

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

"1. £404 11s. 3d.

"2.—

	£	s.	d.
Steamer fares of Mr. Fihelly	143	10	9
Messenger's steamer fare and expenses (London to New York and back)	145	9	4
Mr. Fihelly's travelling allowance, 49 days at £2 2s.	102	18	0
Motor hire, porterage, etc.	7	13	2
	£404	11	3

"3. 31st March, 1924.

"4. 1st August, 1924."

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Commissioner of Police for Twelve Months ended 30th June, 1924.

Thirteenth annual report of the University of Queensland.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): 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 amend the Local Authorities Acts, 1902 to 1923, in a certain particular."

Question put and passed.

NAVIGATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): 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 amend the Navigation Acts, 1876 to 1911, so as to provide for the better management and control of motor boats and motor vessels within the territorial waters of Queensland, and for other consequential purposes."

Question put and passed.

BRISBANE GAS COMPANY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Brisbane Gas Company Act of 1864 in a certain particular."

Question put and passed.

EMU PARK, INNISFAIL, MALENY, MORNINGSIDE, AND TOWNSVILLE PUBLIC LAND MORTGAGES BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): I beg to move—

"That leave be given to introduce a Bill to enable the trustees of certain parcels of land at Emu Park, Innisfail, Maleny, Morningside, and Townsville, respectively, within the State of Queensland, used for certain public purposes, to mortgage the said land and to devote the moneys so raised to making permanent improvements on the said land."

Question put and passed.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) presented the Bill and moved—

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

Question put and passed.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

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

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Land Tax Act of 1915 by extending the operations of the super land tax until the close of the financial year ending on the 30th day of June, 1925."

Hon. members will understand that we have budgeted for the continuance of the land tax and that it has been impossible this year to terminate the super land tax, or give relief in any other direction in direct taxation. To realise the revenue required, it is necessary that the super tax be continued this year. If we continue the practice of extending the super land tax year by year, it is for Parliament at some future date to decide when it should terminate. When the finances improve sufficiently to warrant a review of taxation the Government of the day may see their way to terminate the super land tax or any other form of taxation that it desires.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I regret that it is necessary for the Committee to consider the reimposition of a tax which is really a class tax. We know that money has to be found in some quarter for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of State, but this Committee should realise that in certain districts—and these districts may extend—there has been another imposition put on the landowner in the form of a hospital tax, which he has not been accustomed to pay in the past. The burden, particularly on freehold land—and this applies only to freehold and not leasehold land—is becoming very heavy. The local authority rates, the State and Federal land taxes, the super taxation, and the hospital taxation all tend to tax one class, who in many cases have no opportunity of passing on the burden. It is said that people in the cities who own freehold properties and receive big rentals from them have an opportunity indirectly of recovering the taxation that has been imposed, but when you go into the country—and I can speak very feelingly for my district, where there is a good deal of freehold—this form of taxation weighs very heavily on the landowner. I can speak feelingly of the conditions which obtained in my district in 1923 and of the fortunes of the unfortunate people who are trying to make a living out of the land. Their stock died, and they became impoverished to such an extent that many of them could not secure the necessary finance to stock up their lands so as to make them payable. It is a sad state of affairs when the Government turn round and put a further burden on that class of people.

The TREASURER: Not a further burden. This Bill merely continues the tax.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: The hospital tax is a further burden.

Mr. VOWLES: The super land tax was brought in as a temporary expedient, and it is becoming a permanent tax. The local authority rates are becoming higher, the rates of taxation are being increased, and now we have the super tax reimposed. If taxation is to be levied, it should be levied on the public as a whole, and not on one class. Men owning freehold should not have to pay a land tax and then be called upon to pay a super land tax. It is an injustice to perpetuate class legislation of this nature. I regret that it is necessary in the first place to raise further revenue, and in the next place, that in doing so the Government propose to resort to the practice of putting a further burden on the land. I sincerely trust that in the future by some other means this burden of taxation will be more equitably distributed than it is at present.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I regret very much that the Premier has seen fit to continue the imposition of this tax, as I do not think there is any justification for it. There is ample room to acquire otherwise this amount of money and so enable this tax to be done away with. Last year the super land tax brought in £124,410—a most extraordinary amount of money to be extorted from one small section of the community. Certainly some of those people have been making a good income, but there is a much fairer way of obtaining the money than by placing such an imposition on one class in the community. Anybody going into the figures of income taxation, and who realises the bad time that the cattle people have had and the amount of income tax that has been paid during the last twelve months by

those individuals, together with the comments of the Commissioner of Taxes on that point, must have it borne in upon them that it is a wrong principle to add the amount of this tax to the burdens of people who are already bowed down by taxation.

The losses on mining ventures in the North last year amounted to £153,458, which could have been avoided. The total amount of super land tax was £124,410, and for the year before £124,760. That is a heavy burden to place on one section of the community, because only a limited section have to pay it. Surely, in view of the conditions the man in the country has been suffering from through dry weather, the low price of cattle and dairy produce, we must realise that it is almost impossible for these people to make a living. It is an unjust method of taxation placed on one class of the community only. If it is necessary to raise this amount—and personally I do not think it is, because economies could be effected in other directions—I should much prefer it to be distributed over all sections of the community rather than placed on one unfortunate section of individuals.

Mr. COLLINS: You would make a cat laugh.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member does not understand the difficult position in which a large number of these unfortunate people are placed and the difficulty they have to make ends meet. A far juster way could be devised to raise this money than by continuing this class super tax.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): By this time this super tax should have been removed. Certainly it has brought in a large amount of money. If the Treasurer cannot see his way clear to remove it altogether, he might certainly reduce the rate of assessment under this tax. The latest figures show that there has been an actual increase of receipts over expenditure. The Treasurer knows that. We are faced with a fairly good season throughout the State. The wool returns are showing up well, we have a record sugar harvest, and in quite a number of directions things are looking better than they did a year or two ago.

People are being further taxed—I am not saying anything against it—in the form of additional railway freights and fares, which increase is estimated to bring in between £300,000 and £400,000 this year. In several directions it seems to me that the prospects of the Treasury for the coming year are better than they have been for quite a long time, and I certainly think the time has come when we might reduce this super land tax by one-half. It would then give the Treasurer sixty odd thousand pounds a year. I commend that suggestion to the consideration of the Treasurer. We know that the burden imposed on the man on the land is always great. Men on the land are always fighting climatic conditions from January to December. The city people are not placed in a similar position to that, and there is no doubt whatever that, so far as it is possible to do it, this super land tax in the city is passed on absolutely and directly to the consumer. Men who are carrying on business in the city have to pay these heavy taxes, and of course they must pass them on as they have to make their businesses pay. On the business sheet this session we have the City of Brisbane Bill, and we do not know how that Bill is going to affect the city—whether it will mean reduced taxation or not. I contend that we cannot expect reduced taxation if we wish to progress; so the chances are that there will be greater taxation. Then, again, the people of Brisbane are faced with the heavy taxation which is to be levied by the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board in connection with sewerage. All these charges paid by business people in the city are passed on to the people who go into the shops and purchase the goods that are sold in those shops. The time has come when the Treasurer should make some effort to reduce this super land tax. If he cannot see his way to allow the whole of the tax to go this year, I would urge on him the desirability of trying to reduce it by one-half in the coming year.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I desire to enter a word of protest in regard to the imposition of this super land tax for a further twelve months. The Treasurer, in preparing his Budget for this financial year, included the amount which he expects to receive from this super land taxation. According to a leading article in the "Courier" this morning, the Premier, when away from Australia, made a different statement. He then said that the chief purpose of this super land tax was to compel the cutting up of vast estates in Queensland. To-day he has knocked that particular fallacy on the head.

The TREASURER: No. I think the hon. member is under a misapprehension. I said the primary justification for the land tax was that it would mean the cutting up of large estates.

Mr. KERR: To-day the hon. gentleman has taken up a new attitude in regard to that matter.

The TREASURER: No.

Mr. KERR: He stated that he had budgeted for a certain amount, and the finances of the State required the funds which would be received under this super land tax. He made that statement when introducing the Bill. Therefore we have two reasons for it. The first reason undoubtedly has failed, because there are forty-four landowners in the country who hold land of an area of 100 acres who pay this super land tax to-day, and altogether there are only 1,141 people who pay this super land tax, their taxes amounting last year to £124,410. This tax was imposed in the first place for a special purpose. The Treasurer has now acknowledged that it is being reimposed to balance his accounts, which is an entirely different purpose to that for which it was originally imposed. The leader of the Opposition stated that, if the Treasurer would give greater attention to some of the losses in connection with State enterprises, there would be no necessity for reimposing this taxation. The super land tax for two years was £247,000, and the loss on Chillagoe alone for two years was £281,000. If the Government would cut some of these large losses, there would be no necessity for extracting from a certain section of the people about £250,000 in taxation. We know that the incidence of this land tax cannot be passed on to the consumer. It is illegal to pass land taxation on to tenants who are occupying buildings erected on land in the city, and it is wrong to say that this imposition is passed on. It is not legal for any land owner in Brisbane to-day to enter into an

agreement with his tenant to meet this super land taxation.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: He can put it on the land.

Mr. KERR: He does not put it on the land. Leases were previously made for long periods, and some of them have yet ten years to run. Many landowners in Queen street now find that it is a losing proposition.

Mr. FARRELL: I would like to know of anyone who is losing.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member may not know, but I know of some. Many landowners in Brisbane, because of the impositions of local authorities and this super land tax, are losing and will continue to lose on their property for the next ten years. The Government have not gone properly into the question if they do not understand that that is the true position. It is a breach of contract on the part of the Treasurer in again bringing in this imposition. It is a temporary measure, but year after year we have been led to believe, by inference more than by direct statement, that this taxation would not be imposed again.

The Treasurer has stated that, if Parliament desired at some future date to do away with this taxation, it would be done away with. What is the position? We are investing money in Queensland, and our investments are not likely to give us a sufficient return, so that on the face of things it looks as if this imposition will go on indefinitely. The super tax was imposed for a certain purpose, which does not now operate, and we are lacking in principle if we again impose it on the people of the State. Some definite action should be taken to do away with all this taxation which is creeping in. In this year's budget there is to be £25,000 extra taxation imposed in connection with stamp duty and £300,000 odd for railway fares and freights. Where is this going to end? Some definite action should be taken. A protest should be made in regard to any extra imposition. While Queensland is putting on extra taxation, New South Wales is taking it off. These are the conditions which the people of Queensland have to live under to-day, and they are bringing Queensland down in regard to secondary industries as well as in primary production. If we took off taxation to-day and let money be put into industry, we should recoup ourselves a hundred-fold, and by the money being put into secondary industries the people who are producing would be able to pay income tax. That is what we should look to. It is scandalous to bring in this extra taxation year after year without any hope of redress.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I was hoping that we had seen the last of this taxation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DEACON: Not only has a landowner to pay this super tax, but he has to pay other taxes such as income tax. If his land is over a certain value he has to pay what is really a tax on his capital, whether it is his own or whether it is borrowed. A man may be mortgaged up to the hilt, as some of these people are, but that is not taken into account. He has to pay taxation on the other fellow's money and there is no possible means of getting out of it. Then it hits the man who is not fully established.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Tell us whom it does hit?

Mr. DEACON: It hits everybody with a land value of over £2,500. If a man lets his capital stay idle and invests it in bonds, his capital is not taxed, but the man who has his capital invested in land has to pay a tax on his capital, and very often it is not his money at all, and he has no possible means of passing on the tax. We are often told that the city landowners pay all this tax, but on looking up the last report I find that seven fruit growers, 46 dairy farmers, 238 general farmers, 660 pastoralists, and 190 other holders of country land paid super land tax, or a total of 1,141.

The TREASURER: The hon. member is taking up the position that this only applies to country lands. He says that 1,141 owners of country lands are taxed, but he does not give the details for town and city lands.

Mr. DEACON: Well, leave that out. There is a large number of country landowners who do pay super land tax, and they paid last year in the aggregate £124,410.

The TREASURER: The report shows that 1,141 owners paid £58,537.

Mr. DEACON: But even then the country landowners insist that they cannot pass it on. There is no means at all of doing so.

The TREASURER: That statement is directly contradictory of the statement made by the hon. member for Windsor. The latter says it can be passed on, but the hon. member says it cannot be passed on.

Mr. DEACON: The hon. member was speaking of town lands—of shops—and I am speaking of farming lands. If a man owns a shop, he can pass on the tax. [10.30 a.m.] It is not good business on the part of the Government, nor is it fair, that they should tax both a man's capital and his income. If he is a producer, he has no means of shifting the burden. Of course we have to raise money, and the fairest means of raising it is by an income tax, by which everybody will pay equally according to his means, and at the same time abolishing the land tax.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): Two or three years ago every hon. member reckoned that the absolute limit of taxation had been reached. We heard that on both sides. Yet this year we are going in for new taxation, and this super tax is going to be reimposed, although it hits the one class which cannot pass it on. In the case of the owner of town lands it is going to be passed on to the consumer. In my opinion it is not going to hit the city people so much as the country people who actually pay the tax, and also hit the consumers in the city and thus continue the high cost of living.

The Government should be doing their best to reduce taxation. Heavy taxation is certainly affecting business in the State and preventing people from going in for legitimate enterprise. If we are to go in for secondary industries, we must have less taxation. We are actually driving industries out of the State. Every hon. member professes to be desirous of introducing secondary industries—we have heard that from hon. members on the other side as well as on this—and that is the only way in which we can make

Queensland advance. It is all very well to go in for land settlement, but we can never improve the condition of the people unless we get people to come here to consume our produce. This is not the way to do that. The Treasurer knows that he is being pushed on by extremists, and that this money is required to indulge in wild-cat speculation.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I look upon this Bill as legalised robbery.

The TREASURER: That is a pretty strong term.

Mr. KING: I could say something else.

The TREASURER: You might say that all taxation was legalised robbery.

Mr. KING: I do not say that all taxation is unjust; everybody knows that taxation is necessary. Some people say that all taxation is robbery, but I do not say that. Of course nobody likes paying out money if he can avoid it; but this particular taxation is legalised robbery. We have to bear in mind that the tax Act which we are proposing to continue was imposed for a specific purpose, and was to be only a temporary measure. We have been led to believe that this tax would not be reimposed.

The TREASURER: What is the hon. gentleman's definition of "robbery"?

Mr. KING: Unjustly taking away that which does not belong to you.

The TREASURER: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that under this Bill I am going to take away something that does not belong to the State?

Mr. KING: No. The hon. gentleman has the necessary statutory power, and that is why I say the robbery is legalised.

The TREASURER: The hon. gentleman seems to be contradictory.

Mr. KING: If anyone were to put his hand into my pocket and extract something, that would be unlawful.

The TREASURER: That is not the intention under the Bill.

Mr. KING: It almost amounts to that. During the past few years we have been led to believe that this tax, which was imposed for a specific purpose, was not going to be reimposed. That purpose I contend has passed, but the Treasurer says it is necessary to reimpose the tax because the Government are depending on the money to balance the ledger at the end of the year. There is something else behind the Bill, and it is this: This form of taxation is part and parcel of the socialistic policy of the Government, and that is to make it so hot for those who hold land that it will be impossible for them to continue to hold it.

The TREASURER: To make it impossible for persons to hold large areas of freehold land.

Mr. KING: No one believes that a person should hold a large area of freehold land; but this tax does not hit the large holder only; it hits the small man too.

The TREASURER: What does the hon. gentleman mean by "small man"?

Mr. KING: A man who has 100 acres. If a man has land worth £300, he will be subject to the tax.

The TREASURER: No.

Mr. KING: If he has land to the value of £1,500 he will be.

The TREASURER: No, £2,500.

Mr. COLLINS: Stick up for the fat man.

Mr KING: I am not sticking up for the fat man.

Mr. COLLINS: My word you are.

Mr. KERR: It is a question of principle.

Mr. KING: This taxation is to be imposed in addition to the ordinary land tax, and all forms of local authority taxation, such as the hospital tax, and other forms of taxation. There are a number of forms of taxation that can be imposed by the local authorities, and they are all taxes imposed on land. These taxes are imposed on land to make it impossible to own freehold land and thus deprive people of the ownership of freehold land. That is part and parcel of the Government's policy.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): The Government should give this matter very serious consideration. We must recognise that land tax is very high in Queensland, and this super tax is imposed as an additional tax. Reference has been made to the question of whether this taxation is passed on. In connection with any leases that may have been entered into since the passing of the Act, I say quite definitely that this tax is passed on; but many arrangements extending over a number of years were made in connection with premises prior to the passing of the Act, and this tax in those cases has to be borne by the landowner. When new leases are entered into, the landowners make arrangements whereby all these taxes are paid by the tenants, with the result that that expenditure is added on to the cost of carrying on the respective businesses.

The TREASURER: In that case the landlord does not get a smaller rent because of the land tax.

Mr. ROBERTS: Many valuable premises have been erected in Queen street, and are working to the fullest extent of their productiveness.

The TREASURER: The tax is imposed on the unimproved value of the land.

Mr. ROBERTS: I know that is so, but these businesses have created a value in the land by reason of their location.

Mr. HARTLEY: How do you make it out?

Mr. ROBERTS: If the hon. member for Fitzroy was engaged in business he would know that in taking over his premises it is laid down that the rates and taxes shall be paid by the tenant, and the rates and taxes have to be passed on by him.

Mr. HARTLEY: You supported this tax when you were a member of the Labour party.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am dealing with taxation as it exists to-day. I have been looking into this matter in the short time at my disposal this morning, and I quite agree that it is not possible to compare this tax until it gets over £3,000.

I want to show the difference in this taxation in the various States. I have worked it out roughly that a person owning £4,900 worth of land in Queen street pays £52 1s. 5½d. in land tax. If that person owned land of the same value in Victoria or South Australia he would be called upon to pay only £19 8s. 3d. There is some reasonable justification, therefore, in the contention

that business is interfered with by taxation. The person who has to pay this tax on a Queen street property must make it a first tax on industry. It has to be earned first. It makes it difficult to carry on business, because much of our competition comes from Victoria.

The TREASURER: The hon. member once supported the Labour party, who advocated that tax.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am dealing with the legislation of the Government as it affects the country.

The TREASURER: But you advocated that tax.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is a long time since I was a supporter of the Labour party. I am criticising the taxation proposals of the Government. I want to show that in Victoria the land tax is only ¼d. in the £1, and it is a definite tax. There is a super tax there of 5 per cent. In Queensland our land tax rises from 1d. in the £1, and with the super tax landowners are compelled to pay from 2¼d. up to 6d. in the £1. That is a tremendous imposition as compared with the tax in Victoria and South Australia.

New South Wales is in a very different position. Their position is far better than ours. In that State land tax is levied only in the unincorporated portion of the western division of the State, as provision has been made for the suspension of land taxation by the central government where a general rate of not less than 1d. in the £1 on the unimproved capital value is levied by the local authority. Sydney does not pay any land tax or super tax. Contrast that with a Queen street property valued at £4,900, which has to pay £52 1s. 5½d. I agree with those hon. members who have preceded me that there is every reason why the Government should consider the question of wiping out this super land tax.

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

AYES, 33.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hynes
,, Bedford	,, Kirwan
,, Bertram	,, Land
,, Bulcock	,, Larcombe
,, Collins	,, Lloyd
,, Conroy	,, McCormack
,, Cooper, F. A.	,, McLachlan
,, Cooper, W.	,, Mullan
,, Dash	,, Riordan
,, Farrell	,, Ryan
,, Ferricks	,, Smith
,, Foley	,, Theodore
,, Gilday	,, Wellington
,, Gillies	,, Wilson
,, Gledson	,, Winstanley
,, Hanson	,, Wright
,, Hartley	

Tellers: Mr. Dash and Mr Farrell.

NOES, 17

Mr. Bell	Mr. Moore
,, Corser	,, Morgan
,, Costello	,, Nott
,, Deacon	,, Roberts
,, Edwards	,, Swayne
,, Kerr	,, Taylor
,, King	,, Vowles
,, Logan	,, Warren
,, Maxwell	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Kerr.

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Payne	Mr. Appel
,, Brennan	,, Brand
,, Stopford	,, Ilayton

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The TREASURER (Hon. E. J. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) presented the Bill, and moved—

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

Question put and passed.

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

APPRENTICESHIP BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

On new clause inserted to follow clause 25, reading—

"Every employer shall be entitled to employ at least one apprentice"—

on which the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) had moved the following amendment:—

"At the beginning of the clause insert the words 'Subject to this Act.'"

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The Minister told the Committee yesterday that there is no intention by his amendment to alter the principle of the new clause. He made the definite statement that an employer shall be entitled to employ at least one apprentice. He further confirmed that by saying that that is the intention of Parliament, and that the intention of Parliament will be considered when this matter is being dealt with in another place. He has given us to understand that an employer may engage an apprentice "Subject to this Act." We are prepared to accept the Minister's assurance in that regard, but we must have that assurance put down in black and white.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You must have what?

