

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY 13 AUGUST 1907

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

suffering from an attack of influenza and was unable to leave his bed, and that it would probably be some days before he was sufficiently recovered to resume his usual duties.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) moved: That the Clerk Assistant do discharge the duties of the Clerk during his absence, and do take his chair at the table.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS.

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

- (1) Letter from the Agent-General in London, dated 1st July, 1907, on the subject of Government securities deposited in London under the authority of the Savings Bank (Securities) Act of 1895.
- (2) Twelfth report of the Auditor-General under the Supreme Court Funds Act of 1895.
- (3) Report of the Comptroller-General of Prisons for 1906.

TESTATORS' FAMILY MAINTENANCE BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of Mr. KENNA (*Bowen*), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. G. P. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply for the very able manner in which they moved and seconded the Address. One pleasing feature of their speeches was the magnificent enthusiasm expressed by the two hon. members at the splendid outlook that we have before us in Queensland at the present time. After listening for the last four or five sessions to the continual cry or complaint that, owing to the influence of the Labour party in Queensland politics, capital was being driven out of the State, and that property was depreciating in value, I was very pleased to notice that there is nothing of the pessimistic temperament in the two hon. members I have just referred to. Only the other day, after the Premier had stated to the House that he intended to carry on the Government as the Labour party had promised to give a general support to his programme, I was very much amused at one of the leading dailies coming out with the statement that the very day that arrangement was entered into an investment involving somewhere about £80,000 had been hung up because Labour was once more dominating the politics and business of this State. Whether the paper, in making a statement of that character, expected the public of Queensland to believe it, I am not prepared to say. Another feature, so far as the debate on the Address in Reply has gone, has been the wonderful, father-like interest that has been shown to members of the Labour party, or, as we have been designated during the past week or two, "the party in the corner." I say that we have had almost fatherly interest shown in us by members of the Opposition. But I may say that the intense interest that has been shown to us is neither appreciated

TUESDAY, 13 AUGUST, 1907.

The SPEAKER (Hon. John Leahy, *Bulloo*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

ABSENCE OF THE CLERK.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a letter from Dr. Taylor, certifying that Mr. L. A. Bernays, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, was

[*Mr. Barnes.*

by the Labour party, nor is it reciprocated. The Labour party is well able to look after itself, and hence the almost slobbering expressions of sympathy and terms of praise that have been expressed towards us we have no particular use for. So far during the session there has been a considerable amount of time spent in connection with the discussion of the position of the three parties in the House, and one would almost be led to think that this was something new. Now, it is a well-known fact that the three-party system has been in operation in Queensland for some time. We know very well that at the last election there were three parties who were seeking their suffrages from the electors of Queensland. There was the Labour party, who ran on the straight-out Labour ticket, the Government party, and the Opposition party. I need not remind hon. members that the fight was a very bitter one, but the Labour party was not annihilated, as many people sincerely hoped and wished it would be.

Mr. KEOGH: By whom?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: By your party. We had to fight both parties.

Mr. KEOGH: No.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Yes; we had to fight you both.

Mr. McMASTER: You lost one-half of your party.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: We had to fight the Kidston party and we had to fight the Opposition party.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: When we started on our campaign we had to fight the old Opposition party with the same persistency and strenuousness that we had to do all along.

Hon. R. PHILP: If it had not been for the Opposition candidate standing, you would never have been returned.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: I should have been returned just the same. I will come to that by and by. When I commenced my election campaign in Bundaberg, one of the first statements that I made was that the Labour party was out to fight its own battle. I recognised that we had candidates against our party from the Government party—who was a very strong candidate—and I also had against me a candidate belonging to the Philp party. At the same time, when the Premier came to Bundaberg, he said from the public platform—and his candidate also made the same statement—that there was an alliance between the Labour or Socialistic party and the Philp party to down the Kidston Government. Now, I give that a most emphatic denial. The Labour party has no use for the Philp party any more than it has for the Kidston party.

Mr. KEOGH: We do not want your party.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: It takes some wiping out. Do not get excited. I may point out that the Premier, in his enthusiastic desire to endorse candidates, was blinded by the fact that it was just as possible for him to have been mistaken as it was for any other man, and I contend that the candidate endorsed by him in Bundaberg was not to be relied on to carry out the democratic or radical programme that the Premier put before the country. So far as I am concerned personally, and so far as a very large number of the electors of Bundaberg are concerned, it is generally believed there that the whole thing was that an understanding had been entered into by the gentleman who

ran as the Kidston candidate and the leader of the Opposition that at any price the Labour candidate was to be downed, and if Mr. Kidston's candidate was returned that at the first opportunity he would cross the floor of the House and go back to the arms of his old party.

Mr. KEOGH: No fear.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: I am quite prepared to believe that statement. There is no doubt about it. A man who has been the staunch pillar of the old Conservative Government in Bundaberg up till within five or six weeks of the general election, simply because the leader of the Opposition had not rewarded him for what he considered to be good services rendered to the old Philp party by giving him a seat in another place turns dog or rat on the Philp party, and would not run under the wing of that party.

Mr. McMASTER: You did the same with Tom Glassey.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: I believe the hon. member who interjected has been to the Exhibition judging. He is a pretty good judge, I believe. When the first manifesto was issued by the leader of the Opposition, I think that somewhat took the wind out of the sails of the Government; but the Government coming along with their manifesto, which was a more radical one and a more comprehensive one, the leader of the Opposition came out with a second edition, which was more sweeping than the first. The leader of the Opposition promised in that manifesto to repeal about every tax there was standing in the statute-book. He promised to repeal the Railway Act which was passed last year. This Act was passed here last session to ensure the proper working of any railways that were to be constructed, and he promised to repeal pretty well half the taxes that we have here. He promised also that he would amend the Income Tax Act, which was a very good thing.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Abolish it altogether.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: No, we will not abolish it, but I think it is a very good thing that all incomes up to £200 should be exempt. That is a plank of the Labour platform which we are prepared to stand or fall by. Then, again, the leader of the Opposition in his manifesto threatened to wipe out socialism altogether, but finished up by promising to introduce fifteen or twenty different socialistic measures. But the candidates supporting the Opposition on that occasion made these promises so often before the electors that they were scarcely taken seriously. They came out also with a special promise that, if returned, extra exemptions should be granted to fathers of large families of six or seven children; that a special exemption of so much per head should be granted in the case of, I think, more than four children who were under fifteen years of age. I noticed that the Press, here in Brisbane especially, and the journalistic phonographic records outside which most of the country Press used during the election, day after day in their issues pointed out the special exemptions that the Opposition were prepared to make. That was nothing new. We in the Labour party brought this under the notice of the Premier last session, and pointed out the cases where a man had a large family—I think I instanced the case of a man who had about thirteen children, about eight or nine of whom were at home and unable to work. The Premier promised to consider that when amending the Income Tax

Mr. G. P. Barber.]

Act this year, and I hope the hon. gentleman has not forgotten his promise. I admit that the second edition of the manifesto issued by the leader of the Opposition and the manifesto of the Government were so nearly alike that it was a difficult matter to tell "t'other from which." But the electors believed that there was a more likely opportunity of the Premier carrying out his promises than there was of those of the leader of the Opposition being carried out.

Mr. McMASTER: That is why they were returned in lesser numbers.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: The hon. gentleman interjects that that is why they were returned in lesser number. Let me observe here that, considering the strenuous opposition that there was at one time between the Kidston party and the socialistic party, the Opposition should have been returned here forty strong.

Mr. COWAP: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. P. BARBER: He had the chance of his lifetime, while on the other hand the Premier missed the chance of his lifetime. If Mr. Kidston had kept straight and true to the Labour platform which he advocated for so many years, and gone to the country as the head of the Queensland Parliamentary Labour party, in my candid opinion the Opposition party would have been just about annihilated.

Mr. KEOGH: And you are supporting him still.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Although the two policies of the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition were pretty well alike, yet the electors considered there was a better prospect of the Government policy being carried out, and I have no doubt that even during the election, bitter though the fight which existed between the Labour party—the socialistic party—and the Kidston party, the majority of the electors of Queensland had sufficient political sagacity to recognise that with the good measures—the radical and socialistic measures—outlined in the Government programme, the Labour party would support them and see them through.

Mr. KEOGH: And you are doing it.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Of course we are doing it, and we intend to do it. As I said just now, the electors, when they heard all these promises made over again, had lost all faith in the Opposition leaders to expect them to be carried out. In fact, I came across a bit of doggerel verse during the elections, which summed it up in this way—

SOPS.

"I promise this, I promise that,
If only you'll return me,
I stand for Poor, I stand for Fat,
For any who'll not spurn me!"
But when the polling day is o'er
Those things that Robert mentions,
We rather think, will patch the floor
That's paved with good intentions.

One rather amusing thing to me during the elections was this—I say amusing, but it was eminently satisfactory, too: The Opposition programme contained certain measures that had been advocated by the Labour party for many years, at the time when we were simply put down as being dreamers. For instance, they even went so far as to promise old age pensions. It is only a matter of two or three years ago since the Opposition used to advocate "Thrift! thrift! thrift!" which is all very well in its place. They used especially to tell us here, when these matters were being discussed, that a man should be thrifty; he

[Mr. G. P. Barber.

should be able to save up sufficient to tide him over his old age, even on a wage of about 5s. or 5s. 6d. a day. But now they seem to have become converted to the extent of being able to support old age pensions. And there were several other things in the Opposition policy that have been advocated by the Labour party. By a persistent propaganda we have made these things popular among the electors outside, and I would not be at all surprised at the next election—if we have not succeeded in carrying the Trade Disputes Bill before that—to find it in the forefront of the Opposition programme. As a matter of fact, no leader of any party in Queensland, or in any of the States, or in the Federal Parliament, dare go to the country to-day without having to a large extent a socialistic platform, as he would not have the ghost of a chance of being returned unless his platform contains socialistic measures.

Mr. KEOGH: What rot!

Mr. McMASTER: What nonsense!

Mr. G. P. BARBER: There is no nonsense about it. We shall have to be very careful, or the Opposition party will be commandeering the whole of our platform. They actually claimed credit during the elections for being in favour of adult suffrage, and in favour of extending the suffrage to the ladies all the way through, and yet we know that up to within two or three years ago they fought it on every occasion.

Mr. PAUL: They were in favour of it long before the Labour party were.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: If we turn up *Hansard* for the last nine or ten years, or for the last thirty or forty years for all that, it is only within the last two or three years that we find a member of the Opposition party that is now, or the party that previously sat on the Treasury benches, in favour of it—we find that almost to a man they denied the right of the franchise to the women of this State.

Mr. McMASTER: That is not correct.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: The hon. member says that is not correct.

Mr. KEOGH: We were always in favour of the ladies having a vote, and you are trying to do away with that vote.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: I would just like to say this: that looking at the matter from the result of the polling on the 18th

[4 p.m.] May last, there is one thing in my opinion that the country most emphatically expressed itself upon. The country declared that it had no use for the Opposition party, and had it not been for the family fight carried on between the Kidston party and the Labour party, the Opposition party would have been just about annihilated. Some of our late colleagues of the Labour party were afraid to go to the country at the last election as straight Labour candidates.

Mr. JACKSON: Not afraid.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is right.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: They were afraid the Labour party programme was too extreme. They held that it was too socialistic, they thought it would frighten the people outside, and that the time was not opportune. I presume that every member of the Labour-Kidston party who ran at the previous election as Labour members were afraid of the Convention programme of 1907. The hon. member for Kennedy delivered a speech at Ravenswood, and, referring to the coalition, said there had been a great deal of give and take between

the Labour party and the Morgan section, and that the Labour party had not taken as much as they had given. Now, the Labour party are in a position to go "on their own," and they prefer to go "on their own." No Labour man who ran as an endorsed Labour candidate at the last election had any fear of the result. We knew very well that we had undertaken a very great responsibility in running on the programme that we announced, but we recognised that there was a growing force among the electors in Queensland—that there was what may be called a large socialistic section among the electors—and while the more radical planks of the Premier's manifesto might be supported, yet it was not sufficiently radical for members of the Labour party. We believed that the workers of this State were not getting the full results, or even a fair share, of our labours, and we considered that even though during the past three or four sessions certain radical measures had been enacted, yet the workers had not to a great extent benefited by those measures. The employers have managed to dodge many of the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, and in nearly every Labour reform that we have passed the workers as a whole have not received the benefit that they should have received. Our object was to go out into the country at the late election and place before the electors of Queensland a socialistic programme, and that being so, I think the fact of the Labour party going to the country at that election fourteen strong and coming back eighteen strong—

Mr. KEOGH: You went to the country thirty-four strong.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Shows pretty well that there was a strong feeling of confidence among the electors in our favour. We believe that among the great body of Labour electors of Queensland there is no fear of the socialistic bogie as placed before the country by the Press and by members in this House.

