

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 14 OCTOBER 1924

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 14 OCTOBER, 1924.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL, No. 2.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have presented to His Excellency the Governor Appropriation Bill, No. 2 for the Royal assent, and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent thereto in the name and on behalf of His Majesty.

A message was also received from the Governor conveying His Excellency's assent to the Bill.

CENTRAL SUGAR-MILLS.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the accounts of the central sugar-mills under Government control for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

QUESTIONS.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT *in re* "D" WHEAT POOL'S CHARGES FOR HANDLING WHEAT CROP.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. Has he noticed in the Auditor-General's report that the "D" Wheat Pool took delivery of 144,506 bushels of wheat, and that the cost of handling same to 1st September was 20.12d. per bushel, and that the estimated extra cost of handling to the termination of the pool will be another 3½d. per bushel, making a total of almost 2s. per bushel?"

"2. Seeing that 81 per cent. of this wheat was sold to farmers who had suffered so severely from drought that they had to purchase from the board on the guarantee of the Government, does he consider it fair that these unfortunate growers should have to pay such heavy handling costs with interest added?"

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

"1. The chairman of the State Wheat Board has supplied the following:—The 'D' Pool was purely a seed wheat pool, as only 144,506 bushels of wheat were delivered. The cost of handling, therefore, would be relatively high.

"2. Under the operations of the 'D' Pool growers received more by way of their first advance of 5s. per bushel than has been paid to growers in Southern States. The prices charged for seed wheat are less than would have been charged had no pool been in existence. In previous drought years, before the pool came into existence, prices ranged from 10s. to 12s. per bushel. It was necessary for the board to retain a skeleton staff, so that it would be in a position to handle bigger crops, and also the board had to pay interest and redemption on grain sheds. Wheat was delivered in small parcels, and the clerical work involved in handling small parcels is just as heavy as it would be in handling big parcels."

"GOLDEN CASSET" PRIZE WINNERS.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*), for Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*), asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Does he know that on the evening of Friday, 1st August, 1924, the 'Telegraph' published the names of the prize winners in the 'Golden Casket'?"

"2. Amongst the numbers of £20 prizes No. 97536 was given.

"3. Is it correct that the owner of this ticket made application for the prize and was refused payment?"

"4. Will he inform the House the cause of this refusal?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*) replied—

"1. The 'Telegraph' of Friday, the 1st August last published the names of the winners of the first, second, and third prizes, and purported to publish the numbers of the winning tickets in No. 93 'Golden Casket' art union, drawn on the morning of the same day.

"2. Ticket No. 97536 was published in the 'Telegraph' as a winner of a £20 prize.

"3. Yes.

"4. The official record shows that ticket No. 95736 won a £20 prize. The official record is supported by the reports of the drawing appearing in the 'Daily Standard' and 'Evening Observer,' and other published reports and advertised results of the drawing. The number published in the 'Telegraph' was an error made by the officer of that journal who reported the drawing. I understand that the 'Telegraph' has now made arrangements for its officer to check his report with the official records. The hon. member may inspect the official records and copies of the newspapers at the Home Secretary's Department, or at the office of the 'Golden Casket.'"

TENDERS FOR THIRTY LOCOMOTIVE ENGINES—ESTIMATES, HOURS, AND WAGES.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Re tender for thirty engines, was a price quoted or estimated by the Railway Workshops, Ipswich; if so, what was such price or estimate?"

"2. What are the hours provided and rate of wages under our Queensland arbitration awards for employees in work of engine construction?"

"3. What are the hours worked and rates of wages paid for similar works at the Clyde Engineering Works, New South Wales?"

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

"1. Ipswich Workshops did not tender.

"2 and 3. Queensland 44 hours, New South Wales 48 hours—per week."

HOURLY RATES OF WAGES.

	Queensland.	New South Wales.
	s. d.	s. d.
Fitters	2 3½	2 2½
Turners	2 3½	2 2½
Blacksmiths	2 4½	2 3½
Patternmakers	2 5½	2 3½
Coppersmiths	2 3½	2 3½
Angiesmiths	2 4½	2 3½
Brass finishers	2 3½	2 2½
Forgers (Forgings)—3 cwt. and over	2 8½	2 4½
Forgers (smaller)	2 6½	2 4½
Springsmiths	2 4½	2 1½
Oxy-acetylene and electric welders	2 5½	2 2½
Boilermakers	2 2½	2 2½
Moulders	2 3½	2 2½

"CONTINGENCIES" AND "INCIDENTALS," AGENT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"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 CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

Financial Year.	Rent, Printing, Stationery, and Incidentals.		Advertising and Contingent Expenses in Promoting Emigration to the State.		Total.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1912-13	5,727	19 8	4,517	4 0	10,245	3 8
1913-14	5,391	4 8	5,785	6 8	11,176	11 4
1914-15	7,840	17 5	3,301	12 7	11,142	10 0
1918-19	9,280	11 9	377	18 9	9,658	10 6
1919-20	13,759	18 8	995	4 5	14,755	3 1
1920-21	9,453	1 10	665	11 11	10,118	13 9
1921-22	7,140	15 5	7,140	15 5
1922-23	7,197	6 11	7,197	6 11
1923-24	6,893	17 6	6,893	17 6

CONTRACT OF CLYDE ENGINEERING COMPANY FOR SUPPLY OF RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*), without notice, asked the Secretary for Railways—

“Is it a fact, as reported in last Sunday’s ‘Sun’ newspaper, of the 12th instant, that the Clyde Engineering Company, New South Wales, had declined to accept the contract for building thirty locomotives, and that it was the Government’s intention to distribute the work between Walkers Limited and Evans, Anderson, Phelan, and Company?”

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

“I have no information to add to what I gave the House last Friday, to the effect that the Government had entered into a contract with the Clyde Engineering Works, New South Wales, for the construction of thirty locomotives. The Government have no information to the effect that that contract is to be repudiated.”

CHARGES MADE BY MR. CARTER IN RE BRISBANE SICK CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*), without notice, asked the Home Secretary—

“Has the hon. gentleman received any communication from the Committee of the Joint Hospitals Board with reference to the charge made against the Brisbane Sick Children’s Hospital Committee by the hon. member for Port Curtis?”

“If not, will he ask for an immediate reply to his inquiry?”

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*) replied—

“No. I have every confidence that the committee will send me the information as soon as they are in a position to do so.”

ABANDONMENT OF BOUNDARY RABBIT-PROOF FENCE.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*), without notice, asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“Is it a fact that the Government propose to abandon the rabbit-proof fence on the Southern and Western boundaries of Queensland?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“It is proposed to abandon all that portion of the fence that serves no useful purpose.”

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane for 1923.

Regulation 2 of the regulations made under the Primary Products Pools Acts, 1922 to 1923.

Eighth annual report of the State Government Insurance Office for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

EXPENDITURE OF AGENT-GENERAL’S OFFICE FOR “CONTINGENCIES” AND “INCIDENTALS.”

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return in answer to a question asked by Mr. Deacon (*Cunningham*) on Thursday, 9th October, relative to 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.

BRISBANE TRAMWAY TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the Brisbane Tramway Trust Act of 1922 in a certain particular.”

Question put and passed.

INCOME TAX BILL.

INITIATION.

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): 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 consolidate and amend the law relating to the imposition, assessment, and collection of a tax upon incomes."

Question put and passed.

APPRENTICESHIP BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

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

Question put and passed.

ALL SAINTS CHURCH LANDS BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

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

Question put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACTS 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 further amend the Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1916 to 1923, in certain particulars."

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I would like to know whether the hon. member does not intend to follow the usual custom and give us some information as to the directions in which it is proposed to amend the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Not at this stage. Why do you not study the Standing Orders? You know perfectly well that I cannot give information at this stage.

Mr. MOORE: We are asked to consider whether it is desirable to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act in certain particulars, but we are not told what those particulars are. How then is it possible for us to say whether it is desirable to amend the Act in those particulars or not?

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that the initiation in Committee is the stage at which information should be sought.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, but at this stage I think we should have some information to enable us to understand whether it is desirable that it should come on at all. If, as we are told, there is going to be quite a transformation of the Act, I think we should at this stage get some information from the Minister to that effect. To my mind it is wrong to bring in a Bill without giving any information to the House at this stage.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is to make provision for a 44-hour week.

Question put and passed.

ANIMALS AND BIRDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

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

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

"Omit the word—

'now'

with a view to inserting the words—

'this day nine months.'"

I do so for the following reason. The Bill has gone through the House with very little consideration, and in its present form may do injury to a large number of persons in this State. It was pointed out during the Committee stage that a very grave menace threatens one of our important industries as a result of operations which are covered by this Bill, that is, that trappers will be allowed to go on to properties, and perhaps they will leave the carcasses of animals they kill lying about. I suppose that the blowfly pest has never been worse in Queensland than it is at the present time owing to the climatic conditions, and it must be recognised that, if trappers are to receive permits to go on to properties and the carcasses of the animals they kill are to be left lying about, a tremendous loss will be caused in the sheep industry in the State as a result of the increase in the fly pest. Sheepowners are making every possible endeavour to clean up the carcass of every head of stock that dies. It is immediately carted to a convenient place and destroyed by fire in order that there may be no facilities for the breeding of the fly. I think it is only reasonable that, when we are making an amendment of the law which affects an important industry on which in a large measure Queensland is dependent to-day, as a result of the indiscriminate permits which may be given to trappers, greater time should be allowed for investigation, instead of rushing blindly into a course from which the country may suffer to a tremendous extent. We know what enormous losses the fly pest has caused. The Government have been spending large sums of money in trying to combat it, and we know that one of the most effective means of spreading it is to leave carcasses lying about in which flies can breed. Nevertheless we find the Government bringing in a Bill which will nullify a great portion of their effort, because it will allow carcasses to be left lying about on these runs, with a resultant possible loss of many thousands of pounds merely for the sake of the benefit of a small section of the community and for the purpose of bringing in an amount of revenue it is hardly worth talking about.

There is also the question as to the advisability of the Government allowing trappers to go on to private holdings for which people pay rent to the Crown, or of which they have obtained the freehold, and consequently have a prior right to say who shall or shall not trespass on their ground. It would not be so bad if the holders of these properties were allowed to nominate the trappers who would be allowed to go on to them, and it would not be so bad if they were given an opportunity of exercising

Mr. Moore.]

some supervision over those men by deciding whether they were likely to do any damage to the run or not. I have pointed out the enormous risk of spreading the blowfly pest, but there is also the considerable risk of fire. To-day Queensland is practically relying on the sheep industry for the major portion of its revenue and for the employment of a large number of people, and we must take into consideration the serious position that would arise if the sheep industry were compelled to suffer a heavy disability. Even if it means placing these trappers at a little disadvantage, we should put the Bill on one side before jeopardising our greatest industry. The Minister should accept the amendment so that he will have an opportunity of obtaining further information from the people who are vitally interested in the industry, and, seeing that the Bill is being pushed through without adequate time being given to those vitally concerned to make full representations and put their case before the Government, he should consider whether it is not justifiable to delay putting the Bill on the statute-book for a time, to enable those engaged in the sheep industry an opportunity of placing their case before the Government, and thus giving the Government a chance of fully considering whether this Bill will have the effect of wiping out all the good that has been done by the officers of the various departments, and making useless the money that has been spent in endeavouring to cope with the fly pest in a mistaken attempt at assisting an industry which is only going to benefit a few individuals but will victimise many others.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): There appears to be no good reason why the passing of this Bill should be delayed. I quite realise that the leader of the Opposition has something behind his arguments. I listened very carefully in Committee to the debate on this question, which is one that affects me as a member of Parliament to a very large extent. As the leader of the Opposition stated the shooting of kangaroos and the leaving of their carcasses is likely to accentuate the fly menace, but I can see no reason why the postponing of the third reading of this Bill is going to improve that position at all. The kangaroos will still be shot, and the flies will still be there, and I cannot at all see how it is possible to have those carcasses burnt out on the western downs, as there is no wood there and therefore there is no possibility of the carcasses being burnt in that way.

Mr. MORGAN: That does not apply everywhere.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the kangaroo shooter had to burn carcasses, he would have to cart them 15 to 20 miles in some cases. It may be possible to obtain some disinfectant or poison to sprinkle on the carcasses which might kill the fly, but otherwise I cannot see how it is possible to deal with it, and the postponing of the third reading of this Bill will not provide a solution. The United Graziers' Association have discussed this matter, but they can give no solution of the difficulty, and if they cannot solve the problem to prevent carcasses of animals laying about—and they are the people vitally concerned—it is hardly likely that Parliament can devise any means of meeting the situation.

[*Mr. Moore.*]

I take it that it is a matter which will have to be left to the boards which will be au fait with local conditions.

The fact of men shooting on holdings and disturbing cattle was also discussed in Committee. The hon. member for Leichhardt pointed out that no doubt should exist on that point, as the professional trapper did not shoot at night. He went out to set his snares in the afternoon, then returned home, and came back the next morning to collect and skin the carcasses. I cannot see that the hon. member's argument should delay the third reading of this Bill. They [10.30 a.m.] are matters for the local boards to deal with. All these matters can be arranged for by regulation after the Bill is passed. The boards under the Bill will have power to make regulations to deal with this and all other matters that may arise. Nothing can arise from now until the Bill is in operation that cannot be dealt with thoroughly by regulation. No harm has been done by calling attention to these facts, and perhaps the Minister, after hearing the discussion, may see his way clear to frame regulations for the further guidance of the boards that will be appointed.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I do not agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I am certainly of opinion that good reasons exist why this Bill should not be placed on the statute-book. Already graziers and those engaged in the industry are awakening to the fact that this Bill is not going to be in their interests. It is only during the past few days that hon. members who live in the electorates concerned have received protests not only from property holders but from people engaged in the sheep and cattle industry.

Mr. COLLINS: Do not forget that the party on this side of the House represent the country.

Mr. MORGAN: These people have asked us to protest against the passage of this Bill. That shows that this House has not had a full opportunity of considering all the amendments pertaining to the Bill. It also shows that certain amendments might have been placed in the Bill to provide for penalties to be imposed on those persons who allow carcasses to lie about indiscriminately. It has also been proved that, if certain disinfectants are used on such carcasses, the flies are destroyed and prevented from breeding. In places where wood is scarce and carcasses cannot be burnt there is a method of dealing with the carcasses to prevent the breeding of flies.

Mr. POLLOCK: Cannot that be done by regulation?

Mr. MORGAN: I am afraid it cannot.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why?

Mr. MORGAN: I am afraid that a penalty cannot be imposed by regulation. A penalty should have been provided for in the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill to say that it is an offence for trappers to leave carcasses lying about, and a regulation can only interpret the meaning and intention of the Bill. A regulation providing for a penalty and making it an offence for a trapper to allow carcasses to remain in a paddock without being disinfected or destroyed in some manner would be against the principle of the Bill and be inoperative. No harm

would be done by allowing this Bill to stand over for nine months. Everyone would then have the opportunity to peruse and thoroughly understand it. It would also give the Minister an opportunity to know whether its provisions are correct or otherwise. As the opossum season is not likely to open until next winter, we shall have an opportunity to consider the Bill further and insert such amendments as we may desire, and place the Act on the statute-book in time for the opening of the season—if it is the intention of the Government to open a season next year for opossums and bears.

It is not only in regard to the destruction of carcasses from the sheep breeders' point of view that the Bill is regarded as a menace, but also in regard to another provision which it contains. It is generally recognised that a man's home is his castle, and cannot be entered by a stranger or one who may desire to trespass without creating an offence.

This Bill gives power to individuals to go upon a man's property the moment they receive a license from the board, and, if they so desire, to shoot opossums upon his roof top, round the homestead, or anywhere else they choose. There is no reason why the Bill should be rushed through. Queensland has now been settled for over 100 years, and the trapping of opossums and bears has been carried on for at least fifty years, and there has been no necessity previously for a Bill such as this. The Minister would be well advised to allow the Bill to remain in abeyance for another nine months. That would not cause any hardship to those engaged in the industry, and would not in any way interfere with the protection of the opossum and the bear. The Minister has power to keep the season closed as long as he desires, and, in view of the fact that new conditions have arisen since we first discussed this Bill, and that new protests are coming in daily, not only from those who are engaged in the snaring industry, but from those who own the property on which the opossums and bears will be trapped, the Minister would be well advised to adjourn the proposal for another nine months.

I shall read a petition I have received from the Miles district opossum snarers—

"Miles, 30th August, 1924.

"Mr. Godfrey Morgan, M.L.A.,
Parliament House,
Brisbane.

"Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned opossum snarers of your electorate appeal to you to object to the Government endeavouring to pass legislation providing for the taxation of opossum skins. The present Government claim to help the small man to better his living conditions, yet by imposing a tax on opossum skins they are taking a living from the snarer who leaves his home in the open season to try and earn a few pounds to carry him over a period of unemployment. If legislation is passed imposing a tax on opossum skins it will mean that the snarer will only skin the opossums carrying the best fur and leave the others to rot in the bush, whereas if we did not have to pay a tax every opossum would be skinned for the few pence it may bring.

"We trust you will be successful in pointing out to the Government the

great amount of injury they will be doing to the opossumers of Queensland that can earn every penny they get.

"We are, yours faithfully,
"Miles District Opossum Snarers."

(Signed by 22 snarers.)

These are men who may be looked upon almost as the professional snarers—men who are engaged in the snaring industry whenever the season are open. They have reached an age when it is practically impossible to do strenuous manual labour; they have spent their lives on stations as boundary riders or doing general work; and the only way they now have of accumulating a little money is by snaring the opossum and the bear during certain seasons of the year. These men are opposed to the conditions contained in this amending Bill, and I hope the Minister will look upon our amendment as one that is not going to do any injury to his proposal, and that will not allow the opossum or the bear to be destroyed any more than has been the case in the past. Perhaps in nine months' time amendments may be placed in the Bill which will prevent its being objectionable to the men engaged in the industry and to those who own property on which the animals will be snared.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): After accepting several very important amendments from the other side, I am surprised that the leader of the Opposition should now suggest that the Bill be postponed for nine months. There is nothing hasty about this legislation. It has been under consideration by myself for at least two years. As I said when I introduced the Bill, the idea of the Bill is to protect further the native animals of this State, and to develop on sound lines the commercial side of the business. I gave figures to show the great commercial value of pelts in Queensland, and I said then, and I repeat it now, that this legislation, far from being hasty, is belated. The power to make regulations is sufficiently elastic, as it should be, in my opinion, to enable all the safeguards to be inserted that the representatives of the stockowners think should be inserted. My idea is to hear the views of the trappers themselves—the practical men engaged in the trapping business—and of the people carrying on grazing. I repeat again that anyone who abuses his privileges under a permit will be severely dealt with, because the people who pay rent—the people who are carrying on our most important industry—are the people who should have first consideration. The declaration in this Bill that the native animals belong to the people must be recognised, and to protect them properly and develop the commercial side of the business this legislation has been introduced. I have been talking during the last few minutes with Mr. Coldham, who appears to be a little fearful that some men may be granted permits who will abuse the privilege and that stockowners will suffer. I honestly believe that this legislation, far from having that effect, will have just the opposite effect. At the present time there is practically no supervision at all, and one of the objects of this measure is to provide sufficient revenue out of the industry to administer the Act properly and to enable inspectors to be appointed who will see that the Act is not abused either in the letter or in the spirit. That is not desired. The complaints that

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

have been made by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Murilla about kangaroo shooters leaving the carcasses to rot on the ground, and so spread pests such as blowflies, are in existence at the present time. That question is not being dealt with under existing legislation, and putting off this Bill for nine months is not going to solve that problem. Looking again at the power to make regulations under this Bill, I am quite satisfied that we can make regulations under the Bill as it has passed through this House to deal with that question also. At present under the principal Act regulations may be made and the Bill deals with the following matters:—

The licensing and registration of dealers in respect of themselves and their premises:

Permits to trappers; and

The conditions under which registration and permits under this Act may be granted.

I am quite prepared to hear the views of those concerned as to how permits shall be granted. Then the regulations may provide that the licenses and permits may be suspended or revoked. Power is also given to make regulations for the protection, preservation, and propagation of animals and birds. Mr. Coldham appears to be afraid that permits may be granted to the number of 10 or 20 or more to operate on the one holding. That is not the intention of this legislation at all. The intention is to restrict and regulate the granting of permits, and I have no doubt that the representatives of the graziers on the boards and the representatives of the trappers will see to it that too many permits are not granted for each holding. The boards will have power to refuse permits altogether. They will have power to say that on particular holdings permits will not be granted. All these powers will be vested in the boards, which will now be elective, and will consist of one representative elected by the owners or the lessees of the land, one representative elected by the bonâ fide trappers, and one representative appointed by the Government. The representative who is to be appointed by the Government will probably be an officer of the Department of Public Lands, and it will be his duty to safeguard the people who pay rent to the Crown. The regulations give power also to grant registrations and permits in and for any district, and for otherwise administering within such districts the provisions of the Act. They further give power for—

“prescribing rules governing the powers, authorities, duties, proceedings, and business of such board; and generally for carrying into full effect the provisions of this Act and such regulations in relation to such boards and their functions.”

I submit with all due respect to those who object to government by regulation that these regulation-making powers are sufficiently wide to enable the representations put forward by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Murilla to be given effect to. I am hopeful that the passing of this Bill and the framing of the regulations on sensible lines will not only be a benefit and protection to those who are primarily affected, but will enable the fur trade to be developed as it should be. At the same

time it provides more protection to the people who are paying the rent to the Crown at the present time.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Moore's amendment*) stand part of the question—put; and the House Crown at the present time.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Kirwan
“ Bedford	“ Land
“ Bruce	“ Larcombe
“ Bulcock	“ McCormack
“ Carter	“ McLachlan
“ Collins	“ Mullan
“ Conroy	“ Payne
“ Cooper, F. A.	“ Pollock
“ Cooper, W.	“ Riordan
“ Dash	“ Ryan
“ Dunstan	“ Smith
“ Foley	“ Stopford
“ Gilday	“ Theodore
“ Gillies	“ Weir
“ Gledson	“ Wellington
“ Hanson	“ Wilson
“ Hartley	“ Winstanley
“ Jones	“ Wright

Tellers: Mr. Weir and Mr. Wright.

NOES, 23.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Logan
“ Barnes, W. H.	“ Maxwell
“ Brand	“ Moore
“ Clayton	“ Morgan
“ Corser	“ Nott
“ Deacon	“ Petrie
“ Edwards	“ Roberts
“ Elphinstone	“ Sizer
“ Fry	“ Swayne
“ Kelso	“ Taylor
“ Kerr	“ Warren
“ King	

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Clayton.