Mr. KERR: I will tell the Minister what I propose.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are not in a position to dictate, you know.

Mr. KERR: I am quite aware that I am not in a position to dictate. If I had that power, I would dictate to the hon. gentleman pretty quickly.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You would never live to tell the tale if you did.

Mr. KERR: I know the hon. gentleman is pretty good at words, but they would not get him very far.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KERR: The proposed amendment requires the closest scrutiny on the part of this Committee to make the clause what we intend it should be. It may refer to indentures "Subject to this Act." examinations, the protection of apprentices, transfers, and various other matters. Now we come to the very vital point. In the opinion of the Opposition, it has a far greater significance than that, and the Minister has not told us that it has not got that significance. If he will say that it has not that significance, we may accept his assurance; but we would like him to go further and make it very clear in this Bill. The new clause 26,

without the Minister's amendment, is mandatory in regard to permitting an employer to take one apprentice. What is the logical position if the amendment is agreed to? Clause 1 says—

> "This Act may be cited as 'The Apprenticeship Act of 1924,' and shall be read as one with 'The Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1916 to 1923.'"

That brings us to the Industrial Arbitration Acts, under which the definition of "industrial matters" includes—

> "The number or proportion of apprentices which may be employed by an employer."

Logically then the position is this: If this particular clause is to be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act, which gives authority for the creation of an Arbitration Court which determines the proportion of apprentices that an employer can have, it will logically follow that the new clause must be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act. The Arbitration Act constitutes the Arbitration Court, which can say how many apprentices may be employed.

Mr. HARTLEY: Nonsense!

Mr. KERR: The hon. member is wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The court can only give an award which is in consonance with the Apprenticeship Act.

Mr. KERR: That is so, but the Industrial Arbitration Act, which is to be read as one with this Act, gives the court absolute authority to apportion the number of apprentices.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No; it says the apportionment must be "subject to this Act."

Mr. KERR: The Arbitration Court does not do anything of the kind. It is "subject to the Apprenticeship Act."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This Bill is just as mandatory on the Arbitration Court as it is on the employers, the apprentices, or the Apprenticeship Committee.

Mr. KERR: Let us get away from technicalities. Can an employer engage one apprentice if he so desires?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Provided it is done "subject to this Act."

Mr. KERR: The Minister should make it quite clear. Why not accept an amendment such as this—

> "Notwithstanding any provisions of any award of the Court of Industrial Arbitration to the contrary, subject to this Act every employer shall be entitled to employ at least one apprentice."

That is a fair thing. The Minister should realise that our efforts are directed towards securing what he has agreed to. If the Minister accepts an amendment like that, it will get over all the difficulty. The matter is certainly subject to the Apprenticeship Committee, but it must go to the Arbitration Court. We want the Apprenticeship Bill itself to decide the matter; but, if the Act has to be read as one with the Arbitration Act, it must go to the Arbitration Court and be decided by the court. As the Minister has said that it is the intention to allow an employer to take one apprentice, surely we can put it in the Bill, but, unless the Minister accepts the amendment, it will go to the court and the advocates on each side will have to say what the position is to be. I hope that the Minister, in all reasonableness, will see that this is a very important part of the Bill. It was discussed a good deal in Committee originally, and the Minister saw at once that the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was reasonable. Now he wishes to introduce the words, "subject to this Act." This Bill has to be read with the Industrial Arbitration Act, which in turn means that the question may have to go to the Arbitration Court.

[11 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot deal with the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. KERR: I am trying to point out that, if the Minister wished to be fair, he would accept the amendment which I have suggested. Otherwise we shall not be doing the right thing: we shall not be putting into the Bill in black and white what we mean.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): On reading through this Bill I can see no necessity for the Minister's amendment. As the new clause is to be read with the rest of the Bill, every apprentice is protected. The rest of the provisions of the Bill would bind all apprentices. If a man employs only one apprentice, he is bound by this measure.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you want an employer to employ an apprentice without complying with the regulations as to wages and so on?

Mr. DEACON: The clause provides that every employer can employ an apprentice, and he has to employ the apprentice subject to the provisions of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He has to employ them "subject to this Act" if we amend this new clause.

Mr. DEACON: He is subject to the Act

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You say so, but that does not mean that it is so.

Mr. DEACON: The clause says that every employer shall be entitled to employ at least one apprentice. The rest of the Bill defines the exact number of apprentices he is entitled to, and this new clause does not give him any right to make an exception in regard to the rights enjoyed by all apprentices under the measure. They are defined all through the Bill. Every apprentice has his rights under the Bill, and the clause merely says that the employer is entitled to employ at least one such apprentice.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I do not know whether the hon. member for Enoggera intends to move his amendment or not, but, at any rate, it is not my intention to accept it. Various members of the Opposition have endeavoured to suggest that there are all sorts of reasons behind this amendment other than the plain and direct statement which I made. As a matter of fact, their contentions show that there is something behind their opposition to my amendment. I am justified in saying that on the clause as it stands it could be argued to mean that, notwithstanding anything in this Bill or in any industrial award or regulation, every employer will be entitled to one apprentice, and from time to time we would have the contention raised that that was so, whether the facilities for training were available or

not, or whether the apprentices were subject to the regulation of wages and conditions of labour laid down in the Bill or not.

If the contention of hon. members opposite were accepted, it would deprive the prospective apprentice of the protection which by this Bill we are giving him, and to that extent would defeat the purposes of the Bill. The hon. member for Enoggera, in his usual fatuous style, referred to the Industrial Arbitration Act. It is necessary that this Bill should be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act, because the Arbitration Court is the tribunal which fixes the wages, the hours of labour, and the whole host of conditions relating to the employment of all kinds of labour, and it is necessary that it should have that power. The position with regard to the court's power in fixing the proportion of apprentices is that it is subject to the Industrial Arbitration Act and this Bill, so that the court in making an award dealing with apprentices must make that award in consonance with this Bill, which is to be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act. Is not that perfectly plain? I am sure it is perfectly clear to you, Mr. Pollock, and one's mind must be particularly obtuse if he cannot understand the position. When this clause is amended in the direction that I propose, the court in making an award relating to the proportion of apprentices will have to make that award in consonance with this Bill and the Industrial Arbitration Act. A one-man employer, such as the saddler referred to by the hon. member for East Toowoomba, or a plumber who is carrying on business in a country town and who is a qualified tradesman, will be entitled to one apprentice.

Mr. KING: Not if the Arbitration Court says otherwise.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If he has a number of men, and desires to have more than one apprentice, he will be subject to the proportion fixed by the Arbitration Court in that particular award; but this clause will apply, and any award made by the court will be in consonance with this Bill. If hon. members opposite persist in their opposition to this clause, we shall be justified in assuming that they desire employers to have the right to employ a boy irrespective of any conditions regarding employment——

Mr. TAYLOR: You know that is not true.

Mr. MAXWELL: He knows it is not true.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Or the general protection given by the Bill. That would be the effect of their proposal.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): The Minister's interpretation of the attitude of the Opposition on this clause is totally wrong. He is totally wrong in his interpretation of our proposal and as to its result in connection with the apprentice. We have to recognise that there is a large number of industries under awards which do not allow the employment of apprentices unless a certain number of men is employed. That state of affairs is brought about by an arrangement between the employers and the employees, and they have managed to get the court to agree to that determination. That is unjust to the youth of Queensland, because they are prevented from having an opportunity to learn a trade, and the right to make such an agreement should be taken away from the employers and the employees. It is allowed under the existing law, and we want to alter that law. The leader of the Opposition made the position quite clear when his amendment in connection with this matter was accepted some time ago. Yesterday we were told that our contention that a boy could not be employed in a one-man shop was not true. Last year this question came up, and I made some inquiries from the Director of Labour, Mr. Walsh, and I made some inquiries again this morning, hoping to get some tabulated information as to the number of apprentices allowed in the different industries. Unfortunately, he has not got that information, but he admits that the statement he made is quite true. As a matter of fact, he himself supplied the information to me last session, which I quoted in this Chamber. The Director of Labour again says that that information is correct. I said to him, "How do your inspectors get on with these various industries?" He said, "They have to carry with them a copy of each of the Arbitration Court awards." It must be admitted that it must take some little time for the inspectors to look up every award to see whether a boy can be apprenticed or not, or how many men must first be employed before the employer is allowed an apprentice. I content myself with quoting the information supplied to me by the Director of Labour last year, as he assures me the position has not been altered. Some of the trades I quoted last year in which a boy could not be apprenticed unless there were so many men employed were: Saddlery, hairdressing, engine-driving, breweries, confectioners, distilleries, jam makers, warehousemen, electroplaters, dental mechanics, furniture makers, and picture framers. There are several of those trades in which about only one man is employed. There is a lot of one-man shops in those trades, and a lad could be taught an efficient trade in them. Hon. members must realise that the statement of the Minister is not correct. Clause 17 (7) says—

> "No employer shall continue to employ any minor after the periods mentioned in subsections one, two, and three hereof unless an indenture of apprenticeship has been completed."

Once that indenture of apprenticeship has been completed the employer in a one-man shop becomes as answerable as if he employed ten apprentices.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This clause modifies that clause to the extent of one apprentice.

Mr. ROBERTS: It does not meet the situation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You may say so, but who would pay attention to you?

Mr. KERR: His word is as good as yours.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister has to recognise that this indenture, when completed, must be in triplicate, one copy to be retained by the employer, one by the apprentice, and one by the Director of Labour.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask the hon. member to keep to the question before the Committee.

Mr. ROBERTS: The clause under discussion deals with apprentices.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are making a second reading speech.

Mr. ROBERTS: This clause was inserted to allow every employer to engage one apprentice. I am showing that, after an apprentice is indentured, three copies of the indenture are made, that one goes to the employer, one to the apprentice, and one to the Director of Labour. The Minister has stated that, if there is only one apprentice, there would be no control over him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That might be argued.

Mr. ROBERTS: I can undertsand the Minister arguing anything, but that would not make it sound or acceptable. I see no reason why the amendment should not be accepted, as the Bill says that one copy of the indenture shall be held by the Director of Labour. What is the object of sending a copy of the indenture to the Director of Labour unless it is to enable him to know the conditions under which that lad has been apprenticed, and to see that those conditions are being carried out from time to time. I can see no other reason for sending the copy of the indenture to the Director of Labour.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is the reason.

Mr. ROBERTS: That is my contention—that the Director of Labour will have supervision over this one apprentice, the same as he has over two or three apprentices.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He will have supervision with my amendment.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is why the amendment is going into the Bill.

Mr. ROBERTS: He has supervision without it.

Mr. HARTLEY: He has not. You seem to object to him having supervision.

Mr. ROBERTS: I do not. What I object to is the employer and the employee, through the Arbitration Court, having the right to say that no apprentice shall be taken into any industry.

Mr. HARTLEY: You cannot say that is in this clause.

Mr. ROBERTS: I do say it. We know that to-day there is a large number of our trades in Queensland in which the Arbitration Court—rightly I suppose hon. members opposite will maintain, but wrongly according to my opinion—have come to a decision that no apprentice may be engaged.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): The whole point on which the debate is hanging is in connection with the situation that might arise, as suggested by the hon. member for East Toowoomba, who spoke of the case of a boy who wished to be apprenticed to a tradesman in Toowoomba. Under the Bill, as it stands, that boy could be apprenticed to the tradesman without the interference of anybody, and if he is apprenticed he is apprenticed under the provisions set out in this Bill. If the words "subject to this Act" are inserted, it will simply mean that the tradesman cannot have an opportunity of engaging that boy, because the words "subject to this Act" would mean that the Court of Industrial Arbitration could determine whether that man could engage the boy or not, and might make conditions whereby the boy could not be indentured to that tradesman. It takes away the unrestricted liberty of a tradesman having the right to employ an apprentice. That is the whole point.

Mr. HARTLEY: It is not. It merely says he must have at least one apprentice.

Mr. KING: He may have at least one.

Mr. HARTLEY: Only "subject to this Act," and not subject to the Arbitration Court.

Mr. KING: "Subject to this Act!" What does that mean? "Subject to this Act" and the Industrial Arbitration Act. You must really consider the Industrial Arbitration Act as the back of this Bill. That Act has to be considered before the boy may be indentured. You must read the two measures as one. I defy the Minister to point out any Act under which apprentices may be apprenticed except under the Bill we are considering. The hon. gentleman cannot do so. If a boy is to be apprenticed at all, he must come under this Bill, and will be bound by the conditions of this Bill.

Mr. HARTLEY: Boys were apprenticed before this Bill was introduced.

Mr. KERR: There have been regulations under the Industrial Arbitration Act. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KING: Before the Industrial Arbitration Act came in there were no regulations at all. It was simply a mutual agreement between the employer and employee. These words "subject to this Act" are going to interfere with the rights of the employer and the employee.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): From the insistence with which hon. members opposite have opposed this amendment, it begins to make it look as if, without the amendment, the clause was loaded in favour of the employer in some way that they desired.

Mr. KING: Not at all.

Mr. HARTLEY: Their endeavours are not out of consideration for the welfare of apprentices at all. It makes me come to the conclusion that if hon. members opposite are so keen in opposing the amendment, it might be just as well to eliminate the whole clause. (Opposition laughter.) The Bill is fairly complete as it is. It is certainly a good provision, particularly as applied to small isolated centres, that an employer can have at least one apprentice, free and untrammelled.

Mr. KING: You do not believe in that.

Mr. HARTLEY: I do; but no one can say that any man in a small town on our Western Railway should have the right of employing a boy as a sort of general factotum and jack-of-all-trades. If he is a painter, he cannot have a boy as an apprentice to the painting trade and then employ him in driving a cart, or as his messenger in a hundred and one other ways. He can only have him "subject to this Act," and he must conform to the conditions imposed in connection with the teaching of the painting trade. Unless there is some hidden ulterior motive by which members of the Opposition wish to defeat the good provisions of this Bill, I cannot see why they are opposing this amendment. The contention of the hon. member for East Toowoomba that in clause 17 there is a provision that prevents an employer acting in the way suggested has

no weight at all. Clause 17 (7) provides that—

> "No employer shall continue to employ any minor after the periods mentioned in subsections one, two, and three hereof unless an indenture of apprenticeship has been completed."

One of the conditions is that the minor must have a three months' probationary period to ascertain whether he is suited to that particular trade or not. An indenture does not mean that a minor must have served his apprenticeship. It means that the employer and the guardian of the minor will have signed an article of indenture of apprenticeship to that particular trade. But that does not affect the conditions under which the apprentice shall work or the number of men who must be employed by the employer before that minor can be apprenticed. As to the argument that there is no Act governing apprenticeship, there was an Act thirty years ago that made it possible for a boy to be bound as an apprentice, and, when the hon. member for Logan and the hon. member for Enoggera said there was no such Act, they did not know what they were talking about.

Mr. KERR: I did not say anything about it. You tell the truth.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. member says so many things that are not true that he does not know what he says. There was an Act thirty years ago in this State under which boys could be apprenticed. I think it is some twenty-five years since my own articles of apprenticeship were signed, and they were a much more drastic set of articles of apprenticeship than any that can be found in Australia to-day. I hope the opposition to the amendment will cease, because it is beginning to create in my mind an impression that in trying to get the Minister to agree to the clause as originally passed hon. members opposite had some ulterior motive and wished to defeat the good provisions of the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I cannot understand the objections of the Minister to the proposal made by members on this side in connection with the amendment. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Enoggera that clause 1 of the Bill distinctly provides—

> "This Act may be ctied as 'The Apprenticeship Act of 1924,' and shall be read as one with 'The Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1916 to 1923.'"

If words mean anything at all, this Bill is to be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act, and the Industrial Arbitration Act is stated here as being the principal Act, and the principal Act will prevail, notwithstanding what the Minister has said. There would be no clashing in the way the Minister stated, but there could be in the way the hon. member for East Toowoomba said. That hon. member read out a certain number of trades and callings in Queensland where, by arrangement between employers and employees, no apprentices, unless a certain number of journeymen were engaged, could be employed in a particular calling. It is quite clear that the court need not take any notice of this clause at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you say that the Arbitration Court must not take notice of this Bill? Do you suggest that they ignore an Act of Parliament?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not say they will not take any notice of it, but they can simply say that these men shall not have an apprentice if they do not wish.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: When this Bill becomes law, it is to be read as one with the Industrial Arbitration Act and becomes a part of it. Surely in making an award that award must be in consonance with the Apprenticeship Act?

Mr. TAYLOR: Not at all. It is not mandatory that it shall be in consonance. The court could make an award quite apart from the clause we are considering here when you put in the words, "subject to this Act." The amendment as foreshadowed by the hon. member for Enoggera certainly clears the ground. The charge made by hon. members opposite that the Opposition is simply actuated by a spirit of "cussedness" in order to allow employers to do what they like is not correct.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why did you make innuendoes about my motive in proposing the new clause?

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not hear any made.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Every speaker on that side other than yourself has done so.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not making any innuendoes at all, but I say that the amendment outlined by the hon. member for Enoggera clarifies the position, and makes it perfectly plain. The Minister, when speaking yesterday, said that the Apprenticeship Act would prevail, but I do not agree with that. The right still exists for employers and employees to meet together and say that there shall be no apprentice in a particular calling. How will this new clause operate if the employers and employees take up that attitude?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If an employer does not want an apprentice, you cannot force him to have one. Take, for example, the hon. member for Toowong; he did not have any, and we could not force him to have any.

Mr. TAYLOR: I would like to know from the Minister in what way the amendment foreshadowed by the hon. member for Enoggera would emasculate the Bill, or what trouble there would be in administering the measure if the amendment were adopted. I fail to see where it can do any injury to the Bill at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The amendment that I have proposed is all that is necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think it is not sufficient, and I believe we shall find that, instead of improving, we shall injure the Bill, and what is sought will not be accomplished.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I want the Minister to understand that the Opposition are not against his amendment. We want boys who are apprentices to be indentured and the other conditions of the Act to be made applicable to them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Then why are you opposing the amendment?

Mr. KERR: We are not opposing it; but let us have the amendment I have suggested.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That would make matters worse.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing his suggested amendment.

Mr. KERR: It would clarify the position if the Minister would accept it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I have no intention of accepting it.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I am sorry the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Enoggera, as it would make the position perfectly clear.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It would not make it clear. It would tangle matters to have that amendment in.

Mr. MOORE: I made inquiries from legal gentlemen last night about the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There is a legal man sitting next to you.

Mr. MOORE: I wanted confirmation of our contention that the matter could be raised before the Arbitration Court, and their opinion was that it could, and that the words "subject to this Act" did not mean what we want the clause to mean. There is no desire to enable boys to be placed in apprenticeship outside the scope of this Bill as to rates of wages or anything else, but we do want to have it clear that the Arbitration Court will not be able, as it is doing at the present time, to reduce the number of apprentices who can be employed in any calling or trade. We want to have it provided that any one-man shop or employer shall have the right to take an apprentice.

[11.30 a.m.]

Mr. HARTLEY: He will have that right.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member may say so and the Minister may believe so; but when one goes outside for an opinion it upholds our contention. I asked two legal gentlemen whether the contention we have raised could be raised, and both of them said that it could.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Who were they?

Mr. MOORE: One of them was Mr. Macgregor, who used to be a member of this House. I only asked him for an opinion as to whether our contention was right and whether it could be raised in the Arbitration Court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He is the man who said that Parliament could not legislate in the way it liked.

Mr. MOORE: He has the right to give a legal opinion when he is asked for it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I do not deny his right.

Mr. MOORE: He is a trained man, and has had a great deal to do with interpreting Acts of Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He endeavoured to interpret the Constitution at one time.

Mr. MOORE: He said that this would be subject to the Industrial Arbitration Act, and we want to make it perfectly clear that the possibility of the interpretation which we contend may be put upon the Minister's amendment is eliminated. We want it to be perfectly sure that what we are endeavouring to secure cannot be taken away by a side issue or a technical point. In my opinion, the clause as it stands without the amendment is perfectly satisfactory, and makes it impossible for an apprentice to be indentured except under this Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is all right, but the point I make is that, if your opinion is correct, it might be argued that an apprentice might be employed under the measure free from any conditions except the general conditions. It is better to make the position clear beyond any shadow of a doubt.

Mr. MOORE: The employer has to indenture his apprentice according to the Act. That is perfectly clear, and there is no ulterior motive behind the new clause. We are perfectly open and straightforward.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why do you suggest that I am not?

Mr. MOORE: Because we know that many organisations object to an employer having any apprentices at all, and the clause was designed to prevent their getting their way, and I am of opinion that some pressure has been brought to bear to defeat the object we have in view. Those organisations want apprentices to be employed in the way they have been employed for the last few years, and they have said that they would make representations to the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Nobody has written to me on this matter at all.