Mr. KEOGH: Why not take your proper position as the Opposition?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: We would like to see you clear over to the other side.

Mr. KEOGH: We will be there directly.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Speaking from my own personal point of view, I say that, although no doubt a lot of temporary reform may be carried through by means of the present arrangement with the Government, I think a mistake has been made. (Hear, hear!) A majority of the party, however, having decided to give the Government general support, I am prepared to abide by the will of the majority. I would far rather have seen the anticipated and much desired coalition brought about, because, in my opinion, it would have been better in the long run for the Labour movement, and better in three years time for the socialistic candidates at the next election. I am not afraid of going before the Bundaberg electors with a socialistic programme, and I can well understand the great disappointment and the amount of whining that has taken place among the Opposition who so nearly reached their desired haven. It seems that they were bent on this coalition Government, and that the socialistic party were to be relegated to the cold shades of Opposition.

Mr. KEOGH: The proper place for you.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: That is right. I have no objection to going there myself. Had we taken up our positions on the cross Govern-

ment benches, the socialistic party would have adopted exactly the same methods as they are adopting to-day. We should have given just the same amount of support to good measures as we are prepared to do now, and we should have criticised bad measures in just as strong a manner as we are prepared to do now. The candidates of the Labour party went to the country at the last election believing that there was something more to be obtained for the mass of workers outside than has been obtained for them up to the present time. We believe, as the statistics of all countries in the world show, that the working classes receive a continuously decreasing share of the wealth which they produce. The present proportion received by the workers is about one-third, although the workers constitute 85 per cent. of the population. The other 15 per cent., who do no work, confiscate the other two-thirds of the wealth produced. As one writer says, this causes an irrevocable conflict between the capitalistic classes and the working classes. Not only is this the case in Queensland, but it is the same in the countries of Europe. The Premier of Victoria, who only arrived here by boat the day before yesterday, stated in an interview that there is more socialism in London than there is in Australia, or in Victoria. At the recent elections in Austria, some eighty-two or eighty-three socialists were elected as members of the Parliament of that country. A similar condition of things prevails in Germany, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Sweden, and a few weeks ago the little country of Finland returned a Parliament, one-third of which are socialist members, and seventeen of those are lady socialists. I know that the socialistic bogey is a terrible thing to many of our friends in this Assembly, and a terrible thing to many persons outside this House; but socialism is a great and growing power. The late Mark Hanna, who was probably one of the greatest statesmen America has produced, at an after-dinner speech, stated that the next great fight in America would be between socialism and republicanism. The candidates of the Opposition and the Government parties in this State took very great care to open out at the last election on the Labour party, and they stated that we advocated the confiscation of property.

Mr. McMASTER: It's true, too.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: It is untrue. I am very sorry for the hon. member's ignorance of socialistic questions. The Labour party never advocated any such thing, and when I hear a member of this Chamber make that statement, or any individual outside make the statement, I can only conclude that he knows nothing about the socialistic principles advocated by the Labour party in Queensland. Those are the kind of things that are circulated at afternoon tea-meetings of the nice people, or at the N.L.U. meetings. The hon. member for Musgrave is reported in the Bundaberg Press to have delivered a terrible, thrilling tirade against the Labour party in a speech which he made at the town of Gin Gin to a body of lady electors. The hon. gentleman held up the Labour party as a party who wished to confiscate everything. Such stories as these are told about the party, and they are sometimes pretty blue stories, decorated a little bit with things that are absolutely untrue. The people who tell these stories talk about socialists wishing to abolish the family tie and the marriage tie. Such statements only show the crass and dense ignorance of the people who make them. Some abominable

Mr. G. P. Barber.]

statements of that character were made at the last general election in Queensland, though one could hardly credit that such statements would come from men who pose before the public as parliamentary candidates—one could hardly believe that these gentlemen—heaven save the mark!—would utter such abominable misstatements about the doctrines of socialism. Of course, we know the purpose for which these statements were made. But while there are many persons who take an important part in propagating such statements about the doctrines of the socialistic party, yet there are also hundreds who are gathering themselves together in connection with the socialistic movement. I may just quote one paragraph from a speech delivered by President Edwards, the president of the Welsh Baptist Union—

Only last week Principal Edwards, the president of the Welsh Baptist Union, in a remarkable speech, declared unflinchingly that not only was socialism conquering all other political ideas in the minds of the working people of Wales, but that unless the Christian Church boldly declared itself on the socialist side, the Christian Church would itself be wrecked. Socialism, he declared, had come to do the work that the churches had neglected, and to fulfil the prophecies.

And so in politics and trade unionism socialism grows like the expanding days in spring—making all things become new. Even those who seek to resist can only keep their feet for a moment by walking with its tide

Socialism is invincible. It is a new civilisation, a new genesis of mankind. We, who are its teachers and apostles, are but as reeds shaken in the wind. We may err; we may personally fail; we may even prove recreant to our faith; but socialism, the hope of the ages, the world-power of humanity, advances invincibly with song, beauty, and gladness in its steps.—*London Labour Leader.*

That is what we contend.

Mr. PAULL: That is not political socialism.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: It is political socialism. The socialistic ideas which are being advocated by the socialist party in England are on those lines, and out of about four by-elections which have taken place in England during the past five months three straight-out socialists have been returned—Mr. Pete Curran, and two other members, whose names I forget for the moment. The socialistic movement is making just as great advance in England as it is here, and perhaps a greater advance, because the people there feel more keenly the oppression and thraldom of the wage slavery which results from the present cut-throat competitive system which pervades society. When the House met this session, as every hon. member knows, it was quite on the boards that a coalition Government would be formed, and various Ministers were mentioned by the Press. The amusing point in connection with the whole business is that, although the metropolitan Press during the election campaign called the Premier everything but a gentleman—in fact, although the Labour party is so used to being called names that it takes no effect on them—the treatment of the Ministry as a whole, and of their policy, by the metropolitan Press was an absolute scandal.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. P. BARBER: It did not give them a fair deal at all.

Mr. McMASTER: What about the *Worker*?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: The *Worker* stood by us. The *Worker* is all right. The *Worker* has done more to advocate and to popularise socialistic ideas in Queensland than any other paper, and long may she live! The amusing part of the whole business is that, although the metropolitan Press practically damned the

[*Mr. G. P. Barber.*

Premier, politically speaking, from A to Z, from Genesis to Revelations, during the election campaign, yet when they found out that the Opposition had not been returned sufficiently strong to form a Government, they at once took the Premier to their motherly or fatherly bosom, and advocated for days and weeks that another coalition Government should be formed. And we fully expected to see it brought about the other week. When the leader of the Labour party, Mr. Bowman—who I am very pleased to see in his place to-day—made his statement to the House on the second day of the session with regard to the position the Labour party was prepared to take up, the Premier might just as well have accepted the statement of the hon. member on that occasion, instead of going to the trouble of asking for our support later on. The leader of the Labour party made our position as clear as a pikestaff. Whatever good democratic measures are brought before the House we propose to support. They may not go as far as we would wish; but we are not the blood-curdling, reckless individuals some people would make out. The members of the Labour party are prepared to support good measures from whichever side they emanate, and we are prepared to do that at the present time. The rage of the metropolitan Press the day after it was made known to the House that the Government intended to carry on with the assistance of the Labour party was intensely amusing. Then the members of the Opposition commenced to express their surprise at the Premier accepting that support, and they wanted to know what the price was. Now, I would like to say that there is no price about the business at all. The only understanding that exists is expressed in the resolution passed by the Labour party, which was read to this House by our leader. With regard to the statements about the Labour party being in the position to steer the ship, and all the rest of it, she will be steered neither from the steerage nor from the saloon. From a nautical point of view, both are equally out of place, because it is well known that no ship is steered either from the steerage or from the saloon. The captain never lays his hand on the wheel, either. It is the sailor that does the steering. We recognise that in the Government programme there are some very good measures which we must support. While that is so, the members of the Labour party intend to go on advocating their socialistic programme just as strongly as they have done in the past. Although these measures may bring a certain amount of amelioration to the general mass of the workers of Queensland, yet we are not going to be satisfied with measures that are merely of a palliative character. We believe in the great objective of the Labour party, which is that the worker shall receive the full result of his labour, and we intend to advocate in season and out of season the national ownership of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. The remark was made by one hon. member the other night that the support of the Labour party to the Government was carried on the casting vote of the chairman of the caucus meeting of the Labour party. Well, whoever has been telling the hon. member that has been "pulling his leg." Coming to the Government programme, I notice that the Government intend to open up a large area of agricultural land. The Hon. the Secretary for Public Lands said the other night that he was making every endeavour to secure sufficient land for the settlers who were coming into the State.

Last June twelve months the hon. gentleman made an extensive tour through the upper and northern Burnett, and he knows that in that district there are large areas of country equal to anything we have in Queensland, and all that is required is the extension of the present railway from Mount Perry to enable those large areas to be opened up to settlement. Another statement in the Governor's Speech is—

In order that the influx of new settlers may keep pace with the increasing opportunities thus to be provided, my advisers are adopting a liberal immigration policy.

We know that the question of the labour supply was pretty well thrashed out at various conferences held by those engaged in the sugar industry, and the Government came to an understanding with certain planters to assist them as far as possible in obtaining a sufficient supply of labour to carry on the industry. Well, as a member of the Sugar Workers' Union, and speaking on behalf of nearly 2,000 workers in the Bundaberg and Isis districts

[4.30 p.m.] who are members of that union, I would like to say that there has

never been in that district—nor we believe North as far as the sugar industry extends—any special need for the introduction of labour for that industry. (Hear, hear!) Commencing away down in the Southern district, it is a well-known fact that many men—and some of the best men who come to Queensland and engage in the sugar industry are the men who for some years have been working as canecutters, and workers on the Northern rivers of New South Wales—when the agitation was going on in Queensland for the introduction of a large supply of labour, I noticed that the same agitation was being helped along in the Northern Rivers district, and I went to a little trouble in cutting out from the Southern Press, and even from our metropolitan Press, telegrams or reports of the labour supply all over the State. The *Brisbane Courier* of the 18th of June last has the following from its correspondent at Murwillumbah about the Northern district of New South Wales—

Hands were engaged to-day for the crushing season. Thirteen gangs of cutters signed on, numbering 128 men. Hands numbering over 100 have also been engaged for the mill work. It was thought that there would be some difficulty in obtaining sufficient labour, but a good number of men were turned away.

You will find that is the experience all over Queensland and in the Northern districts of New South Wales. Then, on the 28th June, the *Courier* had the following from its Grafton correspondent:—

Hands were taken on to-day at the Colonial Sugar Company's mill at Harwood. Sixteen gangs of canecutters, numbering 160 men, were sent to various parts of the district, and over 100 extra men were taken on to work in the mill.

And it goes on to say—

There was a large surplus there.

Then, working away North, we come to the Broadwater Mill, from whence a telegram stated that sixteen gangs were sent up there in one day and twelve gangs on the day following, while there was ample labour following. Now, as regards the Moreton Mill, it said in the *Courier*—

There is plenty of labour available.

The Childers correspondent of the *Courier* wrote on the 19th of June—

Labour is plentiful, but no demand, as very little trashing has been done this season.

Mr. PAGET: Had the crushing started at the Moreton Mill on the 19th of June?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: They were engaging their men at that time. Then, going on to Childers: In the *Courier* of the 2nd of July it said—

There are hundreds of men camped about the district waiting for work. The men are of a superior class to those of former years.

Then, the Childers correspondent of the *Courier* telegraphed on the 7th July—

Large numbers of men waiting work. It is not anticipated that any shortage of labour will occur. As an evidence that there were more men than last year even, the relief records show that for the quarter ending June rations were granted to 367 men, as against 285 for corresponding quarter of previous year.