PAIR.

AYES.
Mr. Pease

NOES.
Mr. Peterson

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 37.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Kirwan
“ Bedford	“ Land
“ Brennan	“ Larcombe
“ Bruce	“ McCormack
“ Bulcock	“ McLachlan
“ Carter	“ Mullan
“ Collins	“ Payne
“ Conroy	“ Pollock
“ Cooper, F. A.	“ Riordan
“ Cooper, W.	“ Ryan
“ Dash	“ Smith
“ Dunstan	“ Stopford
“ Foley	“ Theodore
“ Gilday	“ Weir
“ Gillies	“ Wellington
“ Gledson	“ Wilson
“ Hanson	“ Winstanley
“ Hartley	“ Wright
“ Jones	

Tellers: Mr. Riordan and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 23.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Logan
“ Barnes, W. H.	“ Maxwell
“ Brand	“ Moore
“ Clayton	“ Morgan
“ Corser	“ Nott
“ Deacon	“ Petrie
“ Edwards	“ Roberts
“ Elphinstone	“ Sizer
“ Fry	“ Swayne
“ Kelso	“ Taylor
“ Kerr	“ Warren
“ King	

Tellers: Mr. Kelso and Mr. Maxwell.

PAIR.

AYES.
Mr. Pease

NOES.
Mr. Peterson

Resolved in the affirmative.

[Hon W. N. Gillies.

CITY OF BRISBANE BILL.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3—"Interpretation—Elector"—

Mr. KING (Logan): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"On line 8, page 2, after the word—
'city'

insert the words—

'and being a person whose name appears in the ratebook of the council as an owner or occupier of rateable land within the city.'

The clause will then read—

"Elector"—A person whose name is enrolled on an electoral roll compiled pursuant to the Elections Act for an electoral district or part thereof comprised within the city; and being a person whose name appears in the ratebook of the council as an owner or occupier of rateable land within the city."

The object of the amendment is to restore the restricted franchise and do away with adult franchise.

Mr. WRIGHT: Property vote.

Mr. KING: No, not a property vote. We on this side are in favour of the franchise being given to the owner or occupier, and primarily to the occupier. Under the existing Local Authorities Act the occupier is the person primarily responsible for the payment of rates. The occupier is liable for the rates whether he agreed to pay them or not. The occupier is the person whose

[11 a.m.] goods and chattels are attached under a warrant if the rates are not paid. I have said all along that the occupier should have a vote for reasons I have already stated, and because he has to put up with all the disabilities of bad roads and drainage. The occupier for these reasons should be entitled to a vote whether he pays the rates or not. But I could never see the force of every adult who has no liabilities in connection with the carrying on of local government having a vote. He has no obligations or liabilities. A man who is a camper on the bank of a creek, if he is qualified by residence—which is the only qualification—has an equal right in regard to local government matters with a man who is occupying premises and paying heavy rates. I am not saying anything of the equal rights of this man to the owner of the property. I am not advocating the rights of private property.

Mr. COLLINS: Of course you are.

Mr. BULCOCK: You are advocating a restricted franchise.

Mr. KING: I am advocating a restricted franchise in these matters. There is a restricted franchise in some form or other all over Australia in local government elections. The franchise that obtains in Queensland in local authority affairs does not obtain in any other part of Australia. The hon. gentleman who interjected would be the very first man to get up and complain if any man was given the right to place a preferential mortgage over his property. The adult franchise in local government matters means that the person who has no responsibilities or obligations in carrying out local government duties has an equal right with the

owners of valuable properties to say, "I am going to place a tax on your property." That tax amounts to a preferential mortgage. Unpaid rates are a charge on the land, and take precedence of mortgages, whether they are registered or not. The Australian Workers' Union, of which many hon. members opposite are members, only allows those members who have paid their levies to vote in their ballots.

Mr. BULCOCK: We only allow those who are associated with the movement to vote.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah!

Mr. FRY: And they must be financial.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. KING: This principle of adult franchise in local government matters was not asked for by the people of Queensland. It was turned down the only time it ever came before the people. The question of adult franchise in connection with local government came before the Upper House some years ago, and the Upper House decided to postpone for six months the second reading of the Bill. In course of time the Government, to get over their difficulties, packed the Upper House with sufficient additional members to enable them to have this legislation passed. Before that took place a referendum of the people was taken as to the advisability of abolishing the Upper House. That referendum resulted in a majority of 66,000 of the electors of Queensland, under the adult franchise, turning the proposition down. It was badly beaten, and the people decided that the Upper House should remain.

Amongst the questions that came before the people on the referendum for the abolition of the Upper House was the question of adult franchise as applied to local authorities.

The HOME SECRETARY: You would not give the occupier a vote.

Mr. KING: The occupier had a vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not the owner and the occupier.

Mr. KING: Yes. If the occupier paid the rates—and he very often did—he got a vote. The owner had no remedy against the occupier having a vote because, if the owner insisted upon paying the rates, the occupier had a right to deduct the amount of rates from his rent and to claim his vote. I want to go further than that. I have already stated, and I say again, that I favour the occupier having the vote whether he pays the rates or not. As I previously stated, one of the questions which came before the public and the Upper House was the question of extending the adult franchise to local authorities. This was turned down by the Upper House, and the action of the Upper House was endorsed by the people. The reasons given by the Upper House for rejecting the idea were—

"1. That the Bill would open the door to gross injustice being inflicted on all persons having a permanent residence or interest in any district, inasmuch as all owners and occupiers would be liable to having heavy loans and perpetual taxation imposed on them by reckless nomad voters who could themselves escape from all liability.

"2. The local authority franchise is essentially different from the parliamentary franchise in area, interest, and

Mr. King.]

responsibility; and representation should go with taxation, and not otherwise.

"3. The representatives of the people on city, town, and shire councils have not asked for the Bill, nor does the community or any appreciable part of the community desire it."

Those were the reasons given by the Upper House for postponing the second reading of the Bill for six months, and I say those were good, sound, and valid reasons, and hold good just as much to-day as they did then.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I support the contention of the hon. member for Logan. When this Bill was going through its second reading the hon. member for Port Curtis, when talking about New Zealand, pointed out that they had the same local government franchise as we have. They have nothing of the sort.

Mr. CARTER: They have.

Mr. MOORE: I shall read and demonstrate what the New Zealand franchise is. In borough corporations the franchise is given to ratepayers who may have one, two, or three votes. I am talking about municipalities such as Auckland. The first qualification in New Zealand is a freehold qualification. The definition under the New Zealand Act reads—

"A freehold qualification, meaning thereby that he is the beneficial and duly registered owner of a freehold estate in land of a capital value of not less than £25."

Mr. CARTER: Every adult has a vote.

Mr. MOORE: That is the very thing we have been quarrelling about ever since this Bill was introduced. Every adult has a vote in New Zealand, but every property owner also has a vote.

Mr. CARTER: Not an added vote.

Mr. MOORE: He has a vote whether he lives in the area or not.

Mr. CARTER: He has only one vote.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member wants to squib out of it by saying that he has only one vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: There is a rating qualification under the New Zealand Act. There is in addition a residential qualification, and there is also an occupier's qualification. The definition of "occupier's qualification," reads—

"An occupier's qualification, meaning thereby that he is, and for at least three months then last past has been, in occupation as a tenant or sub-tenant."

New Zealand—which is the only country in the Southern Hemisphere that has a wider franchise than the other States of Australia—admits the desirability and the justice of the claim that the man who pays the rates, whether he lives in the area or not, should have a vote. That is the position that we have taken up all through. In New Zealand, if a man has a freehold property in an area, he has a vote whether he lives in that area or not. That is what we have been endeavouring to secure in order to get away from this injustice, by which the man who pays the rates is not entitled to a vote in that area unless he lives in it. He should

be entitled to some say in the expenditure of his own money. During the last four years people have paid a considerable amount of rates to the councils, yet they have had no say in the expenditure of that money. That is wrong.

A restriction of the franchise is the only way in which these people can be given a say in the expenditure of the money which they contribute. Surely there is no justice in the contention that, merely because a man happens to live within an area, he should have a vote, while the man who happens to own a property or leases a property in the area and pays the rates should not have a vote? The injustice may not be so glaring under the Greater Brisbane scheme as it is under present circumstances; but there is no doubt that in the past there have been most glaring injustices. It must be recognised that the right of taxation should also give a right to say how the money shall be expended. The Minister must recognise that these people at the present time are not getting the just deal that they should get. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to accept the whole amendment, he should make provision, as has been done in New Zealand, for the tenant and for the freeholder to have a voice in the election of the council which is going to decide how the money which they contribute is going to be expended. It is absolutely wrong to cut them right out, and to continue to tax them and give them no opportunity of saying how their money shall be spent.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): The hon. member for Logan still clings to his pet property qualification, and hon. members opposite have not got out of the way of thinking of their predecessors of many years ago. The adult franchise has given excellent results in municipal matters, and benefits have accrued from it in other directions, and, if Opposition members are pinning their faith to the property qualification in municipal matters, they are still pinning their faith to property qualification in other matters. If it is right for a person in a municipality to have a voice because he owns property, it is good enough in State and Federal matters.

Mr. KING: Do not forget that the occupier will have a vote under my amendment.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The occupier is a little side-wind. The hon. member for Logan knows the difficulty the occupier had in times past in getting a vote. He knows that the occupier had to go and pay the rates and deduct them from the rent, perhaps, of a particularly harsh landlord at the risk of not being allowed to remain in occupancy.

Mr. KING: Remember I am advocating the case of the occupier.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I know the hon. member says so now, but he has not moved any amendment to that effect. The hon. member knows the loophole in the amendment as well as I do.

Mr. KING: No, I do not.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I wish to point out where the Opposition stands in the matter of a property qualification for electors. They stand for it in municipal matters and in Federal and State matters. If it is a terrible thing for an owner to have to submit to a preferential mortgage on his property in municipal matters, is it not so

[*Mr. King.*

in regard to State and Federal matters? Does he not submit the whole of his property to preferential mortgage in this Assembly when a Loan Bill is assented to? Exactly the same is done in State matters as in municipal matters, and no harm is done. It has been found that a broader civilisation has arisen where the franchise has been broadened.

All along people who wanted a broader civilisation and a broader franchise have had to meet the argument put forward by the Opposition that property has rights. Property has no rights in the matter of a man's life and well-being. It is the people who live in a municipality who have to put up with municipal conditions—not people who own property and live a long way off. They have not to put up with the inconvenience and wretched conditions that property owners impose on people who have no particular voice in the locality in which they live. The people who live in a locality have the right to say how it shall be governed and run. They have had to submit to the yoke of property owners in the past more than to any yoke which has been imposed. Hon. members opposite go right up to the hilt in their adherence to the old property qualification. I am pleased they have moved this amendment, because it gives an opportunity of pointing out to the electors of the State as well as in the Federal arena that the members of the National party are still wedded to their old idea of the property qualification.

Mr. KERR: The occupier will get a vote under the amendment.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, he will not. The amendment reads—

“and being a person whose name appears in the ratebook of the council as an owner or occupier of rateable land within the city.”

That is exactly the same position that we had in municipal matters before. An occupier could get a vote if he paid rates and deducted them from the rent.

Mr. SIZER: You have a Fair Rents Court now, you know.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Opposition members ought to know the conditions under which the occupier could get a vote in times past. They want those conditions back again. The leader of the Opposition is out of harmony with his party when he says that every resident should have a vote. The hon. gentleman believes in every resident in a municipality having a vote.

Mr. MOORE: I did not say so.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The hon. gentleman said he hoped the Minister would go as far as indicated by the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. MOORE: As far as giving the man who owns property a vote.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Then the hon. member does not believe that every resident over twenty-one years of age should have a vote. It is just as well to have it definite, because there seems to have been a good deal of doubt and secrecy about it.

Mr. SIZER: It is no secret.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: There seems to have been a good deal of secrecy and doubt about

it. We notice in the platform of hon. members opposite that they are supposed to stand for the principle of “One adult, one vote,” though, of course, we know that the Opposition are only window dressing, just the same as anybody else.

Mr. KERR: You are always doing it.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The leader of the Opposition now says that the fact that a man lives in an area is no reason why he should have a vote—that is, he should not have a vote unless he owns property. That is the kernel of the opposition of hon. members on the other side to the principle. They think that because a man lives in a district he should not have any right to a vote. They think that no man should have a say in the affairs of his country unless he owns property in it. It is the old cry of “Property, property, property!” They are still worshipping at the old shrine.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I intend to support the amendment. I think it is only right that in local authority affairs the right to vote should be extended only to property owners and occupiers. There is one test which we may apply in these matters. Who is the individual responsible for paying the rates?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The people who work in the community for the good of the community and give the land its value.

Mr. TAYLOR: Any action for arrears of rates or any other amounts due to local authorities can only be taken against the owner, and according to this Bill, it is only the ratepayer or occupier who has any responsibility whatever. Hon. members opposite know that quite well. Surely there should be some rights in property owners?

I think the hon. member for Barcoo made an interjection a little while ago about a restricted franchise. The hon. member and every other hon. member on that side of the Committee is here on a restricted franchise, inasmuch as only financial members of their organisations can vote for their selection as candidates for seats in Parliament. They talk about the money power! They talk about finance being introduced into the matter! Why, they introduce it themselves into their selection as candidates for this House. It shows what a hollow mockery it is for those hon. members to get up here and talk about finance being trotted out as the god to whom we all bow down. They are down on their marrow bones—every one of them—to that same god in carrying out their own work, from one end of the chapter to the other. As the leader of the Opposition pointed out, property owners in the city of Brisbane are absolutely deprived of votes for the representation of the city; but on the other hand men who are here to-day and gone to-morrow can decide the issue. Hon. members opposite cannot dispute that. People living here who may be out of the State in a few weeks or a few months can decide big issues in this Greater Brisbane. They are to have rights equal to those of men and women who have lived here for forty and fifty years, and who have worked hard to make the place what it is. I contend that that is absolutely unfair and unjust, and I think that in local government we had a very good franchise before the adult franchise was introduced by this Administration.

Mr. Taylor.]

Why should my son and my daughter who live with me have equal rights with me in voting in local authority matters? They have got that equal right, but they have no responsibilities in finding the money to pay the rates. I have to find the money to pay them, yet they could vote against my wishes if they so desired. The principle of adult franchise is unfair and unsound. No matter what hon. members opposite may say about it being democratic, I claim that it is not democratic, and I certainly intend to support the amendment.

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): I am not a little surprised to find hon. members on the other side who want to hark back to a period when only a portion of the community living in a city had a vote. I am not satisfied to go back to the condition the city was in when the old system obtained. At that time we had the example of rate-payers refusing to carry a poll to borrow money to clean up a place like the municipality of Ithaca, and the Health Department had to insist upon that work being carried out. Why did that occur? Simply because the owners of the property in Ithaca lived at New Farm or some other more favoured suburb, and dictated as to what should take place in Ithaca. Under the system desired by the hon. member for Logan, supported by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Windsor, we would continue a condition of affairs whereby people would be compelled to live in the very worst and most congested suburbs controlled entirely by people living elsewhere under more favourable conditions. That was the very thing that I argued during the debate on the second reading of this Bill, when I pointed out that that was the system that had placed Brisbane in the position she was in prior to the adoption of adult suffrage. If we were to adopt a limited suffrage, we would be taking a retrograde step, and I claim we are making some advance to-day. In New Zealand, where every man on the Dominion roll has a vote in the municipal elections, he voted to clean up that position of affairs. The leader of the Opposition endeavoured to lead this Chamber to believe that the only people who are entitled to vote in New Zealand were those who paid rates or owned land.

Mr. MOORE: I said they had a vote, too.

Mr. CARTER: The franchise for the whole of New Zealand is the same as that which applies in Wellington.

Mr. MOORE: No.

Mr. CARTER: Yes.

Mr. MOORE: No. There are two Acts.

Mr. CARTER: This statement of the electoral qualification which I have here applies to one of the greater city areas in New Zealand. Let me read the franchise so that the hon. member will be a little wiser than he appears to be.

Mr. KELSO: You are not sure of your facts.

Mr. CARTER: This is the franchise as applied to the city of Wellington—

“The name of any person may be placed on the district electors’ roll in respect of any one (but not more) of the following qualifications:—

(a) Freehold qualifications, meaning thereby that he is the beneficial and

[*Mr. Taylor.*

duly registered owner of a freehold estate in land in the borough, of the capital value of not less than £25.

(b) Rating qualification, meaning thereby that he is the person whose name appears for the time being in the ‘Occupiers’ column in the Valuation Roll in respect of any rateable property in the borough.

(c) Residential qualification, meaning thereby that he has been a resident in New Zealand for twelve months, and for three months last past a resident in the borough, and is a British subject, either by birth or naturalisation in New Zealand.”

That is the broadest franchise that one can have, and that applies in Wellington, with a population of 92,000, of whom over 43,000 are electors. That would just about be equal to the number qualified to vote under a system of adult suffrage. In New Zealand this broad franchise is in operation in the Greater City areas, and in such areas they have made wonderful progress under this better form of government, and have to some extent cleaned up those areas, and the bodies concerned have been able to work in the interests of the people. The system of adult suffrage has accomplished beneficial results in our own city. The local authority bodies in New Zealand are not what you might call bodies of business men, but they are broad-minded bodies capable of carrying on local activities of every kind with advantage to the people. I believe that this Committee is quite satisfied that, where the broad franchise is in operation in the Dominion of New Zealand immense advantages have been obtained by the people. This Committee would be ill-advised in any way to consider the amendment.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The hon. member for Port Curtis has with some trouble endeavoured to prove a case on behalf of a universal franchise in local government matters, but he must know that the only argument he can use from his own point of view is that it is the desire and determined wish of his supporters that all their supporters should receive a vote in [11.30 a.m.] order to capture the control of the city as well as every other governing body within the State. The hon. member tried to insinuate that members of the Opposition were attempting to restrict the franchise. I might remind him that the broad franchise which exists throughout the whole of the State was given to the people of Queensland and Australia before a Labour Government assumed power.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORSER: Because this broad principle has been extended to parliamentary elections it does not say it is a good thing it should be extended to other governing bodies, whether it be the governing body of the city of Brisbane or some big industrial enterprise. It is no more logical to give every adult resident a vote in local government matters than it would be for the workers engaged in meat-works or some other industry to have a vote to decide who the directors of that industry should be. The only claim of the hon. member in support of a universal franchise under this Bill was that certain individuals living outside the area refused to carry a poll authorising a council on the outskirts of Brisbane to borrow money to clean up its

district. The hon. member should know that the Commissioner for Health can override the decision of such a body in a matter of that kind. Such a decision by any local authority could, in the interests of humanity, be brushed aside by the Department of Health at any moment. If that is the only argument the hon. member for Port Curtis can put up in defence of the desire of the Labour party to capture seats on local authorities through the stuffing of rolls by giving votes to casual workers, then there is every reason why the amendment should be carried. The principle of the universal franchise is bad, and it has been extended throughout the State. It is a franchise which does not give those particularly concerned a fair opportunity of managing their own financial affairs. The difficulty of a universal franchise in these matters arises when those who have not to pay can decide whether a loan shall be obtained or not. In such cases those who receive the benefits of the expenditure of the loan have not to find the interest or redemption. Generally speaking, the policy of the Labour party in union matters is to give a vote to those who have paid their way. If it is good in their own particular case, surely the same principle should hold good when it concerns the interests of those who are landholders. We have a Parliament of seventy-two members, and under this principle every one of those members should have a say as to who shall be Premier and who shall be elected to the Cabinet. That would not suit the Labour party, and they will not recognise the principle here. They will not recognise any rights of the Opposition, nor will they agree to select the Ministers under a popular franchise, because it would not suit them.

Mr. CARTER: We have spoken on that.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman may claim to have spoken on it, but he has not been able to carry it out, and now he has been speaking in the very opposite way. I am supporting the amendment and the contention of the previous speakers in its support. I only hope that the Government will give way in this idea of theirs to take away the interests of those who wish to develop the State and control their own homes. They could make a beginning in breaking away from this principle by accepting the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): The amendment is not moved in any desire to have it carried. Hon. members opposite quite recognise that the policy of the Government on the question of a broad franchise is well and clearly defined. Hon. members opposite are merely moving the amendment to please some of their wealthy friends outside. (Opposition dissension.) Hon. members know very well they have no chance of having it carried. If it were carried it would mean a restricted franchise of the Greater City of Brisbane.

Mr. CARTER: That is what they want.

The HOME SECRETARY: The franchise for the Greater City would be more restricted than the franchise under the Local Authorities Act, which was passed by a majority of this House. Hon. members opposite would have us bring in on the one hand something superior in the form of a local authority, and on the other hand they would have us bring in a restricted franchise governing the election of the people who

will represent us on this Greater Brisbane Council. Hon. members opposite recognise that it would benefit very few people, because really, taking the large area embraced in the Greater Brisbane scheme, the man who has most of his interests centred in the city, and who lives, say, in Toombul, will have an opportunity of voting no matter where he resides, and so he will be able to protect his interests, whether they are in the city or the suburbs. If the amendment were accepted, it would mean that a man could not exercise the franchise unless he were a ratepayer on the council's books, or a property owner on the council's books. That would mean that one piece of property might represent two votes, one for the owner and the other for the occupier. I am sure the mover of the amendment had no serious object in view when he brought it forward.

Mr. KERR: The amendment says "occupier" or "owner."

The HOME SECRETARY: It uses the words "owner" or "occupier," so providing for both to have a vote. Such an amendment can only be a benefit to a few people who may be living in Sydney or elsewhere, and who may have interests in Brisbane. What is it going to cost? It means that we would have to dissect the books of the council and print a new roll for each of the twenty electorates, instead of using the one roll which is used to elect hon. members of this House who represent metropolitan electorates. All that expense would be incurred merely to give a few people with a little property in the city, and who may not be residents in the area, an opportunity of having a voice in the election of those who shall represent them. No serious argument has been brought forward in support of the amendment. This House has clearly accepted the principle of a broad franchise, which applies to local authorities as well as to the representation in this House, and the policy of representation in the Federal House is based upon a similar broad franchise. I am not going to support any step which would lessen that broad franchise.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I do not think the Home Secretary was very serious this morning when he made the accusation that the Opposition were not serious in moving this amendment. Surely the hon. gentleman understands the position better than to say we are merely advocates for wealthy friends outside when we move such an amendment. Surely the hon. gentleman understands that the ratepayers who will come within the Greater Brisbane area are not wealthy people at all. Possibly 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. of the ratepayers in the Greater Brisbane area may be termed wealthy—

The HOME SECRETARY: They all have votes.