Mr. MOORE: We want to know what has happened since this clause was first accepted by the Minister. It has to be recognised that the Minister's amendment has been brought in subsequently.

Mr. HARTLEY: Would you have it so that the employer had the right to employ one apprentice unconditionally? That would be the position without this amendment. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. MOORE: Legal opinion outside is absolutely against what the hon. member says.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: My amendment places it beyond any question of an outside opinion. It makes it sure.

Mr. MOORE: It clouds the issue, and places the Arbitration Court in such a position that it can continue the limitation of apprentices if it likes.

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

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hynes
,, Bedford	,, Kirwan
,, Bertram	,, Land
,, Bruce	,, Larcombe
,, Carter	,, Lloyd
,, Collins	,, McCormack
,, Conroy	,, McLachlan
,, Cooper, F. A.	,, Mullan
,, Cooper, W.	,, Riordan
,, Dash	,, Ryan
,, Dunstan	,, Smith
,, Farrell	,, Stopford
,, Ferricks	,, Theodore
,, Foley	,, Wellington
,, Gilday	,, Wilson
,, Gillies	,, Winstanley
,, Hanson	,, Wright
,, Hartley	

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 21.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr Maxwell
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Moore
,, Bell	,, Morgan
,, Clayton	,, Nott
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Costello	,, Sizer
,, Deacon	,, Swayne
,, Elphinstone	,, Taylor
,, Kerr	,, Vowles
,, King	,, Warren
,, Logan	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Sizer.

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Payne	Mr. Appel
,, Brennan	,, Brand
,, Pease	,, Peterson

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I beg to move the following further amendment:—

"After the word 'Act' in the amendment just inserted, insert the words—

'And notwithstanding anything contained in the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916-23.'"

The clause will then contain a principle which we all want in the Bill and have always wanted in the Bill. The fear of the Opposition is that the Industrial Arbitration Act will take control out of the hands of Parliament. The Industrial Arbitration Act gives the judge power to decide the proportion of apprentices to be allowed. In the interpretation of the words "industrial matters," the Act says the court has jurisdiction to decide the number of apprentices. It was not the intention of Parliament to give the court the power to allocate the number of apprentices to be allowed under this Bill. If it is the intention of Parliament to lay down definitely under this Bill that an employer may engage one apprentice, then we should not under any circumstances permit the Industrial Arbitration Court to override the intention of Parliament. I hope that the Minister will see the reasonableness of my amendment and accept it, so that the matter may be cleared up.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I have no intention of accepting the amendment. It means that the employer of one apprentice is being lifted completely outside the ambit of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. KERR: It means nothing of the kind.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It means that so far as the wages and hours of apprentices are concerned the Industrial Arbitration Act would not apply. The amendment would make the clause look ridiculous. It is questionable whether the amendment is in order, because previous amendments approved of by the Committee make the Industrial Arbitration Act applicable to this Bill. The Act and this Bill must be read as one. After that principle has been accepted by the Committee it is now proposed to do something to nullify that principle. If this amendment were accepted, the employer of one apprentice would be able to flout the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): The contention of the Secretary for Public Works is absolutely absurd. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that nothing of the sort would prevail. This Bill deals only with apprentices. The Minister has just carried an amendment, and we want to add to it to make it quite clear that the powers of the small man to engage an apprentice will not be limited.

Mr. HARTLEY: They will be able to limit the number, but not to prevent one apprentice being employed.

Mr. MOORE: I contend that the court will be able to carry on exactly the same as in the past unless the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera is put in. It has been our contention all through that the court will still have the power to limit the number of apprentices in proportion to the number of journeymen employed. We particularly want the one-man employer to be able to take an apprentice. That is the only purpose we are endeavouring to effect. There is nothing in the amendment except an effort to clarify the position. There is nothing to say that the wages paid will not be fixed under the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you understand the Industrial Arbitration Act?

Mr. MOORE: Pretty well, but I do not think, from the contention of the Minister, that he understands that Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you know that we have power under a clause in the Industrial Arbitration Act to take away from the court powers relating to apprentices, and to do it by regulation of the Governor in Council?

Mr. MOORE: You had that power before this Bill was introduced.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Arbitration Court may alter wages and bring them into consonance with our regulations.

Mr. MOORE: Is it likely that the clause as amended by the Minister is going to be effective? Is it going to prevent the court altering wages now?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Arbitration Court is going to do the right and proper thing, as it has always done.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister says "as it has always done." We want to get away from that position. We want an amendment of the law so that we may get away from the position of what "the court has always done" in limiting apprentices to different trades.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are trying to bring principles into the Bill that are quite contrary to principles which have been affirmed previously.

Mr. MOORE: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. The amendment is merely to clarify the position.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: To make it as clear as mud.

Mr. MOORE: That may be the opinion of the Minister. The hon. gentleman is just taking up an obstinate attitude because we are endeavouring to secure something which is wanted very much by a large section of the people.

Mr. HARTLEY: It is not quite clear what you want to secure in this clause.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member should know, as we have explained it clearly

enough. The Minister said that the Arbitration Court has always acted in a way that is just and fair.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I said that it has always done the right and proper thing. This Bill is an amendment of the law which the court will accept and frame awards accordingly.

Mr. MOORE: The amendment of the Minister will not make clear to the Arbitration Court what we are endeavouring to secure.

Mr. HARTLEY: Do you say the Arbitration Court has not always acted in a way that is right and fair?

Mr. MOORE: I say it has acted in a way that brought about the limitation of apprentices, and we want to get away from that position.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Very few employers, if any, have the proportion of apprentices they are allowed to engage.

Mr. MOORE: That is outside the scope of this question. I am not arguing that they have or have not got their quota. I want to make it clear that the man who does not employ a journeyman shall have the right to employ an apprentice. I want to assist the one-man shop.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Under this Bill a one-man employer will be entitled to have an apprentice, provided he complies with the conditions.

Mr. MOORE: Exactly so—"provided he complies with the conditions." We do not want the Arbitration Court to come in and limit his powers, as it has done in the past. That is what we are endeavouring to secure.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): It is unfair on the part of the leader of the Opposition to accuse the Minister of taking up a stubborn attitude. Members on this side, I suppose, have more to do with apprentices than members of the Opposition, and we are just as much, if not more, concerned to see that the lads get a proper training and the protection that this clause gives. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Enoggera would do exactly what the Minister says it would.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They could put the boys to digging post-holes.

Mr. GLEDSON: The Industrial Arbitration Act and the Apprenticeship Act will be two different Acts, and each one will have its own peculiar function. It will be the function of the Arbitration Court under the Industrial Arbitration Act to regulate the hours, conditions of work, and wages under which the apprentices shall be employed, while this Bill makes provision for indentures and for the appointment of committees to look after the apprentices, for registration, and for a general supervision of the apprentices.

If we provide that, notwithstanding anything in the Industrial Arbitration Act, an employer can employ an apprentice, it will mean that we are taking away the advantages of the Industrial Arbitration Act, which I do not think is the intention of hon. members opposite. They say they do not want that to be done, yet that would be the result of this amendment. If they want to do something that is going to allow even the proprietor of a one-man shop to exploit a lad, then we want to know where they stand. Even if a man is employing only one boy, that boy has a right to the wages and conditions of employment fixed by the Arbitration Court just the same as if there were ten boys employed. To take away that right would be a very wrong principle, and a principle that no member of this Committee should support.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): Although the clause states—

> "Subject to this Act, every employer shall be entitled to one apprentice,"

we claim that the Arbitration Court can say he shall not have one apprentice.

Mr. GLEDSON: It cannot do that.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister knows quite well that the Arbitration Court can do that. We know that the Arbitration Court has interfered in the past in this matter. The amendment is intended to safeguard the right of every employer, if he so desires, to employ at least one apprentice without the Arbitration Court having the right to say he shall not do so. That is the whole position as I understand it, and we claim that the amendment will make the position quite clear.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The effect would be the nullification of my amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not follow the Minister at all. There is no intention on the part of members on this side of the Committee to nullify the Minister's amendment in any shape or form.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Then why are members on your side so obstinate?

Mr. TAYLOR: We are not obstinate. We are trying to show the Minister that he is on the wrong track. We want to see that a fair show is given to everyone. To say that we want to see an apprentice digging post-holes is a tarradiddle. We are just as desirous on this side of seeing that apprentices are protected and get a fair run as any hon. member opposite, and to say that we are not is to say what is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. HARTLEY: Your actions do not bear out your statements.

Mr. TAYLOR: I hope the Minister will see his way to accept the amendment, because under the wording of the proposed new clause the Industrial Arbitration Court can simply say that employers shall not take apprentices.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I understood the Minister to say that employers would not employ apprentices. The trouble with employers has been that they say they cannot employ apprentices under the present system. The Minister now says that the Government, by regulation, can lay down the conditions under which the apprentices are to be employed, and that the Arbitration Court cannot interfere with them.

Mr. HARTLEY: Why can they not employ them under the present conditions?

Mr. DEACON: The conditions are too strict and too hard. The Minister said that. I understand that the Minister is now objecting to the power to make the conditions under which apprentices are to be employed being taken away from the Arbitration Court. He has said that the Arbitration Court cannot make the regulations, but that the Government will make them; so in that case there can be no objection to

accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera. If the Minister is correct, then it will not make any difference. Hon. members must realise that there has been an extension of the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court, and that in future apprentices employed in the farming industry may come under an award of the court, and they will also come under the Apprenticeship Act. It is necessary that every employer in the producing industries should have the right to employ one apprentice.

Mr HARTLEY: On conditions that make it worth while for a boy to be apprenticed.

Mr. DEACON: Hon. members opposite are very suspicious. The conditions that are worth while are laid down clearly under this Bill. It does not matter whether there is one apprentice or twenty apprentices, they must all be employed under the conditions laid down in the Apprenticeship Act.

Mr. HARTLEY: You say the present conditions are not good enough?

Mr. DEACON: The Government are now introducing a modification of the conditions. The Minister is trying to impose limitations, otherwise he would not have moved his amendment. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Enoggera makes it quite clear that at least the right of every employer is left as it was before. That is what the hon. member wants. If all the producing industries are included in the Bill, it is necessary that the conditions should be made clear, even if in some cases apprentices are at times employed in digging post-holes. It should be made quite clear that every employer may have one apprentice, otherwise a man on a farm may be debarred from employing his son as an apprentice.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): The hon. member for Cunningham made a very rash statement about the intention of the Opposition in opposing the amendment just accepted by the Committee. The hon. member's statement makes the [12 noon] intentions of the Opposition in this matter quite clear. The conditions of apprenticeship have been controlled by the Court of Industrial Arbitration as to hours and conditions, payment, overtime, and so on. The unions handling the various trades have always had a great deal of trouble in the first place to get apprentices indentured; secondly, in getting them thoroughly trained instead of merely being made general handy boys for the whole shop; and thirdly, in securing the regular attendance of the apprentices at technical classes. This Bill has cleared up the position, and made it plain that apprentices shall be indentured under certain conditions, and that those conditions shall compel the doing of certain things.

The hon. member for Enoggera wishes to introduce another issue by inserting the words, "Notwithstanding anything contained in the Industrial Arbitration Act." The effect of that would be to undermine the good conditions which have been granted with regard to apprentices up to the present time by the Court of Industrial Arbitration, and I have no doubt that, if that were brought about, the contention of the hon. member for Cunningham would be proved to be correct. That is to say, the hon. member for Enoggera would have made it worth while for employers to employ apprentices. The objection of employers has always been that, because of certain restrictions, the employment of apprentices has not been worth while. If under this Bill, or under the Industrial Arbitration Act, they could use apprentices as handy boys about the shops, as messenger boys, or for overtime work, irrespective of the conditions laid down by the Court of Industrial Arbitration, I have no doubt hon. members on the other side would have succeeded in making it worth while for employers to employ apprentices. The object of the employer has been a selfish one. It has not been to get a boy whom he could train into an efficient tradesman, but to get cheap labour from a young lusty lad between sixteen and eighteen years of age, so that he might be able to compete with men who were employing fully qualified tradesmen and giving them the full rates of pay.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I am sorry that the argument has taken the turn it has, but it is only in keeping with the characteristics of some hon. members on the other side. The position was made perfectly clear, not only during the discussion yesterday but also previously, that the Opposition desired to secure better facilities for training apprentices. I want to say that the association with which I am connected—the Master Painters' Association of Australia——

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: And the Employers' Federation.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman on every occasion tries to traduce a body of people——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: But he belongs to a Government who used special constables at Townsville during the railway strike, and asked the Employers' Federation to supply them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member does not obey my call to order, I shall ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman raises that question every time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: Those associated with the painting trade have passed resolutions to the effect that employers shall do all they possibly can to secure apprentices to work at the trade, and pay them the highest rate possible. There are many instances where they pay them a higher rate than is allowed under the award.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The amendment is to add the words "Notwithstanding anything contained in the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1916-1923."

Mr. MAXWELL: I am coming to that. If the employees contend that the allowing of one apprentice to one employer is going to cause industrial strife in a certain area, the Judge of the Arbitration Court, in order to maintain industrial peace, will be quite within his powers in ordering that the proportion of one apprentice to one employer shall not be allowed. It should be the desire of all hon. members to see that every boy is taught a trade, and to see that, if one man is working at a trade himself, he shall have the right to employ an apprentice without any interference from the Arbitration Court, notwithstanding what might be said

by the representatives of employers or employees. Unless the amendment is accepted, the Arbitration Court might provide that three trade-men must be employed before one apprentice can be employed, which is the case with the painting industry. We are told that we are clouding the issue, but I fail to see that. Instead of the Bill doing what we all desire it should do in this respect, it is not getting us one step further.

Mr. BRUCE (*Kennedy*): The hon. member for Windsor contended that the object of the amendment was to place the employer and the apprentice outside the ambit of the Arbitration Court as to the number of apprentices. I would like to know if hon. members opposite doubt the wisdom, the knowledge, or the honesty of the judges of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. KERR: No one has questioned that.

Mr. BRUCE: When it is a question of the lives of the workers and their conditions of work, it is always the contention of hon. members opposite that the Arbitration Court is quite capable of dealing with these matters, and that they should be left entirely to the court; but when it is a question of one apprentice to one employer, they say they cannot trust the Arbitration Court.

Mr. MAXWELL: We do not say that.

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member for Windsor said so, and he is a member of the Opposition. I take it the Opposition advocate the party's policy, and do not speak from their own private points of view.

Mr. KERR: He did not say that at all.

Mr. BRUCE: He contended that if the amendment were not accepted, it would be left to the Arbitration Court to decide.

Mr. KERR: That is so.

Mr. BRUCE: If the contention is correct, what is wrong with the Arbitration Court?

Mr. KERR: It should be definitely stated in the Bill.

Mr. BRUCE: Does the hon. gentleman doubt the honesty of the judges of the Arbitration Court?

Mr. KERR: No.

Mr. BRUCE: Then why the objection?

Mr. KERR: That question does not arise at all.

Mr. BRUCE: My opinion is that the amendment was not moved with the object stated by the hon. member for Windsor or the hon. member for Enoggera, but was moved because orders were given this morning by the "Courier" that it should be moved. (Opposition laughter.) It stated that the Opposition should make a kick and take some action. The sub-leader in the "Courier" this morning urged that they should become active to justify themselves as an Opposition party.

Mr. KERR: You are like Rip Van Winkle; you have been asleep for a month.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): I would remind the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, when he speaks about the Industrial Arbitration Court judges, that this Chamber has not seen fit to leave everything to those judges. When the Industrial Arbitration Act was passed Parliament tied the hands of the court. I regret that so much time has been taken up in this discussion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: It is only one section fighting another. I am quite satisfied that the Minister has in his mind what is desired. There was a meeting of a certain union following the insertion of the new clause in the Bill, and there was a resolution carried at that meeting, and, notwithstanding that the Minister stated he is not aware of it, it was recorded in the Press. The union realised that this amendment took away certain powers which it possessed. The judges of the Industrial Arbitration Court have set up —wrongly, in my opinion—that, unless a certain number of men are employed in certain trades and callings, no apprentice shall be indentured. We want to get away from that position, and we can only get away from it by adopting this amendment.

Mr. HARTLEY: What trades are they?

Mr. ROBERTS: A number were mentioned this morning.

Mr. HARTLEY: You might cite one, but you cannot cite a number.

Mr. MOORE: Seventeen of them were quoted.

Mr. KERR: That shows the knowledge the hon. member has of them.

Mr. ROBERTS: We have it on record that the Director of Labour sated that in seventeen trades no apprentices can be engaged under an order of the Arbitration Court unless a certain number of journeymen are employed.

Mr. HARTLEY: You are interpreting that wrongly.

Mr. ROBERTS: I want to say again quite definitely that we do not want to interfere with the hours or wages of apprentices. The hours and wages will be fixed by the Industrial Arbitration Court. We merely want, before the Bill leaves the Chamber, to have the principle inserted that an employer shall have the right to take an apprentice without approaching the court.

Mr. KERR: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: An employer is prevented from doing that now, and this amendment merely gives him the privilege of indenturing an apprentice, notwithstanding an award of the Industrial Arbitration Court.

Amendment (*Mr. Kerr*) negatived.

New clause, as amended, agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with a further amendment.

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

ANIMALS AND BIRDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

Clause 1—"*Short title and construction of Act*"—agreed to.

Clause 2—"*Interpretation*"—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I beg to move the omission on lines 5 to 14, page 2, of the definition "Holding," reading—

"'Holding'—Any portion of country land comprising more than two thousand

five hundred and sixty acres held by one owner and whether held in fee-simple or under lease license or other form of tenure from the Crown: when the same person is the owner of two or more parcels of land adjoining each other, whether such parcels are held under the same form or under different forms of tenure, such parcels shall be taken as one portion, and be regarded for the purposes of this Act as one holding."

The only place in which a holding is referred to in the Bill is in the regulations giving power to the board to grant permits to trappers to go on to private holdings. That is the only place where the interpretation is necessary, and that is one of the clauses in the Bill to which we strongly object. We consider the principle wrong, and, although the Minister has stated that every precaution will be taken to see that undesirables are not granted permits, it will be very difficult to know whether people applying for permits are desirable or undesirable.. We consider the Crown has a perfect right to issue permits for people to go on to Crown lands, but it has no right to issue permits for individuals to go on to private property. Frequently in the country women and children have to be left alone, and it is going to cause a good deal of worry and anxiety if strangers are to be allowed on the property by means of permits. The principle is wrong, and one to which we objected throughout the Bill. I therefore more the omission of this definition.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I endorse the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. The Minister must recognise the fact that there is a large number of people whose holdings will be greater than 2,560 acres who are doing all they possibly can to protect the native animals and birds. Some people look upon it almost as a crime to destroy opossums or bears. I know of one man who threatened to shoot any person who came on to his holding to snare opossums and bears.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He evidently considered that the life of an opossum was more valuable than the life of a man.

Mr. MORGAN: The opossum does no damage. It does not eat any grass, and he looked upon it as a crime for any person to snare and destroy an innocent animal. That man takes a pride in the fact that there are bears that he can see on the trees in his paddock.

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

Mr. MORGAN: I am giving reasons why the definition of "Holding" should be omitted. If this Bill is put into operation, the board will have power to allow trappers to go on any freehold of more than 2,560 acres, so that I am perfectly in order in what I am saying. The idea of deleting the definition of "Holding" as it appears in the Bill is to prevent the board having power to issue licenses to trappers to trap on freehold areas. The rights of freeholders should be respected, more especially in the matter of trapping opossums and bears. A great number of men who own freehold areas comprising more than 2,560 acres use their land as sanctuaries for the purpose of allowing opossums and bears to breed up, and it is wrong for the Minister to introduce a Bill to enable trappers to trap these animals on those areas. Those areas already come under the Marsupial Boards Act and the Rabbit Boards Act, and pests may be destroyed on those lands. If a man is allowing pests such as wallabies, dingoes, foxes, to breed on his land and is making no attempt to destroy them, I quite agree that the marsupial board should have power to grant licenses to men to enter upon those lands and destroy those pests. That is the law in Victoria. If the owner of a freehold in Victoria is not destroying the pests on his land, the board has power to send men on to the land to destroy the pests at the cost of the owner.

At 12.25 p.m.,

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

Mr. MORGAN: That is quite correct, but I feel sure that the Minister knows sufficient about the habits of the opossum and the bear to know that they are not pests in any shape or form. They happen to possess skins which are of marketable value, and a certain number of people are out to make money by their destruction. If money was given to men to go and destroy a pest on a freehold, I would be in favour of the proposal, because I contend that the owner of a freehold has no right to allow any pest which may become a menace to his neighbour to breed on his land. We like to see a pet kangaroo running about a place; yet a trapper can kill that poor unfortunate kangaroo and get its skin. That does not seem to me to be right.