All the way through the sugar districts it is pretty well the same thing. The *Isis Recorder*, in its issue of 6th July, says—

Although large numbers of men—400 to 500—have been taken on by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and the Hapsburg and Lynwood proprietors, there still remain hundreds waiting for the Isis Central and Doolbi Mills to commence operations. They are mostly young fellows of fine physique, well behaved, which can be testified to by the police authorities. Bundaberg district, 21st July, reports plenty of labour available and of a better class than formerly.

And to that I can add my own personal knowledge, and that is that I have never seen such a fine stamp of men, or fine class of labour, in the Bundaberg district as there was this year. It is a source of wonder this season as to what has become of the old boozakin crowd who use to come about there. Not 5 per cent. of them have come along there this season. They are mostly young men ranging from twenty to thirty years of age, all well-built and well-behaved young fellows. Then, again, working further North to Gin Gin, they report an ample supply of a good class of labour there. The outside correspondents of the Bundaberg Press write in confirmation of these statements both as regards the quantity and quality of the men available. Working still further North, I have not read of any shortage in those districts. The *Proserpine Guardian* remarks—

During the past few months we have heard a great howl about there not being a sufficient supply of labour in Australia to harvest the crop during the coming crushing. This fear should now be ended, as the officer in charge of the police has received no less than 518 names of men asking for work in the canefields. If those numbers were put together they would run into a thousand. A large number of men have gone from the Northern Rivers of New South Wales to the Mossman and other mills, but according to the Mossman correspondent of the *Tweed Herald*, out of forty gangs only three gangs are doing really well, eighteen gangs doing fairly well, and the rest doing poorly owing to ravages of the grubs.

There used to be a fund in the Northern districts for the destruction of the grub; I do not know whether that fund is still in existence, or whether they are still troubled with the pest, but I think they have killed it off.

Mr. PAGET: No; it is very bad right up in the far North.

Mr. KENNA: The grubs are very bad at Mossman.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: There have been several batches of a good class of men sent North through private labour agencies, and I would be very much surprised to hear that during the past few months there was any shortage of labour in the Northern districts. I can hardly believe that there was a shortage.

Mr. PAGET: The mills in Mackay are experiencing a shortage of labour.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: I have not seen anything about it in the Press so far, and I have been following up the newspapers looking for any information about the labour at various places. The hon. member for Oxley said the other night

Mr. G. P. Barber.¹

that a large area of country had gone out of cane-growing, and a large quantity of cane was allowed to stand over last year owing to the shortage of labour. It is all very well to make those bald statements, but I want to know where this took place? The same statements were made in the Bundaberg and Isis districts, but on making inquiries I found the statements were anything but correct. I know this, on the other hand, that the men were handicapped by not being able to get through as much work as they could have done were it not for the shortage of trucks used to take the cane away. In fact, it was only the other week that one gang of ten men and a cook on Saturday night had no less than 60 tons of cane lying on the ground. In another gang at Hapsburg, in the Isis district, there was no less than 200 tons of cane lying there. When men are cutting cane by contract, they are handicapped by not being able to get through the amount of work they otherwise do. It seems to me that there is something wrong about that. I have my own opinion about it, and I will express it directly—as to what I think is wrong about the matter. Then I quote the following correspondence in connection with the Isis district:—

Cane-cutting is now going on at a very satisfactory rate. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company's mill is in full swing, but is taking no cane from the Cordalba end as yet. Hapsburg and Lynwood Estates are supplying Fairymead with four train loads of cane daily; in fact, the trains cannot take it away as fast as the gang could wish.

What encouragement is there for a gang of men to undertake this work if they have not facilities for sending the stuff away?

It is nothing to see over 100 tons of cane lying in the fields at knock-off time at night. The management of Hapsburg is to be congratulated on the way it has set the men out in gangs, and is apparently giving every satisfaction. The men seem to be very superior to what was going last season, and it is fully expected that everything will go on smoothly for the season, which will go to show that white workers of the right stamp can do the work and give satisfaction.

In my opinion, the reason for this cane lying about is this—and I am confirmed in that opinion by the statements that have been made to me by several men who are at present working in connection with this same plantation: This is the first year that this large proprietary have given way, and let their cutting by contract. Last year our union in Bundaberg fought them practically to a standstill, and got the wages of the men raised from £1 5s. to £1 10s. a week, and now the men have taken all their work by contract. It seems that this firm, seeing that the men could make excellent wages by contract work, have decided that they will only supply them with sufficient trucks to enable them to cut and take away as much cane as they would be able to cut and get away under a weekly system of wages, thereby keeping them down to the same rate per week under the contract as they would earn under the weekly system. That seems to be the opinion expressed by the men up there, and I am strongly inclined to believe the report. I do not know what move the conference which was sitting this week in Townsville has on now, but it seems to me that, encouraged by the success of the proposals which they placed before the Premier and Dr. Maxwell, and also those which they placed before the Federal Government, met with, it is quite possible they are coming down now with some move for a further supply. Now, neither by Sir John Forrest, the Federal Treasurer, nor yet by the State Premier, does the question, as it affects the men and the men's wages, seem to have been considered at all. The delegates for the planters and the sugar-growers' conference came down and placed their proposals before the Premier and before Sir John Forrest, who

seem to have decided the thing just as they wanted. Surely, the men's claims should have been considered! When these people come along and desire to screw down the fieldworker to the same rate of wages that obtained here in the coloured labour days, then I say the whole thing is a scandal. Fancy a married man in our district working on a farm, where there is not accommodation for his family to live on the farm. This obtains in dozens of cases. He gets £1 a week. Owing to the great expansion of business, and the demand for house accommodation which has taken place since the black labour has gone, rents have gone up, and the various properties have appreciated enormously; and yet these men, after losing two or three days or a week through wet weather, will finish up at the end of the week with 8s. or 9s. Even if they get the full pound they have probably to pay 7s. or 8s. a week rent in the town and keep their wives and children out of the rest. I say that the claim of these men to a weekly wage of £1 10s. should have been seriously considered before even the Premier or Sir John Forrest had decided on this matter. I do not know how much the Premier had to do with the matter, but a large number, I may say some thousands of the caneworkers in Queensland, would very much like to know how much Mr. Kidston had to do with fixing the rate of wages at £1 5s. You can well understand that the big proprietors and some of the canegrowers are singing out for cheap labour. As a matter of fact, in connection with the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, a gentleman, who made a tour of the Southern islands, pointed out in an article contributed to the *Courier* the other day that he went out to one of the mills there. He says—

The captain and I accepted Mr. Smith's invitation to dinner, and made the 3-mile journey to his residence in novel manner. We took our seats on a sort of light, open railway truck, fitted with seats, which were pushed along the Colonial Sugar Refining Company's line by a couple of prisoners. The way these bare-legged unfortunates got over the ground made us marvel. They must have easily travelled at the rate of 6 to 8 miles an hour. The return ride in the pleasant cool moonlight was charming. We saw prisoners at work on the sugar plantation, and the dinner was cooked by prisoners.

It seems to me that that is just about the class of labour which is very cheap. It comes in very handy, as you can thrash a prisoner sometimes.

Mr. PAGET: Is that in Queensland?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: No; that is in one of the islands—Fiji, I presume. But what a cheap and desirable class of labour for that sugar monopoly, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company! No wonder they are enabled to pay a handsome dividend if they can get a few thousand prisoners to do their work! There was another matter that I intended to refer to in connection with this: One of the growers in our district stated that we wanted 15,000 white men to take the place of 5,000 of the boys who had been deported, so that the sugar-planters would always be sure of a plentiful supply of labour. There is no doubt that gentleman was in earnest when he used that expression. I know that one gentleman pointed out at one meeting—

Private people could not bring out labourers like the Government would be able, for the former would find difficulty in compelling them to remain if they became discontented or refused to work, while the Government could force them to work.

That is an old slavish idea. A man who has had plenty to do with coloured labour somehow or other acquires the idea that they can force the coloured people to work, and it gives me the impression that he would like to resort to the same means when he has got white men to work for him—

The present Government were trying to bring out immigrants with capital, but he contended that this

[Mr. G. P. Barber.]

was a wrong policy, as these were not required in Queensland. They had plenty of capitalists in Queensland already; what was really required was a good supply of labour, and that the Government should supply.

Now, passing to the paragraph in the Governor's Speech referring to immigration, I would like to know what has become of that important association known as the Immigration League. We understood some months ago that it was going to revolutionise our immigration system. The gentleman at the head of it was Mr. Mans Baker, whose name has been appropriately parodied into a "Woman's Butcher." He was very prominent in connection with the league for some time, and I would like to know whether a subsidy was given to the Immigration League by the State Government, or where they got their funds from? I do not know where that league has gone to. They had a branch in Victoria, and one in the sister State of New South Wales, and the general opinion expressed by the people of Queensland and of the sister State was that the whole thing was a scheme on the part of the capitalistic crowd to flood the Australian market with cheap labour. I have no hesitation in saying that that was the move of this league, run by that wonderful Mr. Mans Baker, who sent two or three shipments of labour to Bundaberg. They were supposed to be "boys." Some of them were boys with whiskers; some of them were boys with wives, and after working in the fields for some time they recognised that they had been "had." Most of those boys finished by joining the Sugar Workers' Union, and went in for a rise in wages, and most of them got a rise from 17s. 6d. to 22s. 6d., which was not so bad after all. I would like to know what amount of money was given to this Immigration League by the State Government, because I am undoubtedly of the opinion that this Queensland branch had the same object in view as the New South Wales branch of flooding the Australian market with cheap labour. Some time ago there was a bit of a row in the camp down South, and Dr. Arthur, who was president of the league, wrote this letter, dated 10th April, to Mr. Marshall Lyle, 159 Queen street, Melbourne—

Dear Mr. Lyle,—We are putting boxes on the "Himalaya" and "Medic," both leaving to-day. Can you do the same, or get your Government to do so? This is a splendid work, which requires to be organised. All these hundreds of passengers are potential immigration agents. Don't mix up immigration and land settlement in your pamphlet. In fact, rather issue two. In the immigration book everything must be *couleur de rose*. No hint of difficulty about getting land. You need not be afraid you will be rebuked. Even when Queensland offered cheap farms in London, there was only one applicant. As regards land settlement for home (Victorian) consumption, you can be as pessimistic and as indignant as you please. The blacker the better, though don't get too much on the line, "What is the use of inviting the immigrants here, when we have nothing to offer them." That would chop off subscriptions. Anyhow, don't do anything to frighten off immigrants, because competition for them is so keen in Europe, and even if conditions change for the better in Victoria you might find that it was of no avail, as you had given the place a bad reputation.

Yours faithfully,

RICHARD ARTHUR, President.