Mr. KERR: The other 80 per cent. or 90 per cent. are more or less working men on the basic wage.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I am sure the hon. gentleman was not serious when he said we were moving this amendment to favour our wealthy friends. This is a most important Bill, and the amendment is also a most important one.

The HOME SECRETARY: Show me where the Bill prevents any working man in Brisbane having a vote.

Mr. Kerr.]

Mr. KERR: It does not, and I have not said anything to that effect. The hon. gentleman said that members of the Opposition were looking after their wealthy friends outside. That is a deliberate misstatement. The Home Secretary is not serious. He evidently does not understand that 90 per cent. of the ratepayers in the Greater Brisbane area, whose interests we are looking after by moving this amendment, are people on the basic wage. The Home Secretary has to recognise that fact. I want to make this definite statement, that, if this amendment is agreed to by the Committee, no person who is a permanent resident or who has an interest in any district will suffer a hardship. The Home Secretary knows that somewhere between 70 per cent. and 80 per cent. of the population of the Greater Brisbane area are ratepayers. We are in the fortunate position that the majority of the people are ratepayers and would have a vote under this amendment. We have to realise that there is an essential difference between the parliamentary franchise and the franchise in connection with local government. The area itself is one important factor. Again, Parliament passes legislation, and the local authorities merely carry out that legislation. That is a difference. Also, the interests of Parliament and the responsibilities of Parliament are vastly different from the interests and responsibilities of local authorities.

Mr. BULCOCK: You allow everybody to exercise the franchise in connection with the major responsibility, and you refuse it in connection with local authorities.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows that, if there is a loan to be raised in connection with a local authority, every adult in the benefited area is not given a vote. Only the ratepayers get a vote under these circumstances. There is no consistency in regard to the attitude taken up by the Government in this matter. As to saying that we are trying to rob a certain section of the community of the vote, the amendment would not do that at all.

Mr. CARTER: Of course it would.

Mr. KERR: The people who have all the interest are the occupiers, who may be termed permanent residents after three or six months. We should not give a vote to every person who floats into the town for a month or two, as possibly the votes of these people would be the deciding factor.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the same argument you used when objecting to the adult franchise in connection with the Federal Parliament and State Parliament.

Mr. KERR: There is a vast difference between the adult franchise in connection with the parliamentary elections and the adult franchise in connection with local authority elections. The amendment is perfectly justified. Taxation should not be imposed when those who have the opportunity of imposing it go scot free. When you talk about giving a vote to every person in the community irrespective of any other factor, you are only pledging yourself to secure a greater number of votes at election time. It is not common sense. Take the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board. Is that giving the best results under a popular franchise? Of course it is not. Take the Brisbane Tramway Trust. Should we get the best results by a system of adult

franchise? I venture to say that these vast undertakings can be compared to local authorities. The local authorities manage vast revenues, and the people who find these moneys should have some say in regard to the expenditure. If the question of health steps in, surely the ratepayers who constitute the majority of the people living in a district will have the good sense to clean up their own district! They will do equally as well as the man who is not paying a "bean" towards it. There is no argument against the occupier having a vote—I say that he has the same right to a vote as anyone else. The amendment gives the occupier the right to vote. The time has arrived when any section of parliamentarians should have more sense than to arrogate to themselves the sole privilege of being the friends of the man on the basic wage. Let us consider the matter as a whole, and from the point of view that this is a measure for the benefit of the people. If the amendment is accepted, that desire will be secured.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): Nothing could be fairer than the amendment of the hon. member for Logan, which proposes that the franchise for the election of aldermen in the city of Brisbane shall be given to property owners and occupiers. It provides that anyone who rents a house in Brisbane shall have the right to vote for an alderman. What more do the Government want? Apparently hon. members opposite are very anxious that the casual traveller should have a vote. I heard some hon. member opposite remark that that person contributes towards the taxes, but I say he does nothing of the kind. We all know how easy it is to get on the Queensland parliamentary roll. Anyone who is here for a few weeks can become a voter. During a merely temporary presence in Brisbane he may have the opportunity of voting in an election on a vital point which may lead to the rating of property up to its total value. He may have the opportunity of voting on the expenditure of loan money right up to the limit, and then he may leave the place after the harm is done. Perhaps he will vote for incurring expenditure because he thinks it will be a temporary advantage to himself. Some of the works that may be proposed, may be in the nature of relief work and will not be of a reproductive character, and there may be no chance of their ever paying. Possibly some prospect of enjoyment may be opened up to him in the form of getting recreation gratis and also free tram rides and other things that will influence irresponsible voters. We must remember the great powers which the Greater Brisbane Council will possess. After doing all the harm he possibly can a casual resident may go away leaving the burden on the people who have acquired property in Brisbane, some of whom have been working for the greatest part of their lives to acquire their own homes. The casual travellers can drift out leaving others to carry the baby. I do not think that any Queenslander can conscientiously urge that such a franchise as that is right. The proposal under the amendment is to limit the franchise to those who own or even temporarily rent a house in Brisbane.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Does the amendment propose to make it compulsory to register the occupier's name?

[*Mr. Kerr.*]

Mr. SWAYNE: The amendment is very well drawn. Once it is in the Bill it remains for those administering the measure to see that all bona fide occupiers get votes, no matter by what means. If the amendment is carried, it will mean that everyone who happens to occupy a house, no matter how temporarily, will have a vote, and it will be the duty of the Minister for the time being to see that he gets it. I think we should be justified in going further, and insisting that the control of the Greater Brisbane of the future shall be left in the hands of those who are permanently resident in the place. I think that is a fair contention, and that in any case the amendment is amply sufficient to meet the case. There is no doubt, however, that the whole trend of this Government is in the direction of discouraging thrift in any shape or form. The way in which it will work out will be that the thrifty section of the community will become the minority, and then whatever they possess will be stripped from them. I do not think that in any country in the world it has been the experience that it is desirable that such a class should be eliminated, but that is the direction in which the legislation of hon. members opposite is tending. I would not be in order in going into the principle which underlies it, and I shall content myself by saying that the amendment contains everything in the shape of a liberal franchise in local government matters that can be desired.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. King's amendment on clause 3*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 24.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Logan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Clayton	„ Nott
„ Corser	„ Petrie
„ Deacon	„ Roberts
„ Edwards	„ Sizer
„ Elphinstone	„ Swayne
„ Kelso	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Warren

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Maxwell.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones
„ Bedford	„ Kirwan
„ Bertram	„ Land
„ Brennan	„ Lacombe
„ Bruce	„ Lloyd
„ Bulcock	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ Mullan
„ Collins	„ Payne
„ Conroy	„ Riordan
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Ryan
„ Dash	„ Smith
„ Dunstan	„ Stopford
„ Gilday	„ Theodore
„ Gillies	„ Wei
„ Gledson	„ Wellington
„ Hanson	„ Winstanley
„ Hartley	„ Wright
„ Hynes	

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Carter.

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Peterson	Mr. Pease
„ Vowles	„ Wilson

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4—“*City of Brisbane—Boundaries*”—

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

“On lines 4 to 11, page 3, omit the words—

‘(i.) The Cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane;

‘(ii.) The Towns of Hamilton, Ithaca, Toowong, Windsor, Sandgate, and Wynnum;

‘(iii.) The Shires of Balmoral, Belmont, Coorparoo, Enoggera, Kedron, Moggill, Sherwood, Stephens, Taringa, and Toombul, and parts of the Shires of Tingalpa and of Yeerongpilly;’

with a view to inserting the words—

‘(i.) The Cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane;

‘(ii.) The Towns of Hamilton, Ithaca, Toowong, and Windsor;

‘(iii.) The Shires of Balmoral, Coorparoo, Enoggera, Stephens, and Taringa.’”

The amendment deals with the area of the proposed Greater City of Brisbane, and affects one of the most important principles of the Bill. I do not want to take up the attitude that it is impossible to administer the area proposed in the Bill, but we are not justified in commencing with such a huge area, more particularly as it will place an unjust financial burden on certain ratepayers. I have moved the amendment with the object of protecting the financial interests of those ratepayers.

We would have greater harmony in the restricted area under my proposal, and the natural sequence would be a greater success to the scheme. We know that the area provided for under the Bill is 355½ square miles. The amendment I have moved embraces an area of 99¼ square [12 noon] miles, and contains a population of 1,902 to the square mile. The number of ratepayers in the area I propose is 44,804, as against 63,452 in the area provided for under the Bill. The amendment brings in 77 per cent. of the population of the metropolitan area. It appears to me that the scheme sets out to co-ordinate interests. We all agree that should be so, but in the sense of finance it is co-ordinating interests in which there is no real community of interests, and there would be an unjustifiable loading up of the ratepayers in the outside area without giving them any compensating benefits.

The loan indebtedness of the area confirms my statement. The loan indebtedness of the area embraced in my amendment is £1,830,776, or an average per ratepayer of £40 17s. 3d. The increased loan indebtedness of the balance of the area embraced in the Bill is £169,705, or an indebtedness per head of population of £9 2s. The Committee have to look at this question from the point of view that the loan indebtedness per ratepayer in the inner zone is £40 17s. 3d., whereas the loan indebtedness outside the 5-mile area is only £9 2s. The Bill proposes that the loan indebtedness of the local authorities embraced in the scheme shall be pooled. The logical result will be that the ratepayers in the outer area will have an additional load of indebtedness placed on them, while those in the inner zone will have their load of indebtedness lightened. The

Mr. Kerr.]

revenue per ratepayer received from the area included in my amendment will be £10 14s. 4d., and the revenue received outside that area is £3 16s. 6d. The increased indebtedness per ratepayer outside the area which I propose to exclude will amount to £22 8s. While it imposes that additional burden on a certain section of the community, the inhabitants of the inner zone are going to be relieved to the extent of £9 6s. 9d. per head. When the indebtedness is pooled, over the whole zone it averages £31 10s. 6d. per ratepayer. Of that amount, it will be found that the outside area has had an imposition of £22 8s. 6d., and the inside area is relieved of £9 6s. 9d. per head. Of course, that is based on the proportion of people in each of the areas.

In the matter of interest alone in the 5-mile radius there will be an average saving per ratepayer in the inside area of £1 5s. 10d., and an average increased indebtedness in the outside area of £1 5s. 2d.

I have no intention of repeating my second reading speech, but in this morning's "Courier" I notice it is proposed by the Brisbane City Council to spend £18,000 of loan money on the improvement of the Booroodabin baths. My constituents in part of the Enoggera electorate will be called upon to bear their proportion of those improvements. They will not receive any benefits, but will have to shoulder the responsibility. There is no community of interests there. I want again to emphasise the fact that the Enoggera electorate constitutes one-quarter of the whole area of the Greater Brisbane scheme. The Moggill Shire has a density of twenty persons per square mile. Belmont fifty-seven per square mile, Tingalpa thirty per square mile, and Yeerongpilly thirty-eight per square mile.

The following figures show how the density of people in Brisbane compares with the density in some other cities in the world:—

	People per Acre.
Birmingham	19
Nottingham	24
Chicago	20
Baltimore	30
Wellington	7
Greater Brisbane	1

We on this side of the House have not adopted any parochial attitude. We do not say that it is impossible to work a Greater Brisbane scheme. We think it can be done, but we are looking for means whereby no injustice will be inflicted, and whereby greater harmony of working will be obtained in the area. No one can tell me that the mountains, hills, and vacant land in Moggill, amounting to many square miles, are going to add to the efficiency of the scheme. In Upper Brooklands, Gold Creek, and Cedar Creek there is not one residential area, and there is not likely to be any for some years; yet those areas must bear their share of such a loan as this amount of £18,000 for the Booroodabin baths in Fortitude Valley. There is no community of interests in such an idea. If you say that the people who come into Brisbane and use the roads should contribute to such schemes, you might just as well say that the people of Townsville and Rockhampton should pay for the upkeep of those baths.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Why not say China while you are about it?

[Mr. Kerr.

Mr. KERR: You could say China, and be just as logical.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: There is no logic in your argument.

Mr. KERR: There is. Why should these people be asked to carry the burden of the water and sewerage works in the city?

Let us quote the figures in connection with the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board. The loan indebtedness of the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board is £5,651,000, and the average rate will possibly be 6d. in the £1. I venture to say that it will be another twenty years before the water and sewerage services come within many miles of the Moggill Shire Council, and, perhaps, forty years before they come within the vicinity of Cedar Creek. It is not proposed to bring under this Bill the source of the water and the pumping station of the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board.

The average water rate per building is £6 19s. 9d. The people in the city are getting this water. It is not proposed to extend the water-mains to the ratepayers who live in the Moggill Shire, and it is very unjust to bring all these people within the Greater Brisbane area.

The total loan indebtedness per building is—

	£	s.	d.
Local authority indebtedness per ratepayer	28	5	9
Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board indebtedness	102	1	1

Total indebtedness per ratepayer

130 6 10

I realise the same as other hon. members, that the local authority rates and other rates which have been imposed in the city of Brisbane must very largely be considered in conjunction with the exorbitant taxation to-day; but is there any justification for trying to relieve these people in the city, after they have had the benefit of the expenditure, and put the burden on the outside people who are to receive no compensating benefit? I most emphatically protest on behalf of my electorate against that being done. The tendency is for the population of Greater Brisbane to become more dense than ever. There are tens of thousands of vacant allotments within 3 miles of the General Post Office, and there is nothing to stop the people from building on those allotments. As the population becomes denser what is going to happen? There will be a greater expenditure of loan money required in that particular area, and who is going to shoulder that burden? People who have no community of interests; people who are living upon their farms—people who are living on the produce obtained from rural land. Why should the people in such parts of my electorate be brought under this scheme any more than the people in other districts? Take the districts beyond Bald Hills and on the North Coast line. The people there have exactly the same interests as the people in my electorate, yet they are not being brought into this scheme. I do not see why we should include several of the mountains in the Greater Brisbane scheme.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Do you not want a background to the city?

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman is looking at it as an oil painting only. There are more solid facts required to make this scheme a success. We want no getting up in the clouds and building on a theory. We want to get it in black and white and see where we stand in this regard.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: You have no vision.

Mr. KERR: It is all very fine to talk about a broad outlook and a broad vision, but that does not lead anywhere. Some men who talk about taking a broad outlook and that sort of thing are looked upon as marvellous men; but sometimes you have to forget these things and to consider what it means to the people. It must be remembered that this legislation is a direct attack on a large number of my constituents in the Enoggera electorate. In conclusion, I want to emphasise the fact that no city in the world in regard to which I can get any information has started off with such a large area as is proposed in connection with this Greater Brisbane scheme. Every city that I have read about has started with a concentrated area.

No one can prohibit a person from building on a 16-perch allotment, which is in accordance with the Local Authorities Act. Naturally he will go where facilities are provided. The Tramway Trust is going in every direction where there are no transit facilities yet provided. What is the direct result of the Tramway Trust going into localities not now provided with facilities? The population becomes more and more densified. Therefore we should learn our lesson from other cities of the world, and start with a smaller area, and as the population in that area increases in density the area should be extended. I have included a fairly large area in my amendment. It comprises 99½ square miles, with an average population of 1,902 persons to the square mile. That, to my mind, is a fair and equitable arrangement. I am including the two cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane, the four towns of Hamilton, Ithaca, Toowong, and Windsor, and the shires of Balmoral, Coorparoo, Enoggera, Stephens, and Taringa. It can justly be said that these local authorities can be amalgamated without any trouble.

Mr. WRIGHT: What about Belmont? The people there want to come in.

Mr. KERR: I cannot understand why these people want to come into the scheme.

In conclusion, I would ask the Home Secretary again to consider this proposal. It has been a sort of "fift-fifty" matter ever since the Bill was mooted. Some people are of opinion that the larger area is preferable, while a large number are of opinion that a smaller area will give the greatest benefit. I am responsible to a large number of constituents who are going to have an extra burden imposed on their shoulders without, so far as I can see, their getting any compensating advantages. I go so far as to say that, when the time arrives when the population increases in the outside areas through the greater facilities that are given and a greater community of interest arises, I shall be one of the first to make it compulsory for the people there to come under the Act; but until that time arrives I cannot do anything else but advocate a restricted area in the interests of those people who are having an unjust imposition placed on their shoulders.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): The basis of this scheme is the area, and the area which has been decided upon by the Home Secretary embraces the cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane; the towns of Hamilton, Ithaca, Toowong, Windsor, Sandgate, and Wynnum; and the shires of Balmoral, Belmont, Coorparoo, Enoggera, Kedron, Moggill, Sherwood, Stephens, Taringa, and Toombul, and parts of the shires of Tingalpa and Yeerongpilly. In view of the fact that the activities of local government in that area and the other services which are essential to the city performed at present by the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board, the Tramway Trust, and the Fire Brigade Boards, and Cemetery Trusts are to be controlled by the new council, we must consider the question of area from the standpoint of what will best serve the interests of the people as a whole. We know that local authorities in the past have been asking for greater powers. This Bill gives all the powers desired, and, if those powers are given to them, it affects the question of greater area. The question of health is a matter which affects the interests of the people within all parts of the area within the 10-mile radius just as it does the interests of those living within 5 miles of the centre. The same thing applies to housing, and, although the Water Board has not laid its mains into the outside districts so far, yet a water supply will be required just as much in them as in the concentrated area. We must also provide for lighting, because it will not be long before the electric light service will be carried into all parts of Brisbane—in fact, I hope into all parts of the State—because it is easy and cheap to produce electric light in comparison with the old method of lighting.

The question of parks and reserves does not apply so much to the outside areas as to the thickly-populated areas, but we know that, as population grows and congestion increases, breathing spaces and parks are required for children to romp about in. It is also necessary that men who have put in the whole of the week at hard work should have an opportunity to get out amongst the trees and rest. The provision of roads and bridges must interest everybody even outside the 5-mile area. Because of the lack of co-ordination amongst the existing councils Brisbane is very badly provided with good roads and bridges. Had there been a town planning system in the early days, there would have been very little need to point out the desirableness of building them to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not dealing with the amendment, which proposes to make an alteration in the area to be included in the Bill.

Mr. FRY: Of course, a main road would go right through the area, and I take it would link up the town of Sandgate with the far distant shire of Moggill, for instance, and that being so both those localities are interested in the question of whether we should have a greater or smaller area. Before you can link up the centres I have mentioned it is necessary to build bridges. At the present time there is one direct road connection with Ipswich. You can only proceed to Ipswich by a roundabout way if you do not go via the main Ipswich road. Bridges should be built over the Brisbane River, not only to Kangaroo Point, but one should be constructed from Hill End to St.

Mr. Fry.]

Lucia, and another one further up stream, so as to give easy access to Ipswich. Take my own electorate. It is situated about 300 yards from a large area of land which would provide homes for 60,000 people, but, as the Brisbane River divides that area from my electorate, it is necessary for a person desiring to go there in a vehicle to travel across Victoria Bridge and around the Toowong road, a distance of about 5 miles.

Mr. LLOYD: It is only ten minutes from the Toowong Railway Station.

Mr. FRY: If the hon. member for Kelvin Grove is going to ask the people first of all to go from West End to the Central Railway Station, and then get in a train and go out to the Toowong Railway Station, and then hire a cab or walk for three-quarters of an hour or an hour to St. Lucia, he is asking us to condemn the Bill, because we are asked to support it because of its economic value.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman is not connecting his remarks with the amendment.

Mr. FRY: I am not going unqualifiedly to support the amendment. Before we can support or condemn it we want to find out how it affects the Bill. If we had a bridge constructed to St. Lucia it would open up that area considerably, and, if a bridge were constructed further up the river giving easy access to Ipswich, instead of having only the present Ipswich road, we would have a direct road to Ipswich, which would also be an arterial road.

Let me point out why there should be some co-ordination of services regarding road construction. Not long ago the Toowong Town Council and the Brisbane City Council had some difference of opinion concerning the repair of the Toowong River road. I do not know just how that question has been settled, but the road still remains in a state of disrepair. Those difficulties would be avoided under the Bill. In fixing an area to be known as the Greater Brisbane area you must take into consideration the growth of Brisbane during the last few years. During the last few years the city has extended considerably, and during the years to come the growth will be very extensive and at a rate more rapid than in the past. Whilst there may not be any community of interests between the people who live, say, around the Enoggera reservoir and those in the metropolis, it must be borne in mind that community of interests is extending as years go by. I think one of the weaknesses in the Bill is that, whilst the Government propose to take in Sandgate, Wynnum, etc., they do not propose to take in the Brisbane River.

The HOME SECRETARY: The river is a national highway.

Mr. FRY: That is a matter of opinion. I am prepared to argue that the Brisbane River should have been included. The only argument that could be advanced against the inclusion of the river would be with respect to that portion of the river from a point where it leaves the boundary of the Greater Brisbane area and extends towards Ipswich. It might also be argued that, as the Brisbane River is a national highway, certain complications might arise in connection with other rivers and harbours in Queensland if the river were included in the scheme. I am not prepared to say whether that is so or not.

[Mr. Fry.

At 12.30 p.m.,

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremér*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. GLEDSON: The Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board is foolish to follow the river.

Mr. FRY: The Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board will be distributing its sewage at the mouth of the river. We have two authorities to consider in that respect. I am afraid that, if the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board does not make more haste with its work, it will not be able to collect sufficient revenue to finish the system to distribute the sewerage. It will have spent the whole of its revenue before the scheme comes into operation, and it will be left to the city of Brisbane to collect the revenue to complete it.

I have pointed out that the scheme should be founded on good main roads. I am not referring to contributory roads. I made some reference to the road running along the river to Toowong.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is discussing matters outside the scope of the amendment.

Mr. FRY: The amendment has for its object the alteration of the size of the area. I have pointed out that main roads are not confined to the city of Brisbane.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Main roads are a matter for the Main Roads Board.

Mr. FRY: Main roads are just as essential to a city as the main arteries are to the human body. I pointed out the expense of the maintenance of arterial roads. I pointed out also that there was only one road leading to Ipswich, and that there was only one road suitable for heavy traffic leading through Toowong, and that was the River road.

At 12.32 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. FRY: A road has been proposed to go via Kenmore, Pullen Vale, Moggill, and Riverview ferry.

Mr. GLEDSON: There is a road there now.

Mr. FRY: There is not a good main road or bridge.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to connect his remarks up with the amendment. I understand he has already been told to do so by the Temporary Chairman.

Mr. FRY: I am connecting my remarks up with the greater area proposed under the Bill. I favour the greater area.