The Minister should accept this amendment. I know the hon. gentleman is a softhearted man, and does not like to see wilful and woeful destruction carried on. It would not do any harm if we had opossums and bears in millions; the only trouble is that they possess skins of marketable value. I hope the Minister will look at the matter from the point of view which the Opposition take—that, if a man possesses a freehold of over 2,560 acres, he should be allowed to have his property converted into a sanctuary for the breeding and protection of opossums and bears.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I feel quite certain that the Minister has overlooked one aspect in regard to allowing indiscriminate slaughter, because it will be indiscriminate if the business of trapping gets into the hands into which it will probably fall. It may fall into good hands, or it may fall into indifferent hands. At the lambing season it is imperative that sheep should not be disturbed, and this Bill will give to friction between the snarer and the sheepowner. The very fact of trappers being allowed to go on to a freehold will tend to make the proprietor anxious and to make the trapper cocksure and indifferent as to what he does. My experience with regard to trappers is that they are indifferent—I do not mean to convey the idea that they are bad—but they are as a rule indifferent to the stock they come across. Take the use of cyanide, for instance. It is used in a blackguardly way. It is all very well to say that the restrictions are such that people are not able to buy it. Cyanide was used in my place near the coast last season. It does not matter

what restrictions are placed upon its sale by the Government the trappers will get hold of cyanide, and, although it is one of the most brutal and stupid ways of destroying these animals, it will be used. Not only is it responsible for loss in regard to bears and opossums, but it can do no end of harm in other ways. Take the harm which may be done to a flock of sheep in the lambing season. These men go about with lights at night—they have a sort of open order, and are allowed to go about practically without restriction in the paddocks. I think there should be some restriction placed upon the trappers, both in leasehold and freehold country. The Minister should ask himself whether at times such as I am speaking of he would like any individual belonging to either the unemployed or the trapping class to enter his block? He must see that he is creating very serious trouble.

I do not know whether the Minister thinks that he is fixing a very high standard by providing that a holding of 2,560 acres shall be a holding on which trappers may get licenses to carry on operations. Any number of men with 2,560 acres are small men. In the western country 10,000 acres is a very small holding. I think the limit is altogether too low.

No doubt there are men all over Queensland who make sanctuaries of their holdings. I know one case where a man makes anybody pay who wants to go on to his block, and although these sanctuaries are few and far between, nevertheless a great number of persons do make sanctuaries of their places. and the Bill will be altogether [12.30 p.m.] too hard on them. I was expecting the Government to make it easier to maintain those sanctuaries. The Bill is supposed to protect these birds and animals, and the only way to do so is to encourage the creation of sanctuaries for them. All the world over civilisation has killed out native birds and animals, and the only places where they are to be found in any quantity is in regions where it is impossible for civilisation to get a footing. We ought to avoid that in Australia, if possible. We need sanctuaries for our native animals. At the present time there are sanctuaries where the people are honestly carrying out the law. On the Humpybong Peninsula the people are reasonably carrying out the conditions of sanctuary, and, if the Minister wants to protect our birds and animals, and is not merely introducing this Bill as a means of getting money, he will have to do it through an extension of the sanctuary principle. The fixing of a limit of 2,560 acres is not going to do that at all. We want an area of 50 square miles on the coast, and we want 50 square miles in other places, so that there will be no danger of absolutely killing out these animals. I say without fear of contradiction that the people of Queensland do not want to see the native bear exterminated.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WARREN: It is the most cowardly and miserable thing in the world to kill such harmless little animals, and I think the whole of Queensland should be made a sanctuary for them. There is nothing more quaint or pleasing than the native bear. He does no harm whatever, and it is an absolute crime that the Government should permit them to be killed at all for a few paltry "bob." If the Minister is sincere in wanting to protect our birds and animals, let him do so, but not make this Bill a means of collecting a few pounds. I hope that, if he does not wipe this clause out altogether, he will insert something which will protect our native fauna whether on small or large holdings.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Minister to make provision for the proclamation of sanctuaries in cases where the owners of land make application for that purpose. In my case all I had to do was to make an application setting out the description of my land and the locality, and it was granted without any trouble. The proclamation was made, and it became a sanctuary. In any case where an owner of a holding desires the native fauna on his holding to be protected and there is no restriction, it should be possible to have that holding proclaimed a sanctuary. It must be realised by an owner who applies to have his holding proclaimed a sanctuary that it is just as much a sacred duty for him as for outsiders to see that the fauna is not destroyed on his property once it has been proclaimed a sanctuary. He will have no more right to destroy those animals than strangers from outside.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! This amendment does not deal with sanctuaries. It deals with the elimination of the definition of "Holdings."

HON. J. G. APPEL: My remarks have a bearing on that particular question.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): There is a bigger principle involved in this clause which has not yet been touched upon, and that is the right of ownership. In dealing with this matter we have to take into consideration the objective of the party responsible for this legislation. We know that the abolition of private ownership in land is part of their objective. Many Bills are brought before us from time to time, each tending to abolish the rights of owners of property. This Bill will tend to take away from the owner of freehold land any rights that he may desire to exercise to preserve native animals, and to prevent people from trespassing on his holding. Every Bill that comes forward contains some encroachment on the rights of landowners. I feel I am justified in saying that it is all part of the general scheme to deprive owners of property of their rights in land. This is certainly a very grave encroachment. If an owner of freehold land decides to preserve the native fauna upon his land and allow it to live in peace—especially the animals that are particularly aimed at in this Bill—he should have a perfect right to do so. If he is of the opinion that his stock is likely to be interfered with by the presence thereon of other people, he should be allowed to exercise his rights in this particular regard, seeing that he has bought the land and paid for it, and is doing no harm. Where his rights are not in conflict with the public interest they should be protected. This Bill is part and parcel of a general scheme to make private ownership worthless, and to create such a position as will make it not worth while for anyone to own anything.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I hope the Minister will not accept the amendment, as it will absolutely kill one of the main principles of the Bill. The main objection

raised by the Opposition in regard to allowing trappers to enter any holding is that it will interfere with what they call the sacred rights of the freeholder.

The object of this clause is to allow an opossum or bear trapper to enter any land whether it be Crown or freehold land, for the purpose of trapping. That is the main reason for the clause. The natural resources of the country should not belong to any person by reason of the fact that he holds the fee-simple of the land. Many of our mineral resources exist under freehold property. Under the Mining Act the Mines Department has power to permit a prospector to enter on that land to prospect for minerals. What we are aiming at in this instance is to enable a trapper to enter on freehold or leasehold property to trap native fauna. It has been found by experience that many trappers have had to go on their hands and knees to owners of leasehold and freehold properties in many parts of the State before they were allowed to trap thereon, and then only on payment of a percentage of the catch, or in other words a royalty had to be paid to the owners. A trapper under the Bill, after paying for his license, will be able to enter on any leasehold or freehold land to trap.

Mr. HARTLEY: Supposing he damages property while he is there, what then?

Mr. FOLEY: I claim that the principle is quite sound.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The defence of the hon. member for Leichhardt is not altogether correct. Opossums and bears were of such great value in the past that there was no necessity for trappers to go on their hands and knees to secure permits to enter private property. It has been proved that such a large trade has been carried on in skins, and the industry has assumed such proportions, that it has prompted the Minister to bring in this Bill. That shows that trappers have the facilities to secure skins under the present system.

Mr. BULCOCK: Owners make them pay tribute to go on their land.

Mr. CORSER: Each year trappers enter my property, and I never receive a penny from them. I also know that my neighbours do not charge any royalty when they allow trappers to go on their property. Under the present system the landowner has the right to select the trappers. He knows the character of the trapper who goes on to his property. If some outside authority is allowed to give trappers permission to go on private property, it may happen that some undesirable individuals will interfere with freehold and leasehold lands. We have instances in our country districts—and the further you go out the more my argument holds good—that if a trapper is refused permission to go on to any country, he does so without authority. No one at the present time can prevent a trapper going through his country, because if it has a large area, it is impossible to keep a vigilant eye over the whole of it at night time. There is a further undesirable fact following on the power to enter property, and that is the use of lights on valuable properties which may be used as fattening paddocks. These people may go on to the land and use lights.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The principal Act provides for that.

Mr. CORSER: Yes, but the Minister will not say that he will prevent the use of lights. I have seen men using lights on my own property, but one could not interfere with them right away from civilisation and away from the protection that would be needed if a conviction were secured. The person who would use lights against the law would use a match the next day to burn you out. At present the owner has the advantage of giving a permit to someone whom he may select. The whole territory, whether it be an agricultural farm or a big area of 20,000 acres, is being scoured periodically by somebody year after year. The results recorded by the number of skins collected show that. There is no necessity for this definition of "Holding." A definition could be brought in later on, as provided by the hon. member who moved this amendment, which will give sufficient power to constitute areas.

It is not a matter of the trapper being at a disadvantage. If this definition goes through as it is the holder of the block is going to be at a disadvantage. The trapper will have all the advantage, and, if he is an undesirable character, he is going to use his advantage against the holder of the land. People right away beyond police protection must be protected by the Minister. The hon. gentleman knows that some trappers use cyanide, although the Act precludes its use. As a result the holder of the land loses cattle. One generally knows the man who uses cyanide and lights, and I want to protect the owner of the property against the possibility of such people going on to his land, and to give him the opportunity of selecting suitable people to work his country.

Mr. COSTELLO (*Carnarvon*): I also desire to voice my protest against this definition. It is really invading the rights of the landholder's home. The Minister would certainly protest if someone were given authority to enter his home for the purpose of collecting something or other, if he did not desire the presence of such a person.

At 12.48 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. COSTELLO: We are similarly protesting against the Government allowing unwanted people to go upon these properties. The Government intend to register the trappers. In doing so they take a certain amount of responsibility for the action of the trappers. A man with a license may go on to a holding where the holder has his supply of grass or water. There may be a fire as the result of carelessness or otherwise, and the man may have his feed burned right out. Are the Government going to accept the responsibility and pay compensation for the grass and the resultant injury to the stock?

There is another important question—that of water. Very often—on small holdings of 2,560 acres—such as have been referred to, the only available water is in a dam. If a trapper goes on to a property with his packhorses and destroys the water, who is going to be responsible? Will the Crown be responsible, or will the poor unfortunate selector be compelled to suffer the loss? There is nothing in the Bill to say how many horses a trapper may take on to a property. During a time of drought, if a selector has a little grass and a small quantity of water

which he is saving for his own stock, the trapper will immediately use his permit to go on to that country and his horses will eat up the grass and drink the water. In such a case who is going to be responsible for the damage done by these trappers?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): The hon. member for Carnarvon has painted a very harrowing picture of what might happen to the owner of land under certain circumstances.

Mr. COSTELLO: It is happening every day.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If it does happen, it does not happen under the Bill we are discussing now. I cannot accept the amendment, because it really interferes with a vital principle of the Bill. The first principle of the Bill is a recognition that all native animals are the property of the Crown. These native animals are migratory, and it is proposed to establish boards to grant permits for the securing of these animals. That being so, the definition of "Holding" is necessary. I know that members of the Opposition wish to deny the right of the Crown to establish boards to issue permits to go on any lands except Crown lands. If that were agreed to, we might just as well put the Bill in the waste paper basket, because "Crown Land" as defined by the Lands Act does not include pastoral leases and it does not include special leases, selected lands, or freeholds. The Bill would be absolutely worthless if we did not allow trapping to take place on those holdings. Hon. members opposite have admitted that it is necessary to declare native animals the property of the people. The Bill makes it quite clear that native animals are the property of the Crown, and it seeks to make it possible for those native animals—the property of the people—to be trapped under certain circumstances. To provide for that it is necessary to define "Holding."

The power to create sanctuaries will not be taken away. In fact, the power to create sanctuaries can be strengthened. The hon. member for Murrumba has foreeast an amendment giving the Minister power to create sanctuaries without the approval or sanction of the owner. Quite a number of sanctuaries have been created during my term of office at the special request of the owners of the land. For the benefit of the Committee, I will give the names of those sanctuaries that have been created during my term of office.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. gentleman will not be in order in doing that.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The whole principle of the Bill is involved in this amendment. If it is carried, the Bill might as well be scrapped. It is necessary to define the holdings in respect of which permits shall be granted. I went very carefully into the definition of "Holding," and I had the definition altered after it had been submitted to the Crown Law Department. I want to make it clear that it does not apply to areas of less than 4 square miles. I thought that was the proper thing, because under the Land Act in closely settled areas the maximum area of a grazing farm—and that has only been granted in a few cases where the land is of an inferior nature—is 2,560 acres, so that I have been careful to exclude the small areas in settled districts from the operations of the Bill. The definition now provides that the holdings to which the Act applies shall have an area of over 4 square miles, and that will apply both to leasehold and freehold lands.

Later on I shall endeavour to give the Committee information as to the number of sanctuaries which have been created during my term of office, showing that I quite realise the necessity for setting apart areas for the purpose of preserving native fauna, and that policy will be continued. If it is necessary at any time to set apart further sanctuaries to preserve these animals, it will be done; but I cannot accept the amendment, because it would practically destroy the whole Bill. The definition set out in the Bill in my opinion is liberal.

Mr. MORGAN: Increase the area to 5,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think it would be wise.

Mr. MORGAN: There are many small grazing farms of 5,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is quite true, but I think that the area provided in the definition is quite generous enough. The board will have power to decline to issue permits, if it thinks it is not wise to trap on small holdings, or it could issue a permit to the owner of the holding.

Mr. HARTLEY: Will the owner have any right to object to the board?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He can protest. His real right is contained in the fact that the landowners will elect one member of the board to represent them.

Mr. MORGAN: It does not say so in the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I object to the suggestion that the chairman of the board, who would be a public servant, will be biased in favour of either the trapper or the property-owner. As I said in my second reading speech, the chairman may be an officer of the Lands Department who has a knowledge of the rights, difficulties, and anxieties of the man who pays the rent. I have no doubt that the chairman of the board will exercise his power wisely.

There is just one other word I wish to say with regard to the desire to exclude freehold land from the operations of the Bill. It must be recognised by hon. members opposite and also by hon. members on this side that, owing to the extensive areas held both as freehold and leasehold, there is really no power to prevent the trappers from going on the land now. But the board, when it is set up, will be a guarantee to those concerned that they will get fair and reasonable treatment. The representative of the trappers on the board will see that undesirables are not granted permits so as to bring the trappers into disrepute, and the stockowners' representative on the board will see that their interests are safeguarded; and it will be to the interest of the chairman, who is a public servant, to see that a fair deal is granted to all parties concerned. For these reasons I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would point out again to the Minister that the reasons which justify allowing people to go on to

leasehold or freehold land for the purpose of trapping or shooting under [2 p.m.] the Marsupial Boards Acts does not apply in the case of the opossum and the bear. It does apply to the wallaby, kangaroo, emu, dingo, and fox, because they have been declared to be pests, and they should be destroyed on freehold or leasehold property

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Provided the board gives permission.

Mr. MORGAN: That is so—provided the board gives the trappers permits.

Mr. FOLEY: The same applies under this Bill.

Mr. MORGAN: This Bill is introduced for the purpose of dealing with opossums and bears and native birds, and the reasons for allowing a trapper or shooter to go on to freehold or leasehold land for destroying the animals I have mentioned does not apply in the case of the opossum and the bear, so that the contention that a law is already in existence which enables people to go on to private property does not apply.

Mr. FOLEY: It is a similar law.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes; but the animals concerned in the other case are pests. They do harm to the progress of Queensland; but the Minister cannot say that the bear or opossum does any harm whatever. I have received this telegram from Rolleston, which I think is in the electorate of the hon. member for Leichhardt—

> "Find you take active part Animals and Birds Bill. Ask your assistance to delay progress of Bill to have amendment certain clauses. Letter following."

That is from the secretary of the Trappers and Scalpers' Association.

Mr. FOLEY: I received that, too.

Mr. MORGAN: Apparently the members of that association are not satisfied with the Bill in its present form. They have some amendments they would like to make in the Bill, and I think an association of that description has a right to be considered. We ought to know what their amendments are.

Mr. FOLEY: All they desire can be done by regulation.

Mr. MORGAN: I have also been approached by various trappers in my electorate, and I have been told by quite a number of them that they do not desire that permits shall be issued to enable them to go upon freehold or leasehold property unless the holders are agreeable. At the present time a great number of men have the permission of the occupiers of the land to snare on their country, because they are trustworthy individuals. They may have worked around the station for many years, assisting to destroy the dingo, the wallaby, and the kangaroo, and other animals that destroy the grass. These men are allowed to go on to that country without having to pay any fee whatever. I understand from the snarers that there are very few cases in which those who desire to snare these animals are charged any royalty or fee. It seems absurd to give to certain people who may be undesirable the right to enter private property, where they may indulge in the use of cyanide. I have known some men who use cyanide, but, unfortunately, that cannot be proved.

Mr. CARTER: Very few good trappers use cyanide.

Mr. MORGAN: No good trappers use cyanide. It is only the lazy man who does not care a rap about the industry who uses cyanide. The point I want to make is that this Bill is not going to find favour with people who snare opossums and bears during the open season, and when the season is closed engage in the trapping of wallabies and dingoes. It is the Government's policy—a policy with which I quite agree—to subdivide land into 5,000-acre blocks for the purposes of sheep-raising, mixed farming, etc.; and if there are a few opossums and bears on that country, the man who takes up the country should have the right to destroy those animals if he so desires. During the last year the only means of livelihood for many men on the land was the snaring of a few opossums on their own property, which enabled them to pay their rental and meet other urgent commitments. It is absolutely wrong to allow a board to issue a permit to any person to go on a property for purposes of snaring when the owner of that property urgently requires the opossums and bears for himself. If the Minister will not agree to the deletion of the whole of the definition, I hope that he will accept an amendment to make the area 5,000 acres instead of 2,560 acres.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I very heartily support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla. The Bill aims a very serious blow at the rights of ownership. There was a time when a man's home was considered to be his castle, but apparently that right is being taken away little by little. The amendment is an exceedingly wise one in the interests of the country. We have arrived at a period in our lives when large estates are being cut up, and now the small area is coming into vogue. We have arrived at that period. If the Minister does not accept the amendment, a very great injury will be done to settlement.

The lambing season is a particularly serious time in connection with sheep-breeding, and it so happens that the lambing time is the best opportunity for the trappers. To allow trappers to go on to sheep country at lambing time would be a very serious interference with the industry. The same remarks apply to cattle-breeding. A man with an area of 2,560 acres, in addition to lamb-raising or cattle-breeding, might also indulge in agriculture, and to give men not altogether at times in sympathy with his avocation the right to go in and out of his property at a time when it is desirable they should not go there will have a serious effect on land settlement. Some hon. members may discount a statement of that kind, but we have to study the men settled on our land more than we have ever studied them, and make them contented with their lot. The contentment arises largely from the contentment of their women folk, and we know that there have been occasions when a grave interference has taken place with regard to the sacredness of home life. There is also the danger of fire as a result of carelessness on the part of anyone entering the property.

The generosity of the Government in connection with this Bill passes understanding. There is no need for it. Surely the country is wide enough without giving the latitude which this Bill proposes to give! The

Government are out for more revenue, and from that standpoint alone the amendment should be considered, because it will preserve greater areas for the constant growth and development of the opossum and bear, whose furs are so costly and coming into greater requisition every year. In the interests of the Government themselves—and they are at all times out for the dollars—consideration should be given to the amendment.

There is another phase of our land settlement life that is going to be interfered with by the passing of the Bill. We should do all in our power to preserve the rights of ownership of the land. We are invading the individual rights of man little by little, and giving undue authority and greater recognition to the man who is simply a casual as against the more permanent settler. I hope that the Minister will see his way to accept the amendment, and if he cannot do that, that he will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Murilla, and double the area of the holding which cannot be entered by the trapper without the consent of the owner. Even that area would be far too small, but it is a fair compromise under all circumstances.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): There are two points of view from which we have to regard this clause—the point of view of the interests of the opossum and the bear, and the point of view of the person holding the land, and who may protect the opossum to save himself from loss and annoyance by trappers. I think that at present the animals have not much protection, but they certainly are protected to a small extent by the owner of the land preventing trappers going on his land in some instances. That protection is going to be taken away. The Government propose to issue licenses to enable trappers to go on land whether the owner likes it or not, and the animals will then have no protection whatever. Even now the small holdings are altogether killed out.

Then we have the point of view of the larger landholder—the man who has a lease from the Crown, or who is a freeholder. His industry is worth more to the country than the value of the skins, whether they be opossum, bear, or any other skins. When these licenses are issued trappers will be able to go out and do practically what they like. It will be impossible to enforce the restrictions of the Act. These men will kill as they like, and, as a rule, they have no regard for anything. The general rule is to look after one's own business, and the trapper looks after his business, which is to get as many skins as he can——

Mr. COSTELLO: And as quickly as he can.