Now, I think the same thing might almost be said about the wonderful league constituted here. It was a most ignominious failure, and should never have been brought into operation. I know the Labour party are blamed for being against the introduction of immigrants, but they believe that before importing a large crowd of people to this State, we should first of all find employment for our own people; we should find land for our own people; we should make their social conditions better and brighter than they are at the present time. It is all very well

for a certain class of people to be able to get cheap labour, but it is we who belong to the working sections of the community who know what it means to have to compete for work in the different towns and districts of the State. There is nothing that delights the heart of the capitalist more than the fact that for every job which he has at his disposal there are twenty or twenty-five applicants. He knows that with a plentiful supply of labour he is able to get his work done pretty well for nothing. In hundreds of cases in which men have wives and families to maintain they are driven by force of circumstances to take the first employment that offers at a price on which it is a hardship to exist. We believe that we should find land in the first place for our own young people, and remunerative work. We should establish a system of State aid for settlement on a sound and liberal basis, and by that means we believe Queensland would gain an enviable reputation, not only amongst the other States of the Commonwealth, but also a world-wide reputation as being a place where the social conditions of the workers were good. The cry of "more people" means more cheap labour; more competition in the shops and in the factories to cut down the wages which unionism has succeeded in raising; more people to be rack-rented by landlords, by usurers, and taxed by capitalistic politicians for their own ends. That is one of the strong reasons why the Labour party oppose the introduction of a large supply of cheap labour. Passing on to the paragraph in the Governor's Speech referring to the conservation of water, there is no doubt that the same paragraph has been before the country for many years. I would like to say that twenty years ago there was a proposal to dam the Burnett River near Bingera Plantation where there is ample material in the shape of stone, rock, sand, and gravel, all that is required being labour and cement. Then again, I am very pleased to see that the Government talk about developing our educational system. There is one thing in connection

with that system to which I have always been opposed. The system is not free in the sense in which it should be free—that is, in regard to the supply of books. Children should not be expected to buy their own books. In some cases four, five, or six children from one family attend school, and they require a considerable number of books in the course of twelve months, and it comes very hard on the parents to have to provide those books, especially in cases where the father is only in receipt of just sufficient to keep the home together. I think that in cases of that sort—in fact, in all cases—it should be a general rule—all the books required should be provided by the State. Further on in the same paragraph we are told that there is to be a development of our educational system in connection with continuation classes to be conducted at night. This is very encouraging, because there are many of our young people who will be glad to take advantage of such classes. One of the great troubles in Queensland is that many of our lads are never taught their trade in a practical manner. During the six or seven years that a boy is learning a trade he may have had six or seven different bosses. That is a bad system. We should have a proper system of apprenticeship introduced and followed in this State. Some time ago a commission was appointed in Melbourne to inquire into this question of apprenticeship, and they have submitted a report which contains some excellent recommendations. The following quotation on this subject may be of interest:—

The committee appointed nine months ago to make recommendations with regard to the apprenticeship

Mr. G. P. Barber.]

question have brought in a report. They suggest, among other things, the urgency of technical instruction, the appointment of apprenticeship boards, the prohibition of premiums, the enforcement of a master's duty to teach and an apprentice's duty to serve, the cancellation of indentures for misconduct, the removal from employment on the master's default, and a probationary system. It is shown that the most serious defects existed in the training of youths for nearly all skilled trades, and that in some of these trades there was a scarcity of labour. The factory systems, it was pointed out, have rendered necessary the development of all classes of technical schools and of trade classes. To make good the defects incidental to the training in workshops, it is recommended that trade or night classes be established in different centres, that inspection be free, and that attendance in certain cases be made compulsory. The new apprenticeship law recommended is designed to take the place of the old and inefficient Masters and Servants Act.

I think we require a proper system of apprenticeship in Queensland in connection with the various trades carried on in the State. I am pleased to notice that a Bill is to be introduced providing for the better inspection of boilers. The Government have already appointed two or three more inspectors than we had at this time last year. The inspectors in my district have done real good work; a large number of boilers have been condemned as absolutely unfit for further work, and the present condition of the boilers in use is safer than it was before. Still, even there, there is room for improvement. I am glad to observe also that the Government intend to introduce a measure for the establishment of wages boards. With regard to the liquor question, it is stated that the Government intend to deal with this subject by an amendment of the Licensing Act. Of course I do not know what the provisions of the proposed measure are. I recognise that it is a very big question, and that once you begin to amend the Licensing Act you open up a very wide field for discussion. I hope, however, that provision will be made in the measure which is to be submitted to the House on the lines of the new Act in New South Wales, under which the people have an opportunity at every general election of expressing an opinion as to whether the number of licenses should be reduced or whether there should be no licenses. I am of opinion that it is absolutely impossible to reform the drink traffic. The only way to reform it is to reform it out of existence. I was probably the only candidate at the last election who declared himself a straight-out prohibitionist.

Mr. RYLAND: No, you were not alone.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: During the last election I declared myself a straight-out prohibitionist, and I lost a lot of support that I had received on previous occasions. Many people connected with the drink traffic who supported me at previous elections voted against me at the last election, and opposed me all they knew. I do not know whether they will give me any further support, but I know that many of them, and a number of temperance people, gave their votes for the other fellow. But that is their business, not mine. I believe in straight-out prohibition, and I hope that when the Licensing Act is amended provision will be made for allowing the people to decide periodically whether the number of licenses shall be reduced or whether there shall be any licenses at all. I know it will be said that the wiping out of licenses means a depreciation in the value of property. That has been the case in connection with prohibition districts in New Zealand.

Mr. RYLAND: The value of property went up there.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: In a temperance newspaper called the *Vanguard* it is stated that in Invercargill, during the twelve months that hotel bars were abolished, fifty-seven new build-

ings had been erected in the town, and additions had been made to twenty-nine others, at a total cost of £42,000. It was further stated that the general revenue from rates had increased, that gasworks' receipts had increased by £560, and those in connection with waterworks by £413; that business generally was in a most flourishing condition; that under "licenses" the rates from sixteen hotels had totalled £612, while under "no license" the aggregate amount was £642. There is a long report here showing the great benefit that has accrued to the district. There has been a falling-off in crime, drunkenness, and many other things. I shall never be satisfied until this State, like the colony of New Zealand, is in a position to give the people the power to pronounce on straight-out prohibition. With reference to the eight hour system on our railways and fortnightly pay, as I have a question to ask to-morrow dealing with the matter, I shall say nothing further just now than that I hope the next move the Government make will be in the direction of establishing the principle of a minimum wage in connection with all work on the railways. In the little State of South Australia, where, as one hon. member put it, they have a real Labour Premier in office, they have established a minimum wage in connection with all Government employment. No porter on the railways there gets less than 7s. a day. It is a scandalous thing that in Queensland a young fellow—in fact, some of them are married men—who take up the work of railway porters have to probably work at a station for twelve or eighteen months—I know of one case where a married man had been working for a period of over two years—then he had to sit for examination as a porter, and after passing the examination he has still to work for the miserable sum of 5s. 6d. per day for six months before he gets an increase in his wages. If a State which is far poorer than Queensland can afford to establish a minimum wage, we ought to do the same thing in this State. I got a return from a member of the Legislature in that State the other day—it is too long to read just now—giving full details of the wages paid to all classes of labour—on the railways, on the dredges, in connection with harbour works, and to school teachers as well. There is one other matter I would like to refer to in connection with the railways. The leader of the Opposition stated the other day that there is a great shortage of rolling-stock. The Premier said that was hardly a correct statement—that there was plenty of rolling-stock. Now, as far as Bundaberg is concerned, there has been a considerable shortage of rolling-stock, and there is, I believe, at the present time. During last crushing season, which was a very busy one—and this season will be still busier—on several occasions the rolling-stock was so scarce that some cane trucks that had been fitted up by the Millaquin Refining Company to bring their cane from the outlying mills to the new crushing plant at Millaquin were taken by the Railway Department, which was short of trucks, sent to the Isis, and loaded up with raw sugar which was sent down to Brisbane. That is not a proper state of affairs. If this company goes to the expense of specially fitting up these railway trucks for cane carrying, they should be kept for the special use of the company. (Hear, hear!) Then, again, during last crushing season on several occasions the new crushing plant at Millaquin was hung up for hours at a stretch, simply because there was no engine at Bundaberg to take the cane down. An engine was sent there to assist in shunting on the railway, but the traffic to the Millaquin refinery requires an engine for itself to run backwards and forwards during the crushing season, and there is no time for that engine to

[Mr. G. P. Barber.]

be used in shunting operations in the railway yard. It is a very serious matter for a big plant like that to be hung up for several hours. I am told on the very best authority—by some of the servants of the company—that the general manager of the refinery had to communicate with Mr. Ralston, the general manager of the Queensland National Bank, in Brisbane, asking him to shake up the railway officials to provide better shunting accommodation. There is an interesting item in the Speech—old age pensions. As the Government intend to introduce a Bill, it will not do for me to say much about it at the present time. I noticed one or two members speaking from the Opposition side the other night expressed themselves in favour of old age pensions. That is very satisfactory, although the conversion of the hon. members has been very recent. It shows that they have seen the error of their ways and have come to believe in an old age pension. What they will probably want to know next is where the funds are to come from. I notice that Mr. Hall, the Government Statistician in New South Wales, pointed out to the Old Age Pension Commission that, if a tax of 3d. in the £1 were imposed on absentee owners of land in Australia, it would bring in about £925,000. That would be a very good method of "raising the wind," and providing money for old age pensions. Another matter I notice here is that the Government intend to reintroduce this session a Bill providing for a referendum on Bible teaching in State schools. I shall take just the same attitude in reference to that Bill as I did last year.

Mr. MAXWELL: Vote for it?

Mr. G. P. BARBER: No; vote against it. It was very amusing during the election campaign to notice that three Opposition candidates changed their views on it. When the hon. member for Bundamba was pulled up at one of his meetings he expressed himself in favour of the referendum, although he voted against it last session. The hon. member for Rosewood and the junior member for Townsville also showed a surprising change of front when they were confronted during the campaign in reference to this question.

Mr. CRIBB: I never spoke against the referendum. You cannot point to anything I said against the referendum.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: The hon. member voted against it.

Mr. CRIBB: I never spoke against it. (Laughter.)

Mr. G. P. BARBER: Well, when a man votes against a thing you naturally come to the conclusion that he is against it. The reason the hon. member gave for voting against the Bill last session, according to the Press reports, was that he simply wished to defeat the Premier—about the most miserable, wretched excuse I ever heard in my life. I intend to oppose the Referendum Bill, and also the object of the referendum. It cost me a lot of votes—I believe 150 votes. However, I opposed it, and I shall do so again.

Mr. MAXWELL: It will be another 100 next time.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: The Labour section in the House expected to have found in the Government programme a Bill on the same lines as the Trades Unions Disputes Bill of last year. We hold that such legislation is necessary to protect the unionists of this State, in order to prevent unscrupulous employers from stopping men from joining a union, because, as a matter of fact, this sort of thing is going on not only here in Brisbane, but up in the Howard district an industry has been practically hung up there

owing to the refusal of the proprietors to allow the men working there to form a union. One would think that unionism was a terrible thing. I will read an extract from the address of an extensive employer of labour who is a strong advocate of unionism. He was a colonel, and I would have liked the hon. member for Burrum, who is also a colonel, to listen to this, but he is not here. These are extracts from the speech of Colonel James Kilbourne, of Columbus, Ohio, delivered at a gathering of the National Civic—

I am an optimist on the labour question. For more than a third of a century I have been manager of a company between whom and its employees there has never existed even the slightest difficulty. . . . Labour will ultimately receive a still larger share of the joint proceeds, and capital will have to content itself with less. . . . Organised labour has increased wages to the benefit, not to the injury of the general public; it has shortened the hours of work not to the advantage of working men and women alone, but of the community at large; it is fast doing away with child labour to the ultimate improvement of the race both physically and morally. . . . It has amended the fellow-servant law so that the responsibility for death or injury by accident is placed where it rightly belongs; it has so educated public opinion that it is no longer reputable for one man to buy the labour of another as he would merchandise, at the lowest obtainable price. . . . When united action of the workers is no longer necessary to secure justice, unionism will cease; but that time has not yet arrived. . . . While public opinion is improving and is coming more and more to the labourer's side, while instances multiply of just and kindly relations existing between the employer and the employed, proving by their results the benefit to each of the recognition of the rights of the other and making in some cases unions essential, yet in a majority of cases union organisation is still necessary in order to secure just wages, and what is of equal if not greater importance, the acknowledgement of equal manhood. . . . Let us hasten the day when strikes and lockouts shall be no more, because all men shall recognise the obligations that pertain to the unions of both employers and men.