I do not wish to detract from the argument of the hon. member for Enoggera that the question is governed by finance. He pointed out that the people of Moggill and Sandgate would have to contribute towards the baths which it is proposed to establish in Fortitude Valley at a cost of £18,000. I wish to hear further argument on this smaller area before I decide to support it.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): I cannot vote for the amendment in its present form. I quite realise that there is a very great deal of force in the arguments of the hon. member for Enoggera. Really, I cannot see that there is any virtue whatever in having either a 5-mile or a 10-mile radius, because it is perfectly certain, from what

the hon. member for Enoggera has said, that the 10-mile radius in some directions becomes a very difficult proposition. That has been clearly pointed out. Places are going to be included in the 10-mile area that should not be included for a considerable period yet. I can conceive the amendment, if carried, precluding places, where the residential areas are very considerable, and where those areas are desirous of coming into the scheme, from coming in. I gather from an interjection made by the hon. member for Bulimba that Belmont wants to come in.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do want Belmont to come into the scheme.

HON. W. H. BARNES: As I have already intimated privately to the Minister in charge of this Bill, I believe in the larger area because I think it is going to be the best in the interests of the community.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the only way we shall ever get a Greater Brisbane.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Enoggera said that the greater area would have the effect of driving people outside the present radius. That is one of the reasons why I favour the larger area. I believe that with our excellent Workers' Dwellings Act we shall prevent slums being established in the city, and shall have a wider area in the city for the building up of industries. If there happens to be an extension of industries in any particular area, the result will be a further extension of the erection of workers' homes outside even the radius laid down by the Bill. At any rate, it is going to widen the area very considerably, and for that reason I consider the larger area will be better in the long run. I admit there will be some very glaring anomalies, but that will happen, no matter what the radius is.

I wish to say a word or two as to why I shall vote against this amendment. There is associated with the Belmont Shire Council a railway for which they are paying a very heavy interest. So far as I know, they are conscientiously meeting their obligations, while other people who did not give guarantees in the same form have been relieved of their responsibility. Probably there is no district that is so suitable as a residential area as the district around Norman Park, and right on to Belmont. The tram lines are going to the top of Camp Hill, and if this amendment is carried, we shall exclude from the Greater Brisbane area what must be a very important suburb.

Mr. KERR: Why?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Because the amendment says that district is to be excluded. It all gets back again to what I previously said—that the mistake has been made in the grouping of the Bill. It would have been very much better not to have confined the area to a 5-mile radius or a 10-mile radius, but to have brought in those places which by reason of the population and other considerations should have been brought in. That is where the mistake was made, but seeing that the mistake has been made, I am prepared to vote for the greater area and vote against the amendment.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I, too, regret that I cannot see exactly eye to eye with the hon. member for Enoggera on this point. Yet I quite sympathise with him in the object of his amendment, because I believe

there is a lot to be said in favour of excluding Moggill and other places which the hon. member is particularly anxious to protect. I certainly congratulate the hon. member on the fight he has put up in that direction.

Mr. GLEDSON: You are not assisting him very much.

Mr. WRIGHT: What does Sandgate say about it?

Mr. SIZER: Strange to say, the Sandgate Town Council does not want to come into the scheme, but I am of the opinion that the people of Sandgate do want to come in, and therefore I am prepared to support the inclusion of Sandgate.

The HOME SECRETARY: They have advocated both ways.

Mr. SIZER: The mistake was made in taking the sixteen shires and following their present boundaries, quite disregarding the conditions that will operate under the new scheme. It should be possible even at this stage to alter the proposed boundaries. As the hon. member for Wynnum said, it should not be necessary to keep strictly to a 5-mile radius or a 10-mile radius. We should adopt an area that will include those places that are at present densely populated and which really have a community of interests, and also those places that are likely to have a community of interests within a very short space of time. I am quite satisfied that a large part of the area which it is proposed to bring in is not going to benefit in any shape or form, while at the same time it will be saddled with certain financial responsibilities. That is very unjust, and that part could be eliminated from the Bill without affecting the principle.

I would ask the Minister at this stage to give further consideration to the question of excluding from the Bill those interests which are not likely to be of any assistance to the measure, and which at the same time are going to have a burden placed on them. He might draw a line based on community interests, and include portions of shires which it is necessary to tack on to the metropolitan area, irrespective of the other portions of the shires concerned.

The HOME SECRETARY: You do not think a Greater Brisbane Bill is a Bill for a day, do you?

Mr. SIZER: I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to that, but he has got places included in the present proposed boundaries which I venture to say will not naturally come within the ambit of the scheme in fifty, sixty, or seventy years' time.

The HOME SECRETARY: They could not carry on for a day if you left them out.

Mr. SIZER: There would be no difficulty if you cut off a mile or so from the proposed boundaries so as to bring the boundary nearer to the city than is at present intended. You cannot tell me that an imaginary line of a mile or so is going to make all the difference in the working of the scheme. I could not support the amendment, as it would exclude from the area the town of Sandgate, which should be included; yet I know that by accepting the bigger area we shall have to bring in a certain amount of land which will not be benefited by it and in regard to which an injustice will be done. I suggest to the Minister that he should

Mr. Sizer.]

make a new boundary line, including areas on the basis of true community interests, and making adequate provision for outside areas to come in within a reasonable length of time. I would also suggest that the hon. member for Enoggera should make provision in his amendment to allow, if desired, of other areas coming under the scheme at a subsequent date. If the amendment is carried, it will mean that we shall have to amend the measure later on to allow of other local bodies coming under the scheme, as there will otherwise be no provision to enable that to be done.

There is one point in favour of the amendment. While some hon. members are advocating a bigger area, the Minister, under the Bill as it stands at present, does not propose to extend some of those services which are so essential to the greater area. It appears to me that there is no particular need for the greater area at the present time unless we are prepared to give those additional services which the outside areas are asking for. I would ask the Minister to give that matter consideration when we come to the relevant clause.

I would like to know whether the extension of these facilities is going to be made to the outlying areas within a reasonable space of time. We do not care to take on a big financial responsibility in the outlying areas unless we have something to gain in the shape of additional services. That is a quid pro quo which should be considered. The present Brisbane City Council and the whole of the councils in the metropolitan area are practically dying councils, and they should not be in a position to commit their particular areas to a large expenditure of loan money at the present time, the payment of which is going to be passed on to the bigger area in the course of the next few months. The Brisbane City Council should be restrained from going on with the enormous schemes which they propose to carry out. They intend to spend £18,000 for baths and £500,000 for abattoirs. I would ask the Minister to bear that matter in mind, and see if he cannot in some way or other protect the outlying districts from any action of the Brisbane City Council in the immediate future which will involve such tremendous expenditure. I would suggest to the hon. member for Enoggera that he endeavour to achieve his object by altering his amendment, in which case I would be prepared to support it. If it is allowed to go to a vote in its present form, I regret very much that I cannot support it.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I quite agree that there is room for differences of individual opinion as to some of the areas which I have excluded. They have not been excluded for any particular reason, except that I think we must have a starting point for the Greater Brisbane area. I believe firmly that, when community of interests demands it, they should be brought into the Greater Brisbane area.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did you bring in Enoggera?

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman is justified in asking me that question. The Enoggera area is a large one, and in some places is only about 2 miles from the General Post Office. Most of it is within 5 miles of the General Post Office, so that it is impossible to exclude it. Moggill, on

the other hand, is a large area, but has a small population. It is a separate shire. We should do something to make a start, and there is nothing in my amendment to prevent the extension of the area later by Ordinance or Order in Council. Hon. members will recollect that the Windsor Town Council took in part of Ithaca and part of Enoggera by Orders in Council, and as these other areas become populated and require the facilities which a Greater Brisbane can provide, so will it be right that they should be included. I hope the Minister will consider this clause again, and delay its passage through Committee. There is no desperate hurry to get it through to-day, and I am sure that a little more consideration on the part of the Minister might bring about a solution. He seems to have some leaning in favour of my view, and it will not do any harm to postpone the clause until a later hour of the sitting.

I quite agree that Wynnum is populated to such an extent, as the hon. member for Wynnum said, as to justify its inclusion in this scheme, and that could very well be done by Order in Council. If the hon. member for Wynnum desires he can move an amendment to have it included in the Bill as it stands, since the matter is a non-party one, but a start has to be made with a smaller area, and it is obvious that certain parts of the area covered by the Bill should not be brought in at once. I particularly stress the argument that the Moggill Shire has no community of interests with the remainder of the area, and should not be asked to carry additional burdens.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I rise to support the amendment. I indicated on the second reading that I would support an even smaller area to start with—that is, the cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane—with power to take in one shire after another if it was found possible to do so. At present I feel that they are undertaking something which is beyond them, and it may get the affairs of the city into an awful mess if the area is constituted on the 10-mile basis.

To my mind, the whole question hinges on finance, which is an aspect of the matter which has not been sufficiently debated, but about which the public should have the fullest information. I believe that, if this Bill comes into operation, the outlying shires will in many instances have their rates doubled in one jump, and the people will rise in their indignation and ask, "Why was this aspect of the matter not put before us? Why did we not know exactly what we were doing?"

Take the shire of Toombul and the city of Brisbane. Where the city of Brisbane has an indebtedness of over £1,000,000 the shire of Toombul has an indebtedness of about £100,000. Is it not patent on the face of it that, if you compel Toombul to come in under this scheme, the people in that area will have to pay through the nose in the payment of interest and redemption for any benefits they may obtain? I know the Minister proposes to ease the burden a little by spreading the repayment of the loans over a period of forty years. I am not overlooking that.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman in arriving at his figures has made no allowance for the result of reproductive loans. Most of the loans are reproductive loans.

[*Mr. Sizer.*]

Mr. KELSO: It was the duty of the hon. gentleman to give us full financial details as to how the scheme is going to affect the different local authorities.

The HOME SECRETARY: I quoted a table giving that information.

Mr. KELSO: That table does not deal at all with the revenue that it is considered will be obtained by the expenditure of this money on reproductive work. To ease the burden the Minister proposes to pool the debts and make them payable over a period of forty years. Certainly that is a concession, but, unless something further is done, the increase in rates in the outside shires, which are comparatively sparsely populated, will be a very crushing burden.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. gentleman had read my table he would not say that.

Mr. KELSO: I have read it, and I fail to see the relief of which the hon. gentleman speaks. That is one reason why I am against the larger area at the present time. Even the area outlined in the amendment is too big to start with. There will be a tremendous amount of work in connection with co-ordination, and the best thing would have been to have accomplished our desires by evolutionary means. We could start with a small area, and then, as the aldermen of the city found they had the capacity to carry out their functions over a wider area, they could issue an ordinance to the effect that within the following month or two months they proposed to bring in a certain adjoining shire, and, when they had co-ordinated the activities in connection with that shire, they could have widened their activities again. It has been stated this morning that it is necessary to commence with a wide area so that the various public utilities can be extended to those areas. It has been argued that you must have a wide area to allow tramways operated by the Greater Brisbane Council to be extended throughout all those areas. The hon. member for Port Curtis during his second reading speech told us of what he saw in New Zealand, and by interjection admitted that the tramways extended beyond the boundaries of the city of Wellington. There is no reason why, with a smaller area, these public utilities that are really centred in the city itself could not be extended to the outside districts if necessary. The argument against a smaller area really loses its force when it is said that public utilities cannot be carried beyond the confines of the city. When the Brisbane Tramways Company were operating, they were given power to extend their lines into districts beyond the borders of their original franchise, and there is no reason why the same power should not be exercised by the Greater City Council in its desire to extend public utilities beyond its own boundaries.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman would be very popular in Toombul if he agreed to extend public utilities beyond the boundary of the Greater Brisbane area.

Mr. KELSO: The Minister contradicted my assertion that there would be a very large increase in the rating of outside shires. He pointed out that I forgot to take into account the fact that some of the [2 p.m.] loans were reproductive. I still fail to see where the question of reproductive loans comes in. There is cer-

tainly a reproduction insofar as the rate-payers have annually to pay a considerable amount in principal and interest. Can the hon. gentleman show me where, except in loans for electric lighting purposes, these loans are reproductive?

The HOME SECRETARY: They represent 40 per cent. of the repayments.

Mr. KELSO: I presume that the hon. gentleman in making up his table has taken that into consideration.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did you ever hear of loans for markets and wharves?

Mr. KELSO: Yes; but they are not a very big thing. The hon. member has taken that into consideration in his table.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, I have.

Mr. KELSO: I will take the hon. gentleman's own figures.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the flat rate.

Mr. KELSO: From the figures the hon. gentleman supplied we find that the loan rate for the shire of Kedron in 1923 was .08d. in the £1, but the consolidated loan rates for the whole of the proposed area will be 1.65d. in the £1.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you know that the shire council of Kedron is going to build a bridge to take the tramways across?

Mr. KELSO: I am glad of that interjection, because, unfortunately, the shire council is not building that bridge.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is going to do so.

Mr. KELSO: It wanted to do so, but, unfortunately, the Treasury cannot find the money. I have been in collaboration with the shire council in approaching all the financial and banking institutions in the city, but we have not been able to make any arrangements to finance that bridge, and the construction of the bridge is held up for that very reason. I would be pleased if the hon. gentleman could assist the shire out of its difficulties.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am only showing you that development is necessary.

Mr. KELSO: It seems to me—and my calculations are fairly correct—that the loan rate on the outside areas will be doubled.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the general rate.

Mr. KELSO: I am not taking the general rate. I am showing how the consolidated rate will affect the shires in the outside areas.

Mr. CARTER: They have low valuations and high rates there.

Mr. KELSO: These shires are going to get it in the neck under the scheme to consolidate the loan indebtedness.

Let me take another instance to show how it will affect the outside shires. The loan rate for the shire of Moggill for 1923 was .07d. in the £1, and under the consolidation the rate will be 1.65d. in the £1. The Minister will surely admit that is a pretty heavy increase.

Take the case of the shire of Sherwood. The loan rate there for 1923 was .01d. in the £1.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the taxation for all sources, and you will find it is 6d. and 8d. in the £1. Provision is made in the Bill for differential rating.

Mr. Kelso.]

Mr. KELSO: The other case to which I wish to refer is the shire of Yeerongpilly. There is no loan indebtedness there, and all of a sudden a loan rate of 1.65d. will be imposed on that area under the Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: Look at all the benefits they are going to receive.

Mr. KELSO: I am glad the hon. gentleman has said that. Everything is going to come in the future. We are to have twenty wards in the city. I do not know what suburb the hon. gentleman lives in, but he lives in one of the outside suburbs.

Mr. KING: He lives on Ipswich road.

Mr. KELSO: I am glad to hear that the Minister lives in such an aristocratic suburb as Coorparoo.

Mr. KING: Not in Coorparoo—in Annerley.

Mr. KELSO: Whatever suburb the hon. gentleman may live in, if he found it was necessary for the council to do some work in that section, what earthly hope would he have of getting that work done within a reasonable time when there is only one representative out of twenty to care for that area? From the figures supplied by the Minister, it appears that that member is responsible, with others, for 385 square miles of territory.

The HOME SECRETARY: You might as well argue on similar lines about the electorate of the hon. member for Burke.

Mr. KELSO: The circumstances are entirely different. That particular argument has been put up, and it has been proved that the cases are not similar. Up to the present each division has had at least twelve aldermen or councillors to attend to its wants. Now the area is to be enlarged to practically the equivalent of a parliamentary electorate, and one alderman is expected to attend to each huge ward. Take the ward represented by the hon. member for Enoggera. How is it possible for any one man to attend reasonably to the wants of such a community?

The HOME SECRETARY: You support Enoggera being included in the Bill?

Mr. KELSO: I am only citing an example to show how impossible it is for one alderman to attend to the wants of such a tremendous area. That is one of the reasons why I am advocating a start in a small way. As the aldermen feel they have the capacity to go further out, let them go further out. We are putting an area of 385 square miles into the care of twenty men, who will have to see not only to the wants of the community, but later on, by an Order in Council, will have to care for the public utilities in that huge area of 385 square miles. The whole of that administration will be left to the tender mercies of those twenty men who, we may presume, will not be experts. If that is going to be the case, we may assume that the Greater City of Brisbane will go back considerably, and will not make the progress that has been made during the last decade or so.

From the statement of the Minister we find that the rateable area within the 5-mile radius is £14,413,000. That is over an area of 80 square miles. Outside that radius there is an area of 305 square miles which has a rateable value of £1,609,000. Is that any argument in favour of a restricted area?

[Mr. Kelso.]

I can hardly follow the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman talked about community of interests in his second reading speech, which was very good from his point of view, but surely to goodness there is no community of interests if you have a rateable value of £14,413,000 within an area of 80 square miles, and beyond that you have an area of 305 square miles with a rateable value of £1,609,000? I honestly believe that the areas outside of this amendment are going to feel it so severely that when the Greater Brisbane scheme is in full operation, and when the full financial effect is felt by the people outside, they will blame hon. members in this House for not making clearer exactly what the financial position was. For that reason I propose to support the amendment.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Enoggera. It seems to me that the only idea the Minister has in mind is to Americanise the city of Brisbane. I do not know of any city in the British Dominions that has an area similar to the area proposed in connection with this Greater Brisbane scheme, although I believe that in the United States of America there are a couple of cities which have an area equal or nearly equal to that area. I do not know that it would be detrimental to have such a large area in a community such as the United States of America, but in a community such as ours, where there is no community of interests, it would certainly be detrimental to the whole of the area. Just imagine in a young country like Queensland commencing to lay out a Greater City of Brisbane comprising an area of 385 square miles! I have here an extract from a leading article which appeared in the "Telegraph" of Monday, 28th January, 1924. Amongst other things the writer of this article says—

"There is a notable difference of opinion upon the question of the area of the Greater Brisbane. Which areas shall be included and which excluded? At the outset then there is controversy about what the Greater Brisbane is to be. One might say that the question of area is all-important. It is possible to place under the control of the proposed new council an unwieldy area, or an area in other respects unworkable. We should not attain the good government of the city of Brisbane by any such procedure. There must then be some decision on the question what the city is to be—its limits must be defined, and we must recognise that the question of limits is going to play an important part in the success or failure of the whole scheme. On the other hand, we are told that the area proposed is not only comparable with those of other 'greater' cities, but that it is workable under the conditions that will arise here."

Later on the writer of this article says—

"It is to be noted that men who have had practical experience in local government, who have controlled the affairs of some of the very areas which will be included in the Greater Brisbane, offer vigorous criticism of the means by which it is proposed to attain a better local government over a wider field. Surely it should pay us to listen to the criticism offered by such men. For if the Greater

Brisbane Bill is not a measure aiming solely at the best interests of the citizens, what is it? We do not desire a measure that will merely collect and absorb a number of local authorities, provide for the taking over of the water and sewerage services, the trams, and the fire brigades, and leave us with nothing but a well dug-in bureaucracy, which may or may not be subservient to the Government. What we want, and what we need, and everybody knows it, is the better government of Brisbane, the capital city of Queensland. We ought to be wise enough to discover how great an area we can safely include in such a Greater Brisbane."

I venture to say there are a great many people who, like myself, honestly believe in the principle of a Greater Brisbane. I have always advocated a Greater Brisbane, but it seems to me that, in including an area such as is proposed in this Bill, the Government are going to overburden the scheme. The city of Adelaide comprises an area of 3,700 acres; the city of Melbourne comprises an area of 7,740 acres; Sydney comprises an area of 3,195½ acres; and Perth 14,343 acres. No hon. member can gainsay the fact that they are very important cities. No one will say that Melbourne is not an ideal city, and Adelaide is looked upon as being the best planned city in the Commonwealth. The hon. member for Sandgate this morning struck a note which local authorities should take into consideration, and which the Government also should take into consideration.

There seems to be an unseemly haste on the part of certain local authorities to rush in with a view to expending large sums of money prior to the consummation of the Greater Brisbane scheme. I believe that when the Treasurer receives a deputation from the Brisbane Council, introduced by the present deputy mayor of Brisbane, in connection with the expenditure of £500,000 for abattoirs, he will do exactly the same as he did to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: Just on the eve of the consummation of a Greater Brisbane scheme it is most unfair to incur an expenditure of £500,000 for abattoirs, and place the burden of taxation in that regard on the people in the outside areas when the money has been spent without their consent. It was a different proposition that I was connected with when I was mayor. I do not take any exception to anything to which the ratepayers within the city have given their consent, but I strongly protest against any local authority now running into debt and making the people outside bear the burden without their consent having been given to the expenditure. I do not know whether it is any use trying to convince the Minister of the seriousness of the position and the desirability of keeping to a smaller area, but I stress the desirability of accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera and beginning in a small way and subsequently extending the environment of the city.

Amendment (Mr. Kerr) negatived.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 12, both inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 13—"Election of Mayor"—

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"On lines 11 and 12 omit the words—

'The Mayor shall be elected by the electors of the City voting as in one electorate.'

with a view to inserting the words—

'At the first meeting of the Council or at some adjournment thereof, and thereafter at the first meeting of the Council after the conclusion of every triennial election of aldermen or at some adjournment thereof, the aldermen present shall choose one of their number to be Mayor, who shall, except as hereinafter provided, hold office until the conclusion of the next triennial election of aldermen.'

The principle I desire to establish is the election of mayor by the aldermen, and not by the electors. I have not had any experience of local government work since the Act was amended providing that the mayor shall be elected by the electors, but the principle I am enunciating is in accordance with that which I have advocated on more than one occasion, and I quite realise that in advocating my amendment I shall have to reiterate arguments made on a former occasion. Very often a popular man may, by means of the popular form of election, secure the reins of government of a city but he may not perform the work in a proper manner. I certainly think that aldermen sitting round a table can decide which of them will carry out the duties of mayor satisfactorily. I anticipate that I may be told that my proposal opens the door of log-rolling, but that is so even in the selection of a candidate for the mayoral office under present conditions. There is nothing to prevent an organisation for going in for log-rolling with the object of selecting an individual who is popular or who is pre-eminent in organisation work. It is true that I have opposed the larger area and also the limitation of the number of aldermen to twenty, and that my amendment would reduce the number by one, but I am dealing with the principle and discussing the Bill as it is before us at the moment. In my opinion the proper men to elect the mayor are his brother aldermen.

Mr. McLACHLAN: How are you going to reconcile your amendment with clause 5?

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that his amendment conflicts with the provisions of clause 5, to which the Committee have already agreed, providing that the council shall consist of twenty-one aldermen. His amendment therefore is out of order.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 17, both inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 18—"Extraordinary vacancies—Aldermen"—

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

"On line 50, page 6, after the word—'vacancy,'

insert the words—

'Provided that no action need be taken to fill a vacancy which occurs within a period of six months prior to the date for holding a triennial election of aldermen.'