Mr. DEACON: And as quickly as he can. He does not care about the interests of the owner of the land. If there is a mare about to foal and there happens to be an opossum or a bear in its vicinity, the trapper shoots, and does not care much for the safety of the mare. It does not matter what restrictions are put on him, he will do this sort of thing. You cannot go round the paddocks watching him. Who is going to follow a trapper over a large area of country and see that he complies with the provisions of the Act? It is an impossibility. For the sake of the country we should protect the larger interests which are involved, and these are certainly the interests of the landholder. There are more people dependent directly and indirectly upon the land than there are dependent upon the opossum and the bear. The Government are endeavouring to confine the stockowner to a course of action which he may not like; and in that event there is nothing to stop him from poisoning out all the native fauna on his land. If the trappers are going to be a menace to him and too much of a nuisance, he will have to protect himself, and he will probably kill out every native animal on his holding. The native animals will be given no more protection than they have at present, and in the landowners they will have another enemy in addition to the trapper. Men who are known to be respectable and trustworthy have no difficulty now in getting permission to trap on freehold land. As a rule the settler does not care for wild animals, and, if a trapper can be trusted, he is allowed to go on to his land and carry on his calling. It appears to me that the object of this Bill is to give permission to trappers to go on to land even though the owner of the land objects.

Mr. FOLEY: Provided that he complies with certain conditions.

Mr. DEACON: The board will not bind the trapper, who will not care a hang. The trapper is not watched, and he can do what he likes; and he does it. The only protection is to give the owner of the land power to turn the trapper off if he thinks necessary. If you remove that power, the owner of the land will be placed in an impossible position. The Minister should consider some modification of the definition in the interests of the selectors, who deserve more consideration than the trappers.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): Hon. members opposite do not seem to care a "tinker's curse" whether a trapper goes on to a leasehold or not, but they appear to have some particular dislike to a trapper going on to freehold country. The work of taking the opossum and the bear is very similar to that of destroying pests like dingoes and marsupials. Under the Marsupial Boards Act a board is created, which has power to make certain by-laws, and the trapper when he receives a permit is compelled to conform to the by-laws passed by the board, and, if he unnecessarily disturbs stock or does not make the necessary provision for protection against fire, the selector can bring it under the notice of the board, and the permit may be cancelled.

The same thing will apply under this Bill. Trappers in the various districts will apply to the board for permits to trap on certain country. The board, after receiving applications, will go into the whole question. It will have power, under the regulations, to pass by-laws, and to insist on the trappers conforming to those by-laws. The trapper is just as law-abiding as a member of Parliament. That is his calling, and he recognises that, if he does not conform to the by-laws, and disturbs stock unnecessarily, his permit will be cancelled, and he will be deprived of an opportunity of earning his livelihood in that calling. The experienced trapper does not unnecessarily disturb stock. Under the Marsupial Boards Act, before a trapper can go on to any holding, he must give notice to the squatter or selector. I take it that the boards to be created under this Bill will pass similar by-laws, so that, if necessary, selectors will have an opportunity to remove their stock from country where a trapper may be operating during

the open season. If that is done, fat stock will not be disturbed unnecessarily.

With regard to disturbance of stock, an experienced trapper does not go about the bush at night with a flare torch and a pea rifle to earn his living. He carries on an occupation which is very hard work for a period of two or three months. He lets the snares do their work at night, and he carries on his work in the day time of skinning bears and opossums and preserving their skins.

In regard to the women folk of our selectors being in fear of marauders or trappers going on to the selections and interfering with them, the districts in Queensland where the opossum exists are mostly isolated districts away back in the ranges and a considerable distance from civilisation, with the result that no women folk will be molested. The arguments put forth by the Opposition carry no weight whatever. It just shows the old instinct of the Opposition to look after the interests of the landowners of the State without giving any consideration to those who do not own land and who are compelled to carry out their calling as trappers.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Many of the trappers are landowners.

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

AYES 33.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hanson
,, Bedford	,, Hartley
,, Bertram	,, Hynes
,, Brennan	,, Kirwan
,, Bruce	,, Land
,, Bulcock	,, Larcombe
,, Carter	,, McCormack
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Conroy	,, Riordan
,, Cooper, F. A.	,, Ryan
,, Cooper, W.	,, Smith
,, Dash	,, Theodore
,, Dunstan	,, Weir
,, Ferricks	,, Wellington
,, Foley	,, Winstanley
,, Gillies	,, Wright
,, Gledson	

Tellers: Mr. Hanson and Mr. Riordan.

NOES 21.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Maxwell
,, Barnes, G. P.	,, Moore
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Morgan
,, Clayton	,, Nott
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Costello	,, Sizer
,, Deacon	,, Swayne
,, Edwards	,, Taylor
,, Fry	,, Vowles
,, King	,, Warren
,, Logan	

Tellers: Mr. Clayton and Mr. Edwards.

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Pease	Mr. Peterson
,, Gilday	,, Bell
,, Payne	,, Edwards
,, Stopford	,, Petrie
,, McLachlan	,, Kelso

Resolved in the affirmative.

[2.30 p.m.]

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"After line 45, page 2, insert the following paragraph:—

'In paragraph (iv.) of section four, the words 'any Crown land, and with the consent of the owner or occupier thereof any other land' are repealed, and the words, 'any specified area of land (whether Crown land or not),' are inserted in lieu thereof.'"

At the present time the Minister's powers are absolutely cramped, and in cases which I have brought before him it has been quite impossible for him to meet the wishes of the producers.

This clause will give the Minister power to proclaim sanctuaries in any part of the State, irrespective of whether the owner is willing or unwilling to give his consent, or is absent and unable to give his consent. I need not labour the question, as it must be obvious to hon. members that it would be wise to give the Minister this power. I hope he will accept the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): The hon. member for Murrumba was good enough to indicate to me a few moments ago that he intended to move this amendment, and I believe it will be a good thing to have this power under the Act. The amendment gives the Minister power to proclaim any area a sanctuary, irrespective of whether it is Crown land or not, and I have very much pleasure in accepting the amendment.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment (*Mr. Warren*) agreed to.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I do not like the wording of subclause (4)—

"After section eight the following sections are inserted:—

8A. It is hereby declared that for the purposes of this Act all animals and birds and all skins thereof, until lawfully taken or killed, are the property of the Crown."

I therefore beg to move the following amendment:—

"On line 56, page 2, after the word 'birds,' insert the words 'upon Crown lands.'"

That will give to the Crown the right to all animals and birds and the skins thereof on lands held by the Crown, but it is not right to take from the holders of land, particularly freeholders, any rights or possibilities of profit they may have. On every occasion which presents itself there seems to be a determined desire on the part of the Government to carry out their policy of abolishing freehold by gradually confiscating the rights enjoyed by the landholder. Although hon. members on the Government benches, including the Premier, do not admit that they are right out for confiscation, they agree that that is the ultimate aim and object and intention of their policy. It is the policy of the Government eventually to confiscate all means of production, and confiscate all the rights of individuals and place them in the hands of the Crown. This clause is following out the decided policy of the Government. On all occasions when we have Bills dealing with the man on the land, there seems to be an attempt to work in some means of confiscating something. On the one hand we have all sorts of pinpricks, and on the other hand we have these attempts to take away the advantages

which have always been enjoyed by the landowners.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a declaration of the rights of the people.

Mr. CORSER: It is a declaration of the determination of the mob, and it is a declaration on the part of the Government that they intend to take and have and hold all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. This clause is following along that line of policy. Although they do not believe it is possible at the present time to confiscate everything, they believe it can be accomplished by a system of adopting stepping-stones towards their goal. This Bill is accomplishing something to bring about that objective.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: In years gone by the kanaka was brought to Queensland against his will.

Mr. CORSER: That was not a bad thing for the hon. gentleman. We do not blame him for that. He is a Cabinet Minister now, and——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: My object in moving the amendment is to give those who own the land the right to the skins of opossums, bears, and other animals on their own territories. At the same time it will preserve to the Crown the right over Crown lands that is enjoyed to-day. It is only a small measure of confiscation; still, it is the principle we object to, and we want to preserve the rights of owners of existing holdings.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Kuchan*): I have no intention of accepting the amendment. As I have already said, if an amendment of this character was accepted, we might as well consign the Bill to the waste-paper basket. The definition of "Crown lands" under the Land Act is—

> "All land in Queensland, except land which is, for the time being—
>
> (*a*) Lawfully granted or contracted to be granted in fee-simple by the Crown; or
>
> (*b*) Reserved for or dedicated to public purposes; or
>
> (*c*) Subject to any lease or license lawfully granted by the Crown:
>
> "Provided that land held under an occupation license shall be deemed to be Crown land."

That means that practically the whole of the grazing areas of this State, comprising two-thirds of the area of Queensland, and the whole of the freehold land would be exempt from the operation of the Bill, notwithstanding the fact that opossums and bears, which are of a migratory nature, might be on those lands. There is no sense in moving such an amendment, unless it is with the idea of destroying the Bill.

Amendment (*Mr. Corser*) negatived.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On line 8, page 3, omit the words 'at the prescribed rate,' and insert the words—
>
> 'not to exceed 5 per cent. on the estimated marketable value of such skin or bird.'"

The object of the amendment is to make the clause more definite, and to make the royalty chargeable not at so much per skin, but on the value of the skin. The Minister knows that a large number of skins are more valuable than others, and if the royalty to be charged is going to be at the flat rate of 1s.——

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I did not suggest that the royalty should be 1s. per skin. I pointed out that if a royalty, say, of 1s. per skin—the royalty charged in Western Australia is 1s. 6d.—a certain amount of revenue could be raised.

Mr. MOORE: We want to have the royalty based on the value of the skin. The Minister mentioned that the amount received for the sale of marsupial skins last year was £300,000. A charge of 5 per cent. on that amount would bring in a revenue of £15,000. Surely that amount would be ample to provide for the expenses required to administer this Bill. It has been stated that the royalty has not been imposed for the purposes of revenue, but to ensure the proper administration of the Act. The royalty will be utilised to pay inspectors and rangers to see that the provisions of the various clauses and regulations are observed. Consequently, the rate I suggest should be sufficient. It seems a shame to take such a large amount of money from the trappers when it is not required to administer the Act. We consider the principle of taking a percentage not to exceed 5 per cent. on the value of the skins received would be a better method than to charge a fixed amount per skin, and that method would provide ample funds to administer the Act effectively, and to pay a number of inspectors to supervise its operations. Such a provision would not be taking more from the industry than would ensure the efficient administration of the Act. It is a better principle to fix the royalty on the basis of value, rather than on the basis of so much per individual skin.

Mr. COSTELLO (*Carnarvon*): I have pleasure in supporting this amendment. The Minister will be very wise from his own point of view in the administration of the Act if he accepts it. If the hon. gentleman charges a fixed price as a royalty, it will no doubt cause discontent among the trappers, and representations will be made to the hon. gentleman pointing out the injustice of the imposition. The trappers will say that the board has fixed an excessive rate, particularly if that rate is 1s. per skin, as suggested by the Minister in his second reading speech. There are times when skins do not reach a very high price—times even when they have practically no commercial value; for instance, such opossums as "reds" and "rumpers," which were worth only about 1s. 6d. to 2s. each in the last market. It would be very unwise to have a fixed rate per skin. The amendment will place the matter on a simpler and fairer basis. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment, which will give satisfaction to all concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I certainly think the amendment of the leader of the Opposition is a reasonable one. According to an opinion which has been given to me by a gentleman in whom I have every confidence, the figures quoted by the Minister the other day are very much inflated. If the figures supplied by this gentleman are correct, the value received from skins last year was nearer to £160,000 or £170,000 than £300,000. Instead of the average value being 5s. or

6s., it is somewhere in the vicinity of 3s. or 4s., whilst some skins were sold at 10d. each.

Mr. FOLEY: Very few.

Mr. TAYLOR: There may not have been very many; still there were some. The price of skins is really determined by the fashions of the day. As we know, fashions, especially so far as women are concerned, change continually, and these skins may reach a very low value indeed. The amendment is a reasonable one, and should meet all the requirements. It certainly will not harass the industry. One of the strong points brought out in the speech of the hon. member for Murilla when speaking on the Bill was that 6,600 trappers will be affected, according to last year's figures, and, taking the value of the skins as £300,000, the average income per trapper would be about £45 a year. If we want the trappers to continue in the business, I certainly think the amendment is absolutely necessary, because, if the royalty is to be anything like what we are told is the royalty charged in the other States, you will drive every trapper out of business.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I have been approached by trappers in connection with the royalty which the Government propose to levy on opossum and bear skins. This is a matter that concerns the trapper very much. All skins are not of the same value. For instance, "super blues" are much more valuable than any other opossum skins. On the other hand, "reds" and "rumpers" are of very little value. The "rumpers" may not be worth 1s., yet the Minister proposes to impose a royalty of 1s. on all skins. That seems to be a wrong method to adopt. It is not a fair thing to charge the same amount of royalty on a skin worth 12s. 6d. as on a skin worth only 5s. Then again, there are considerable numbers of young opossums snared, and, if a royalty of 1s. per skin is charged, these young skins may be wasted, as the trapper may think the young opossums not worth skinning. The same thing applies in the case of the "rumpers." The fairest way would be to charge a royalty not exceeding 5 per cent. of the value. According to the figures given to us by the Minister, during 1923—the last season that trapping was allowed—opossum skins to the value of £300,000 were taken. I think the season was only open for two months, and during those two months the trappers, according to the Minister, obtained opossum skins to the value of £300,000. Five per cent. on £300,000 would give £15,000, and, in my opinion, that is quite sufficient for the board to work on in addition to the royalty that would be received on other skins. They would receive a royalty on bear skins during the open bear season, and the Minister told us that the value of bear skins taken during the last open bear season was equal to the value of the opossum skins taken in 1923. Therefore the Minister would get under our proposal at least £30,000, while under his own proposal he would get £60,000 from opossum skins, and he ought to get a similar amount from bear skins. That would be a total of £120,000. It is ridiculous to say that we require that amount of money out of the industry.

The Minister said the Bill was not introduced for the purpose of producing revenue. If that is so, why collect from the industry more than is necessary to carry out the provisions of the Bill? Under the amendment the Government would receive at least £15,000 a year, if not £20,000, from opossums alone. That would be quite sufficient to carry out all the work necessary, and give all the protection needed to foster the industry. Then again, it is well known that the skins of the opossums in North Queensland are of less value than the skins of the opossums in Central Queensland. If the proposal of the Minister is carried, it will mean that the trappers in the Northern portion of the State, although they will receive from 25s. to 30s. per dozen less for their skins, will have to pay the same amount of royalty as those who are trapping the more valuable opossums in the South. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment, which will leave him plenty of scope to obtain all the money required. We should make the Bill as complete as possible while it is going through the Committee, as it is undesirable continually to have to bring in regulations to extend the scope of legislation. If we have to impose taxation on the people in the industry, we should let them know definitely what it will be. I have pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): Apparently the Opposition agree with the principle of imposing a royalty on opossum and bear skins. From observation and from inquiries I have made I have not found any trappers object to a reasonable royalty on the skins they have trapped, provided the royalty is used for the purpose of preserving and properly protecting the industry. I think that the Bill as it stands gives all the necessary powers. The wording of the Bill is—

"Royalty at the prescribed rate."

It appears that the Opposition are afraid to trust the Minister for fear he may impose an undue royalty upon the skins.

Mr. MORGAN: He spoke of imposing a royalty of 1s. a skin.

Mr. FOLEY: I can assure the Opposition, from discussions I have had with the Minister, that the trapper will be quite safe if the matter is left in the Minister's hands. The impression has got abroad that it is the intention of the Minister to impose a flat rate of 1s. per skin, but that is erroneous The Minister made no such suggestion in his second reading speech, when he spoke at length in reply to the remarks of Opposition members, and removed any misunderstanding which existed on that point.

After the merchants in the skin trade in Brisbane receive the skins from the trappers —I am speaking particularly of opossum skins—they grade them from "top blues" right down to "rumpers" and "damaged skins." There are from twenty to twenty-four different grades. It would be ridiculous for anyone to think that the Minister would impose any fixed rate upon the different grades of skins which bring very different values. There is nothing wrong with the principle of charging a royalty on a percentage basis according to their value, but it would be much safer to allow the matter to remain in the control of the Minister, who, after thorough investigation into the matter, can arrive at what revenue is required properly to administer the Act, and strike a royalty accordingly. Speaking on behalf of the trappers I represent, I feel confident that the Minister will not impose any undue royalty upon them.

[3 p.m.]

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 2 (*Mr. Moore's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hanson
,, Bedford	,, Hynes
,, Bertram	,, Kirwan
,, Brennan	,, Land
,, Bruce	,, Larcombe
,, Bulcock	,, McCormack
,, Carter	,, Mullan
,, Collins	,, Riordan
,, Conroy	,, Ryan
,, Cooper, F. A.	,, Smith
,, Cooper, W.	,, Theodore
,, Dash	,, Weir
,, Dunstan	,, Wellington
,, Foley	,, Winstanley
,, Gillies	,, Wright
,, Gledson	

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Riordan.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Logan
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Maxwell
,, Clayton	,, Moore
,, Corser	,, Morgan
,, Costello	,, Nott
,, Deacon	,, Roberts
,, Edwards	,, Sizer
,, Elphinstone	,, Swayne
,, Fry	,, Taylor
,, Kerr	,, Vowles
,, King	,, Warren

Tellers: Mr. Costello and Mr. Fry.

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Pease	Mr. Peterson
,, Gilday	,, Bell
,, Payne	,, Edwards
,, Stopford	,, Petrie
,, McLachlan	,, Kelso

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On line 45, page 3, insert the words—
>
> 'The following provision is added to section nine:—
>
> 'A person who has been convicted of an offence under paragraph (ii.) of this section shall not be eligible to be granted or hold a permit under this Act. In any prosecution for an offence aginst this Act, any person who has been convicted of an offence under the said paragraph (ii.) shall be deemed to have been and to have acted without a permit at the time in question, notwithstanding that at that time he was the holder of a permit.'"

The amendment means that, if a person is convicted under the principal Act for using cyanide, he shall not have the right to hold a permit to trap, and also, if at the time a person receives a permit it is not known by the board that there is a conviction against him, he shall be held to be in the same position as a person who is trapping without a permit. Fully 90 per cent. of those engaged in the industry support me in my contention that we cannot be too strict in provisions relating to the use of cyanide, which, in my opinion, is a crime. I believe that, with the use of cyanide, only one out of every three opossums that are destroyed is collected. In certain areas where the native bear is protected, the poor unfortunate animal is destroyed in the same way as the opossum through the use of cyanide. I do not think anyone stands for the use of cyanide in this industry. It is known that cattle are destroyed by this means, and many valuable animals have perished. An animal whose skin is valuable may be discovered dead, but the carcase may be too decomposed to be of any use. A person who has been convicted of using cyanide should not be allowed to engage in the industry again. The principal Act contains provision for the imposition of a fine on a person guilty of using cyanide, and, if the amendment is accepted, a person who has been so convicted after the Bill is passed will not have the right to a permit to trap. I have known police magistrates in the Western districts impose a paltry fine of £10 on men who have been convicted of this offence. It is ridiculous that a man who causes the wilful destruction of these animals in this way should be allowed to go scot free with a fine of £10. He might have obtained £500 for skins by the use of cyanide.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Kidman was fined £10 the other day for not sending in his income tax return.

Mr. MORGAN: That is a paltry offence, as compared with the poisoning of valuable stock by these men.

Mr. FOLEY: Is that fine not recognised as punishment under the British law?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. There are certain clauses in the Liquor Act which disqualify a licensed victualler from holding a license after he has been convicted a certain number of times. We know that it is very difficult to secure a conviction in the cases I have mentioned, and the police complain that it is almost impossible to do so. If we do obtain a conviction against a man for using cyanide he should be refused a license.

Mr. FOLEY: Would that apply to a man who has been convicted in the past?

Mr. MORGAN: No, only to men who are convicted after the passing of this Bill. When men in the past were convicted, they would not be liable to the penalty which is now proposed. I would not suggest a conviction such as in the bribery case; but when people commit crime with their eyes open and know the penalty they are likely to suffer if caught, then they are less likely to commit the crime.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Enoggera*): I cannot accept the amendment. It is certainly a most serious offence to use cyanide to catch opossums, and section 7 of the principal Act makes provision for a heavy penalty being imposed on any person who wilfully kills any animal during the close season; but whether a person should be disqualified for life from engaging in this particular calling after paying the penalty provided by law is another question. It is an accepted principle that, when a man pays a fine, he pays the penalty for his offence and is a free man again. It would be reasonable to disqualify a person for a certain period after he had been convicted.