I say that I hope that even before this session passes that the Premier will introduce that Trades Union Disputes Bill. (Hear, hear!) I know that a large number of unionists in Queensland supported the Government candidates at the last election in the expectation that that measure would find a place in the Government programme for this session, and there is at the present time considerable discontent and disappointment among these people outside. In fact, I might say that several Labour organisations and unions have already passed resolutions desiring the Labour party especially to urge on the Government the necessity of introducing the Trade Union Disputes Bill this session. I would like to say that there are some very good measures in the Governor's Speech, and they will have my support. At the same time, I take up the same attitude as my colleagues in this corner, and claim my right to criticise any measure which the Government may introduce. That is the attitude the Labour party intend to take up, and will adhere to. We went to the country on a certain policy. We advocated our principles before the country at the last election, and a large number of the electors supported us by their votes. We were returned to this House eighteen in number—there is one less now, as a matter of fact—but we were returned eighteen strong in favour of the Labour platform. Some hon. member said here the other day that the ladies of Queensland had not voted for the socialistic candidates. If I understand the voting at all, I think that a very large number of the ladies of Queensland voted for the Labour candidates. A large number of the women, including the factory girls, the shop assistants, and a portion of our female electors who have to go out to their daily toil, have recognised the fact that it is in the application of the principles advocated by the Labour party that they have

Mr. G. P. Barber.]

any hope of having their conditions improved. They know that it means to them shorter hours of labour, better conditions in the factory, better conditions in the shop, a better rate of wages, and a larger share of general comfort to them. I will bring my remarks to a close by quoting the concluding portion of the manifesto issued by the Labour party at the last election, as follows:—

On the policy outlined above the Labour party confidently appeals to those who in the past have supported its platform, and claims their allegiance in the cause of justice. Splendid work has already been accomplished by the power of solidarity and the uncompromising spirit of earnestness and self-sacrifice that has ever animated the legions of labour. There is much more to be done, and never were unity, zeal, and faithfulness to our principles more demanded of us than at the present juncture.

Ours is the one policy that aims to put an end to a social system manifesting itself in cruel injustice and appalling evils—children sweated, women degraded, men enslaved, class pitted against class. Ours is a policy bringing the boon of permanent peace and happiness into the lives of the people, a policy that all who love their kind can work with heart and soul to achieve.

The Labour party refuses to lend itself to the perpetuating of a state of society that spells poverty and arduous toil for the great masses of the people, and inordinate wealth and corrupting idleness for a class. It recognises the impossibility of patching up a system that produces wretchedness, suffering, and bitter strife as its unavoidable consequences. It makes the ideal of social justice its beacon light, convinced that in doing so its feet cannot wander astray, and persuaded that in appealing to the highest sentiments of human nature it is taking the surest course to the practical betterment of society.

In conclusion, the party calls upon all Labour men and women to uphold the glorious principles of the movement—to press ever forward, undeterred by the defection of false hearts and weak wills, confident that the forces of progress are on their side, as they are on the side of the forces of progress.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): Like the hon. gentleman, who has just sat down, I also would like to make a few remarks; but I do not think they will extend to the length of the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg. As one can expect from the representative of a sugar district, the sugar question concerns him most, and with many of the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman in connection with the labour employed on the sugar plantations I have a great deal of sympathy. The hon. member's speech consisted very largely of socialism and sugar. He also traversed the Governor's Speech to a great extent. I shall not have much to say in connection with the Governor's Speech; but later on I should like to say something on the question of socialism that has occupied so much of the hon. gentleman's speech this evening. I am very glad to see the leader of the Labour party present this evening, although I know that he has not yet quite recovered from the illness from which he was suffering. I am glad the hon. member is present because earlier in the session the hon. member charged me with having violated my principles. I do not know what made the hon. member make that charge against me, because he did not explain it at the time, but I imagine he meant that I left the Labour party, and that because I did not sign the Labour platform at the last election, I had violated my principles. If that is what the hon. member meant, I will have something to say about it later on. The hon. member, who just sat down, referring to myself and other hon. members, said that we were members of the Labour party prior to the last general election, and that we were afraid to sign the Labour platform. Well, I will explain to the House and to the country why I—and I can speak for some of the other ex-Labour members—why we did not sign the Labour platform. It is not because

we were afraid to sign it, to quote the words of the hon. member. It is not that at all. I think it is very proper—and it is really one of the principal reasons why I decided to take part

in this debate—I think it is very [5.30 p.m.] proper that there should be a statement in *Hansard* explaining the

reasons why some of us declined to follow the Labour party at the last election on its new platform and its new constitution, because I think that so far no member has dealt with that particular matter. I would just like to say, with reference to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg, that I do not agree with some of the things that he said. For instance, he said that there was no difference between the Philp and Kidston platform at the last election. Now, the hon. gentleman must know that there was a considerable difference between those two policies. For instance, the manifesto of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition was not in favour of old age pensions. What the leader of the Opposition proposed was to increase the indigent allowance. The hon. member will remember that that was the plank in the platform of the leader of the Opposition, whereas the Premier advocated straight out a system of old age pensions.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is only pending the Commonwealth legislation.

Mr. JACKSON: Of course, it goes without saying that, if the Commonwealth Parliament passes an Old Age Pensions Bill, naturally the State old age pensioners will drop out as soon as the Federal Legislature establishes an Old Age Pensions Act.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is a fair thing to mention that when you say it is the leader of the Opposition's platform.

Mr. JACKSON: I quite agree with that; but the hon. member for Toowong, I think, will recognise that the Federal Parliament has talked of old age pensions for a great many years. Ever since the establishment of federation Federal members have brought the question of old age pensions before the Federal Parliament, and, as anyone knows who has followed up the matter, the real reason why the Federal Parliament has not dealt with old age pensions is on account of the Braddon clause, which provides that three-fourths of the State Customs and Excise revenue must be returned to the States; and, in order that the Federal Parliament should deal with an Old Age Pensions Act, it would be necessary to raise over £1,000,000. That the leaders on both sides of the Federal Parliament have declined to introduce any system of direct taxation to provide old age pensions means increasing indirect taxation through the Customs and Excise revenue by £1,000,000 in order to raise £1,000,000 for old age pensions. That is the real reason why the Federal Parliament has not dealt with it. Of course, in another two or three years the Braddon clause will drop out of the Constitution, and no doubt the old age pensions will be obtained by the Federal Government taking action.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The present Minister for Customs says he is going on with it now.

Mr. JACKSON: I am not sorry to hear that the Minister for Customs is proposing to go on with it. I do not understand how the Minister proposes to raise the revenue, because it will certainly take over £1,000,000 to provide old age pensions for all Australia. Of course, if it is by some system of direct taxation, I do not see why it should not be done. In the meantime, we think the State Parliament should deal with this question, but if the Federal Government feels the time is ripe let them go on with it, and the State old age pensions can drop out. Personally,

[*Mr. G. P. Barber.*]

I do not know that there is any advantage in the Federal Parliament dealing with this question. I think the State can deal with it as well, and although I do not know the details of the proposed Bill which is going to be laid before the Assembly, I understand at any rate that on one point it is proposed to provide for reciprocity the same as I think the New South Wales and the Victorian Acts do, and that will get over the difficulty where the old age pensioners have not resided a full term in Queensland. If the system of reciprocity is adopted, there is no reason why an old man or woman who has resided ten or twelve years in Queensland or New South Wales should not qualify for the State pension. However, I am getting away from my subject. I did not intend to deal at all with old age pensions, but I was pointing out to the House that there is a marked difference between the policies of the leader of the Opposition and of the Government, and I quoted the old age pensions as one point of difference. But there are others—for instance, the Trade Disputes Bill, which the hon. member for Bundaberg has been speaking about this afternoon. The leader of the Opposition did not propose to introduce any Trade Disputes Bill. That is a very important matter. The hon. member for Bundaberg found fault with the Government because there is no Trade Disputes Bill in the Government programme, but the hon. member must know that the Governor's Speech does not comprise all the legislation that is introduced during the session, and, further, the hon. member must also recognise that it is not possible for any Government to include in the first session all the items of the Premier's manifesto. The Premier's manifesto is intended to extend over the term of Parliament—two or three years—so that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues should not be impatient about the Trade Disputes Bill. I hope to see that Bill introduced myself.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is one of the most important to the industrial portion of the community.

Mr. JACKSON: I quite recognise that, and it will have my support if it is introduced. It was carried, as we all know, last session, but rejected by the other Chamber. I have not the slightest doubt that if it is introduced again we will have the support of hon. members sitting on that side of the House in the Labour corner. Now, there was also this difference between the two policies—that the leader of the Opposition advocated practically unrestricted immigration. Surely the hon. member will see that there is a very great difference between unrestricted immigration and the immigration that the Premier favours. Then take the question of the sales of land. The leader of the Opposition would advocate the unrestricted sale of Crown lands. The hon. member would not contend that the Premier is going on a policy of that kind.

Mr. G. P. BARBER: He sold some since the election.

Mr. JACKSON: However, I do not want to follow the hon. gentleman up in his speech, but I will come back to the question of socialism. The Address in Reply gives hon. members opportunities not only for discussing the Governor's Speech but for ventilating the grievances or requirements of their constituencies, and I must say that some of the new members have shown themselves adepts at ventilating the requirements of their constituents. I am not blaming them for that, but paying them a compliment. I do not propose myself to speak from a constituency or parochial point of view.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: But I will try to speak from a Northern point of view, if not from a

national point of view. The hon. member for Croydon, Mr. Creagh, spoke about the North having been neglected, not having had fair play, and I think he quoted his own electorate as a case in point. I am sorry the hon. member is not here, but I would like to point out to him that Croydon has probably had about £10 out of the deep sinking fund for mining to £1 Ravenswood has had, so that he has nothing to complain about.

Mr. MAXWELL: More than any other particular field in Queensland.

Mr. JACKSON: I think, with the hon. member for Burke, that Croydon has had in proportion to its extent more than any other field in Queensland out of the deep sinking fund. As we all know it got a railway almost immediately after the field was opened. I am not going to blame the hon. member for Croydon for ventilating the claims of his constituency, but Croydon has always had good representation in this House—it has good representation now in the person of Mr. Creagh—but it seems to me it is not quite the neglected district that the hon. member would have the House believe. Now, the hon. member wanted to form a Northern party. The hon. member for Burke did something in the direction of trying to form a Northern party.

Mr. MAXWELL: Blame me.

Mr. JACKSON: I think it was made some years ago. Now, it is a very difficult matter to form a Northern party out of diverse elements.

Mr. CREAGH: When you do not want to.

Mr. JACKSON: I will support the hon. member if it is possible, but I want to point out to him when members have different political views they find it somewhat difficult to work together, even in industrial matters or for the requirements of their districts. I think it would be a difficult matter, but I do not want to discourage the hon. member. If the hon. gentleman will make an attempt, I will be glad to support him.

Mr. CREAGH: You will not discourage me.

Mr. JACKSON: I will just refer shortly to the deep sinking fund. Mining is one of our important industries, and the deep sinking fund does not seem to have been a very great success. Before the hon. member for Croydon came back to the Chamber I was saying that Croydon had had a very fair share of that fund.

Mr. CREAGH: When?

Mr. JACKSON: It has had £10 to other districts' £1.

Mr. CREAGH: From this Government?

Mr. JACKSON: From this and previous Governments during the last twelve or thirteen years. I think that fund might be devoted to a better purpose. The hon. member for Burnett, when he spoke last week, referred to the desirability of establishing a State smelting works. Now, during the late election I remember reading in the Press that the late Home Secretary, Mr. Airey, said that the Government would establish a State smelting works in Townsville, with smaller furnaces in far away districts. I hope that statement is correct, because whilst I am not with the socialistic party in their desire to nationalise all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, I believe in a certain amount of State socialism. I believe every hon. member in this Chamber does. Even members of the Opposition party, I am quite sure, when they see that the State can render useful assistance in the establishment of an industrial enterprise, will support a proposition of that kind. That is the view I take myself—that experiments may fairly be made in these matters.

Mr. Jackson.]

Mr. MACARTNEY: We cannot support any policy until we see the details. We do not know where we are.

Mr. JACKSON: I think the hon. member knows where he is. He knows he is sitting in Opposition.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is what is grieving him.

Mr. JACKSON: What I was going to suggest was this: I think the establishment of State smelting works, either in Northern or Southern Queensland—I do not very much care which—would be a great advantage to the mining industry generally—not only of advantage in relation to the gold-mining industry, but in regard to developing the industrial metals generally. I have no idea what the establishment of such works would cost; it might run into £100,000. But suppose we put it at that figure. Let us suppose that the Government abolish the vote for deep sinking, which runs into £2,000 or £3,000 a year. I think it used to be £5,000, but it has been cut down until only about £2,000 is put in the Estimates every year. During the past twelve months, I believe the vote has been very much exceeded, but anyway I think members will admit that a sum of £4,000 would not be an excessive amount to devote towards assisting the mining industry. For many years past money has been spent in subsidising deep sinking, and I do not suppose that 5 per cent. has been returned to the State. We have there an instance of State socialism which has not been beneficial to any great extent. Well, £4,000 would pay interest at 4 per cent. on £100,000, and I think it would be a wise departure if the Government devoted £4,000 to paying interest on the cost of a State smelting works. On the other hand, the works might be a success from the start, and there might be no occasion to spend even the £4,000, but if the works were not directly productive, the vote of £4,000 would help to tide them over the dead time. I put that suggestion before the Government and mining members, and I think if we were united on the subject—

Mr. CREAGH: Why not unite and form a deputation?