Mr. Kerr.]

The clause will then read—

“When an extraordinary vacancy arises in the office of alderman (other than the mayor) a separate election by the electors of the electoral ward in which such vacancy has arisen shall be held to fill such vacancy.

“Provided that no action need be taken to fill a vacancy which occurs within a period of six months prior to the date for holding a triennial election of aldermen.”

The amendment is to provide that, if an extraordinary vacancy occurs six months prior to the council going out by effluxion of time, the council can carry on for that period. I do not think it is necessary, after the council has been in power for two and a-half years, to go to the expense and trouble of electing another alderman to fill the vacancy for such a short period. I do not think it is necessary for me to explain the amendment further, and I hope the Minister will accept it.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I cannot accept the amendment. Although it looks very simple, it contains a principle that might become very disastrous. When any vacancy occurs in this Parliament the position is filled immediately, so that the people concerned can have direct representation. If a member were to resign from the Greater Brisbane Council, it might mean that the forces would be equally divided, and that would perhaps have a more serious effect than most people imagine. If an alderman resigned the remaining aldermen would naturally vote for one who subscribed to their own particular policy. The alderman who resigns might belong to a party who were advocating a well-considered policy, and that policy might be changed within six months from the time that the people would be again appealed to, merely because of the fact that the voting strength was diminished by the resignation of an alderman. The expense of conducting a by-election is not so great in compact areas like these, as would be the case with shire councils. The amendment would be a reasonable one if it were an amendment of the Local Authorities Act, where shires may be put to a considerable expense in holding a by-election. Whenever a vacancy occurs in this House an appeal is made to those people who have lost their representative.

Mr. MOORE: The Speaker need not issue a writ for an election.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is quite so. The election need not take place immediately. The aldermen of the Greater Brisbane Council may be fighting a certain policy neck and neck for two and a-half years, and if the amendment were adopted, a certain section might be able to change the whole policy of the Greater Brisbane Council because of the resignation of one alderman. That applies equally to both sides.

Mr. MOORE: The amendment provides that the election need not take place.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think that a by-election in one of these electorates would cost more than £100. I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment (*Mr. Kerr*) negatived.

Clause 18 agreed to.

[*Mr. Kerr.*

Clause 19—“Governor in Council may appoint Mayor or Aldermen when none elected”—

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

“On line 23, page 7, after the word—
‘for,’

insert the words—

‘and elected to.’”

The clause will then read—

“If at the time prescribed or appointed for holding an election—

(a) No election is held; or

(b) No candidate is nominated for and elected to the office of mayor or of alderman for an electoral ward;

the Governor in Council may appoint an elector to be mayor or an elector to be an alderman. . . .”

[2.30 p.m.]

The HOME SECRETARY: Can the hon. gentleman tell me how a candidate can be elected if he is not nominated?

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*): I cannot see what the hon. member means by his amendment. Provision is made in the Bill for the nomination of candidates and the filling of vacancies. Persons must be nominated before they can be elected. There would be no sense in putting in the words suggested in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a usual thing for the Chairman to say so, but I must confess that I cannot see the sense of the insertion of the words suggested. I cannot see how a candidate can be elected to an office if he is not nominated. However, I shall submit the amendment to the Committee.

Amendment (*Mr. Kerr*) negatived.

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

“On line 32, page 7, after the word—
‘appointed,’

insert the words—

‘Provided that in case where any persons are lawfully occupying the position of alderman, the council shall be entitled to submit to the Governor in council a list of persons qualified to fill such vacancies, and, upon such being done, only the persons whose names are so submitted may be appointed.’”

This is a very necessary amendment. I had one personal experience in regard to this matter when the recommendations of a constituted council, elected by the people on the adult franchise, were entirely ignored by the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: What was wrong with that?

Mr. KERR: The action taken by the Minister on that occasion was very unjust.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who was the Minister?

Mr. KERR: The Secretary for Public Instruction, who was then Assistant Home Secretary. Notwithstanding the fact that a petition signed by a large percentage of the residents was presented protesting against the action of the Minister, no redress was given. The residents submitted certain names for appointment to the vacancy that

existed in the Moggill Shire Council. The Council confirmed the suggestions, but the Minister ignored them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What advice did I give to you?

Mr. KERR: I am not prepared to accept any advice you give.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You were ordered out of the office for being rude.

Mr. KERR: It was you who were rude. The hon. gentleman is the rudest man I have met on my visits to the departments. I do not know what the object of the hon. gentleman was when I took my constituents there, but—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. KERR: I hope that the Minister will take that into consideration, and that in future the recommendations of a duly constituted council will be given effect to, and that the Governor in Council will not act as an overriding authority as he did on that occasion.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I take it that the hon. member for Enoggera wishes to give full value to the principle of adult franchise. Those whose names would be submitted to the Governor in Council would be elected by adult franchise. The inclusion of this amendment would also prevent Government nominees being pushed in when they could not get in at an election. It is no good advocating adult franchise on the one hand and taking it back on the other. If the Government were prepared to accept this amendment, it would be in keeping with the principle of adult franchise. We know very well that, if a vacancy occurs and the people in the area do not want a supporter of the Government, the Government push in one of their nominees.

The HOME SECRETARY: The people would have the opportunity of nominating their own representatives.

Mr. FRY: The council should have the privilege of submitting the names of men they think suitable for the position.

The HOME SECRETARY: There will be no vacancies at £400 a year.

Mr. FRY: That may be, but this amendment has no bearing on the money question. If a vacancy does occur, the council should have the opportunity of filling it. The Government should not cut out the principle of adult franchise.

Mr. WRIGHT: You voted to restrict it to-day.

Mr. FRY: No.

Mr. WRIGHT: Well, you were not here when the vote was taken.

Mr. FRY: I have never voted against the principle of adult franchise or arbitration courts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. FRY: That only shows that the hon. member for Bulimba will say anything for political purposes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FRY: To carry out the principle of adult franchise the Minister should accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): The Home Secretary should be disposed to consider this amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: Tell me what you would get out of it.

Mr. TAYLOR: First, the Governor in Council would not be able to make an appointment of their own. Say a council is elected and there may be one or two aldermen not nominated or a couple of seats not contested, and vacancies exist. The question arises who are the proper authorities to fill the vacancies?

The HOME SECRETARY: The people.

Mr. TAYLOR: Under the Bill the power of filling those vacancies rests entirely with the Government. All the amendment asks for is that a list of names of people whom the council may think desirable should be submitted to the Governor in Council. They may only send in the requisite number, or they may send in half a dozen names. The council should be able to submit the names, and those selected by the council should be selected. I do not see anything wrong in that principle.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the election of mayor. That might be all right in local authority matters generally, but it is unnecessary here.

Mr. TAYLOR: I cannot follow the reasoning of the hon. gentleman. I certainly think a council of twenty aldermen and a mayor should have power to submit names, and the selection should be made from those names which are submitted to the Government by the council.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): For the life of me I cannot see any need for the amendment. The position is totally different to the case cited where the Assistant Minister last year made certain appointments. In the Greater Brisbane Bill the Governor in Council will exercise his authority if a vacancy occurs, but I cannot see how it will occur. I must confess that I cannot contemplate a position arising where either the aldermen who have control of the council or those who are in opposition and who are dependent upon the votes of their supporters are going to fail to nominate a man.

Mr. KELSO: You are making provision for that contingency.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, if they are so absolutely foolish. If a council permitted that position to arise, I would not take a nomination from that council. I can understand that such a position might arise in country districts, but in the case of the Greater Brisbane Council, where men will be aspiring to the position of aldermen, for the life of me I cannot understand such a position arising, and I cannot see any need for the amendment.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I would ask the Home Secretary to consider the matter more seriously. I think it is a perfectly reasonable amendment, and I want to know why the Governor in Council should have the right to fill these vacancies. What better right has the Governor in Council got than the aldermen?

The HOME SECRETARY: Because the aldermen have failed to nominate a person.

Mr. KING: They may not have failed. This clause gives the Government an opportunity of appointing one of their own

Mr. King.]

supporters to a position which carries a salary of £400 a year. I do not think that power should be exercised by the Governor in Council. Under the adult franchise the people who are elected as aldermen are the direct representatives of the people, and surely they ought to be trusted to fill a vacancy if a vacancy occurs. They are more the representatives of the people than the Governor in Council. The Minister says it is different in the case of outside local authorities. Perhaps it is, but even there, although there was no emolument attaching to the position, the Government stepped in and appointed one of their political friends to a vacancy, notwithstanding that the direct wish of the representatives of the people was that some other person should be appointed.

The HOME SECRETARY: Supposing the vacancy left the controlling body in a minority, and that minority nominated a man who might be absolutely repugnant to the other aldermen? Would we have to accept that nomination?

Mr. KING: That is a very extreme case, and a case that is not at all likely to happen. We are dealing with a case where there may be one vacancy. A vacancy was caused in the Wangaratta Shire Council through a nomination not having been received in time. In that case the shire council recommended that a retiring councillor should be appointed. The retiring councillor had to ride some hundreds of miles to get his nomination in within a certain time, and, unfortunately, owing to floods he could not get there in time. In that case this man was representing interests away from the coast, and, instead of accepting the recommendation of the shire council that that old councillor should be reappointed—it was not his fault that he was not nominated: it was the fault of circumstances—they appointed a waterside worker.

Mr. COLLINS: What is wrong with him? He is just as intelligent as you are, although he may wear "bowyangs."

Mr. KING: The hon. member misunderstands the trend of my argument. I am not saying a word against the ability of a man because he happens to be a waterside worker. That is quite contrary to my intention. You may have a man working as a waterside worker put in by the Governor in Council to represent a district with interests that are not identical with the interests of the coastal district. That is the position. In that case the Government overlooked the claims of an ex-councillor in favour of a political supporter.

Mr. COLLINS: They overlooked some of your squatter friends.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): The Minister says that he can understand an amendment of this nature in connection with the Local Authorities Act, but not in connection with this Bill. I take it that this clause is inserted to provide for any contingency which may arise. The same contingency which might operate in the case submitted by the hon. member for Logan might also operate in a similar degree in the case of nomination in connection with the City Council. At the last minute a nomination paper might not be put in, and according to the Bill it is to be left to the Governor in Council to appoint an elector as councillor. The amend-

ment of the hon. member for Enoggera fairly meets the case. After the aldermen have been sitting together for a time they have a very good idea as to who would make a good representative for the balance of the term. The hon. gentleman must know that in regard to companies, it is understood—and the articles of association generally provide—that any vacancy of a nature similar to this can be filled by the existing directors. In the case of the appointment of an auditor under similar circumstances the matter is left to the directors of the company. I hold that when these aldermen have sat for a while and get to know the business they are the proper persons to make a recommendation—certainly not the Governor in Council. There is not the slightest doubt that if the recommendation is left to the Governor in Council, it will intensify political feeling more than ever. When the election comes along it is not a matter of the respective qualifications of the different men and their ability to carry out the work, but a question of two political parties trying to dominate the affairs of the council. The old idea of local government apparently is thrown to the winds in this Bill, and we shall have just as severe a political fight when it comes to electing members for the respective areas as at a State election.

Mr. FARRELL: Why should it not be so?

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Of course, we should have left your crowd to run it for all time.

Mr. KELSO: Local authority matters are surely outside politics. After all, what is a local authority? It simply means that, instead of a man attending himself to his front door and his drainage, and all that sort of thing, it can be done collectively, so that the burden will be spread over the whole of the community. It is more effective, collectively, to carry out the duties which appertain to every man, as otherwise some men would do the work and others would not do it. I fail to see why politics should come in. Hon. members opposite try to make it a political matter on every occasion.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Of course, you would not make a political appointment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KELSO: Would the hon. gentleman suggest that all political appointments come from this side? He knows that the greatest political appointments in Queensland have been made from that side.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The brains are here—that is why.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KELSO: I suppose I am out of order, but it is very hard to keep to the subject when somebody like the Secretary for Public Instruction interjects in the way he does. I think that greater justice will be done if, instead of the appointment being made by the Governor in Council, it is made on the recommendation of the aldermen themselves. The argument which the Minister has put up does not hold water—that if any body of men neglect the interests of the Council and fail to see that a nomination is put in in time, those men are not the proper people, nor have they the capacity, to make a recommendation for the filling of the vacancy. I think that the men who are interested in the matter, who are in the locality and in daily contact with the class of people who

[Mr. King.

are likely to make good councillors are the ones to make the recommendations or nominations, instead of leaving it entirely to the Governor in Council under a system which would offer a temptation to one side or the other to make a political appointment.

At 2.50 p.m.,

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremes*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I am supporting the amendment on account of the experience we have had in the past. In the Moggill Shire a vacancy occurred, and the Minister appointed a councillor against the wishes of a great majority of the people. An amendment such as this will prevent accusations against any Minister of using his position for political purposes. In the Moggill Shire a recommendation by the local authority, supported by over 90 per cent. of the residents, was ignored by the gentleman who formerly occupied the position of Assistant Minister, who went outside the area and appointed two political partisans.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mention his name.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Assistant Minister was the present Secretary for Public Instruction, and it is for this reason I am supporting the amendment. I do not think the Governor in Council or any member of the Executive should be browbeaten by a Minister such as the hon. gentleman into supporting the claims of certain interested parties. I do not suppose that we shall get very much satisfaction from the Minister, but we shall at any rate have ventilated our grievance against a most unjust act.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): Before the Minister finally decides not to accept the amendment I should like to draw his attention to the method by which a senator in the Federal Parliament is appointed in the case of an extraordinary vacancy. He is appointed by both Houses of the State Parliament, and all we ask is an extension of that principle, so that the Greater Brisbane Council will be able to nominate a man to fill the vacancy, and effect shall be given to that nomination by the Governor in Council. We have had a unhappy experience in this connection, and, when an opportunity presents itself of providing that it shall not occur again, the Home Secretary should give every consideration to it. It is a principle which may be applied to the Greater Brisbane scheme just as well as to country local authorities.

Amendment (*Mr. Kerr*) negatived.

Clause 19 agreed to.

Clauses 20 and 21 agreed to.

Clause 22—"Remuneration of Mayor and Vice-Mayor"—

Mr. MAXWELL: I had circulated an amendment on this clause to omit lines 9 and 10, page 8, reading—

"Any such salary to the Vice-Mayor shall be deducted from the salary of the Mayor."

The Minister has also circulated an amendment, and, if he moves his, I shall not press mine.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford (*Mount Morgan*)): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"On line 9, page 8, after the word—
'shall,'

insert the words—

'unless otherwise determined by the Council.'

Amendment (*Mr. Stopford*) agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 25, both inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 26—"Duties of Council until 1st October, 1925"—

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"On line 39, page 8, after the word—
'officers'

insert the words—

'in which the council shall take into consideration preference to the permanent officers employed by the local bodies, and a retiring allowance to such officers who may retire or be retired.'

Unless such an amendment is inserted, an injustice may be done to a body of excellent men and women at present associated with local government matters within this area. While on another occasion I did not agree with the granting of mandatory powers by Parliament, still I have a precedent for moving my amendment. In "Hansard" for 1922, at page 1838, the hon. member for South Brisbane moved an amendment in Committee in connection with the Brisbane Tramway Trust Act. This is the amendment—

"In making appointments, the general manager shall not exercise any discrimination against any person on the ground that such person ceased work as an employee of the company on the occasion of the tramway strike of 1912."

That is a mandatory instruction issued by Parliament in framing the Brisbane Tramway Trust Act, and I contend that I am perfectly justified in adopting that as a precedent for moving my amendment. I realise that in bringing into operation a Bill such as this there is bound to be a section of very desirable people thrown out of employment, and where it is at all possible to prevent those people from being thrown on the industrial scrap heap that precaution should be taken. The new constituted local authority will have every opportunity to place those officers in positions. I hope the Minister will be prepared to accept the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): The amendment looks a very simple one, but hon. members must realise that it really means that we are determining the functions of the future council in a mandatory way.

Mr. MAXWELL: The same thing obtained in connection with the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Brisbane on the Brisbane Tramway Trust Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman makes a very great distinction. He refers in his amendment to the permanent officers. He is not very much concerned about the navvy working on the road or the sanitary man or any other employee of the council.

Hon. J. Stopford.]

Mr. MAXWELL: They will get the same protection.

Mr. KERR: You are very unfair.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am going to quote what the hon. gentleman asks. His amendment provides that—

“The council shall take into consideration preference to the permanent officers employed by the local bodies and the retiring allowance to such officers who may retire or be retired.”

Clause 30 of the Bill provides—

“All officers and servants of each such local body holding office or being employed on the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, shall be deemed to have been appointed and engaged under this Act, but shall otherwise be subject to be dealt with as officers and servants of the council: Provided that any officer of a local body who has been engaged and is still employed under a subsisting contract of service extending over a period of years which has not expired on the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, shall, subject to the terms and provisions of the said contract, be continued in office by the council until the said contract expires.”

A deputation waited on me on this particular matter. I pointed out to the deputation that the officers it was proposed to abolish were getting nine months' notice of the intention to amalgamate their councils. I also pointed out that it could be taken for granted that the men who would form the new council would be fair-minded men, and I personally agreed that the new council should give preference to the officers of these councils amalgamated. (Hear, hear!) It was pointed out to me that many of those

[3 p.m.] officers were in the position of town clerks and had practically controlled their councils for so many years that they could not be expected to work under some departmental head in the big scheme, as it would be irksome to them. Without any knowledge of the requirements of the council, I would not feel justified in placing too much responsibility on the shoulders of this Committee by asking that the principle suggested in the amendment should be laid down to the new council. The expression of opinion, both of myself and the hon. member, that the old employees should get preference will be recorded. (Hear, hear!) That preference will apply to all the old employees of the councils. There can only be one town clerk and one chief engineer, and to lay down the principle definitely in the Bill that preference shall be given to all the old officers might result in men being placed in positions for which they were not suited. I do not feel inclined to lay it down that a retiring officer shall be placed in the same position as a servant of the State, who has regularly paid into a fund in order that he may receive a retiring allowance.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I agree in the main with the speech of the Minister, but he waved his hand at the end of his speech when I expected him to conclude by telling the new council, to make sure that it gave due consideration to the claims of those who are at present employed by the various councils. Parliament should insert a provision to that effect in the Bill. I believe it is the

[*Hon. J. Stopford.*]

opinion of the Committee that those employed by the councils which are going to be abolished should get first preference for employment from the new council, if they are suitable.

Mr. McLACHLAN: That is not the purport of the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: The amendment lays down that there shall be a retiring allowance granted.

Mr. FRY: We have a precedent for the amendment in the practice adopted where towns have been enlarged in other parts of the world, also by the Commonwealth Government. It would be as well if the Committee recorded in some way its opinion that the new council should give preference to the officials at present employed.

The HOME SECRETARY: Would you record that by a resolution?

Mr. FRY: The new council would then be guided by such a resolution. We might state that if the new council did not give this preference, an amendment would be made in the Act requiring such preference to be given.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): This amendment should be inserted in the Bill. It is purely a preference clause. A preference clause was embodied in the Brisbane Tramway Trust Bill with respect to the men who went on strike in 1912.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A preference clause?

Mr. KERR: Yes. At that time I asked that a clause providing that there should be no preference against returned soldiers. The Government would not accept that, and to-day the 1912 strikers are getting all the preference and the returned soldiers are getting no preference.

On this occasion we are asking that certain employees of local authorities shall be given a preference, and that a clause to that effect be inserted in this Bill. It means a good deal in the matter of the retiring allowance, which is also justified. Some of the shire clerks and other clerks employed by local authorities have been in that employment for a number of years, and have acquired a vast experience, yet there is nothing in the Bill to say that their services are going to be retained. What is going to happen to them? Are they going to be cast aside? The hon. member for Toowong asks that, when employment is available, these men shall receive first consideration. That is a very just request, and we are asking the Home Secretary to give these men that right.

The question of retiring allowances can come up for the consideration of the new council when it is elected. It is not a difficult matter to deal with. We should recognise the long service given to the authorities by some of these servants of the public. These people are just as much public servants as are the public servants in the Government employ, and they should receive every consideration. The Home Secretary should allow some definite clause to be inserted in this Bill.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): The Home Secretary spoke about manual labourers. The hon. gentleman knows that every opportunity will be given to the workers to retain their positions. If what we anticipate is

going to eventuate, the Council will require more labourers to do the work in the outside areas. I am not standing for any injustice to these men, and I do not mind if the hon. gentleman includes them in the amendment. That would clinch the matter. I want the hon. gentleman to prove his sincerity. I admit that what he says is correct, and that a certain proportion of these employees will be given an opportunity to look for other sources of employment. We must consider that a number of these men have been employed in these positions for a number of years.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is why we cannot deal with the question.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman dealt with it when the Brisbane Tramway Trust Bill was before the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: How?

Mr. MAXWELL: By issuing instructions to the Tramway Trust management that certain men were to be given preference.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. KERR: Yes; it is in the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; we merely provided that no discrimination should be used against them.

Mr. MAXWELL: I have already read the provision to the hon. gentleman.

The HOME SECRETARY: Read it again.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for South Brisbane moved the new clause, and it was inserted in the Act. I never believed in tying up a concern by the issue of mandatory instructions, but the Labour Government having created such a precedent, I would be very foolish not to avail myself of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: We created no precedent.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not know what the hon. gentleman understands by the word "precedent," but undoubtedly the Government created a precedent on that occasion, and it is no use arguing about it any further. While I believe that the Greater Brisbane Council will employ a number of these people—

The HOME SECRETARY: I hope so.

Mr. KERR: Then why not put that in the Bill?

Mr. MAXWELL: If the matter were left to the hon. gentleman, it would be all right, but there is one viewpoint we cannot lose sight of, and that is the interference of an outside organisation which dictates the action of hon. members opposite.

Mr. COLLINS: The Employers' Federation?

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman knows that there is an outside organisation which tells hon. members opposite what they have got to do. It whips them into line. It is for that reason that I object to the clause as it stands.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Who was in the lobby this morning?

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman evidently knows who was in the lobby this morning. I do not know the gentleman he is talking about, but, if a gentleman is interested in certain legislation that is passing through this Chamber, he is perfectly justified in attending here to see what is going on and to hear what hon. members

say. So long as you have a condition of affairs such as exists to-day when men who are elected to public positions carry out instructions that are given by political organisations outside, it is necessary that an amendment such as this should be placed in the Bill.