Mr. BULCOCK: What about providing that he be disqualified if he be convicted on more than one occasion? It would be very hard to disqualify him for one offence.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about disqualifying him for two years?

Mr. MORGAN: I am prepared to accept that.

Mr. CORSER: There might not be an open season next year.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It might so happen that there would be no season the following year either.

Mr. MORGAN: What do you suggest—two years?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I suggest that after the word "Act," where it first occurs in the hon. member's amendment, he should insert the words "during the two years after the date of conviction." If the hon. member adds those words, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: Will you make it three years? There may not be a close season during those two years.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I think two years is a fair thing.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it the hon. member for Murilla is prepared to accept the Minister's suggestion?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. I ask leave to amend the amendment by the insertion of the words suggested by the Minister. The amendment will then read—

> "A person who has been convicted of an offence under paragraph (ii.) of this section shall not be eligible to be granted or to hold a permit under this Act during the two years after the date of conviction. In any prosecution for an offence against this Act, any person who has been convicted of an offence under the said paragraph (ii.) shall be deemed to have been and to have acted without a permit, at the time in question, notwithstanding that at that time he was the holder of a permit."

Amendment (*Mr. Morgan*), as amended, agreed to.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "After line 45, page 3, insert the following new subclause:—
>
> (7) The provision of this section shall not apply to dingoes, foxes, hares, or rabbits."

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I had a previous amendment to move, which is almost similar to that of the Minister, except that it embraces kangaroos, wallabies, and emus, in addition to the animals mentioned. The kangaroo, wallaby, and emu are pests which are doing a considerable amount of damage. The Government now propose to bring in a Bill which will enable the board to levy royalties on the skins of these animals. Bonuses have been paid by boards and also by individuals for the destruction of the kangaroo, wallaby, and emu, and, of course, the dingo and the fox. The Minister should not interfere in any way with the work of the boards. It seems ridiculous that certain funds have been raised for the purpose of destroying these animals, and people have been taxed for that purpose, and now the Government propose to charge a royalty on such skins. I shall read an extract showing what is happening in Western Australia, where a royalty is in existence at the present time.

This paragraph appeared in the Adelaide "Stock and Station Journal" of 10th September, 1924—

> "The pastoralists in the nor'-west of Western Australia are up in arms against the kangaroo. They are seeking the removal of the royalty payable on skins, and aver that the 'roo has become a menace to the pastoral industry. They have stated that for every million sheep there are now two million kangaroos, which eat nearly all the grass. One man had shot 100,000 in one year, and another individual 2,000,000 in two years."

Then another paragraph appeared in the "Blue Mountain Echo," New South Wales, which reads—

> "As a result of the royalty which was placed some years ago in Western Australia on kangaroo skins, most of the marsupial shooters in that State took on other work as a protest against such royalty being charged. During the past few years the number of kangaroos has increased very greatly, especially in the 'Nor'-West,' where the marsupial was almost unknown a few decades back. One of the chief pastoralists there recently stated, during the course of a deputation on the subject, that the kangaroos were now twice as numerous in the nor'-west as sheep."

The same thing applies, though not to such a great extent, in the western portions of this State. I was told by Mr. Philp, a pastoralist, who attended a recent meeting of the Cattle Breeders' Association, that on a property he has on the other side of Quilpie kangaroos are there in mobs of 100 or more, and that they are continually smashing down the wire netting fences, enabling dogs to get in. I said to him, "Why don't you get men to shoot them?" He said, "The skins are of so little value at present that they will not trouble to shoot the kangaroo." The kangaroos are getting just as numerous in the western portions of Queensland as they are in Western Australia. There are two paragraphs in different papers written by different people, which state that the royalty in Western Australia has proved a failure. One man shot 100,000 kangaroos in a year. That seems an enormous number. One would almost think it is a misprint, but the same figures are quoted in both papers. Notwithstanding the enormous number shot, the skins are of so little value that a trapper could not make a living by shooting them. The same thing applies to wallabies. Why the Government are including the kangaroo, wallaby, and emu in the Bill I do not know. They have certainly exempted the fox, the dingo, and the rabbit. I am very pleased that they have done that, but I would like to see the Minister go still further and exempt the kangaroo, wallaby, and emu. The emu is very destructive, and it carries seed from the prickly-pear for miles. It carries prickly-pear seed from infested districts into clean country, and it is one of the principal agents in the spread of prickly-pear. It also destroys the fences in sheep country. If we are going to encourage the breeding up of pests that we know to be destructive, we are not doing that which is in the interests of the people of Australia.

Mr. RIORDAN: What did that "'roo" shooter do in his spare time? (Laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: It says in this paragraph that one "'roo" shooter shot 100,000 in one year. It does not say whether he was shooting on any particular property. Whether

these figures are correct or not, they show that the kangaroos are increasing very rapidly. There are twice as many kangaroos in North Western Australia as there are sheep, and no one can say that they are as valuable as sheep. Our marsupial boards grant permits to trappers to destroy the kangaroo, the wallaby, the dingo, and the fox on any property, no matter whether it is freehold or whether it is leasehold. Now we are going to have a Bill passed which will enable a board, if it so desires, to protect animals upon which we are paying a stock tax for the purpose of destroying them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government fixed the royalty.

Mr. MORGAN: We have a provision later on under which we are going to allow the board to fix the royalty. When the Government have already passed legislation which enables several boards which are in existence to tax the stockowner for the destruction of these particular marsupial pests, why should they pass another Bill which will enable them to collect a royalty? We may secure a royalty of 6d. or 1s. on kangaroo skins, but they are not of sufficient value for people to destroy them unless they get a bonus for doing so. Unless something is done, kangaroos will increase. The Minister thought the matter was of sufficient importance to bring in this amending Bill, and has adopted the suggestion which I made last year that foxes, dingoes, hares, and rabbits should not be subject to royalties, but the same argument applies to kangaroos. A fox skin is of much more value than a kangaroo or wallaby skin, without getting the board's bonus at all. You can sell a fox skin for at least 10s., if not 15s. The Government do not propose to place a royalty on fox skins because they happen to be valuable fur skins. We want to get rid of the fox, as it does a considerable amount of damage, and we do not want to interfere with men who are engaged in killing foxes. The same should apply to the killing of kangaroos and wallabies, because they are just as much a menace to the sheep as the dingo or the fox.

Mr. FOLEY: You might as well enact a whole list of animals.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member is supposed to be the father of this Bill, and it is brought in for the purpose of getting revenue and to bring into existence a board for the purpose of controlling the opossum and bear industry—two animals which are not a pest to the sheep industry in any shape or form, and different altogether from the kangaroo and wallaby. The Minister would be well advised to include in his amendment the kangaroo and wallaby.

Amendment (*Mr. Gillies*) agreed to.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): Section 12 of the principal Act provides—

> "Any animal or bird taken or killed not within the close season may be bought, sold, consigned, or kept in possession during the ten days next following the commencement of the close season."

I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On line 49, page 3, after the word 'inserted,' insert—
>
> 'The following words are added to the said subparagraph (*a*):—' and the carcase of any such bird may at any time be kept in cold storage for human consumption.'"

We know that in open seasons there are very considerable numbers of birds shot, and they are put into the cold stores in Brisbane and taken out later on as they are required. Many of the shipping companies in Sydney keep a certain amount of game in cold storage, though I do not know whether they do it in Brisbane. The amendment only provides that, when game is placed in cold stores for human consumption, the people placing them there will not be guilty of an offence nor be liable to a fine.

[3.30 p.m.]

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I have no objection to the amendment. I have no desire to interfere with a valuable product.

Amendment (*Mr. Moore*) agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On line 38, page 4, after the word 'revoked,' insert the words—
>
> 'the creation of a board consisting of one representative elected by the trappers, one representative elected by the stockowners, and one representative elected by the local authorities within each district constituted under this Act for the purpose of.'"

I think we should say definitely how the board shall be constituted and how it shall be elected. At the present time we are leaving everything in the hands of the Minister, for the proposed new paragraph will give the Governor in Council power to make regulations, inter alia—

> "authorising the Minister to create a board, consisting of such number of persons as the Minister thinks proper"—

Of course we may be told that we should trust the Minister, but the hon. gentleman will not always be in that position. He may become Premier, or fill some other position, and some other Minister may be in power who may alter the personnel of the board. If we are going to have boards created, let us say definitely how they are to be constituted, as under the Local Authorities Act. They distinctly state how the councils shall be elected, and why should we not do the same in the case of the marsupial board or a board created under this Bill? It is only reasonable.

We all know what leaving everything to the Minister has meant in the past. A Bill has gone away from this House and most important alterations have been made by regulations of which hon. members did not approve at all. I, for one, have always protested against government by regulation, and against too much being left in the hands of Ministers. We have been appointed by the people in our districts as their representatives in Parliament, and we ought to know how boards such as these are to be constituted. We all know that under the system of party politics appointments are likely to be party appointments. I say that with all due respect to the Minister and the Government. The same criticism was levelled against the Liberals when they occupied the Treasury benches. We say that the appointments of the present Government are political, and a number of members opposite make no bones about it. They say that, when a Minister

is making an appointment, he ought to know the political views of the person he appoints, and that, if he is not a supporter of the Labour Government, he has no right to get the job. I think that is a scandalous state of affairs. It means that political influence counts rather than qualifications or experience. I certainly cannot see how the Minister can disagree with the principle contained in the amendment providing for a board consisting of a representative of the trappers, a representative of the stockowners, and a representative of the local authorities. Where could we get any better representation? The stockowners' representative would look after the interests of the stockowners, and the trappers' representative would no doubt look after the interests of the men engaged in that industry, and the local authority within the area will be asked to nominate its representative. If the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment, I hope that he will accept an amendment stating definitely how the board is to be constituted. I am not satisfied with the Minister getting up and saying that the board is going to consist of this, or that, or be constituted by some other mode of appointment. Let it be stated definitely in the Bill, so that no Government or Minister in the future can constitute a board different from that which is provided in the Act unless he obtains power to do so from Parliament. If it is not definitely stated in the Act, the Minister may disband the board, because it is not doing what he considers is a proper thing to be done. He may place on that board certain persons who are of the same political belief as his party. He may place them there in order to obtain political kudos. I am opposed to these poor unfortunate animals being used for political purposes, and that is what is being done under the Bill.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I hope the Minister will not accept the amendment, particularly that portion which provides for the election of one representative by the local authority in each district. I cannot see how this is a local authority question at all. I fear that the Opposition, having failed with some of the amendments they have moved, are now trying to gain their ends by having a representative from the local authorities elected to the board, and thereby maintain the balance of power to the advantage of the landowners. I think that is the object behind the amendment. Where marsupial and dingo boards have been constituted by the election of the persons concerned within the district where those boards are functioning, the difficulty of the Department of Agriculture has been to compel those representatives who were elected to administer the Marsupial Boards Act in the spirit intended by Parliament. In connection with the South Leichhardt Dingo and Marsupial Board the Minister had to go so far as to withhold its subsidy in order to force the board to administer the Act in the proper spirit. Under the proposal that I have discussed on many occasions with the Minister it is his intention to arrange for the creation of the boards by regulation, and he has pointed out during this debate that they will be constituted by the election of a representative of the trappers, a representative of the landowners in the district, and the appointment of a Government representative. That is the fairest method. A public servant, such as the land commissioner, might be appointed as the Government representative. He would have a good knowledge of the requirements of the landowners in the district, and would see that the landowners got a fair deal and that the spirit of the Act was observed in the administration, particularly in regard to the trapper. I hope that the Minister will adhere to something along those lines instead of allowing the local authorities to come into a matter that does not concern them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Leichhardt that this is not a local authority matter at all. I can only repeat what I have already said, that the boards will consist of a representative of the trappers, a representative of the owners, and a Government nominee.

Mr. MORGAN: Will you put that in the Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, I am prepared to accept an amendment to that effect. "Owner" is defined in the Bill as—

> "The person for the time being entitled to possession of a holding."

The draftsman has just pointed out that the hon. member's amendment is not moved in the correct place, and, if the hon. member for Murilla will withdraw his amendment, I will move another amendment along those lines.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I accept the suggestion of the Minister, and ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment (*Mr. Morgan*), by leave, withdrawn.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On lines 44 and 45, page 4, omit the words—
>
> 'such number of persons as the Minister thinks proper,'
>
> and insert the words—
>
> "One representative elected by the trappers, one representative elected by the owners, and one representative appointed by the Minister."

Amendment (*Mr. Gillies*) agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

> "On line 47, page 4, after the word 'district.' insert the words—
>
> 'and fixing a period of close season with respect to the whole or portion of any such district and such animals or birds as may be deemed advisable.'"

The amendment really means that after the board is elected it will have power to fix the duration of a close season as desired. That is certainly a desirable state of affairs. I indicated in my speech on the second reading that the trappers have been used more or less for political purposes. On occasions the Minister has stated definitely—and he was commended by the Press—that the opossum season would not be opened during a certain year. Then an agitation would take place, and those engaged in the industry would have deputations waiting upon the Minister—I have been on them—and petitions have been sent in beseeching the Minister to open the season, and, for political reasons, this has been done even

against the original intention of the Premier and the Secretary for Agriculture. If we take that power out of the hands of the Minister, and put it into the hands of a board on which the trappers are represented, those trappers will have a right to say whether the season shall be opened or closed. It is not right to leave the matter to the discretion of the Minister, when people may be able to persuade him to act contrary to his conscientious desire.

Mr. FOLEY: Would not the same thing apply to the board?

Mr. MORGAN: It would be a different thing altogether. The board is separate and distinct, and would not be approached for political purposes.

Mr. FOLEY: Have you not approached councils?

Mr. MORGAN: Never as a member of Parliament have I interfered with the working of a board or a council.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: I want to show that, if the opening and closing of seasons is taken out of the hands of the Minister, and left with the board, there will be no necessity for members of Parliament to use their influence in any shape or form. We know that elections in some electorates may be won or lost through this sort of action. The present Government have refused to open the season just prior to an election. Such an incident occurred before the election in 1923, when the Premier stated distinctly in my electorate that the season would not be opened, and the Minister also made similar statements, yet the season was opened a little before the election——

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not right. You say it occurred just before the election.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes; it was announced that the season would be opened, and, if the hon. member for Normanby were here, he could bear me out. I believe some of the trappers—trappers who support the Labour cause—waited on the Premier and urged that the season should be opened, and this was done in order to secure the votes of those trappers.

In an electorate such as my own, as well as in the Leichhardt and other electorates, we know this is a political question. We know that a great number of trappers vote one way or the other according to whether the opossum season is opened or not. If the Government had not opened the season just prior to the last election, they would have lost a number of votes. When the Premier was in my electorate he was asked whether the season would be opened or not, and he said very emphatically that it would not be opened; but no sooner had he left the district than the Labour organisers went throughout the district telling the trappers that the season would be opened on 1st June, and it was opened on that date. There is no denying the fact that these men knew the season would be opened, and many of them had their snares and everything ready to commence operations.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How did that affect the election?

Mr. MORGAN: If these men had not got information before the date of the poll that the season would be opened, they would have voted against the Labour candidates; but owing to the fact that they were told by the Labour organisers in the district that the Government were going to open the season on 1st June, they voted Labour. It makes all the difference in an electorate like mine. If I were Secretary for Agriculture I would not like to have the responsibility of deciding whether the season should be opened or not, because, if 400 or 500 men sent down a petition asking me to open the season, it might cost me my seat in Parliament if I were to refuse. A man would have to be a very strong man to refuse to open the season under the circumstances. The present Minister was not strong enough to refuse because he made an elaborate speech giving reasons why the season should be closed, and the "Courier" and "Daily Mail" had leading articles complimenting the Minister on his attitude; but six weeks afterwards the season was opened, and the opossums were allowed to be slaughtered and snared. That shows that the Minister was not big enough to resist the pressure that was brought to bear upon him.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Native animals have had better protection during my term of office than ever they had previously.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not correct. I went to the Department of Agriculture, and I have got a list extending over the last twenty years showing when the seasons were opened and when they were closed, and it shows that the seasons were opened more frequently by the Labour Government during the war period than ever before.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: For shorter periods. That makes all the difference.

Mr. MORGAN: Previous Governments closed them for three or four years at a time, while since the Labour Government came into office the season has been opened, with one or two exceptions, for a short period every year.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I do not know what are the views of the Minister in regard to this amendment, but I would point out that some years ago the Canadian Government appointed what was known as an Advisory Board to go into this question. The board consisted of honorary members who travelled through various parts of Canada and went very exhaustively into the question of close seasons, the payment of royalties, and so on; and an Act of Parliament was passed by the Canadian Government based on the recommendations of that board. Under the provisions of this Bill, the Minister in the future will be in a much better position than he has been in the past, inasmuch as he will have the advice of the rangers appointed under the Act. He will have the advice of the district boards which will be appointed, and will, therefore, be much better advised in regard to the advisability of closing or opening the season than he has been in the past. In the past he has has had to depend a good deal on evidence submitted by policemen and land rangers who had no idea whether the opossums were numerous in any particular area, as they depended upon prejudiced evidence which they received from trappers and pastoralists. Personally, I do not

Mr. Foley.]

think the amendment is necessary. We must all recognise that the Minister will be conscientious in the administration of this measure, and will not allow political reasons to enter into the question of whether the season should be opened or not. During his term as Minister the seasons may have been opened more occasions than for the same term of a previous Administration but not for long periods, but I have not the actual information at hand just now. If previous Governments had paid more attention to opening the season for shorter periods than they did, opossums and bears would be more plentiful in Queensland than they are to-day. Past Governments at times opened the season for twelve months, and the slaughter went on for the whole of that period, and the animals were not given a chance to breed up.

Mr. MORGAN: That was many years ago.

Mr. FOLEY: No. Just before this Government came into power the season was open for about eight months, and bears were slaughtered during that period. From conversation with opossum trappers, I find that we are doing the right thing by opening up the season for a short period of two or three months. In that time the trapper makes from £150 to £200, which is fair remuneration. At the same time, it is not possible for him to get into touch with all the opossums and bears in any particular area. A great number are missed, and during the ensuing twelve months they have a chance to breed up again.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I cannot agree with the amendment, because the power should rest with the Crown of saying when the opening season shall take place. Certainly, when the boards come into existence, any recommendation they make to me will be viewed as the opinion of those concerned in the industry, and will be carefully considered when fixing the opening of the season.

The hon. member for Murilla disputed my statement that during my term of office greater protection has been given to native animals in this State than hitherto. My statement is borne out by the figures giving the open seasons for opossums for different years—

Year.	Open Seasons.
1909	... 6 months
1910	... 6 months
1911	... 5 months
1915	... 4 months
1916	... 4 months
1917	... 6 months
1918	... 5 months
1919	... 6 months
1920	... 3 months

Mr. MORGAN: It was closed by the Liberal Government for the four years from 1911 to 1915.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then it was closed till 1st May, 1922, and was opened only for two months in 1922 and two months in 1923. That was really only seven months during five years, whereas prior to that the term was generally for six months down to four months. For native bear the figures are—

Year.	Open Seasons.
1915	... 4 months
1917	... 2 months
1919	... 4 months

and the season has been closed ever since. That indicates that I have been carrying out my duty, notwithstanding that prices in those years have been abnormally high. Of course, if prices are low, there is no
[4 p.m.] trapping; but, when prices are high, there is an incentive to trapping. I have had many urgent requests to open the bear season during my administration of the department, but it has been closed since 1919.

I think the power should rest with the Minister, but I can assure hon. members that all reasonable requests made to the Government will be fully considered. If there were an open season in one particular district of, say, four months and the rest of the State had a close season, there would be an inducement to the trappers to take skins from the districts where there were close seasons to the districts where it was open. I repeat that, while I am Minister, very full consideration will be given to the representations made by the boards. I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I much prefer to leave the matter in the hands of the boards. Of course, when there is a necessity for closing the season over the whole of the State, the Minister could do it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We would not have that power if the amendment were carried. The boards would have to be unanimous.

Mr. MOORE: That is not my reading of the amendment. My reading is that the boards would say whether there was a necessity to protect the animals during certain seasons.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: But you say that it may be desirable to close the season over the whole State?

Mr. MOORE: If it is going to be left to the Minister to open the season in any part of the State, it might just as well be left in the hands of a board to say what it would like done in its district. We could establish a custom of opening it in certain districts at certain times and then closing it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The whole thing bristles with difficulties. If the season were open in some districts, trappers would take their skins from the closed districts to the open districts.

Mr. MOORE: At the same time if the season is open for four months, there is no doubt there will be very heavy trapping, although in some cases it does not matter so long as there is an open season which gives the trappers an opportunity to get rid of the skins stored in their barns.