Mr. JACKSON: I am quite willing to do so, but I have one deputation already for this week.

Mr. MAXWELL: You have not given sufficient evidence to show that it would be a good thing.

Mr. JACKSON: And that leads me to another subject. I think there is too much centralisation in Southern Queensland. It has been said: "The poor ye shall always have with you." Why, the South will not even let us have our own poor in Northern Queensland, and they bring them down South to Dunwich. I have a deputation in a day or two to the Home Secretary asking for the establishment of a Northern benevolent asylum. I do not want the House to think that I am advocating that it should be established in any particular place. I am going to the Government with an open mind on that subject, and so long as it is established in the North, fairly central to the larger centres of population, that is all that I shall trouble about. Then take the question of the insane. They are all brought down to Southern Queensland. There is no reason why we should not have a branch of Goodna in the North. It is even more cruel to bring lunatics from the North to Goodna, where their relatives will have no chance of ever seeing them again unless they are fairly well off.

Mr. LENNON: It is very expensive to bring them down.

Mr. JACKSON: Yes; and the same argument applies to bringing down the old people to Dunwich. I think these are two matters that

should be given attention to by the Government, and I hope Northern members will assist me in trying to obtain some redress. With regard to our railways also, there is room for a great deal of decentralisation. I think that more power should be given by the Railway Commissioner to the various traffic managers in the Central and Northern districts of the State. Now, I do not want to dwell too long on Northern requirements. I have said nothing about my own constituency, though there are many matters in connection with it upon which I might dwell. For a few moments I will put on one side Northern requirements, and take a broader point of view. I think that the three great problems we have to face in Queensland are drought, rabbits, and prickly pear, and I might also add the ticks, too. The late Secretary for Agriculture—who I see sitting opposite—referred to the danger from ticks, and I would compliment that hon. gentleman on his speech, particularly in dealing with Northern matters from an agricultural point of view. But, whilst I recognise that many of the subjects the late Secretary for Agriculture spoke about are of great importance, I think he will find that it is not possible to enter very largely into the cultivation of the economic plants he mentioned until we get more population. In my opinion, there is only one way of solving the three problems to which I have alluded. We may spend a great deal of money in fighting the drought, we may spend £100,000 on water conservation, but until we get closer settlement we will never be able to cope with those three pests successfully. Of course, that opens up the whole question of immigration. It has always seemed to me that if the Government of a State assist to bring people out to a country, if the Government subsidise immigration, then it follows as a matter of course that the Government should also find work for the unemployed. If the Government introduce more people than can be absorbed, then it follows that the Government should endeavour to deal with the unemployed question. The present Government have done as much to solve the unemployed problem as any previous Government, if not more, and have shown that they recognise their responsibility in this connection. I cannot understand how anyone who advocates State-aided immigration can fail to agree to the other principle that it becomes the duty of the State to find work for the immigrants who are introduced. Possibly my friends in the Labour party who are opposed to assisted immigration would not be so violently opposed to immigration if the Government adhered to the principle of finding work for the unemployed, and if also there was a land tax imposed. An influx of population will lead to an increase in land values. If the population of a country increases rapidly, so does the value of land increase rapidly, and I think it is fair for a Labour man to argue that if the State brings people into the country it is increasing land values, and the people who have their lands made more valuable by the increased population should contribute something to the State for that increase—in fact, should pay the expense of bringing those people out. That is a fair proposition. Of course, I recognise that the matter wants handling very carefully, and the Premier, as I understand, is going to handle it very carefully. It is a mistake to suppose that the Government are going to introduce people here without knowing whether there is work for them on arrival. In fact, the Premier has stated that he will have no hand in assisting to bring people to Queensland, unless he knows there is work for them to go to when they come here.

Mr. MACARTNEY: In face of the Federal law against contract labour, how can the State bring out people under contract?

[Mr. Jackson.]

Mr. JACKSON: I think the Federal Government have modified their position in that respect. At the same time, I recognise that the question of immigration is one outside the functions of the State—that is a Federal matter. Now, I should like to say a few words with regard to the political situation. A great deal has been said on that subject this afternoon by the hon. member for Bundaberg, who pointed out that there was no compact between the Labour party and the Government. The Premier has been reprehended in a way for having sold himself to his satanic majesty—in other words, to the Labour party. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Bundaberg, as I have said, pointed out that there was no compact between the Government and the Labour party. Nevertheless, since the proposed new coalition failed there has been a great deal of writing in the Press, and a great deal of talk, to the effect that the Premier has made some compact with the Labour party. I may just quote the words of Shakespeare in Henry IV., where he says—

My voice shall sound as you do prompt my ear.

The Premier is referred to in something like those terms, and it is practically said that his voice shall sound as the Labour party do prompt. I think that is not a correct statement of the position. The position, as I understand it, is that the Premier will simply go on with the policy which he put before the country at Rockhampton. Why should he resign until he is defeated? I do not think it would be a right thing for the Premier to resign his position until he is defeated by a vote of the House. If this side does not represent the wishes and opinions of the majority of members and of the people in the country, then the other side should turn the Government out of office. That is the common-sense view for anyone to take of the situation. I shall explain to hon. members the view which I take of the situation. We have eighteen Labour members returned. They are returned, I suppose, as exponents of socialism, or the nationalising of all industries, and they object to all kinds of private enterprise. Then there are twenty-five members returned to support the policy of the Premier. But the electors who voted for the eighteen Labour members voted also, I think, for the Premier's policy, but they voted for something more than that, so that practically the Premier should be supported by twenty-five plus eighteen members—that is, by forty-three members. I contend that forty-three members were returned to support the Premier's policy. There are certainly eighteen members who are returned to support something in addition—that is, a socialistic policy.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Who said the Labour party are against private enterprise?

Mr. JACKSON: Does not the hon. member see that if the Labour party adopts in its Constitution an objective which aims at the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, they disapprove of private enterprise?

Mr. HARDACRE: But it does not.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member for Bundaberg a little while ago stated that it did aim at those things, and the hon. member for Clermont has also stated that it does. If the hon. member for Leichhardt does not mean that—if the objective of the present Labour party does not mean the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, then I ask the hon. member what is the meaning of the objective?

Mr. CREAGH: You ought to be able to explain—you advocated it.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member is quite wrong in saying that I advocated it. I did not advocate it, and that is the very reason why I and other members sitting on this side of the House belonging to the Labour party were not able to follow them at the last election. I challenge the hon. member to quote any statement in any speech of mine which shows that I advocated the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, the proposal to establish State mining batteries.

Mr. JACKSON: Surely that is ridiculous! I have just been advocating the establishment of State smelting works, but because I advocate the establishment of State smelting works, does that bind me to the principle of the nationalisation of all industries? So far as I know, the hon. member for Leichhardt never believed in what is called "collectivism"—that is in the nationalisation of industries. The hon.

[7 p.m.] member has always been a single-taxer, but I never knew him advocate collectivism. The advocate of the nationalisation of all industries must necessarily be opposed to private enterprise, because the two things are contradictory. It is rather curious that, whilst the Labour party have inserted in their constitution a socialistic objective, which aims at the nationalisation of all industries, in their platform they have a plank which proposes the stimulation of private enterprise. That is a curious contradiction; and they wonder why candidates cannot agree to sign their platform when there is a contradiction between the constitution of the party and its platform. Every man who signs the platform gives in his adhesion to the principle of the nationalisation of all industries. Yet there is a plank in the platform of the party which advocates loans to settlers. Loans to settlers means the stimulation of private enterprise. I would like this contradiction to be explained by some member of the socialistic party—because that is the proper name to give to the Labour party now, and the hon. member for Clermont stated that the other night; he said, "We ought to be called the socialistic party," and so they should now that they have adopted a socialistic objective—

Mr. KENNA: Some of the members of the party are not socialists at all.

Mr. JACKSON: I contend that any man who joins the Labour party since they adopted the socialistic objective of 1905 must necessarily be a man who aims at the nationalisation of all industries. They may repudiate it privately, but we have seen during this debate that, whilst the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Maughan, and the hon. member for Leichhardt repudiate it, or say that the objective does not mean what I say it means—we find the vice-leader of the Labour party and the hon. member for Bundaberg openly advocating the principle of nationalising all industries. It looks as if there was a split in the party, some believing in the nationalisation of industries, while others do not. This gives me an opportunity of explaining why a split took place in the party before the last general election. There are some members who do not understand the situation, and in private conversation with the hon. member for Croydon I found that he did not understand the position. It has often been thrown at the Premier that he split up the Labour party. It has been often brought forward against myself and against the Secretary for Railways that we aimed at breaking up the Labour party. Now, the real position is that in 1905 a Labour convention was held. It has been the custom of the Labour party, ever since I was connected with it, to hold conventions

Mr. Jackson.]

every two or three years, at which the aims of the party were set forth, and the platform was altered or amended. In 1905, after the formation of the coalition Government, a Labour convention was held. I attended that convention as a delegate for the organisation in my own electorate. A number of the delegates, very strongly imbued with socialistic notions, embodied in the constitution of the party a socialistic objective, which it may be just as well to place on record in *Hansard*; and this will be a sufficient answer to those hon. members who deny that the Labour party is a socialistic party in the sense of aiming at the nationalisation of all industries. In 1907 this objective was inserted in the constitution of the Labour party, and I contend that whether it is in the platform of the party or not does not matter. No man can become a member of the Labour party without accepting the constitution of the party, so that, if a man gets up and says, "The platform says nothing about the nationalising of all industries," I say to that man that the constitution of the party says so, and no man, unless he is a hypocrite, can sign the platform without adopting the principle of the nationalisation of all industries.

The PREMIER: He must be either a socialist or a hypocrite.

Mr. JACKSON: He must be a socialist in the full sense of the term. Of course, there are different definitions of socialism, with which I shall deal later on; but, when I speak of socialism, I mean the nationalisation of all industries, or—to use a hackneyed expression—"the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange." I shall put the objective of the Labour party in print, and I shall be interested if any hon. member can twist it to mean something different to what I say it means. During the last election Mr. Reid visited Ravenswood—the same as the leader of the Opposition did—with the very laudable object, from their point of view, of defeating the Government candidate.

Mr. KENNA: They regretted going there.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not know whether they regretted going there or not, but the fact remains that they went. Mr. Reid was not the only leader of the Labour party who went there to try and knock me out.

Mr. MANN: He got knocked out himself, didn't he?

Mr. KENNA: Wasn't it at Ravenswood that he got hit on the nose?

Mr. JACKSON: I do not want to go into personalities of that sort. I had nothing to do with that. I was out of Ravenswood when it happened.

The PREMIER: That is not the way you fight your political battles.

Mr. JACKSON: I am not blaming Mr. Reid or the leader of the Opposition for coming to Ravenswood. I never went into the hon. gentleman's electorate, although I was invited to do so. Still, I do not take any credit for that, nor do I blame the hon. gentleman for coming into my electorate in support of his candidate. Mr. Reid—who is the big gun of the Labour party outside this House—dealt at Ravenswood with the State Labour objective. Mr. Reid said distinctly that the Labour objective goes the whole hog. He said that the Federal Labour objective only proposed to nationalise monopolies, and he remarked that it was leaving open the back door which the Federal Labour members could creep out of. We all know that the objective of the Federal Labour party only means the nationalisation of monopolies, and that is a principle which I myself can agree with, and so can the Premier.

[Mr. Jackson.

At the Convention of 1905 the Minister for Railways and myself were both present, and we openly said there that if the Labour party adopted the Federal objective we would support it. We never split the Labour party. That is an unjust accusation to bring against us. We tried all we could to keep the Labour party solid, and yet we are charged with violating our principles. We simply could not follow the Labour party in its socialism. That is the whole explanation of it, and the Labour members know it. The Labour members sitting in the House to-day know well that no one tried harder than I did to keep the Labour party solid.