At 3.12 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I fully recognise the difficulty of the Home Secretary in dealing with a position of this sort, and I hope, with the hon. gentleman, that the Greater Brisbane Council will give preference to those men who are in the employ of the local authorities that are about to be done away with. The Home Secretary was asking just now about precedents. We have got a well-established precedent so far as the present Government are concerned, and that is that, when they dispensed with the services of the late Commissioner of the Queensland Government Savings Bank, he was paid £10,000 as compensation for the termination of his appointment. Although I advocate that the local authority clerks and other employees should be permanently engaged, I can appreciate the difficulty in inserting a mandatory provision in the Bill that they shall be engaged. At the same time I express the earnest hope that the Minister will use his influence with the incoming Council to see that these men get a fair deal.

Amendment (*Mr. Maxwell*) negatived.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): There are one or two matters in regard to which I should like a little information. We know that the elections are going to take place on 21st February next, and that the new council will not properly function till 1st October, 1925. The term of office of members of local authorities affected by this provision expires on 30th June, 1925, and I am just wondering what the Home Secretary intends doing in the matter of keeping existing councils going till the 1st October.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The existing councils have nearly two years to go yet.

Mr. KING: I can see quite a number of interesting situations cropping up because we shall have the elections on 21st February next. Probably some of the councillors elected to the Greater Brisbane Council will be members of present local authorities, and they may be holding the dual positions.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think there will be any harm done by that.

Clause 26 agreed to.

Clauses 27 to 31, both inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I beg to move the insertion of the following new clause to fellow clause 31:—

"Botanic Gardens.

"(1) In this section the term 'Botanic Gardens' means all that parcel of land situated in the county of Stanley, parish of North Brisbane, city of Brisbane, comprising an area of fifty-seven acres and three roods or thereabouts, which was duly constituted a reserve for Botanic Gardens by an Order in Council published in the 'Gazette' on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, and which said Order in Council was amended by an Order in Council published in the 'Gazette' on

Mr. Hartley.]

the twelfth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, excluding from such parcel of land the land which is occupied by a building known as 'The Botanic Museum,' and also so much land as is sufficient to form a convenient curtilage for such Museum, together with a reservation of a public right of way to and from the said Museum, and such other reservations as may be deemed necessary, which excluded part of the said reserve shall be described, declared, and defined by an Order in Council published in the 'Gazette.'

"(2.) On and after the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, the Council shall control, manage, and maintain the Botanic Gardens, and the Botanic Gardens shall be deemed for all the purposes of this Act to have been established by the Council as a reserve for Botanic Gardens and a public park under this Act.

"(3.) On and after the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, the Botanic Gardens shall by virtue of this Act be deemed to be permanently placed under the control of the Council for the purposes declared in the aforesaid Orders in Council creating the said reserve and for no other purposes whatsoever, and the Council shall be the trustees of the Botanic Gardens as a reserve within the meaning of the Land Act of 1910 and its several amendments.

"(4.) On the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, the trustees of the said reserve holding office on that date shall go out of office and shall cease to exercise or perform any of the powers, duties, or functions which they were theretofore authorised or entrusted to exercise or perform as such trustees.

"(5.) On the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, all machinery, implements, tools, utensils, animals and birds in captivity, and all other personal property whatsoever theretofore vested in the Crown or in any department of the Government or in the said trustees and then being in or upon the Botanic Gardens, shall be divested from the then owners thereof and shall, without any transfer, conveyance, or assignment, or notice other than this Act, pass to and become vested in the Council for the purposes of this Act.

"(6.) Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prejudice any lease of any part of the Botanic Gardens existing on the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, but every such lease shall be construed as if the Council were the lessor of the land demised thereby in substitution for the lessor named therein, and the lessee shall attach to the Council.

"(7.) All officers, servants, and workmen holding office or being employed on the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, in or about the Botanic Gardens shall be deemed to have been appointed and engaged under this Act, but shall otherwise be subject to be dealt with as officers, servants, and workmen of the Council.

"(8.) Without limiting its general

power to make ordinances under this Act, the Council is expressly empowered to make all such ordinances under this Act as it deems proper relating to the control, management, improvement, maintenance, use, and good government of the Botanic Gardens: Provided until the Council has made other provision by ordinance in that behalf the by-laws made by the trustees of the said reserve, a copy whereof was published in the 'Gazette' on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, shall remain in force with respect to the Botanic Gardens and shall be administered by the Council; and for that purpose the said by-laws shall be construed as if references therein to the 'Minister' and 'gardens,' respectively, were references to the 'Council' and 'The Botanic Gardens' respectively."

The sole object of the amendment is to take over the present Botanic Gardens and vest them as a trust in the Greater Brisbane Council. All the employees at present engaged in the Botanic Gardens are safeguarded, and will pass over to the Council.

There is one part of the Botanic Gardens which is not to be taken over—that is the building known as the Botanic Museum, which will still remain under the control of the Government. It is really the headquarters of the Government Botanist, and, with sufficient land for approaches and other conveniences, it will be retained by the Government.

I do not think there will be any objection to giving the control of the Botanic Gardens to the Brisbane Council. The Government have hitherto maintained the gardens at an expenditure of something like £5,000 per annum, but I think the people of Brisbane will be quite content to take over the gardens and manage them in future. There are two very fine Botanic Gardens at Rockhampton and Townsville. The Botanic Gardens at Rockhampton are equal to, if they do not surpass, the Brisbane Gardens.

Mr. KELSO: What is the area of land on which the Botanic Museum stands?

Mr. HARTLEY: I have not defined the area, but there is just sufficient land to make it suitable for the purpose of the building—I suppose there will be about an acre. I hope there will be no opposition to this amendment. I think the Brisbane Council can well maintain and manage the Botanic Gardens. The Councils in Rockhampton and Townsville are responsible for the Botanic Gardens there. In the Botanic Gardens in Rockhampton not only do they go in for ornamental plants and flowers, but they also act as a nursery for the acclimatisation of fruit trees, particularly orange and mandarin orange trees. It is becoming a profitable part of their business, and it is a great advantage to people in the Central District to be able to go to a place where they are sure of getting first-class fruit trees which have been acclimatised to the district.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): Subclause (3) provides that the Botanic Gardens shall be deemed to be permanently placed under the control of the council for the purposes declared in the Orders in Council of 1st July and 12th August, 1916, "and for no other purposes whatsoever." Under the administration of the Department of Agriculture very free opportunities for recreation are

[Mr. Hartley.

offered in the Botanic Gardens, and large numbers of persons make a practice of going there for recreation in the lunch hour and indulging in exercises in which I certainly think there is no harm. I am quite in favour of the Botanic Gardens being controlled by the Greater Brisbane Council, but I do not see any reason for the inclusion of the words I have quoted.

Mr. HARTLEY: You would make it possible to have golf links and bowling greens, and half a dozen other things there.

Mr. SIZER: Why not? No provision is made in the amendment whereby the Botanic Gardens may be used for recreation purposes.

The HOME SECRETARY: The present regulations stands until there is some fresh regulation.

Mr. FRY (*Karilpa*): The point raised by the hon. member for Sandgate is a good one. This case has somewhat of a parallel in South Brisbane. The market reserve was handed to the City Council to be used for no other purpose, and the result has been that they have to pay interest on a sum of £40,550, and it is estimated that by the time they pay off that sum they will have paid in interest and redemption about £101,000. The case is not altogether parallel, I admit, but the fact that the reserve was handed over for no other purpose than that of a market tied the hands of the Council, with the result I have mentioned. That is a phase of the question which should receive some consideration, because it might involve the new Council in some difficulty.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I am quite in accord with the sentiments of the hon. member for Fitzroy as to the control of the Botanic Gardens, but I would like to ask whether the necessary power is not contained in clause 35, which says that the Council shall have full power to make ordinances for the general good government of the city, and then proceeds—

“(3.) Without limiting the generality of its powers, the Council shall have and possess express powers in relation to the following matters:—The provision, construction, maintenance, management, control, and regulation of the use of roads, bridges, tunnels, ferries, subways, viaducts, culverts, and other means of public communication; public parks, aviation grounds, recreation grounds, and other public places; reserves . . .”

Mr. HARTLEY: At the present time that is not observed.

Mr. KING: That is so.

Mr. HARTLEY: This amendment means that the gardens shall be handed over as a reserve.

Mr. KING: Clause 35 provides, inter alia—

“Furthermore the Council shall, subject to this Act and to any alteration by ordinance, be deemed to possess all the powers, rights, privileges, and authorities, and to be subject to all the liabilities, duties, obligations, and responsibilities of a local authority under the Local Authorities Act, and the Health Act, and any other Act conferring powers, rights, privileges, or authorities, or imposing liabilities, duties, obligations, or responsibilities on a local authority.”

It also provides—

“The Council may do any acts not otherwise unlawful which may be necessary to the proper exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this Act or under any other Act conferring powers or imposing duties on the Council.”

Although I do not object to the amendment, I believe that the Council will have power under the present Bill to acquire the Botanic Gardens.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I quite agree with what the hon. member for Fitzroy has said with reference to taking over the Botanic Gardens, but I would like to know from the Minister what action the Government are going to take. Do they propose to compel the local authority to pay a certain amount of money for the Botanic Gardens?

Mr. HARTLEY: No. They will be handed over.

Mr. MAXWELL: That will be quite all right. The hon. member for Sandgate was perfectly justified in raising the point he did. I take it the Minister has given an assurance that, if cricket or tennis is to be played in the Botanic Gardens—

The HOME SECRETARY: The Botanic Gardens will be conducted as they are at present until a new ordinance is issued dealing with them.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I understand that at the present time the Botanic Gardens distribute trees all over the State. I know that many schools obtain trees from that source.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Rockhampton Botanic Gardens are controlled by the Rockhampton Council, and they also distribute trees.

Mr. MOORE: I understood they were all run by the Government.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I think it is generally agreed that the amendment should be accepted, and that the Botanic Gardens should come under the control of the Greater Brisbane Council at the earliest possible opportunity. If I understand the position aright, the Botanic Gardens at the present time are controlled by the Department of Agriculture, and all that is proposed by the new clause is that the Greater Brisbane Council shall take over and carry them on on similar lines, or in a way which is deemed to be in the best interests of the community.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The expense will have to be borne by the Council instead of by the Government.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes. At the present time the property is vested in trustees, and I take it that no legal difficulties will be experienced in transferring the Botanic Gardens to the Greater Brisbane Council.

New clause (*Mr. Hartley*) agreed to.

Clause 32—“Existing Treasury Loans”—

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

“On pages 13 and 14, omit the words—
(1.) Where any such loans were borrowed, bearing interest at the rate of four pounds per centum per annum, the Treasurer shall extend the period

Mr. Moore.]

of such loans and consolidate the same into one loan so that the whole period of the loan as so consolidated shall be forty years, beginning on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and on and from that date such consolidated loan shall be deemed to be a loan to the Council for the period aforesaid.

'(2.) Where any such loans were borrowed, bearing interest at the rate of five pounds ten shillings per centum per annum, the Treasurer shall extend the period of such loans and consolidate the same into one loan so that the whole period of the loan as so consolidated shall be forty years, beginning on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and on and from that date such consolidated loan shall be deemed to be a loan to the Council for the period aforesaid.

'(3.) The Treasurer shall cause to be made in the books of the Treasury the necessary adjustments so as to give due effect to the provisions of this section.

'(4.) Save as hereinbefore mentioned, the existing terms and conditions of every such loan from Consolidated Revenue shall be observed by the Council in respect of the consolidated loans and each of them; and the instalments of interest and redemption in respect thereof, adjusted in accordance with the extended period of each such consolidated loan, shall be payable from time to time accordingly by the Council to the Treasurer, and the Treasurer shall have and may exercise the same rights and remedies for the recovery of such moneys as he possessed with respect to the loans before the consolidation thereof.'

with a view to inserting the words—

'The Council, in substitution for each such local authority, shall on and after that date be chargeable with the payment of all sums from time to time due and payable, whether by way of interest or principal money, under the terms of the said loans, and the existing terms and conditions of every such loan from Consolidated Revenue shall be observed by the Council, and the instalments of interest and redemption in respect thereof shall be payable from time to time accordingly by the Council to the Treasurer, and the Treasurer shall have and may exercise the same rights and remedies against the Council for the recovery of such moneys as he possessed against each such local authority before the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five.'

The object of the amendment is to prevent the adoption of a system of pooling the loans and extending them over a period of forty years. We know that a number of these loans have been obtained at various times, and are to be repaid within the time that it is estimated would be the life of the work that the money was used to construct. In some cases that period would be ten years, fifteen years, and twenty-five years. It all depended on what was estimated by the Treasury to be the life of the work that was to be constructed with the money.

[Mr. Moore.

At various times the Treasury has lent money to various local authorities, stipulating the amount to be paid back by way of interest and redemption. No matter what

period of time these loans were [3.30 p.m.] made for, or how long the works for which the loans were obtained might last, under the Bill they are all now to be pooled and spread over a period of forty years. No other borrowers from the Government are going to receive such favourable conditions as these. The objection I take to it is that a large amount of this money has been spent on work which will not last for a longer period than ten or fifteen years. Much of it has been spent on such works as temporary water channeling and the construction of metal roads which will not last very long. We are shifting the burden of those loans on to the people thirty and forty years hence, who will be called upon to pay interest and redemption on work which has not only worn out years and years before and for which they receive no benefit, but which have been reconstructed again. It is unfair and unwise to place the burden of these liabilities of the ratepayers of to-day on to the ratepayers of the future. If all the works on which the money was advanced were going to last for a period of forty years as suggested in the pooling arrangement, it would be a different proposition altogether.

The HOME SECRETARY: You know that most of those loans were made for works of a permanent character.

Mr. MOORE: I know that a good many of them have been incurred for such purposes, but I also know that a great many of them have been incurred for periods of ten years. The loans are usually made for the period for which it is estimated by the Treasury the works will last. It cannot be said by any stretch of imagination that the life of many of the roads on which loans have been made will continue for forty years after next year. Some of the loan money has been used for purchasing machinery, and the life of that machinery has been estimated by the Treasury at periods varying from seven to fifteen years. It cannot be said by any stretch of imagination that this machinery will last for forty years. It is an objectionable principle to induce the people to come into this scheme by shoving the burdens of to-day on to the generation living thirty to forty years hence. If another council asked the Treasury to extend a loan which was granted for work of a temporary nature over a period of forty years, their request would be refused. The Treasury would suggest that that council should pay its own liability, incurred for the benefit of the ratepayers during their lifetime, and not pass it on to the people coming after them. If the work being constructed is of such a nature that it is going to last for the whole period of forty years, there would be no objection, as the people forty years hence would be reaping a benefit from the money expended.

My contention is that the works on which a large amount of this money has been expended cannot by any stretch of imagination be expected to last for half that period. When the work does not last for that period, there can be no justice in placing the burden on the shoulders of the people of the future and asking them to carry burdens which should be carried by

the people of to-day. The various loan works which were referred to in a table submitted by the Assistant Minister in his speech on the Bill he had in charge last year showed that a vast majority of the loans were for work which might be called of a temporary nature. A great many of the loans were for the construction of roads and kerbing and channelling. A certain amount of the money advanced was for the purchase of machinery, and the installation of electric lighting. It might be perfectly justifiable to extend a portion of these loans over a period of forty years, but for a great many of them there is no justification for any extension. I take it that in granting loans to local authorities the Treasurer is guided by the advice of his officers, who make inquiries into the life of the work on which it is proposed to expend the loans. A stipulation is then made according to the life of the work as to how and when the loans are to be repaid.

Taking all that into consideration, the Treasurer says: "I am prepared to lend the money for a certain specified time, seeing the people want the advance for a public necessity." Now, after definite arrangements have been entered into, and in many cases the people have enjoyed the benefits of the work for some time, we propose to shift the burden to other shoulders, and in some cases to double and treble the amount of liability that was contracted for in the beginning. Seeing that many people will have no benefit accruing to them from the amount of money expended but will have to pay interest and redemption on a future loan, used probably to carry on the same work in the same area and for the same purpose, we are really double banking the money they have to pay for the same conveniences. That cannot be said to be a just or fair method of finance. I can quite understand an endeavour being made to soothe the feelings of people in the outside areas for having to pay heavier rates. The clause in the Bill may be regarded as a sop to make the money due by way of loan appear as little as possible by making it repayable over a longer period, instead of calling upon the ratepayers to meet heavy payments during the first few years of the Greater Brisbane scheme. This idea has been evolved to whittle away any protests that might be made by the people in the outside areas; but that does not make it more just, nor does it reduce the liability. It is only going to extend the debt a little longer than was intended at the time the money was lent. Consequently, I do not think there is the slightest justification for this extension of terms. I see every reason for sticking to the original terms on which the money was advanced. If we do that, people in the outside areas will not have to shoulder a liability over such a long period of years and will possibly have an opportunity later to secure the expenditure of a certain amount of loan money in their own areas and so receive some particular benefit. That is preferable to having to pay interest and redemption over a period of forty years on a loan from which they have received no benefit merely to lighten the indebtedness of people who have already received benefits and who entered into an obligation, which obligation it is now proposed to push on to the shoulders of those who have received no benefit. The principle is wrong. It is wrong to compel these people to come into the Greater Brisbane area and

contribute far more than they ought for benefits which other people received and which they did not themselves receive. I hope the Minister will regard the amendment favourably, and will withdraw the clause about the pooling of loans for forty years, letting the liabilities stand as they are and allowing the terms originally arranged with the Treasurer to be carried out in their entirety. If it is necessary for all loans to be pooled, then let the original terms be adhered to so that people will not have to contribute money for work which is worn out, for machinery that has become out of date, and which possibly has been replaced by new machinery. I hope the Minister will look into the question thoroughly, and see that an injustice is not done to the few people in the outside areas.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): There is one thing that we must recognise at the outset, and that is that the local authorities which borrowed the money were prepared to meet their liabilities, otherwise they would not have borrowed it. The Minister has said that most of this money has been borrowed since 1918. We know that there is a high rate of interest chargeable on that money, and, if we provide that the repayment shall extend over a period of forty years, the council will not have an opportunity to renew these loans or repurchase the bonds issued. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the people who created the liability should be responsible for the repayment. That is the whole crux of the position. The Local Authorities Act under which this money was borrowed provides that a poll of the ratepayers shall be taken as to whether loan money shall be expended or not, and now we have the unfortunate position arising that ratepayers who have not had an opportunity of voting on the question of spending the money will be debited with part of the amount borrowed. The principle is wrong. It is wrong to relieve those who borrowed the money of their liability and put a further burden on people who had no say in the expenditure of that money. Local authority loans have always been one of the best assets to this State. If the public debt of the State gave as good a return as is given by the loans to local authorities, we would not be in the serious financial position we are in to-day. It is proposed now to extend the period of these loans for forty years, and naturally, if there is any shortage, it will have to be made up from other avenues. I do not think we should depart from the period of repayment fixed when these local authorities borrowed the money. If we do, the various works for which the money was borrowed will be over-capitalised. Some of the roads which were constructed on borrowed money will only last for seven years. After seven years there will only be about one-sixth of that money repaid, yet additional money will have to be forthcoming to repair and renew those roads, and in forty years these roads will be over-capitalised to a very large extent because of the long-dated loan. What is more, the people who received the benefit of that road will be dead and gone, and posterity will be charged for something which is being utilised to-day. It is a wrong principle, and, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, it is a sop to try to create harmony in regard to the Greater Brisbane area. If the burden which we know

Mr. Kerr.]

is going to result is going to be imposed in the shape of a piece here and a piece there, and spread over a large number of years, it will not hit a man so hard as if the imposition was put on in one piece. The Government have endeavoured to seize any avenue of escape to placate the people. They say, "Your rate of repayment is only such and such a rate," but they do not say that it is a rate for forty years. If they said, "This extra rate is for the period of the loan," there would be a greater outcry against the imposition on the part of the people who do not want to come in under this scheme. The Government have tried to obviate that cry, and they think they will do so by extending the period of the loan to forty years. It will be difficult for the Minister to advance any argument why the amendment should not be accepted. It will be difficult for him to show that those people who incurred the liability should be released therefrom, without even their own application to be so released. They are being released, and the burden is being put on to somebody else. I trust that before the Minister turns down the amendment he will be able to satisfy the Committee that he is doing the right thing. Personally I think he is wrong.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I am not going to accept the amendment, because it would destroy the whole of the Greater Brisbane scheme. What we are aiming at in this Bill is to bring about unity of action over the area which we have already declared will be included in the Greater Brisbane area. This Bill has been on the stocks for some years, and one of the most difficult problems we had to overcome was the problem of finance. Every effort was made to overcome the difficulty, and the only possible method that appealed to those who gave the matter every consideration was that we would have to pool the debts, and you cannot pool the debts without consolidating them.

Mr. KERR: That is not necessary.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am sorry to differ from the hon. member. Our advisers are men who are experts in this matter. The hon. member has referred to the high rate of interest. The interest is 4 per cent. and 5½ per cent. The proposal is to consolidate the loans for forty years. The hon. member spoke of the interest charges and the financial effect in regard to this Bill, and we as a Government are prepared to relieve the local bodies of a burden by enabling them to tide over the initial stages to the extent of £20,000 per annum. The Leader of the Opposition raised the question of the period of the loans. We have to try to overcome these difficulties in order to get a Greater Brisbane area. Imagine what it would have meant if the old Bill had been gone on with, and the benefited areas had continued. Every little section of the community would have appealed to have a benefited area proclaimed for every improvement.

Mr. MOORE: We have not asked for that.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is only logical that you should ask for it.

Mr. MOORE: Not at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: You cannot pool the loans without consolidating them. You will have to continue the system of benefited areas if you do not pool the loans.

[Mr. Kerr.

What I have been striving to accomplish is simplicity of finance, and that is accomplished by the two proposals we make here. It is not a new thing. In 1899 the loans of certain local authorities were consolidated and extended in Schedule 2 to the Local Works Loans Act of 1899. In the Schedule referred to there is a list of municipalities and other bodies, the loans of which were consolidated and extended. The tendency is for local authorities everywhere to pool their loans. Hamilton, Stephens, Ipswich, and other local authorities recognise the benefit of pooling their loans and striking a common rate all over the area. I look upon the consolidation and pooling of the loans as one of the best principles in the Bill.

At 3.52 p.m..