If it is known beforehand that there is going to be a definite period of two years or three years as a close season, the same opportunity is not there for illicit trapping and the hoarding up of skins. The boards operating in certain specified districts will have some knowledge of the number of animals within that district, and will know whether they require protection in that district for a certain period. Presumably these districts will be fairly large and somewhat similar to those defined under the Marsupial Boards Acts. The Minister would be in a better position if the boards were allowed the right to declare whether the season should be closed or opened. He knows that in certain districts strong pressure is brought

to bear by members of Parliament during certain periods of the year when the electors in those various districts desire to have the season opened. The Minister knows perfectly well that on occasions, when the season was opened recently, it would have been far better to have kept the season closed. Pressure was brought to bear by members of Parliament and organisations outside who desired to have the season opened whether it was going to exterminate the animals or not, merely because the price of skins was high. I am not so much concerned about the Bill being a revenue-producing factor or about it providing work for the unemployed during portions of the year as I am about the protection of the animals, to see that they are not wiped out in the way they have been during the last few years. The position is becoming very acute because of the illicit methods adopted by trappers, which have not given the animals a chance at all. Anyone who has moved about the southern part of Queensland must realise that it is a rare thing to see those animals where they used to be plentiful. They are now almost wiped out because of the perpetual harassing by trappers, not only in the open season but in the close season as well. During the close season they keep the skins by them, and when it is opened they are given an opportunity to dispose of them. If power was given to the boards in the various districts, the Act would be effectively and efficiently administered, and the responsibility would be thrown directly on the people interested, with the result that the administration would be more effective in providing protection for the animals.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): The figures given by the Minister disclose that the season has been opened for a greater number of months since 1914 than prior to that year. During the five years prior to 1915 the season was only open for five months, and during the first three or four years of the administration of this Government the season was open for a similar period each year. From 1911-15 the season was closed altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I was talking about the five years that I have been in charge.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister stated that during the time he has been in charge the season was open one year for three months and one year for two months. This Government have opened the season for a greater number of months than previous Governments. During 1911-15 the season was closed altogether, showing that previous Governments did more to protect the opossum than the present Government. I am not going to say that the opossums and bears are protected by a two months' close season. The hon. member for Leichhardt told us that in his district—it applies also in my district, but perhaps not to the same extent—men engage in this industry whether the season is open or not. He stated that skins are hoarded up and disposed of when the season is opened. They are put into dress-cases, taken over the border, and sold in Sydney. I have known men to travel during the close season from the West to Sydney with several dress-cases full of skins. After selling them in Sydney they return to the district. That was at a time when they could not legally sell those skins in Queensland.

Mr. BULCOCK: Are you aware that the tanner in New South Wales has now to sign a declaration that the skins he treats were secured in the season, otherwise he cannot treat them?

Mr. MORGAN: The season in New South Wales is open at a time when the season in Queensland is closed. The tanner would naturally make a declaration that the skins were secured in the open season in New South Wales. I do not agree with the Minister that short seasons preserve the native fauna. Unless we do away with illicit trapping in the close season, the native fauna will become less and less. If the figures quoted by the Minister are correct, it will be found that the figures showing the number of skins taken in the open season of two months last year were greater than in previous years when the season was open for three, four, or six months.

Mr. BULCOCK: Don't you recognise that some of those skins were hidden away in barns until the season opened?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. If the season was open for only one week, the number of skins which would find their way to the market would show an enormous catch for that week. The person who secured those skins in the close season would not attempt to sell them until the season opened because of the risk of being caught. I am sorry that the Minister cannot accept the amendment, as I consider it is one which should be accepted.

Amendment (*Mr. Morgan*) negatived.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

The third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

TULLY SUGAR WORKS AREA LAND REGULATIONS RATIFICATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): There is little to say on the second reading of this Bill. I practically outlined the whole of the proposals contained in the Bill in the initiation stages, and hon. members have since received the Bill and have read its provisions. The regulations referred to are the regulations already in existence under the Sugar Works Act as applying to the Tully sugar works area, and this Bill is merely to validate those regulations so that the control of land settlement in the Tully sugar works area will come within the ambit of the Lands Department. I do not think any further explanation is necessary. I beg to move—

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

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): What the Minister says is quite right regarding the major portion of the Bill, but, when the hon. gentleman was speaking on the introduction of the Bill, he pointed out that clause 11 departed from the proposal that was issued in regulations and that he had altered the basis of valuation for local authority ratings. Unfortunately I find that clause 11 in the Bill is

exactly the same as No. 11 of the regulations. It reads—

> "For the purposes of making valuations under section 218 of the Local Authorities Acts, 1902 to 1923, land held under lease or license under these regulations shall be deemed to be held under lease or license from the Crown under the laws relating to the occupation and use of Crown lands."

About 1920 there was an amendment of the Local Authorities Act in which it was provided that perpetual leaseholds and land held under lease or license from the Crown on which there was a stipulation for clearing noxious weeds and for which a fee-simple could not be obtained was to be valued as if it were freehold. The same rate was to apply as was applied to land of similar quality in the same district. The land in the Tully sugar works area is perpetual leasehold, yet the Government are not following the system of valuing it similarly to freehold land in the same locality. They have gone back to the old idea of valuing it at twenty times the annual rent, which was the old leasehold method.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; it stipulates that, for the purposes of valuation, land held under lease or license under the regulations shall be deemed to be held under lease or license from the Crown under the laws relating to the occupation and use of Crown lands.

Mr. MOORE: That works out at twenty times the annual rental. This does not come within the amended section of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is the intention.

Mr. MOORE: That is not what is here. This goes back to the principle of twenty times the annual rent, and that is one of the reasons why we objected to the regulations going through in the first instance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I was advised that the Bill made provision for valuing leasehold land at the same value as similar freehold land in the neighbourhood.

Mr. MOORE: This goes back to the other principle of twenty times the annual rent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If that is the case I will remedy it.

Mr. MOORE: We discussed the other part of the Bill previously, and I quite agree with the principle of the Bill

Mr. KING (*Logan*): If the Minister gives us his assurance that he will make the slight alteration he has promised I am perfectly satisfied.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I wanted to put the Bill through Committee, but I will get one of my officers to look into the matter, and I will put my other Bill through Committee.

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

The consideration of the Bill in Committee was made an Order for a later hour of the sitting.

ALL SAINTS CHURCH LANDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): This is merely a formal Bill to give the Church of England authority to mortgage certain lands held by them for the purpose of making improvements upon those lands. There is really very little in the Bill, and I do not think it contains anything of a controversial nature. We are only embodying in this Bill a power that the existing trustees already hold, but we are transferring that power from the trustees to the Synod, which is the proper authority to have control of this property.

Mr. FRY: Have they agreed to it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I can assure the hon. member that I would not bring in such a Bill against their wishes. They have approached me on the matter.

Mr. FRY: I was approached on the matter

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Who approached you?

Mr. FRY: The South Brisbane Council.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. member is all at sea. This has to do with the All Saints Church property in North Brisbane, and, of course, the Bill is introduced at the request of the church authorities. I am not proposing to abolish any particular church by this Bill. (Laughter.). I have pleasure in moving—

> "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. KING (*Logan*): As the Secretary for Public Lands has said, this is purely a formal Bill to give the Synod of the Church of England power to mortgage certain lands. Of course a trust deed or a trust settlement must be very strictly construed, and, if the power is not there, it cannot be exercised. This Bill simply gives statutory powers to the trustees to function in the best interests of the trust.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is a little difference. The trustees are not to be displaced, but they cannot mortgage the property without the permission of the Synod.

Mr. KING: Yes, the Synod is the governing body and exercises the power to mortgage

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: As a rule, the minister is the governing body, but in this particular case we are making the Synod the governing body. The Synod will take its responsibility

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

COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

Clauses 1 to 6, both inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

CITY OF BRISBANE BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): Like other hon. members who have spoken, I agree with the principle of this Bill, but I am looking forward to some alteration of its clauses in Committee.

[4.30 p.m.]

The hon. member for Merthyr made the statement in his speech that one reason in favour of the passing of a measure embodying such a great area was that the metropolitan Press was in favour of it. I interjected that such a statement was incorrect, and I desire to quote some newspaper extracts to prove my contention. The "Telegraph" of 17th September, 1924, says—

> "The Bill, however, is, in our opinion, capable of amendments that would be advantageous. We think, with very many others, that the area proposed to be included is too wide, at all events, for the present—that approximately a 5-mile radius would do very well to begin with, provision being made for the merging of outlying districts as the growth of population and other circumstances warranted.
>
> "By taking in the very large area set down in the Bill, the work and problems and difficulties of the new council will be enlarged, and this seems inadvisable for many reasons, one of them being that the council itself will be new and somewhat experimental. The simpler its duties at first—in reason, of course—the better; and while we admire a large, comprehensive policy, while we are in complete sympathy with the general principles of the Bill, we feel that modifications at the beginning of the new era would be wise."

The "Daily Mail" of the same date says—

> "The Bill introduced in the Legislative Assembly in October last to create a Greater Brisbane was manifestly too far-reaching, taking into consideration the great change proposed and the area so vitally affected. The Bill tabled in Parliament yesterday differs radically on important points. Its bulk is approximately the same—two clauses more—but the whole Bill has been recast, and the order of the clauses rearranged. Considering the subject dealt with the Bill is simple in scope and outline. The most noteworthy feature is that it does not make any change in the area to be brought within its scope, so that the Government has disregarded the discussions and recommendations on the point of area to be affected. Most persons experienced in local government were of the opinion that the Government had proposed far too great an area at the outset in joining up two cities, six towns, ten shires, and parts of two other shires, the whole having an area of 380 square miles and a population of 220,000, or more than one-fourth the total population of the State. This is the largest area in any greater city scheme in the world, and, moreover, the numerous boards and local authorities operating within its boundaries complicate the position. It would have been far better if the Government had been content to make a start with the two city and six town local areas, and as the council digested these, to extend the scheme by including contiguous areas. As it is, city and country lands are jumbled together without any community of interests, and even the provision that has been made to operate a differential rate for rural lands does not overcome the objection."

The "Courier" of the same date had this to say—

> "The objection to it has been that it plunges a new council into the administration of a vast area which ought to be assumed by a gradual process. It would have been a much more practicable and workable project to have had the beginning with a purely urban area with provision for the absorption of other areas as development and experience warranted. Whatever inherent wisdom a new council may possess, it will not find it easy to resist a claim from agrarian areas for the same utilities as are given to urban dwellers. For instance, why should not the dwellers out on the D'Aguilar Range or on Paradise road, out beyond Cooper's Plains, be entitled to electric light and sanitary services as well as the denizens of Sandgate or the eastern areas of Bulimba? And the city dwellers may ask why they should be submitted to an invidious system of rating—for we may assume that in the practical administration of the vast area which is to be included in the city of Brisbane there will be differential rating. That is bound to cause considerable difficulty and heartburning. And looking at Schedule 2 of the Bill, which gives the boundaries of the city, it will puzzle even the most indulgent critic of the Home Secretary's Department to find an excuse for the long lines of inclusion in some districts. Thousands upon thousands of acres of far-out and dense bush with no geographical relation to Brisbane whatever have been ringed with the blue of the city boundary."

Those are the opinions of the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT: What does the "Standard" say?

Mr. MAXWELL: I leave the "Standard" for the hon. gentleman to quote. The hon. member for Merthyr quoted the "Standard" and also portion of the articles I have just quoted, but I have gone further than the hon. gentleman, and I have quoted the whole of them. We were told by the hon. member for Merthyr that Mr. H. E. Morton, Engineer for the Melbourne City Council, who is a thoroughly practical and up-to-date man, had indicated that he agreed with the area proposed under the Bill. I have searched through the Press report of the remarks that were made by Mr. Morton, and I cannot see where he expressed himself in favour of the area proposed under the Bill; but I do find that he referred to the acute problem of traffic congestion, which applies to the city proper. How the hon. member for Merthyr has read into the remarks made by Mr. Morton approval of the area proposed under the Bill I cannot understand.

It has been suggested that we should look at what has been done by Glasgow in connection with a scheme such as this, but Glasgow has an area of only 30 square miles, whereas in the case of Brisbane the area within a 5-mile radius is 80 square miles, and the area proposed under the Bill is 385 square miles. No comparison can be made between Glasgow and Brisbane. It is quite another matter with Brisbane with its vast area, waste spaces, and comparatively few people.

It is not my function to deal at the present time with the traffic congestion of the city, but I want to say that with my friend the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, who was associated with me on the Brisbane City Council, we realised the responsibilities of the traffic problem; and suggestions were made with a view to having the traffic coming into the city through one suburb and making its exit through another. When that matter was being discussed by the Brisbane City Council, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley and myself advocated the laying of a tram track along Elizabeth street. A section of the Council laughed at us at the time, but I am pleased to say that the suggestion I made on that occasion has borne good fruit, and such an arrangement has now been made. It was also suggested that the trams should run along Ann street. I realise the difficulties in regard to the congestion of traffic, but I also realise that by adopting this large area of 385 square miles we are not going to solve that problem.

One has only to go to the southern States to realise the position they are in down there. Melbourne—which is looked upon, and I believe is, the queen city of the South—is divided into eight wards. It has an area of 7,740 acres—about 12 square miles—with a population of 103,500. The property within the area is valued at £3,245,000. It is one of the oldest cities in the Commonwealth. The Home Secretary is ambitious, because he desires to extend the operations of the city of Brisbane right to the foot of D'Aguilar Range. The boundaries under the Bill commence at the seafront at Wynnum, go along the seashore, skip across the river from Lytton to Luggage Point, where the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board reserve is, then along to Cribb Island, Nudgee Beach, jumping across Cabbage-tree Creek, then along the seafront from Sandgate to South Pine River, thence along that river proceeding through Kedron, Nundah, and Enoggera to the D'Aguilar Range to Bremer, thence in a direct line through the parish of Indooroopilly until they strike the Goodna Mental Institution.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will leave you there.

Mr. MAXWELL: I might be permitted to say that the hon. gentleman will find himself there if he persists with such an area as this, and asks twenty aldermen to govern it. From Goodna the boundaries come through Oxley, Yeerongpilly to Tingalpa Creek, and back to the point of commencement.

The HOME SECRETARY: Where would you start from?

Mr. MAXWELL: I will tell the hon. gentleman later on. Sydney is an incorporated city. The Brisbane City Council, as the hon. member for Fortitude Valley knows, asked the Government of the day to grant a charter to incorporate the city. It was then proposed to proceed by the process of absorption, and advance on similar lines to those taken in Sydney, Melbourne, and other places. A Bill such as this has been introduced instead. I certainly find fault with the area, as it is rather cumbersome.

I will now proceed to compare the City of Brisbane with the City of Sydney, divided into thirteen wards, which return twenty-six aldermen. It only comprises an area of 3,195¼ acres—less than 5 square miles. Melbourne, with an area of 7,740 acres, is divided into eight wards, and returns thirty-two aldermen. Brisbane, with an area of 385 square miles, is to be governed by twenty aldermen and a mayor. When one compares the position with the position of the older cities of the Commonwealth, he is forced to ask himself whether the Home Secretary has not bitten off rather more than he can digest. If the Minister does not suffer from municipal indigestion after passing a measure like this, then the ratepayers will. I find that Perth comprises an area of 14,433 acres—22½ square miles. It has a population of 154,866. Adelaide, from a town-planning point of view, is the model city of the Commonwealth. There is no doubt about that. It has its town areas, its park lands, its Government lands, its squares, streets, and frontages.

If the hon. gentleman wanted to do something that was going to beautify the city, he would have started with an approximately 5-mile area. By doing that the hon. gentleman would have given the local authorities an opportunity to become absorbed by the Greater City Council when the time suited. Nobody can cavil at the town planning of Adelaide. There they have a total of 3,700 acres—less than 6 square miles—and six wards. Those six wards have between them nineteen aldermen or councillors, with a mayor. Perth has eight wards, twenty-four councillors, and a mayor.

To me the position in regard to our scheme seems ludicrous. For our 385 square miles the Government ask us to appoint twenty aldermen and a mayor. Those twenty-one people will have to function within that huge area. The whole thing seems—I cannot exactly term it a joke, but certainly I cannot believe that the Minister is serious in his proposal. The hon. gentleman states that an alteration of the proposed area will mean the retention of joint authorities for many public utilities—the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board, the Tramway Trust, Fire Brigade Boards, and Cemetery Trusts—and that the object of the Bill is to secure the unification of all those services. If that is the case, why does not the hon. member take them over at once, or start with a small area until these utilities are ready to come in? What is the Tramway Trust? It is a trust belonging to the local authorities that has been created. It is quite true the Government have representation upon that trust, but only in so far as the payment of the purchase money of the tramways is concerned. The Government, having guaranteed that money, naturally have a right to representation upon that trust. Why should not the tramways come in immediately?

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you agree that the tramways should come in immediately?

Mr. MAXWELL: It is a local authority trust, and I am taking the hon. gentleman's own statement that the object of the Bill is for the unification of the services. If that is so, why not proceed immediately with the unification of the services? I realise how difficult it is to proceed immediately with unifying the whole of the services. It is for that reason I am advocating, like my leader,

that a start should be made with a smaller area. The Minister said—

> "If the greater area and Greater Brisbane Bill are worthy of the worry, trouble, and research given to the matter by various Ministers, public service officers, and local authority men, we must aspire to something bigger than the ordinary local authority."

What is the use of the hon. gentleman talking such piffle?

The HOME SECRETARY: What! Do you not aspire to have this scheme greater than the ordinary local authority?

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes, but what is the good of the hon. gentleman standing up in this House and telling us that there has been all this trouble, worry, and research on the part of Ministers, public servants, and local authority men? The late Assistant Minister (the Hon. F. T. Brennan) in charge of the Home Department arranged with certain local authorities that, so soon as they did their work, he would have an interview with them. He did nothing. Will the hon. gentleman in charge of the department say what he has done? Has he paid any attention to the advice of the local authority representatives?

The HOME SECRETARY: I will give £100 to the Children's Hospital if you can show me where the local authorities have defined a 5-mile radius, and they have had two years in which to do it.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a reasonable question. What is the good of him saying in his second reading speech that this is the result of the combined wisdom of Ministers of the Crown, public officials, and local authority men, when he knows full well that he paid no attention to what the local authority representatives told him?

The HOME SECRETARY: What did they tell me?

Mr. MAXWELL: I have here the resolutions that were passed at a conference of local authority representatives, which was held on the 10th February, 1924, to review the City of Brisbane Bill. One resolution reads—

> "It is recommended that the area of the city of Brisbane should be approximately a radius of 5 miles from the General Post Office."

The HOME SECRETARY: Did they define the area?

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes, and the hon. gentleman had better get his £100 ready. The resolution continues—

> "Your committee considered the area of the city as specified by the Bill, to be unwieldy, and that it was unreasonable to include large tracts of purely farming country and even bush lands in the area of the Metropolitan City of the State; it was also considered that the representation was too restricted in view of the immensity of work that would be called for."

That is the opinion of the local authority representatives who met to consider the City of Brisbane Bill. Then again, I have here a report which was presented by the General Purposes Committee of the Brisbane City Council. I want to be perfectly frank about this and perfectly honest, because I know what committees' reports are. I may say I never got this from an alderman or an officer of the Brisbane City Council. I find that the following aldermen attended the committee:—

> "The Mayor, and Aldermen Burrows, Doggett, Down, Gelston, Hetherington, Loug, McLachlan, Oxlade, and Raymond."

The report, amongst other things, says—

> "That the area prescribed by the Bill is altogether too large, and, therefore, unworkable.
>
> "That it is impossible to establish a common rateable basis suitable to the many differing needs of such an area.
>
> "That the proposed representation is not equitable.
>
> "That there is no limitation placed upon the amount of the general rate.
>
> "That it would be impossible for the number of aldermen mentioned in section 24 of the Bill to carry out the necessary work involved in the administration of the area."

I gave the hon. gentleman, first of all, the opinion of the councillors who considered the Bill. I have now given him the opinion of the General Purposes Committee of the leading local authority in Queensland—the Brisbane City Council.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now give me the recommendation in favour of the 5-mile area.

Mr. MAXWELL: I said an approximate area. I suggest the area suggested by my leader, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman has reminded me of that. We have in the leader of the Opposition the president of the Local Authorities' Association, and the hon. member for Logan is the secretary of the Local Authorities' Association.

Mr. WRIGHT: He agrees with the Bill.

Mr. MAXWELL: He does not.

Mr. WRIGHT: He said it was a democratic measure.

Mr. MAXWELL: It seems to me that it means the government of a section for a section and by a section. I do not know whether that is democracy. That is the view that I take of it. The Minister has asked me what area I suggest. I agree with my leader, the president of the Local Authorities' Association, when he says that the Greater City of Brisbane should have approximately a 5-mile radius, and include Brisbane, South Brisbane, Ithaca, Windsor, Hamilton, Toowong, Coorparoo, Stephens, Taringa, Balmoral, and Enoggera.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is that what your leader says?