A LABOUR MEMBER: How did you try to keep it solid?

Mr. JACKSON: We were charged with trying to break it up, whereas I tried to keep it solid. This is the full wording of the objective as adopted at the Convention of 1905—

(a) The securing of the full results of their industry to all wealth producers by the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be attained through the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State and local governing bodies.

Now, they actually tried to put that objective into the Federal Labour party's constitution. There was a long debate over it, as hon. members know quite well, so that when hon. members try to read one objective into the other, like some ridiculous articles from newspapers have done, my answer to them is: Why did not the Federal Labour party adopt this State objective? Hon. members say that one is the same as the other. Well, if that is so, why did not the Federal Labour party adopt this one? If this objective is just the same as the nationalisation of all monopolies, why did not the Federal Labour party adopt it?

Mr. MAUGHAN: The principle is the same.

Mr. JACKSON: The principle is not the same at all. The two principles are entirely different. One aims at the nationalisation of monopolies, and the other aims at the nationalisation of all industries. And we find some members of the Labour party, as I have just stated, divided on this matter. First, we had the hon. member for Clermont, who commended it, then we had the hon. member for Maryborough, and to-day we had the hon. member for Bundaberg, who said that the objective of the Labour party was to wipe out the competitive system, and to establish the nationalisation of all industries. If some hon. members are going to repudiate their objective, let us know where we are. If they do not believe in this principle of the nationalising of industries, let us know where we are. I say that that is the principle which they have adopted in their constitution. As I stated before, I attended the Labour convention held in the year 1905, and we were beaten by the socialists present. Then we appealed to the organisations to reconsider the decision of the convention. The organisations refused to accede to our request to hold another convention. Does this not show that we strained every nerve to keep the Labour party solid? The very fact that we, the members of the Parliamentary Labour party, appealed to the organisations for the reconsideration of the matter showed that we wanted to keep the Labour party solid. They would not have another convention then, but in the early part of this year another convention was held, and the organisations stood by the decision arrived at at the 1905 convention. Now, I have nothing to say against the organisations or against the members of the organisations. I think that many of them were influenced simply by a feeling of loyalty to the party. In their hearts many of them do

not believe in that objective—the whole of them do not. They simply felt that they were loyal to the party, and they stood by the party. I have met many members of the organisations myself, and talked the matter over with them, and I do not think that they are any more believers in the possibility of a principle like this being carried into effect than I am. In the early part of this year another convention was held, and an objective practically the same as before, so far as the nationalisation of industries was concerned, was inserted in that constitution again. Now the Labour members—the individualistic Labour members, if you like—held back till the last minute to see if there was any chance of the 1907 convention going back on the objective embodied in the constitution. As a matter of fact, it is well known that the members of the Government party never attempted to form any organisation antagonistic to the Labour party generally, and yet they say we were trying to injure the Labour party. If we could have induced the Labour party to adopt something like the old platform which we could all agree on, then there would never have been any trouble with anybody. Just let me quote a few words of the speech I made in this House when speaking on the Address in Reply in 1905. This was after the socialistic objective was inserted in the constitution of the Labour platform. Just towards the close of my speech on that occasion I said—

Let my remaining few words be addressed to the Labour organisations and Labour voters throughout the country. They have in their hands just now the making or the marring of a great political party. On the organisations the responsibility will rest.

Well, the organisations stood by the work of the convention, and my words have come true in this respect, that they have marred, they have spoiled, and they have made the possibility of unity in this great political party impossible.

Mr. MAY: They have consolidated the party.

Mr. JACKSON: It does not look like consolidation when some appear to repudiate the objective and some approve of it.

Mr. RYLAND: No one repudiates it. No one has gone back on it.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not want to deal with the Labour party's attitude in sitting on the Opposition cross benches just now, but there is no consolidation about that. If it has consolidated the Labour party, as the hon. member says, then I cannot say that they are showing it very much so far, but we will see as matters come along.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That last division ought to satisfy you.

The PREMIER: The only party that is consolidated is the dead party. (Laughter.)

Mr. JACKSON: I will now, for a few minutes, deal with the question of socialism. I explained the objective. This afternoon we had a quotation given by the hon. member for Bundaburg in support of socialism. A few Sundays ago I attended a church meeting—it was on a Sunday afternoon—and I heard a very popular preacher quote from a number of writers in support of what is known as collectivism—nationalisation of industries—and he finished up saying, "Ladies and gentlemen, these men are not fools." Well, while one writer can be quoted in support of nationalisation of industries, a dozen other writers can be quoted against. That is the difference between myself and the socialists. I am in favour of the nationalisation of some industries, but not of all industries. The hon. member for Leichhardt shakes his head. I was speaking before he came in, and was saying that the hon. member never claimed

to be a socialist so far as I remember. I have always known the hon. member to be a land taxer, but I never knew him to believe in the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Mr. HARDACRE: The word "all" was specifically struck out by the convention.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member is quite wrong there. I can go with him in the nationalisation of some industries, but we refused to go with him in the nationalisation of all industries. As I say, I heard a popular preacher, a few Sundays ago, quote some writers in favour of economic socialism. I would like to take up the time of the House for a few minutes by giving three or four extracts from writings by some very eminent men. These quotations may not be known to hon. members generally. Here I have a short extract on "England's Place in Civilisation," by Mr. Gladstone. These are Mr. Gladstone's own words—

A protracted experience of public affairs, not unattended with a high estimate of the general diligence, devotion, and ability of the parliamentary as well as the civil servants of the Crown, has long convinced me that of the more difficult descriptions of the public business, apart from simple routine, it is only a small part that is transacted with the requisite knowledge, care, and thoroughness.

That is pretty strong from the late Mr. Gladstone, who had, as we all know, a very long experience in the conduct of public affairs. Here is an extract from the celebrated Russian economist, Professor Novikoff, in the "New Review"—

This writer admits that the desire of the socialists to give to human beings an existence worthy of the name is most praiseworthy.

But he thinks collectivism is pure madness. I say that that is quite right. The object of the socialists is quite right in trying to improve the lot of the people, but I say with the Russian professor that the methods are quite wrong. Now, there is a very interesting book in the library on Tolstoi. The writer, Dr. Steiner, gives an account of an interview with Tolstoi. Dr. Steiner, addressing the count, said—

Count, what about the future? I mean the future of humanity. What will be the ultimate form of society? The future, he answered, is with God to know, and for us to prepare. Our business is to live right now, and God will make all things right then.

His remark about socialism was startling—

The greatest enemy to democracy is this social democracy; it is the preparation for a new slavery. It teaches a future good without a present betterment. It promises golden streets, without the bloody Gethsemane. But isn't socialism a preparation for an ideal State? No, indeed not. It is just the contrary. It will regulate everything, put everything under law; it will destroy the individual, it will enslave him. Socialism begins at the wrong end. You cannot organise anything until you have individuals; you are making chaos out of cosmos; you will breed terrorism and confusion, which only brute force will be able to quell. Socialism begins to regulate the world away from itself. You must make yourself right before the world around you can be made right. No matter how wrongly the world deals with you, if you are right the world will not harm you, and you may bring it to your way of thinking. The modern Labour leader wishes to liberate the masses, while he himself is a slave.

Now I give that quotation for what it is worth. There is the opinion on socialism of a very great man—Count Tolstoi.

Mr. KENNA: He is a philosophic anarchist.

Mr. JACKSON: It may be a good thing to be a philosophic anarchist, but this anarchism is an ideal, and if the Labour members say they want an ideal—the nationalisation of industries is only an ideal—then I would ask: Why do not they go for the further ideal, why don't they place in their objective a still higher ideal of philosophic

Mr. Jackson.]

anarchism. But they do not. Here is another very interesting quotation from the Premier of France, M. Clemenceau, and he said it in connection with collectivism—

It is clear that arbitrarily to modify the social organisation without troubling to find out whether the man is in a condition to adapt himself to it can only lead to disorder. Thus even those who set out to remake first the social organisation are brought back to the reform of the individual.

Having given those quotations in opposition to the principles of collectivism or the nationalisation of all industries, I would like now to give the House a quotation in connection with socialism that I can approve of, and that very likely hon. members sitting behind the leader of the Opposition can approve of. Here is a short extract by Bishop Mercer, of Tasmania, who puts socialism from my point of view. He says—

I take socialism to be the name of a "tendency" rather than of any actually existing social or political movement. Views as to "production," "capital," and so forth, will vary indefinitely, but certain essentials will remain. Socialism tends—(1) To remove all artificial barriers which unnecessarily separate human beings from one another; (2) to secure for every child an equal chance to make the most of itself, and to live a truly human life; (3) to distribute wealth in such ways as shall produce the greatest sum total of human good; (4) to train character in such directions as shall make the strong rejoice to bear the burdens of the weak.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do you believe in that?

Mr. JACKSON: Yes; I do believe in that.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Well, that is the objective.

Mr. JACKSON: If those are the views which the hon. members entertain, it will please me to assist them to put things of that kind into effect, but that is not the economic socialism of the party the hon. gentleman is connected with. It is hard to lay down any hard and fast line in connection with State socialism. If he approves of that—that it is not possible to lay down a hard and fast line in connection with State interference in industries—why then does the hon. member support a platform which aims at nationalisation of all industries?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Gradual, not revolutionary.

Mr. JACKSON: Does the hon. member maintain that that is not the objective of the Labour party—to nationalise all industries. Does he repudiate it?

Mr. LENNON: No, I do not repudiate it. (Laughter.)

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member for Leichhardt says he repudiates it. If the hon. member does not believe in the nationalisation of all industries, he should be sitting on the Opposition bench or where the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government sits. The position is very well stated in that extract as regards State interference. This is an extract from a magazine article. The writer says—

We are at present feeling our way. We are experimenting to discover where the boundaries lie. But may it not be that there is no fixed frontier, that every age will have to work out this problem for itself, that the division between individual and State action—both essential forms of human energy—will always vary with the varying history of man.

Mr. COWAP: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: Those views I can support. In fact, it seems to me almost absurd for any party to lay down a hard and fast line and say that society must develop on those lines, and on those lines only. That is where the members of the Labour party make a mistake. Their intentions are good enough; their objective is all right so far as humanity is concerned, but our intentions are just as good; we are aiming at the same objective—to improve humanity. I dare

[Mr. Jackson.

say hon. members on the Opposition side of the House would use the same language, but, of course, they differ in their methods. Probably they think our method is a little bit too advanced for them, but after all I give members credit for doing their best. We cannot expect to think alike, nor to all believe in the same methods for bringing about the reformation of society. I have taken up a very much longer time than I intended when I got up to speak. I did not intend to go into these matters at such length, but when the hon. member for Bundaberg this afternoon discussed socialism at considerable length, I thought it was just as well to give some extracts in reply. As a matter of fact, I wanted to clear my position and explain that there was no sacrifice of principle as far as I was concerned in getting away from the Labour party as soon as the party got the objective of collectivism.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The objective is not the only difference.

Hon. R. PHILP: No; selling of land and syndicate railways.

Mr. JACKSON: That is the main difference between myself and the Labour party. It is well known that before the convention of 1905

there was a plank in the Labour [7.30 p.m.] party's platform against the sales of land, but in 1905 that plank was amended. Now, when the old plank was in the platform, it provided against the sales of land. That plank was simply aimed at the sales of Crown lands; now it is aimed at the alienation of all freeholds. In 1905 the Labour party made that plank so drastic that I admit it was very difficult to remain a member of the party which proposed that no individual selector should be able to obtain a freehold title to his land. I know there are many land nationalists among that party who look upon the ownership of land as being at the bottom of all our industrial troubles, and who think that, if they can only wipe out freehold ownership, almost every industrial trouble would vanish.

Mr. BOUCHARD: They do not object to the ownership of land by themselves though.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not like to use strong language; but I think the men who take up that view are more or less political cranks if they think our industrial troubles will vanish if we adopt the leasehold tenure in preference to the freehold tenure. I can assure hon. members that if there was not an acre of freehold, if every acre of land in Queensland was held under leasehold, we would still have pastoral tenants ruined under the leasehold system if a drought comes along, just as we have them ruined under the freehold system. The leasehold system may be a good thing possibly to aim at. I am not very strong on it myself; but what I say is that you could not possibly get a majority of voters to agree to wiping out the freehold tenure of land. For my own part I think the two systems should run side by side.