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): The Minister says that by pooling these loans they have overcome the difficulty of finance. I admit that they have, but I do not think that it is by any means equitable. It seems to me that some of the people have been sacrificed in a desire to follow the line of least resistance. I agree with my leader that many of the works for which this money has been borrowed are practically dead works, and say unhesitatingly that by extending for forty years loans of which some were borrowed for ten, fifteen, or twenty years, the Government are penalising posterity. The councils which borrowed them entered into certain obligations to repay within a certain period at a certain rate of interest with certain half-yearly payments. They understood their obligations, and they are not now asking to be relieved of them; but this clause certainly deals with posterity in an inequitable manner. People who have practically nothing in common with the people who borrowed the money and assumed the obligations have now to take over the liability. In fairness to the local authorities concerned and those who come after us, the Minister should see that those who incurred the liability discharge it within a reasonable period—that is, practically within the lifetime of the persons who incurred it.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): When South Brisbane was divided from Brisbane, it was loaded with responsibilities of which it has not been able to get rid to this day. You cannot argue that the moneys for which the responsibility was thrown upon South Brisbane at that time were spent on works within that area. They were not. The South Brisbane Council took over certain liabilities of the Brisbane Council, and to burden it still further with this debt is very unfair. In many instances a consolidation of liabilities must be unfair, as will be seen from the financial table given to the House by the Leader of the Opposition. For instance, we find that the loan indebtedness of Brisbane is £1,056,257, or £126 9s. 8d. per ratepayer, the revenue being £249,447, or £29 17s. 5d. per ratepayer.

Then we have South Brisbane with a loan indebtedness of £330,952, being £42 3s. 4d. per ratepayer, and a revenue amounting to £73,424, being £9 7s. 1d. per ratepayer. Then we have Yeerongpilly with no loan indebtedness whatever, and a revenue amounting to £3,277, or £1 12s. 2d. per ratepayer. That fully points out the reason why the smaller areas are complaining about

coming into the scheme. They are afraid that they are going to be hit not only in regard to loan indebtedness and other burdens, but also in connection with the burdens of increased valuations and rating that will be imposed so as to repay these loans.

How did South Brisbane get into that position? Apparently South Brisbane had no control over the position. The powers for the time being placed a responsibility upon South Brisbane which she has never been able to shake off. I have here figures which have been specially prepared for me which I desire to place on record, as they have never been placed on record here before. I do not know, Mr. Cooper, whether you will allow them to be printed in "Hansard" without being read.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman of Committees has on previous occasions ruled against tables being inserted in "Hansard" without being read.

Mr. FRY: Let me take first the market land in South Brisbane. It comprises allotment 7, section 3, with an area of 2 acres 8 perches, with a frontage of $4\frac{1}{2}$ chains to Glenelg street, 3 chains to Grey street, 3 chains to Stanley street, and $4\frac{1}{2}$ chains to lots 13 and 16, valued at £22,750. Allotments 1, 2, and 20, section 7—the land upon which Messrs. Watson, Ferguson, and Company's printing works now stand—have a frontage of 3 chains to Stanley street, 3 chains 25 links to Glenelg street, and valued at £17,820. A fee-simple valuation was placed upon the market reserve and no adjustment arrived at, as in the case of the ferry reserve. The market reserve was granted to the municipality of Brisbane under deed of grant, which shows that the land was granted upon trust as a site for a market, and for no other purpose whatsoever, on condition that the Corporation of Brisbane and their successors should drain the land, and provided that, if the conditions, reservations, and provisos therein contained or any part of them be not duly observed and performed by the Corporation of Brisbane and their successors, then the land should be forfeited. After the conveyance of the reserve from Brisbane to South Brisbane a certificate of title under the Real Property Acts was issued to the latter on 7th November, 1890, showing that they were entitled to the fee-simple—

"saving always to the Crown all the rights and interests preserved by the said deed of grant."

In 1914 the Council leased portion of the reserve to Messrs. Watson, Ferguson and Company, Limited, for a term of thirty years, but upon presentation of the lease at the Titles Office, the Registrar of Titles declined to register the same, on the ground that the lessors are trustees of the land within the meaning of the Land Act of 1910, and that the provisions of the lease should conform to the requirements of that Act. A dispute arose in 1916 and the matter was submitted to the Attorney-General, who upheld the Registrar's contention. There is a piece of land which was saddled on to South Brisbane at the time of separation which is going to cost them £101,000! It has meant additional taxation on the people, and it has increased their rates. That is one instance where South Brisbane, although it may benefit under the Bill, will benefit justly. It is entitled to that benefit.

Then there is the other property which the South Brisbane Council received—the ferry reserve, in Stanley street. It was valued at £22,440. It consists of allotments 9 and 10 of section 7, with an area of $\frac{1}{2}$ an acre. It is the land upon which the Sunshine Harvester building now stands. In report—
[4 p.m.] ing on the assets taken over, the accountant called attention to the fact that the board of valuers had treated the ferry reserve as a property held in fee-simple and had valued it accordingly at £22,440. It was found, however, that the municipality of Brisbane did not hold and consequently could not transmit any title to the reserve in question, and that a fee-simple valuation would be extremely unfair to South Brisbane. He accordingly amended the valuation to a figure equal to the capitalised value of its then rental, namely £4,320, or a reduction of £18,120. In this case they did a fair thing, but they could not get the same treatment in regard to Market Square.

Let me take another case where a burden was placed on South Brisbane by inflating the value of the land. The values of land in 1883 could not be any more than they are to-day. The board of valuers presented a report of the valuations made on 26th October, 1888. The Board valued at £82,740 the South Brisbane wharves, formerly known as Musgrave Wharf, with an area of 1 acre 3 roods, comprising lot 8, section 5, with frontages of 301 $\frac{1}{2}$ links to Stanley street, 250 links to Glenelg street, and 1 chain to Stanley street. I doubt whether anywhere near that value could be obtained for those wharves to-day. That has been a burden which South Brisbane has had to carry because of the separation of North and South Brisbane.

Then again, take the bridge allotment, allotment 1, section 9, area 1 rood—the vacant allotment at the back of the Adelaide Steam Ship Company's Wharf. This was valued at £16,500. I question whether half of that amount could be obtained for that land to-day, yet South Brisbane has had to carry that burden all these years. That is another instance where hon. members might say that South Brisbane is getting a benefit, whereas, if they are fair, they will realise that South Brisbane was penalised in the first case and had no option but to accept its liability. Any compensation which may come from this Bill is therefore warranted. A certain amount of adjustment took place between North and South Brisbane at the time of the separation, but the adjustment was not favourable to South Brisbane.

I realise that the City of South Brisbane will benefit considerably under this Bill, while the reverse will be the case with Yeerongpilly and other local authority areas which have no loan indebtedness, or which have a very small indebtedness. Undoubtedly, that will be the case unless the Minister accepts the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Those areas will simply have to carry the responsibilities of the cities of Brisbane and South Brisbane. The Brisbane City Council have spent their money very liberally. I do not know what return they have for it—

The HOME SECRETARY: They had good returns.

Mr. FRY: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I cannot say that South Brisbane is justified in taking over any more

Mr. Fry.]

of the liabilities of the City of Brisbane, at any rate, not under similar conditions to the previous transactions I have mentioned. Through the City of South Brisbane taking over that burden, the ratepayers of that area have to carry additional burdens, and the rates, instead of being nominal, have had to be raised to about 1½d. in the £1. Those are the disabilities of separation. No doubt difficulties will arise under the scheme of consolidation, and those in authority must be as fair as possible to the different local authorities concerned. From what I have heard and read, the real contention of the smaller local authorities is that they do not want to carry the burden of the greater cities, and it will depend to a great extent on the constitution of the new council, and how they devise their ways and means, as to how the small local authorities will be treated.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I do not think the Home Secretary really tried to discuss the matters which were brought before him. The kernel of the whole thing is that these loans are to be extended over forty years, many of them being originally for short terms. Under the system by which local authorities borrowed money, the length of the loan and the class of work upon which it was to be spent was specifically stated. One hon. member cited the case of a road where the benefits accruing from the moneys expended certainly do not spread over a greater period than ten years. After ten years have passed, that road as an asset is out of existence. If it has to be kept in good condition for a period of forty years, it is plain that the loan must be repeated four times for the same work.

As the leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is a bad principle to extend a loan over a term of years, when the work for which the money was borrowed is no longer in existence. That means that you are placing on posterity a burden which should be borne by the present generation. That is the whole thing in a nutshell, and for some reason or other the Minister does not want to see it. I do not think for one moment that the hon. gentleman cannot see the point, because he is quick enough to appreciate the position. In order to support his argument, the hon. gentleman wants to make out that in pooling a debt the whole effect of that pooling is to spread it over a certain number of years. All these loans can be pooled exactly in the same manner, but they could be met at the same times that they would have fallen due had the pooling not been in operation. The Minister should give careful consideration to the proposal of the leader of the Opposition. The question of pooling still remains, but these loans should be paid off within the lifetime of the work for which the money was advanced. That really is the object of the amendment, which means that the present generation should pay for work which can only last for a certain limited time, instead of spreading the whole of the debt over a period of forty years.

Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): I would like to emphasise what has been said by previous speakers on this side in connection with the proposal to extend the term of these loans for a period of forty years. I do not know that the Minister has given the Committee the information we are seeking as to the reason for extending the period for forty years. Is it in his mind that the

longer term will allow the Greater Brisbane City to get going from a financial point of view? Or is it in keeping with the policy of the present Government to pass it on, and let someone else in the future pay? We all know that various works have been approved of from time to time by the Treasurer and that loans have been granted extending over a certain period according to the lasting nature of the work. So far as I know, there is no present loan granted by the Treasurer which extends over forty years. Supposing the Treasurer had plenty of money—which apparently he has not got now—and a local authority asked for a loan for forty years, it would not get it. The Treasurer would not lend money to a local authority for a term of forty years.

Mr. HARTLEY: How do you know?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Loans are classed, and I am perfectly right when I make the statement that, if financial conditions were normal, it would be quite impossible for any local authority to get a loan for a period of forty years even for work of a most lasting character; yet for some reason or other the Minister says he is going to extend the term of these loans for forty years at certain rates of interest.

Mr. HARTLEY: Those are very generous terms.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: It looks to me as if it were a kind of sprat to catch a mackerel. It may be very generous, but it is not an indication of good finance.

Mr. HARTLEY: It will be very comfortable.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member says it will be very comfortable, but I want to ask, Is it good finance? There are many things that could be made very comfortable, but at the expense of posterity. The motto of the Government is "Let posterity pay." The Minister ought to give consideration to the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 32 (*Mr. Moore's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 35.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Kirwan
" Bedford	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Brennan	" McCormack
" Bruce	" McLachlan
" Bulcock	" Mullan
" Carter	" Payne
" Colliins	" Pollock
" Coaroy	" Riordan
" Cooper, W.	" Ryan
" Dash	" Smith
" Dunstan	" Stopford
" Farrell	" Theodore
" Gillies	" Weir
" Hanson	" Wellington
" Hartley	" Winstanley
" Hynes	" Wright
" Jones	

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Dash.

NOES, 23.	
Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. King
" Barnes, W. H.	" Logan
" Bell	" Maxwell
" Brand	" Moore
" Clayton	" Morgan
" Corser	" Nott
" Costello	" Roberts
" Deacon	" Sizer
" Edwards	" Taylor
" Elphinstone	" Vowles
" Kelso	" Warren
" Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Costello and Mr. Deacon.

[*Mr. Fry.*

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. PEANE		Mr. TIERSON	
" Foley		" Petrie	
" Wilson		" Appel	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 32 agreed to.

Clause 33—*"Victoria Bridge loan"*—

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I am very glad, indeed, to notice this load also is being lifted from South Brisbane. The rate required to raise the precept of the Victoria Bridge Board on South Brisbane is approximately twice as great as the rate required to meet the precept levied on the local authority on the north side of the river. In addition to that, the South Brisbane Council has had to maintain Stanley street, Melbourne street, Grey street, Vulture street, and many other streets which have been torn up by traffic, which did not all by any means belong to South Brisbane. They have had to bear the burden for districts much further removed, and therefore I am glad to see the load being lifted from the South Brisbane Council, on which it has placed another injustice.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 34—*"Current debentures where interest only payable by instalments"*—agreed to.

Clause 35—*"Powers and jurisdiction of the Council"*—

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*): I beg to move the following amendment:—

"On line 9, page 16, after the word—
'conveniences,'

insert the words—

'abattoirs; milk supply;'"

Mr. MAXWELL: Why do you want to do that? Is it necessary?

Mr. McLACHLAN: I think it is necessary, and that is the reason why I am moving it. No express power is given, but the Council may require it. We all know that Brisbane is the only big city in the Commonwealth without up-to-date abattoirs, and I need not take up the time of the Committee by arguing in favour of their establishment. It must be apparent to everybody that they are needed.

Mr. MAXWELL: Why do you not leave it to private enterprise?

Mr. McLACHLAN: I think that we should give the Council power to establish abattoirs and undertake a pure milk supply. The powers in the Bill are very wide, but I do not think this power is included.

Mr. KERR: They are very wide.

Mr. McLACHLAN: They are; but I want to make sure that the establishment of abattoirs and providing a pure milk supply is possible.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I do not think the amendment is necessary. There seems to be something sinister or something behind the amendment when it emanates from a member of the Brisbane City Council. We are entitled to know why the hon. gentleman has singled out abattoirs and the milk supply.

Mr. McLACHLAN: They are two very important questions.

Mr. SIZER: If the hon. gentleman will read the clause, he will find that there is power in the Bill to deal with those matters without moving the amendment.

Mr. HARTLEY: I bet you have not read the clause at all.

Mr. SIZER: I have studied the clause far more than the hon. gentleman has done. If the hon. member for Merthyr would read the clause thoroughly, he would find that general powers are given which will enable the Council to deal with the matters that he proposes to deal with by his amendment. Still there seems to be something sinister in raising the important question of abattoirs. I am speaking as one of those who will come into the Greater Brisbane area. It is a downright piece of impertinence on the part of the Brisbane City Council to come to the Government at the present moment asking for legislation to give them power to establish abattoirs so that they may pass the responsibility on to people in the outlying districts without giving those people a voice in the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is it not better to have the powers expressed beyond doubt?

Mr. SIZER: The Government should take a determined stand and say that the request that is now being made for the right to rush on the construction of abattoirs at an expenditure of £500,000 should be quashed for the time being. It is not the function of the Brisbane City Council to proceed with indecent haste with an expenditure of £500,000, and place the burden on the outlying districts.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Does the hon. gentleman believe in a proper system of meat supply?

Mr. SIZER: I do. During my second reading speech I said that it was the duty of the Brisbane City Council or the Greater Brisbane Council to see that the people obtained pure meat which had been inspected by competent officers.

Mr. McLACHLAN: That is what the amendment means.

Mr. SIZER: It means a lot more than that. I want to show the hon. member for Merthyr what can be accomplished without the acceptance of his amendment. I believe the hon. gentleman is honest in his intentions, but he is not so much concerned as to whether the people obtain a pure meat supply.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am very much concerned. I have just returned from the South, where I saw the scheme in operation.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman is more concerned about putting into operation one of the planks of his party dealing with municipalisation or nationalisation.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Is that not a good thing?

Mr. MAXWELL: No.

Mr. SIZER: I am opposed to it in every shape and form.

Mr. McLACHLAN: That is the milk in the coconut. The hon. gentleman is opposed to a plank of our platform.

Mr. SIZER: I am opposed to municipalisation in any shape or form.

Mr. FARRELL interjected.

Mr. SIZER: If the hon. member for Rockhampton had been in his place when I

Mr. Sizer.

delivered my second reading speech on this Bill, he would have heard me distinctly say that I made a distinction between trading concerns—

Mr. FARELL: The hon. gentleman is in the Chamber less than any other hon. member.

[4.30 p.m.]

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. He was away in Rockhampton instead of being here when I made my speech. The main function of the new Council will be to see that the people of Brisbane get food in the way of meat and milk that is wholesome and pure. The only function which devolves on the Council is that of inspection, and, if it appoints competent officers to inspect and pass only meat which is of first-class quality, then it will do all that it is expected to do, and all that the people of Brisbane wish it to do.

Mr. McLACHLAN: You know very little about the question if you say that is all they are expected to do.

Mr. SIZER: That is all that is expected of the Council. I am strongly opposed to municipal abattoirs. A scheme has been put forward by the graziers of Queensland which is of far more importance to the community than the municipal scheme. It will give to the people of Brisbane all that is required, and will not cost them a single penny.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER: The scheme which the hon. member for Merihyr and his colleagues have evolved will cost £500,000.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Your argument goes to show that what I am asking for is not in the Bill.

Mr. SIZER: I am opposed to municipal abattoirs, whether they are provided for in the Bill or not.

Mr. HARTLEY: I can quite understand that.

Mr. SIZER: There is no need to place on the people a burden of £500,000 to establish municipal abattoirs when the United Graziers' Association—and they are the producers of cattle—have evolved a scheme which will give all the inspection that is wanted.

Mr. HARTLEY: Who proposes it?

Mr. SIZER: The United Graziers' Association.

Mr. HARTLEY: Ah!

Mr. SIZER: It is an association of cattle-growers.

Mr. HARTLEY: Ah!

Mr. SIZER: Is there any objection to that? Is there any harm in the graziers who produce the meat putting forward a scheme which will not cost the community one farthing, and which is going to give the community the service it wants?

Mr. HARTLEY: Wait until you sit down, and I will tell you.

Mr. SIZER: The two "bally" cows in the hon. member's back yard will not furnish the meat supply of Brisbane. (Laughter.) The scheme of the graziers will give all the efficiency that is wanted. I have no less an authority than the Premier to support me in that contention. That hon. gentleman, in

[Mr. Sizer.

the course of an interview, said that there had been some argument in favour of public abattoirs. He also said—

"They did not want to criticise the proposal to establish public abattoirs. So far as this particular scheme was concerned, it furnished all that the public abattoirs proposal would furnish. It would provide for the killing of cattle and sheep under rigid inspection and in the most hygienic manner, and there would be a proper system of distribution that would give good service to the public. Provided, therefore, that the prices were regulated and that the public were not exploited, the whole of the conditions and essentials of public abattoirs were fulfilled."

That was in reference to a scheme which was propounded by the Graziers' Association, supported by the Premier.

Mr. CORSER: Not when he had his spats on. (Laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: No, not when he had his spats on. He had probably dumped them overboard then. The Premier endorsed this proposal, and I also endorse it for the purpose of saying that I am opposed to the people of Brisbane being saddled with an expense that is unnecessary, as the graziers themselves are prepared to accept it.

Mr. HARTLEY: From philanthropic motives?

Mr. SIZER: No, but they will supply meat that is pure and wholesome. The Commissioner of Prices can fix the price, and the scheme will have this distinct advantage: That it will secure continuity of supply for the people of Brisbane, and at the same time will enable Queensland growers to take advantage of Southern and overseas markets, which a municipal scheme will not do. When discussing these two schemes on their merits we must admit that both schemes will give service to the community of Brisbane, but one scheme will cost us £500,000 and the other will cost us nothing, and the one that will cost us nothing will also make adequate provision for Southern and overseas export. If we do not give our cattle growers what they are asking for, we are lacking in our duty as a Parliament.

I adopt a similar attitude in the matter of the milk supply. I am as solicitous as any hon. member in this House to see that the people have a pure and wholesome milk supply, but I believe that milk supply should be controlled by the farmers. Two pools have been sanctioned by the Secretary for Agriculture with such an object in view, and the proposals have been carried by an overwhelming individual vote; yet they have failed to secure the requisite 75 per cent. majority, and the scheme will not come into operation. I hope to see the control of the milk supply in the hands of a co-operative company formed by the dairymen themselves, under the rigid inspection of the City Council. Under such circumstances the public will be adequately safeguarded.

We have had no encouragement in any shape or form from State enterprises, and it is time we gave those particularly interested in an industry the right to control their industry, provided they do not make inroads into the welfare of the community by unduly exploiting them in the matter of prices. We are in a position to make every adequate

provision for such a scheme. We can regulate the prices, and, where meat is concerned, lay down the system under which it shall be killed and distributed. Where milk is concerned we can lay down hygienic conditions for its handling. If our Greater Brisbane Council do that, they will fulfil their functions and nothing more. I am not going to tolerate municipal trading in any shape or form, because I believe we have had such a gruelling experience of State trading, which we have carried on at the expense of existing industries and for which we have taxed struggling industries in order to make good the losses brought about by State trading.

Returning to the meat supply scheme, which has a direct bearing on this amendment, the Premier was most emphatic on this point. He said—

“The City Council had been moving in this matter, and it was necessary therefore for them to know what the proposal was before the Government adopted it. He thought the local authorities and the Government would be wise to give careful consideration to the scheme and to adopt it because it would relieve the Council of its responsibility of raising the money and running the scheme, while at the same time achieving the ends desired.”

Mr. BRUCE: That is only one man's opinion, anyhow.

Mr. SIZER: It is an opinion that cuts far more ice than the opinion of the hon. member for Barcoo. It is the opinion of the Premier of this State, who rules his party and whips them into line, and who tells them what he wants them to do. I give the Premier all credit as a deep thinker. The hon. gentleman has gone into this scheme very carefully, and from his experience as an administrator he knows the difficulty of raising money and of running an industry under Government control.

He realises that this scheme is sound and will give the people all they want, and that it will involve the people in no expense. The Premier knows perfectly well that, if the growers take hold of the scheme, it will be a great success. In view of that, every man in the community must give due weight to the Premier's remarks, and I am satisfied that the majority of the people have done so in this regard.

I want to enter my protest against the idea that I represent being brought into any scheme that will saddle them with municipal trading. I enter a protest at the action of the present Council of the City of Brisbane in attempting to force this issue at the present moment and attempting to saddle on the people of Brisbane an expenditure of £500,000 when a Bill is passing through Parliament which will exterminate them and bring a new body into being. I object on that ground, and I object also because I do not believe in municipal trading.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I have much pleasure in congratulating the hon. member for Sandgate on coming to light this afternoon on this amendment, even though it was only to pose as a special pleader for the United Graziers' Association. It is rather laughable to hear the hon. member remark to members on this side, “If they had been in their places.” It sounds very much to me like Satan reproving sin. In fact, in

this instance, I think Satan could be likened to a Sunday school teacher compared with the hon. member, because he never comes into this House except to make a speech in the interests of some private company, or in the interests of private enterprise.

Mr. FRY: That is very unfair.

Mr. HARTLEY: In this instance, he appears as the opponent of municipal enterprise in relation to the supply of fresh, good wholesome meat and pure milk, in order to safeguard the health of the people of Brisbane.

Mr. FRY: What did the Premier say?