Mr. MAXWELL: That is what my leader says. I accept the hon. gentleman's challenge, and would suggest that he should get his £100 ready and send it on to the Sick Children's Hospital.

During his speech the Home Secretary said the local authority men had loafed on the Government.

The HOME SECRETARY: So they have in health matters. You loafed on the Government when you were mayor.

Mr. MAXWELL: I deny that, and I deny that any other local authorities loafed on the Government. I tell the hon. gentleman that the local authorities did the work that

the Government could not do. The hon. gentleman challenged me in connection with the Joint Health Board, and he evidently was considering one Joint Health Board when I was thinking of another. I will take him back to 1919, when we had the unfortunate epidemic of pneumonic influenza.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who was the medical officer?

Mr. MAXWELL: The medical officer was Dr Streeter, who was appointed by the Hon. John Huxham, the then Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: How did he come to be a medical officer of your council?

Mr. MAXWELL: He was not.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who was the medical officer of your council?

Mr. MAXWELL: Dr. Taylor. I am not going to be drawn off the track by the hon. gentleman. I am going to deal with him so far as the Joint Health Board is concerned.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who was your permanent medical officer?

Mr. MAXWELL: I happened to be one of these members of the local authorities who were asked by the Home Department, "For God's sake to take over the cleaning-up of the pneumonic 'flu."

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, it was so dirty.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Government ran it—it was dirty. We went through the Exhibition Building to see the conditions of affairs which obtained. We went through the whole of the hospitals wearing masks, and, when the local authorities took control of the waterside in the 1919 epidemic it was said that the local authorities had worked wonders. Yet we find a gentleman of the calibre of the Minister saying that they loafed upon the Government. They did the Government's work—the work that the Home Department could not do—and we now are subjected to this sort of attack. I could have understood these statements being made upon a soap box when the elections were on, when hon. members opposite invariably attempt to belittle the pioneers of local government and the defenders of State parliamentary rights. I wish to goodness that we had men of that calibre to-day, and also on the Treasury benches in our State Parliament.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is a reflection on Parliament.

Mr. MAXWELL: I would be quite satisfied if we had a number of similar men to-day. There is no reflection on Parliament at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: You never had a medical officer in Brisbane.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman is evidently very perturbed. He will have an opportunity of replying subsequently, and he should reserve his shot till then.

The HOME SECRETARY: I simply say you never had a medical officer in Brisbane. You loafed on the Government.

Mr. MAXWELL: I hope the hon. gentleman, as the present head of the department, will understand the position when I say that the heads of the department did not do their work, because it was the function of the Commissioner of Public Health to see that a medical officer was appointed. I ask the hon. gentleman why, if the Brisbane City Council did not have a medical officer, he did not prosecute the Council? But that kind of allegation is the usual thing.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did you not, as mayor, appoint one?

Mr. MAXWELL: Because we had one. Hon. members opposite will say anything that will tend to belittle and ridicule and bring down men whose shoes they are unfit to tie.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did you not, as mayor, appoint one?

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not going to stand any politician on the opposite side of the House traducing local authority men.

Mr. WRIGHT interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am in a better position than a gentleman who has just come into the country. I have been associated with these men. I have been mixed up with local government work, and I know
[5 p.m.] the work that they have done. (Renewed interjections.) I am asked why they did not do a lot of the work they are doing now?

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did you not do it when you were mayor? You got £1,000 a year for that position.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is very necessary to combat the ignorance of the hon. gentleman there. I never got £1,000 a year. It is evident that the hon. gentleman does not know his Act. He does not know that an amount of £1,000 is voted to the mayor as an honorarium. And how does he spend it? In entertaining and in giving to charities. One might say to the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill: Why did he not leave the measure as it was, so that the mayor could have an honorarium voted to him by the council, instead of providing a salary of £1,000 a year and allowing the aldermen on top of that to vote a certain sum of money to the mayor to be expended in the way the council might think fit? The hon. gentleman has asked me why I did not do certain things. Why did the hon. member for Fortitude Valley not do certain things when he was mayor? Why did others not do them? I shall tell you why? Simply because the Local Authorities Act did not give them the power. The Government—I am not blaming the present Government only—would not trust the local authorities. On the day when I was elected mayor I am reported as saying—

> "With the aldermen's assistance and co-operation he would endeavour to do what his predecessor had done—make Brisbane one of the best cities in the Commonwealth. Until the Local Authorities Act was broadened, there could not be the advancement here as in the southern States."

What did my friend the hon. member for Fortitude Valley say? I quite agree with him. I knew the position in which we were placed, and that we had not the power to do what we wished. This is what the hon. member said—

> "Alderman Wilson, M.L.A., referred to the necessity for securing wider powers for carrying on the civic work more effectively. He looked to the day when the Local Government Act should

be amended so as to bring Brisbane into line with the capital cities of the southern States."

Yet the Home Secretary has the temerity to ask me why we did not do certain things. We did not do them simply because we were restricted.

The hon. member for Bulimba the other day gave this as his reason for desiring to keep business men out of the municipal sphere of activity—

> "I am one of those who believe that the business man is not always the most successful man in local government matters, and oftimes when you have a body of business men discussing a certain project a lot of the discussion centres round a question of whether the utility is going to pay——"

Mr. WRIGHT: Go on.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is that not one of the things which is absolutely essential in a representative of the people—an ability to decide whether the money is going to be wasted or not? To show the futility of the hon. member's suggestion, let me quote what he went on to say—

> "I congratulate the Brisbane Tramway Trust upon the excellent way in which they are running the trams."

Mr. WRIGHT: You were not there.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am quoting the hon. member just as I took him down when he spoke, and as he ought to be quoted.

Mr. WRIGHT: Of course, you are. Why do you not quote what I said?

Mr. MAXWELL: Now I want to say something about my association with the Brisbane City Council, and I am taking up the cudgels not only on my own behalf, but also on behalf of those with whom I was associated.

The Premier, when speaking in Committee of Supply in 1921, in referring to me, said this—

> "I do not know whether his own record as administrator of the city would bear very close investigation.
>
> "Mr. Maxwell: I challenge you to show otherwise.
>
> "The PREMIER: Perhaps the hon. member might have an opportunity of challenging one of his own confreres at present in the council, who has been criticising him. One of the daily newspapers a couple of days ago said—
>
> Alderman Gelston also emphatically condemned the action of those responsible for the unenviable state of affairs. Less than half of the financial year was gone.
>
> "But more than nine months of their income had been expended."

For three years I have carried these documents in my bag, and now that an opportunity is given to me to reply to what was said on that occasion, I am pleased to say that I am able to reply, because I realise that it is absolutely essential that business men should control the destinies of a city such as ours. I have here a letter received from the manager of the Commonwealth Bank, a copy of which was forwarded to each member of the Finance Committee in the City Council in accordance with the request made at the meeting held on 21st July, 1921. The letter reads—

> "Commonwealth Bank,
> "Brisbane, 19th July, 1921.
>
> "The Chairman,
> "Finance Committee,
> "Brisbane City Council.
>
> "I hereby certify that the following statement shows the balances of the accounts specified hereunder, as at close of business on 16th instant:—

		£	s.	d.
City Fund ...	(Dr.)	21,893	2	10
Contracts Deposit Account ...	(Cr.)	1,474	17	10
Sinking Fund Account ...	(Cr.)	346	11	3
Debenture Account—				
Series "E" ...	(Cr.)	2,671	14	6
Series "F" ...	(Cr.)	3,611	8	10
Series "G" ...	(Cr.)	626	12	8
Series "K" ...	(Cr.)	12,002	6	3
Series "H" ...	(Cr.)	1,735	5	6"

I do not want to create a false impression. I realise that the balance of that money in debentures was money lying in the bank waiting to be expended on certain works that had to be done. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, who at that time was an alderman and is to-day acting mayor of the Brisbane City Council, will bear me out when I say that the arrangement made with the manager of the Commonwealth Bank was that the charge on the overdraft would be computed on the daily balance. Is that right?

Mr. WILSON: Yes.

Mr. MAXWELL: That being the case, there was to the credit of the council the sum of £22,468 16s. 10d., and when the debit of the city fund is deducted from that amount it leaves a balance to credit of £570 14s. In addition there was a loan of £80,000 falling due on 1st January of that year, which was met out of a sinking fund which at that time showed a credit of £101,000. Does that show slovenly financing?

Mr. LOGAN: That is sound financing.

Mr. MAXWELL: It does not follow that because there is a debit balance in the City Fund that the Council is in deep water. In support of that let me quote what was stated by Alderman McLachlan—the hon. member for Merthyr, who was chairman of the Finance Committee on 30th June, 1924—

> "It is necessary for the council to realise that money cannot be found for works that are not provided for. I would ask aldermen to realise that we are practically at the end of our tether so far as the finances are concerned, and if we go on doing as we are now we will finish up with a larger deficit than was ever anticipated."

It does not follow that the finances of the Brisbane City Council are in a bad way. With a view to distorting the vision of the people, and misleading and misrepresenting facts for political purposes, men are prepared to use any argument.

Reference was made to the motor-cars I was supposed to have used when I was mayor of Brisbane. I make this statement as a business man on behalf of business men. I will read what the Assistant Treasurer of the Brisbane City Council said in reference

to this matter in a return prepared on 17th October, 1921. I did not get this return yesterday, but at the time. The hon. member for Port Curtis only read that part of the return which suited himself.

Mr WRIGHT: You did the same thing a few moments ago.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Port Curtis only read a portion to endeavour to show that I, as mayor at the time, was wasting money by running round the streets of the city in motor-cars. Let me give the details of the amount which is contained in the following return:—

"RETURN CALLED FOR BY ALDERMAN CARTER, MEETING OF 3RD OCTOBER, 1921.

"The total amount spent on motor-car hire during the period 1st July, 1920, to 30th June, 1921, was £963 17s. 9d., which includes amounts of £211 18s. 4d. incurred in connection with the visit of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and £73 for hire of car during overhauling of the 'Swift' No. Q2714.

"The expenses incurred in the maintenance and repair of the four (4) motor-cars owned by the Council and under the control of Chauffeur Jones and the City Engineer and Parks Superintendent were £1,306, which includes, amongst other items, petrol, insurance, chauffeur's wages and expenses.

"Yours faithfully,
"(Sgd.) WM. E. BANKS,
"Asst. City Treasurer."

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*): I beg to move—

"That the hon. member for Toowong be granted an extension of time to allow him to complete his speech."

Question put and passed.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not desire to conceal anything in this matter.

Mr. CARTER: You had £1,000 a year to pay for your own cars.

Mr. MAXWELL: That remark shows the ignorance of the hon. gentleman. How dare the hon. gentleman come into this House for political purposes and attempt to lead the people to believe that during my term as mayor I spent thousands of pounds in motor-cars?

Mr. CARTER: I did not say that. I said you wasted a lot of money on motor-cars.

Mr. MAXWELL: Not at all.

Mr. CARTER: Of course you did.

Mr. MAXWELL: There is another matter that I wish to deal with, and it is just as well that all these matters should be cleaned up. I thank hon. members for giving me the opportunity for continuing my speech.

Mr. CARTER: You are apologising now.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am only stating facts.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL: If any apology is due, it is from the hon. member for Port Curtis, who in this House asked how many thousands of pounds I, as mayor, had spent on motor-cars. I have given the House the various items.

Hon. members may remember the fuss that was made in connection with certain debentures that were issued by the Brisbane City Council, and how the hon. member for Fortitude Valley and myself, as two members of the Council, received some blame.

Mr. CARTER: Do not blame the hon. member for Fortitude Valley.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am clearing the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, just as I am clearing myself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. MAXWELL: The attack was made on the Labour aldermen just as well as myself.

The HOME SECRETARY: Alderman Raymond never signed any contract with the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. (Government interjections.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: I did not think that I would get such a lot of machine guns trained on me this afternoon. It is evident that hon members opposite do not relish the information.

Mr. CORSER: They do not like to hear the truth.

Mr. MAXWELL: Any board of directors, or local authority representatives, or any man in a high position prefers to be guided in financial matters by his bankers. We shall see what the Commonwealth Bank said regarding the offer made by Alderman Raymond in connection with the debenture question—

"Commonwealth Bank,

"Brisbane, 28th January, 1921.

"The Acting Town Clerk,
"Town Hall, Brisbane.

"Dear Sir,—City of Brisbane debentures "G.a." £8,000—5 per cent. maturing £1,500—1/1/21—£6,500—1/7/21.

"Referring to my interview yesterday with the City Treasurer, when he informed me that Alderman Raymond is prepared to renew the debentures held by him, provided he is paid 6½ per cent. interest, free of State income tax, I have to advise you that the bank considers that, in present circumstances, Alderman Raymond's debentures should be renewed on the terms asked for by him.

"Yours faithfully,
"(Sgd.) A. S. DOUGLAS,
"Manager."

We were following the advice of our financial adviser. I think that clears that matter.

There is another matter connected with the way the business men on the Brisbane City Council fixed up loans and other things.

Mr. CARTER: They did fix things up.

Mr. MAXWELL: They could not have done so had they not been business men. I have here details of the loan floated in connection with the Brisbane Town Hall, and I want hon. members to pay careful attention to what I read—

"TOWN HALL LOAN.

"Amount floated, £530,000.

"Rate of interest, 5 per cent.

"Conditions—

1. The Council to float a local loan when advised by the bank to do so,

the bank to be allowed 1½ per cent. commission out of which brokers' commission will be paid; advertising and all other expenses to be borne by the Council.

2. Pending the flotation of a loan the bank to advance the above amount, the Council to draw the money as required and interest to be calculated on the amount drawn from time to time only.

3. If a loan be not floated by the Council within five years, the bank to take up the unissued debentures at the then current rates, 1½ per cent. commission referred to above being payable to the bank, payment of interest and repayment of principal to be made by equal half-yearly instalments over a period of not more than twenty years."

Those arrangements were made in February, 1920.

Then there is the question of the concrete roads loan. There is one outstanding feature in connection with concrete roads. The hon. member for Port Curtis and those associated with him attempted to ridicule me and those associated with me who advocated concrete roads, and said that concrete roads were no good, that they were a failure. Since then they went South and have done in this connection exactly what we advocated.

Mr. CARTER: I objected only to the employment of contract instead of day labour.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member dealing with the City of Brisbane Bill?

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes, in this way: I am pointing out the necessity for continuing to have business men on the Brisbane City Council, and am replying to the hon. member for Bulimba. In view of the incidence of adult suffrage and of the amount of work that is to be put upon the twenty men and mayor who are to constitute the City of Brisbane Council, it will be an impossibility for business men to continue in that work. I am showing the necessity for an amendment which I propose to submit when we go into Committee, which will give business men an opportunity to continue to work on this Council. I am now showing why business men should be upon the Council. Let me quote this with regard to the concrete roads loan—

"CONCRETE ROADS LOAN.

"Amount floated, £190,000.

"Rate of interest, 5½ per cent. per annum.

"Conditions—

1. The loan to be made available in five annual instalments commencing 1st July, 1921, four of £40,000 each and one of £30,000, repayment of principal and payment of interest to be made by equal half-yearly instalments over a period of fifteen years."

Mr. CARTER: What has that to do with the City of Brisbane Bill?

Mr. MAXWELL: I am in the Speaker's hands, and not in yours. And this is the arrangement that the business men made—

"2. The Council to draw the money as required, and interest to be calculated on the amount drawn from time to time only."

This also applies to the Town Hall loan. I have given a reply to the accusation made against me and the business men associated with me on the Brisbane City Council, and I leave it to the public to say who is right and who is wrong.

I now want to give the reasons why I object to certain clauses in this Bill—

Because the area is too large;

Because it is the government of a section by a section for a section;

Because the ratepayers will have scarcely any voice in the spending of the money although they provide it;

Because they have no voice in the loan proposals;

Because I object to adult franchise under these conditions;

Because it means taxation without representation.

Take, for instance, the fire brigades boards that are going to be eliminated altogether, and the representation of the insurance companies who contribute to the upkeep of fire brigades boards is going to be eliminated too. Is that fair? Perhaps I am arguing on fake premises.

Mr. HYNES: You will be eliminated next election.

Mr. MAXWELL: I challenge the hon. member to contest the seat with me. I have read the Bill through, and I object most emphatically to municipal enterprise. I object to municipal councils dealing with food supplies, engaging in trade and commerce and in manufactures in the city. Surely we have had enough experience of the State enterprises of this Government without encouraging the City Council to go in for that kind of thing. When you come to consider that the ratepayers are going to have nothing whatever to say in that connection, do you think it is fair treatment in a British community? I say unhesitatingly, No! The people who have to find the money have nothing whatever to say about the spending of it.

I also object to the mayor being a member of Parliament. I have had experience as a mayor and I say with that experience that no one man can do two men's jobs.

Mr. HYNES: Why don't you give up your business?

Mr. MAXWELL: I did. I say emphatically that, if they want a man who is going to look after the interests of Brisbane, then it is not right for a member of Parliament to submit his name for the position of mayor.

Mr. WRIGHT: You have had experience?

Mr. MAXWELL: I have had experience, and that is why I am saying this. It is impossible for one man to occupy the two positions, because the interests conflict. The opportunity is given under this Bill to engage in municipal enterprise on similar lines to what the Government have done in connection with State enterprises. One would have thought that, after the experience we have had in connection with the mismanagement in State enterprises, they would have shied clear of that. Who is going to pay for all this? The man with the 16-perch allotment as well as the wealthy man? Where is the taxation going to lead the

men who are the ratepayers? The ratepayers have no voice in the matter.

Mr. CARTER: Everybody is a ratepayer.

Mr. MAXWELL: Everybody is not a ratepayer, and no one knows the position more accurately than the hon. member. Let me quote a table that I have had prepared to show the injustice that is going to be done to the people in the outlying areas—

POPULATION.

Within five-mile radius	188,737
Outside five-mile radius	51,769
Total	240,506

LOAN INDEBTEDNESS.

	£
Government Loans, whole area	545,907
Interest thereon (with redemption) per annum	64,276

COMPARISON OF LOAN INDEBTEDNESS.

——	Within five-mile radius.	Outside five-mile radius.
	£	£
From Government ..	383,410	162,497
From Other Sources ..	1,591,359	..
Totals .. £	1,974,769	162,497

INTEREST.

Government loans (with redemption) ..	43,184	21,092
Loans from other sources	121,854	..
Totals .. £	165,038	21,092

Re proposed pooling of loans for 40 years (assuming average interest 5 per cent. and redemption 10s. per cent.):—

——	Per Capita.	Per Ratepayer.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Interest and redemption on Government Loans over whole area	0 2 6	0 0 6
Present interest and redemption on Government Loans—		
Within five-mile radius ..	0 4 7	0 19 3
Outside five-mile radius ..	0 8 1	1 2 8
Present interest on loans from other sources—		
Within five mile radius ..	0 13 0	2 14 5
Outside five-mile radius ..	Nil.	Nil.
Present interest on total indebtedness—		
Within five-mile radius ..	0 17 7	3 13 8
Outside five-mile radius ..	0 8 1	1 2 8
Annual interest as per Bill—		
Whole area	0 12 8	2 7 10
Average saving to inhabitants—		
Within five-mile radius ..	0 4 11	1 5 10
Average increased payment by inhabitants of area—		
Outside five-mile radius ..	0 4 7	1 5 2

Figures such as these are astounding, and it seems to me a most peculiar attitude for the Home Secretary to take up when he tries to link up such a big area as 385 square miles. He has such a splendid example to follow in regard to the city of Melbourne, the queen city of the South. He has also the example of the city of Adelaide, which is looked upon as one of the best laid out cities in the southern hemisphere. Melbourne is quoted as the Edinburgh of Australia.

Is the hon. gentleman being advised by public officers? He has not been advised by local authority men. We have a statement from local authority men who met in conference and recommended certain things, but the hon. gentleman has pushed them all aside. He says that the Greater Brisbane city will comprise an area of 385 square miles, the boundaries of which will commence at the mouth of the Pine River, going right back to the D'Aguilar Range, thence extending to Wynnum, and from there coming back to the commencement at the Pine River.

Then we are told that the hon. gentleman desires a Greater Brisbane to prevent the undue subdivision of land. Do hon. members opposite know the provisions of the Local Authorities Act, and that the local authorities have power to deal with that kind of thing? Does the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Health Department say that the officers of his Department are not competent men? He says that one reason why we want a Greater Brisbane Bill is to get a pure milk scheme. I remember the time when the Brisbane City Council controlled the milk supply in Brisbane, and heavy fines were inflicted for adulteration. It was evident that the Department of Public Health on that occasion thought there was a lot of money in the business, so they took it over.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.