Mr. HARTLEY: You need not worry about what the Premier said. That is his opinion. Our platform stands for the municipalisation of public utilities for the benefit of the people, and not for the aggrandisement of, or for the swelling of, the balance-sheet of the United Graziers' Association, which the hon. member for Sandgate has championed this afternoon. What is the trouble? The United Graziers' Association can see a good thing sticking out in the establishment of abattoirs for the killing of cattle and the distribution of meat, if they can get the Government to assist in financing the scheme. That is the trouble. But will they distribute the profits? Of course, they will not. The profits will go to the united graziers.

Mr. SIZER interjected.

Mr. HARTLEY: I am sorry I have got the hon. member squealing. Of course, when an hon. member gets up to be the special pleader for the United Graziers' Association he ought to know what to expect.

Mr. FRY interjected.

Mr. HARTLEY: If the hon. member was a fact, one would need a microscope to examine him: he would be so insignificant. I congratulate the hon. member for Merthyr on moving this amendment. If the hon. member for Sandgate realised the value of it, he would realise that this is the right moment to move it. He hides behind the excuse that it is going to land the Greater City of Brisbane in an expenditure of, approximately, £500,000, and, as a representative of an outside area, he objects to that area being saddled with a portion of that expenditure. If he stayed there, he might be right; but the amendment will be an intimation to the Brisbane City Council that a greater authority than they—that is, Parliament, which can speak for the whole of Sandgate, with its sandflies and mosquitoes—(laughter)—is in favour of municipal enterprises. What would be the position if this amendment was defeated, and the hon. member, with his private enterprises, had his way? The United Graziers' Association would no doubt take charge of the supply of meat for Brisbane, but not in the interests of the people of Brisbane. It would not concern them whether good or bad cattle were killed.

Mr. BELL: Don't be silly.

Mr. HARTLEY: The old “skelly” cows which had passed their breeding days would be brought into the slaughter-yards as being quite good enough for the people of Brisbane, while they shipped the prime cattle.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where would the inspectors be?

Mr. Hartley.]

Mr. HARTLEY: I am sorry I am getting on the nerves of hon. members opposite, but I cannot help it.

Mr. KING: You are only telling us what you would do yourself.

Mr. HARTLEY: These are the people who oppose municipal enterprise for the reason that private enterprise is conducted purely for profit irrespective of the health or well-being of the community.

Mr. KING: "Suspicion haunts the guilty mind."

Mr. HARTLEY: They would like inspectors appointed just to keep the public quiet, but under a municipal scheme the concern would be conducted healthily in the best interests of the people, and the cost of inspection would be far less, because there would be less incentive to any practice which would lead to the supply of an inferior quality of meat, and therefore it would be to the advantage of the City of Brisbane to have this amendment inserted in the Bill, so that they could have their own municipal abattoirs.

When we come to the question of a milk supply, the hon. member's case, and that of anybody who supports him, is 100 times worse. Anybody with eyes in his head who walks around the city and sees the milk supply will be staggered.

Mr. MAXWELL: What is the matter with it?

Mr. HARTLEY: Everything is wrong; there is very little right in connection with it. The hon. member for Enoggera said on one occasion that he found beer piping and many other things mixed up with it. It shows how much he knows about it. Anybody who buys the average quality of milk sold in Brisbane will very soon find out that there is a good deal wrong with it. You will not get a pint of milk that there is not something wrong with.

Mr. KING: Is it not under Government control?

Mr. HARTLEY: No; there is not a semblance of Government control about it.

Mr. KING: It is.

Mr. HARTLEY: There is only inspection under the Department of Public Health—an inspection that is certainly not adequate. What is wrong is this: The milk comes in to these private distributing companies. I am not talking about the small man with his ten or twelve cows. He is the man from whom in nine times out of ten you get a good quality of milk; but I am talking about the milk supply companies whose big wagons you see going to the railway stations and coming back with the day's supply.

Mr. SIZER: There are no milk supply companies.

Mr. HARTLEY: Moonshine! There are milk supply companies.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where are they?

Mr. HARTLEY: The milk that comes into Brisbane practically lands here at least twenty-four and sometimes thirty-six hours old before it gets into the hands of the people.

Mr. SIZER: That is wrong.

Mr. HARTLEY: We will say it is twenty-four hours.

Mr. SIZER: That is wrong.

[Mr. Hartley.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. member does not know anything about it. I have often seen milk going to the railway station to be sent to Brisbane. It is brought from the Brisbane station in big tanks holding anything from a couple of hundred gallons upwards, and I am prepared to bet that in nine times out of ten those tanks are not cleaned out once a week.

Mr. SIZER: Do you know—

Mr. HARTLEY: I know the hon. member has a voice like a bull who has broken his voice. (Laughter.) I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment because it means a good wholesome supply of healthy meat and a good clean supply of pure milk for the children of the city without any profit to the graziers, for whom the hon. member appears to be a special pleader.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): The hon. member for Fitzroy is simply ignorant and unfair. After listening to his remarks I am satisfied that he knows nothing about the matter. (Opposition laughter.) In my opinion he has not read the scheme which has been placed before the Premier—not by the United Graziers' Association, but by the cattle-owners of Queensland. There are two associations in Queensland to-day, one known as the United Graziers' Association and the other as the Cattle Growers' Association, which combined in placing the scheme before the Premier.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is why I said the united graziers.

Mr. MORGAN: That scheme would mean the establishment of public abattoirs in Brisbane. I want to point out the difference between municipal abattoirs and those which would be established under this scheme.

Mr. HYNES: One would exploit the people and the other would not.

Mr. MORGAN: First of all, the hon. member for Fitzroy was wrong when he said that the stockowners desired to get financial assistance. They did not. They never asked for it.

Mr. HARTLEY: I did not say they wanted the Government to lend them money but to guarantee their finances.

Mr. MORGAN: They asked for the passage through this House of a Bill which would enable a board to be appointed to levy on the stockowners so that the necessary money would be raised for the establishment of abattoirs in Brisbane. With municipal abattoirs the only consideration would be the supply of good meat to Brisbane and suburbs. The scheme of the stockowners is greater. They purpose to supply not only Brisbane and suburbs but also the Southern States with chilled meat.

Mr. HARTLEY: What is their motive?

Mr. MORGAN: Their motive is to try to increase the value of cattle in Queensland, the breeding of which is distinctly shown by the balance-sheet of the State stations to be a losing proposition. The cattle industry is second only to the wool industry in Queensland.

Mr. HARTLEY: They do want to get a greater value for their cattle?

Mr. MORGAN: They do, but not a greater price for their meat, because we claim that there is a huge difference between what the grazier gets and what the butcher sells for, and that under our scheme there

would be no difference in the price to the consumer, but that the stockowner would get a better price because of better facilities for distribution. The municipal abattoirs would slaughter only 1,000 cattle a week—which is all that is necessary to feed the city of Brisbane and suburbs—whereas the abattoirs which would be erected under the scheme of the cattle-owners and would be under the control of representatives, not only of the cattle-owners themselves but also of the municipality of Greater Brisbane and the Government—which in itself shows that the stockowners are not out to fleece the consumers of Brisbane but to bring back to prosperity the great cattle industry of Queensland, which is strangled from an export point of view—would be designed to supply Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide with chilled meat.

At 4.55 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. MORGAN: They are the reasons why we think it would be much better to have abattoirs established in Brisbane under the control of the municipality, the Government, and the stockowners, instead of being controlled solely by the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. gentleman knows that the object of that scheme is to obtain greater profits for the grazier.

Mr. MORGAN: Does the hon. gentleman object to the grazier obtaining a better price for his cattle?

Mr. HARTLEY: No.

Mr. MORGAN: The balance-sheet of the State stations shows that the cattle industry is not paying to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: Instead of establishing abattoirs to be controlled by the Brisbane City Council, it is proposed by the scheme submitted to the Premier by the stockowners of this State—

Mr. HARTLEY: Why could they not get the same value for their cattle with municipal abattoirs?

Mr. MORGAN: The municipal abattoirs would be concerned only with the killing of cattle for the supply of meat to the city and suburbs of Brisbane, whereas under the scheme proposed by the graziers, to be controlled by the Council, the Government, and the stockowners, cattle will be slaughtered to supply beef not only to Brisbane and its suburbs, but also to the Southern States, and also to establish a chilled meat industry in Queensland so that, instead of my cattle and other people's cattle being sent to Sydney to be slaughtered, they will be slaughtered in Brisbane, and our own men will be continually employed year in and year out. Whereas the municipal abattoirs would kill only 1,000 head of cattle per week, the abattoirs under the control of the municipality, the Government, and the graziers would kill 5,000 per week, and naturally where a larger number are slaughtered the cost of treatment is less.

Mr. HARTLEY: What is wrong with municipal abattoirs killing for graziers to enable them to supply meat to the South?

Mr. MORGAN: Unfortunately the Brisbane City Council, notwithstanding our deputations, have held our scheme in abeyance for at least twelve months.

Mr. HARTLEY: Now the hon. member for Merthyr is making an advance.

Mr. MORGAN: No. Unfortunately the hon. member for Merthyr is not broad enough in his ideas. I have no objection to his amendment because it means little or nothing; but I would like him at the Brisbane City Council meeting to point out that there is something more in the graziers' scheme than merely the supplying of meat to the city of Brisbane and suburbs. He should view the matter in a broader way, and recognise that the cattle industry of Queensland is the second greatest industry in the State, and is likely to remain so, provided it gets a fair and square go from the municipalities. What is this parochial view that has been preached by the hon. member for Fitzroy, and what is this parochial view that has been adopted by the Brisbane City Council? If the cattle industry is not fostered, people will go out of it day by day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman must discuss the amendment, which is to give the Greater Brisbane Council power to construct abattoirs and institute a pure milk supply.

Mr. MORGAN: This is a very big subject, and I must go a little out of my way in connecting up my remarks with the amendment. We are dealing with the second largest industry of the State, and I am pointing out that, if the local authority, instead of establishing its own abattoirs, would combine with and assist the graziers, the people in the future would obtain meat at a price cheaper than they are likely to obtain it in a few years. The people of Brisbane are paying a high price for their beef. I say advisedly that never before in the history of Queensland have the butchers in Brisbane and its suburbs made such huge profits in retailing meat as they have done in the last two or three years.

Mr. FRY: Why is that?

Mr. MORGAN: I wish to say in answer to the hon. member for Fitzroy that no butcher in Queensland is killing more "shelly" cattle to-day than the State butcheries.

Mr. HARTLEY: What rot!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to connect his remarks with the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. MORGAN: I want to point out to the hon. member who moved the amendment that I consider the scheme for the establishment of public abattoirs under the control of the graziers, which has been

[5 p.m.] placed before and approved of by the Premier, is one that is likely

to improve the industry in every way, and is preferable to municipal abattoirs. I am opposed to the amendment because the consumers of Brisbane would get cheaper meat under the scheme placed before the Premier by the stockowners. I also want to point out the difference between Adelaide and Brisbane. The Brisbane City Council recently sent a delegation to Adelaide for the purpose of inquiring into the meat supply. The meat supply of Adelaide is almost perfect because municipal abattoirs are established there, but South Australia does not export one ounce of beef. The abattoirs were established only for the purpose of supplying Adelaide and the immediate vicinity.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The people of Adelaide get a perfect meat supply.

Mr. MORGAN: South Australia is a wheat and sheep producing State. It does

Mr. Morgan.]

not grow beef to any extent. Much of its beef supply comes from Western, Central, and Northern Queensland, which possesses something like 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. of the total supply of beef in Australia. Enormous numbers of cattle are sent out of Queensland each year. An attempt is being made to establish a trade between Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide. The conditions in Brisbane are altogether different to those existing in Adelaide. I claim, therefore, that it will be far better for hon. members opposite and those interested in the cattle industry, to assist the scheme put forward by the stockowners and approved of by the Premier in every possible way.

The HOME SECRETARY: That has nothing to do with the amendment. The amendment only gives the Council the power to establish abattoirs if it so desires.

Mr. MORGAN: We can see what is happening by the resolution that was carried at a meeting of the City Council yesterday.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Is not the press report a very good one?

Mr. MORGAN: The report might be very full and correct, but it would be a fatal mistake for the aldermen to proceed with the scheme. The council proposes to approach the Government for a loan of £500,000 to establish abattoirs.

The HOME SECRETARY: If you carry this amendment, they will not come.

Mr. MORGAN: It should not be tolerated for one moment. I hope the Premier will turn the scheme down, because it is brought forward by men who do not know anything about the subject.

Mr. MAXWELL: That does not matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: It is a scheme that is likely to result in a huge blunder, if gone on with. I hope the Minister will see eye to eye with the Premier, and will not allow parochial matters to interfere with his judgment. The hon. member for Fitzroy thinks the whole purpose of the scheme is to exploit the consumer.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is really what you are after.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member is wrong. He usually looks at things differently.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about you and the hon. member for Fitzroy settling it by arbitration?

Mr. MORGAN: Never mind about that. I want the hon. member for Fitzroy to look at the question from a broad point of view. The hon. member generally does so, but, unfortunately, that is not the case to-day. The cattle industry means more to Queensland than it does to Brisbane. Supposing we get cheap meat for a short time, and that the people engaged in the industry eventually go out of cattle, there will be a shortage of supply, and instead of paying an average of 4d., 5d., or 6d. per lb., we shall have to pay from 1s. to 1s. 2d. per lb. If we do not give the people engaged in the industry a decent living, they will get out of it, and there will be no beef for local consumption. Sheep have reached a high value owing to the price of wool, and it is almost impossible for the poor man to have mutton on his table. He can afford beef, but if we continue to oppress the meat

industry, the cattle men will go out of the industry, and the price of meat will become exorbitant.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*): The hon. member who moved this motion is to be congratulated on having brought it forward, more especially in view of the fact that there is a considerable public agitation for some improved method of storing and handling meat. Since that is obvious, two phases of the question present themselves—the one that was advocated by the hon. members for Murilla and Sandgate, and the other representing the consensus of opinion of hon. members on this side of the Chamber. The hon. member for Murilla was rather amusing in his advocacy. He stated that they have a perfect meat supply in Adelaide, and that the people get a maximum amount of service in the matter of their meat supply. A perfect meat supply means that nothing is to be desired, and that they have the best supply possible, under the most ideal circumstances; and the hon. member for Murilla admits that such is the case in Adelaide. What is the basis of that meat supply? Is it under the control of the people themselves—a municipal activity controlled by a board—or is it one that is handed over to the tender mercies of exploitation by the private trader? The hon. member for Murilla has said that the cattlemen propose to ask this House to put a Bill through in order that they may strike a levy enabling them to collect money to establish abattoirs and a meat export branch of the industry. How long would it take for that to be done? The need is imperative in this instance. Too much time has been lost already, and I venture to say that hundreds of people have lost their lives through the inadequate supervision of the milk and meat supply in the metropolitan area. Apart from that consideration, the cattlemen have not shown any very great business acumen in conducting their own affairs. They have had any number of opportunities for exploiting the London market. Yet what do we find? They sell the meat here at 2½d. a lb., and it fetches from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d. a lb. in London. In other directions they have not been able to control the industry in the way it should be controlled. There is no industry in Australia to-day that has squealed more for Government assistance than the cattle industry. There is no industry in Queensland to-day that has got more assistance from the Government than the cattle industry. They have got assistance in the form of a reduction of rents, a remission of freights, and in various other ways; and now they are asking that they be given the right to establish abattoirs in Brisbane so that they may get an additional rake-off. The hon. member for Murilla frankly admits the good service that is being rendered to the people in Adelaide by the municipal abattoirs.

The cattlemen have not been able to conduct their own affairs satisfactorily in the past, and we have no assurance that they will be able to conduct them any better in the future. They talk about co-operation and everything else in connection with the establishment of abattoirs. They have discussed the scheme for quite a long time, but abattoirs have not eventuated, and the public necessity for their establishment is certainly no less but very much greater now than it was when this question was first raised. It has become an imperative necessity that this

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

public utility should be established. We all know the very great dangers that the members of the community are running at the present time in relation to the meat supply. We know that only about 65 per cent. of the total number of carcasses sold for consumption are inspected by the meat inspectors. We know also that tubercular beef is going into consumption, and that under the present haphazard system of killing—a little abattoir here and a little slaughter-yard there—adequate supervision is not possible. It is a question of the public health against private interests. The public health can be best served by the total elimination of private interests and private enterprise, and the substitution of Government authority and regulation from the time the beef or mutton arrives here on the train until it is finally dished on the consumer's table.

Mr. SIZER: By inspection.

Mr. BULCOCK: It cannot be done by the present system of inspection, because the slaughter-yards are situated at too great distances apart. Therefore, you have to bring it down to one central killing authority, and that one central killing authority, to my mind, and to the mind of most progressive thinkers, is essentially the killing authority that is subservient to the people and regulated by the people, and thereby do away with the desire of exploitation, with the desire of personal gain, and with the desire to score at the expense of the community. No public utility that involves the question of public health can be adequately controlled by private enterprise. For that reason, I hope the Minister will accept the amendment, and I congratulate the hon. member for Merthyr on moving it.

I do not want to be egotistical in this matter, but quite recently I have been doing some slide-work in connection with the metropolitan milk supply, and I can assure hon. members, to put the case very mildly, that the metropolitan milk supply leaves much to be desired. You find pus and blood and other things in the milk. At present one branch of governmental activity looks after the milk to the sliprails, and another branch of governmental activity is supposed to look after the milk from the sliprails on. You can only harmonise the two factors by having one body looking after the milk from the time it is delivered from the cow until it finally reaches the consumer, but it is obvious that that system does not obtain at the present time. Many systems have been devised to try and overcome the various difficulties that occur in this direction. It is obvious that municipal regulation of the milk is the only thing that is going to protect the interests of the community.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: How can that be done?

Mr. BULCOCK: I would explain it if I were in order, but I question whether I would be in order in doing so at the present stage. Meat and milk are two of the most vital factors in our community, and inseparably bound up with them is the health of the community. We all know that tubercular milk is going into consumption. I venture to say that any day in the week tuberculous matter could be separated from the milk supply of Brisbane in numberless instances. Pasteurisation is necessary, and the control of the milk supply by the municipal authority will bring that about.

Then you come to the question of public utilities for the public benefit or for private gain. I say that the public must be considered in connection with the meat and milk supply. It is a question of health and well-being with them, and it should not, under any circumstances, be a question of profit or gain for the individuals who are fortunate enough to establish abattoirs under the proposition which is being put forward by the representatives of the cattle men in this Chamber to-day. I believe that the time has come when meat, milk, and other commodities of that nature will be regarded as public enterprises, and those who oppose that system to-day will be in time converted. Even the hon. member for Murilla has been converted to the system of municipal abattoirs by his great eulogy of the conduct of the municipal abattoirs in another place.

Mr. MORGAN: You cannot understand the difference. One is merely to deal with local supply, and the other is for export purposes.

Mr. BULCOCK: It would be fallacious at the present time to establish abattoirs here for meat export purposes in view of the number of abattoirs we now have. The hon. member knows that there is a considerable difference of opinion as to whether new abattoirs should be established for the export trade, or whether some of the existing abattoirs should not be taken over. The consensus of opinion is in favour of taking over abattoirs for the meat export trade. I do not think we would have any serious objection to the hon. member taking them over and doing as he likes in regard to export of meat, so long as our local needs are first satisfied, and we have a healthy and abundant supply of meat.

Mr. MORGAN: We could do that.

Mr. BULCOCK: We know that the scheme encouraged by the hon. member for Murilla will probably involve an outlay of £2,000,000, whereas the cost of central abattoirs conducted by municipal enterprises would probably be somewhere in the vicinity of £500,000, basing the estimate on current figures.

Mr. MORGAN: We can do everything we want with £500,000.

Mr. BULCOCK: The hon. member knows that he is talking with his tongue in his cheek. It would require £500,000 for the establishment of a municipal distributing centre alone, together with the necessary appliances. This is a far greater question than the mere question of municipal enterprise. It is a question of whether the people shall be served by their own instruments for their own preservation, and be governed by themselves, or whether they shall be handed over to the exploiter who will sell diseased meat and get the biggest possible profit for himself. Hon. members opposite say, "Give us a Meat Trust, and we will allow the price to be regulated." The hon. member for Sandgate suggested a regulation of prices. A very remote contingency! Assuming that the Labour party were not in power, how long would the office of the Commissioner of Prices last? The people would be handed over to the tender mercies of the exploiters, of the cattlemen and others, who would make them pay on a par with those in the South—from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a lb! We have some protection here and some regulation, and, if we can only extend

Mr. Bulcock.]

that protection and consolidate our position by controlling our own utility by the establishment of a municipal meat and milk supply, we shall do well.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I have been very much struck by the difference of opinion which exists as to the milk supply of Brisbane. One must admit that there is a great need that something should be done, and I have expressed the opinion more than once that personally I do not care whether the Health Department or the City Council of Brisbane controls it.

The hon. member for Fitzroy stated that the milk companies get their supplies in large containers. I do not think that any milk is taken to the consumers of Brisbane in any containers over 8 gallons, and I do not think the disease starts in those containers at all. First of all, I am not going to say that too great a proportion of diseased cows is being milked, and this amendment does not touch on that matter at all. An Act of Parliament would be required sanctioning some scheme whereby the City Council or some other authority could control the outside supply of milk. That would have to be done, or it would have to be handed over to a co-operative company.

Mr. HARTLEY: A municipal supply would control that.

Mr. WARREN: I would like to know from the hon. member what is wrong with co-operation.

Mr. HARTLEY: There is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member talked about the beef barons making big profits. Do the butter factories make big profits?

Mr. HARTLEY: They make very fair profits.

Mr. WARREN: Absolute nonsense. They do not make any profits at all. If this scheme for the supply of healthy meat to the people of Brisbane were put into operation, it would not be a profit-making concern. Neither would it, if an arrangement were made between the producers of milk and the City Council or the Home Secretary's Department by which a co-operative concern took control. It would not put one penny more into the pockets of the producers. What is the scheme for the organisation of the farmers designed for? Merely that they may handle their business in a co-operative way. I maintain that co-operation is able to do the proper thing, and no organisation, whether Government or municipal, can take the place of a properly run co-operative concern. The milk supply is wrong from beginning to end. There has been no improvement for fifty years. The hon. member was quite right in some respects and the Secretary for Public Instruction was also correct in his statement about the milk supply. The reason why we are suffering from these disabilities is that nothing has been done by any authority, and the producers cannot get together to improve matters. It has been the desire of all milk suppliers for a number of years to improve the conditions of things.

At 5.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

[*Mr. Bulcock.*