Hon. R. PHILP: They are wiping out the leasehold system in New Zealand.

Mr. JACKSON: As a matter of fact, a commission was appointed in New Zealand a short time ago to deal with the land question, and I believe that commission recommended that the remaining Crown lands of New Zealand should be reserved for lease, and not alienated in fee-simple. But the reason they gave was this: The Crown lands of New Zealand were very limited. There is not much land left in the hands of the Crown, and it was because they thought the leasing system would be better for the poor man that they recommended the reservation of the remaining Crown lands, and that they should not be converted into freeholds.

Mr. MAXWELL: But the Government have not followed that out. They brought in a Bill giving the right to a freehold.

Mr. JACKSON: It was not that the Land Commission thought there was any particular magic in leaseholds; it was simply because they thought it would be an advantage to the poor man to lease, rather than buy, the land, because it would enable him to reserve his capital for the purchase of stock and the making of improvements. Now, this Government, as is well known, tried to meet the Labour party during past years by agreeing to the introduction of the leasing system in addition to the freehold system. It was the hon. member for Leichhardt's clauses which were accepted, and they were ultimately rejected. I think the Government did a fair thing. Labour members do not seem to be able to give and take—it is all take with them. They are not prepared to give anything. They have taken up a position on the Opposition cross benches, and say, "We will support the Government on measures we can approve of." They want their platform carried out, and if the Premier wants something carried out which does not meet with their views they say "We will not meet you." Why, you cannot carry on an ordinary business on those lines. There must be give and take with political parties just as there is in the ordinary affairs of life. However, that is their business. If they like to take up that attitude, well and good. It is their lookout. I admit that the Labour party were bound to go to the country as an independent party. The convention laid it down that they should, and they had no alternative.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Was not the hon. member bound to go to the country on that platform?

Mr. JACKSON: No, decidedly not. I had my choice to go to the country as I liked, and I decided to support the Government because I considered their policy was sufficiently democratic. I do not speak as I do by way of opprobrium. When I say the Labour party were bound, I am not using the word in any objectionable sense. I think that by going to the country as an independent party they benefited somewhat, because the three parties were fighting each other, but whilst they were bound to go to the country in that way, they were not bound to take up their present position in this Chamber. They had liberty to decide where they should sit—whether they should give the Government a general support or oppose it. They were not bound by the convention in that matter. But apparently they met in caucus; they discussed their attitude and went over to the Opposition side, thus showing their hostility to the Government. It is no use denying that they have shown hostility. The very first speech made by the hon. member for Clermont indicated hostility. He openly flourished the tomahawk and brandished the scalping knife. But other members of that party have not taken that view. They appear to be more reasonable. There is a split in the party.

Mr. HARDACRE: There is in your party.

Mr. JACKSON: Labour members were quite entitled to decide what course they should take, and the only reason why I mention this is that I want the point to be made clear. There are some Labour voters who think the Labour party had no alternative except to sit in opposition to the Government. I say they cannot quote one tittle of evidence to show that they had to take up that position. They were free agents as regards giving support to the Government or not. I admit that they could not join any alliance with the Government. They cannot take port-

folios unless they have a majority of portfolios. They talk about no compromise, but here is compromise at once. They can only take office with a majority of portfolios. Fancy seventeen or eighteen Labour members insisting upon a majority of portfolios. But I have nothing to say against that if they choose to put it in their platform. It is a new item.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where did you get that information from?

Mr. JACKSON: Formerly there was nothing in the Labour platform to say that they should not accept office unless they got a majority of portfolios, and I say that seventeen or eighteen members are not fairly entitled to a majority of seats in the Government.

Mr. MAY: They do not want any at all.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member may not want any, but I think some hon. members would be very glad to get a portfolio. I do not say there is any objection to that. Why should they not have a portfolio? I do not see any reason why they should not.

Mr. RYLAND: Why should not the Government join the Labour party?

Mr. JACKSON: There is one insuperable obstacle to that in the shape of the socialistic objective, and plank 11 is another obstacle. I have simply been trying to make my position clear, and to clear myself from the charges which have been made that I have in some mysterious way violated my principles. I challenge anyone who makes such a charge to show that I have violated my principles in any shape or form. I could, if I chose to go to the trouble, quote from speeches which I delivered in Opposition to show that I denounced collectivism then as I do now, and I challenge any hon. member to quote from any speech of mine a statement justifying the inference that I advocated the nationalisation of all industries. Members may find that I have advocated some State socialism, as I have done this afternoon, but I never advocated the nationalisation of all industries. I have always striven to be reasonable in my views, and where I consider that it would be a good thing for any Government to embark in an industry which would be an advantage to the State and assist private enterprise I shall always be prepared to help them in their proposals.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

* Mr. BLOCKSIDGE (*Woolloongabba*): In rising to address this House for the first time I desire to ask that the consideration which is usually extended to new members be extended to me. Feeling that that will be done, I desire to ask that the consideration which in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. In perusing the Speech we find congratulations on the following matters: The continued prosperity of Queensland; the restoration of confidence and the revival of enterprise throughout the State; the prosperity of the pastoral industry; the satisfactory position of the sugar-growers, farmers, and dairymen; the extension and expansion of the mining industry; and the satisfactory condition of the public finances. (Hear, hear!) These are certainly things upon which we may congratulate ourselves and the country, but when we consider the whole of the facts, I think we must be forced to the conclusion that we have very little to thank the present Government for in bringing about that state of things, and that we must look further for the cause. If we look matters fairly and squarely in the face, we must come to the conclusion that the

Mr. Blocksidge.]

acts of Providence have had very much more to do with the bringing about this state of things than the Government or their administration. One thing that is absolutely necessary at the present time is the restoration of confidence in the Government and their administration, and that is just as much required as restoration of confidence in the resources of the State. There is no doubt that, as far as the people of the State are concerned, more particularly those who have money to invest, and who would invest money in the direction of developing our resources, they lack confidence in the present Government and in their administration. I want to say just here that for that reason I regret that the effort made to bring about the fusion of the two Liberal sections of this House was not successful. I should, as a member sitting on this side of the House, have been pleased to have seen that fusion brought about, and from what I have been able to gather I think that both inside and outside the House there is a majority in favour of such a fusion. Certainly a majority of the people outside favour a fusion of the two parties.

Mr. RYLAND: No; there are two to one against it.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: My opinion is, that the majority are in favour of a fusion of the two parties, and I maintain that if the country were polled on the question at the present moment the country would vote solidly, with the exception of a few extremists, for a fusion of the two liberal sections in the House. For that reason I regret that the effort to bring about the fusion of the two sections has not been successful, because what this State requires at the present time is a strong and stable Government, a good sound administration; and by the amalgamation of the two parties I have mentioned a strong and stable Government would have been established, and we would have had legislation which is necessary for the welfare of the State. We would also have had confidence restored amongst the people of the State. Not only would we have had confidence restored amongst the people of the State, but we would have had it established among people outside the State who desire to take an interest in its welfare. At the present time we are enjoying good seasons, and people outside who have capital, and who desire to invest it in a way that would result in the development of our resources, refrain from doing so. Instead of people coming here to invest their capital, we find that money earned in Queensland is being sent to other centres—to London and other centres of the world—for investment. That does not show a healthy state of things. We know for a fact that millions of money have been sent to London and other centres for investment, which does not show a healthy state of things in Queensland. It shows that in this State, where we have only a handful of people and so many great resources to develop, a work requiring capital, there is a want of confidence in the administration. One is struck with the amount of indefiniteness of language that is used to cloud over and conceal the true intentions of the Government, so far as the Governor's Speech is concerned. I may not be up in all the points which should be in a Speech or which should not be in a Speech, but I think that when a Speech is delivered it should state fairly and clearly the intentions of the Government. As an illustration of what I mean, I would refer hon. members to the following sentence in the Governor's Speech:—

My advisers are adopting a liberal immigration policy

[*Mr. Blocksidge.*

But we are left absolutely in the dark as to the true intentions of the Government in this matter. What the State requires at the present moment is more people. We must have more people if we are to develop our resources. We must have more people to fill up the vacant spaces in the State, and what I would like to see introduced is a vigorous, systematic, and continuous scheme of immigration, under which we would get people of the right sort—people who have some capital and desire to take up land, and men who are honest workers and who will go on the soil and in other ways assist in the development of our industries. So far as I can find, there is no indication in the Speech of any action in that direction. Then we have considerable reference to railways. There are no clearly defined lines as to what is proposed in that direction, or in the direction of bringing forward a vigorous railway policy. What we want is a vigorous railway policy. The railways we have at present should, with all possible haste, be extended into agricultural, mining, and timber districts. What we want to do is to open up the country, induce settlement, and assist those who are there now to get their products to market. I am pleased to note, so far as the Speech is concerned, that it is the intention of the Government to reduce railway fares and freights. That is certainly a step in the right direction, and it is only justice to the people who find the revenue in connection with our railways. If the railways pay—and we are led to believe that they are now paying—all over and above should be returned to those who find the £ s. d. If any concessions are to be made, they should be given to the man who finds the money. Railways should be used for the purpose of encouraging settlement. That should be one of our primary objects in extending our railways and stimulating our producing industries, and any action in that direction will have a beneficial effect. The leader of the Opposition stated in his manifesto to the country that, as our great arteries of inland trade cannot be rivers, they must be railways. The more you study the question the more you come to the conclusion that it is necessary that every attention should be given to the extension of our railways, and to the introduction and carrying out of a vigorous railway policy. So far as the Speech is concerned, we have a bald statement that something is to be done, but no details are given as to what is to be done. I am not going to get off the lines and mention certain things that might be done, or that it may be intended to do, but I want, as clearly and concisely as I can, to keep to the Speech of His Excellency. Having said that about railways generally, there are two or three matters I would like to refer to which, perhaps, concern my own electorate more or less. First, I would like to say that I trust the Government will use every effort to bring about the construction of the connecting link in the Tweed River railway system. I refer to that portion of the line which has not been built between Tweed Heads and Murwillumbah. Of course, I know that the Government of Queensland are not responsible for this; but I would ask that they should use every effort to induce the Government of New South Wales to build this missing link. From personal acquaintance with the Northern Rivers district, I know that the people of that district desire railway communication with Brisbane. It would be to their advantage, and, from a business point of view, it would also be greatly to our advantage, and I trust that the Government will give the matter their

early attention. Another matter in connection with this line that I wish to speak about is the extension of the railway across the Brisbane River to the north side. It is desirable that early attention should be given to the extension of the line from Melbourne street across the river to Roma street or thereabouts, for the purpose of linking up the railways on the south side with the Central Station. The present terminus at Melbourne street is not a satisfactory one, and, from what I know, it was never intended that it should stop there. Possibly during the past few years there may have been reasons why the original intention has not been given effect to; but, so far as money is concerned, those reasons no longer operate. Money can be found for the extension now, and I certainly think it would be in the interests not only of the south side but also of the State that the connection across the river should be made. In the report of the Commissioner some years ago it was stated that it was intended to have three goods stations in and around Brisbane. Those stations were Roma street, Fortitude Valley, and Woolloongabba. While the link between Melbourne street and the north side is not built, it is hardly possible to use the Woolloongabba goods station in the way in which it should be used as a goods station, and the building of a line from Melbourne street to the north side would greatly increase the facilities for using Woolloongabba goods station. Another matter that perhaps more concerns my electorate, so far as railways are concerned, is the level crossing at the Fiveways, Woolloongabba. I mention this because a number of fatal accidents have happened there during the last few years, and as population increases in the locality other fatal accidents are inevitable. That is one reason why the Government should give early attention to this matter. Another reason is that this level crossing practically destroys what should be one of the best business centres in the district. Another reason is that some years ago a promise was given by the then Secretary for Railways, and I think also by Mr. Thallon, that something would be done in that direction, and the Government went to the trouble of having the line surveyed, making provision for a trestle bridge. I do not approve of that altogether. I think something should be done to divert the line and bring it under Stanley street. Now, that project was dropped because it was said that there were no funds. That argument cannot be used to-day. There-

fore, I trust that, so far as these [8 p.m.] level crossings are concerned, something will be done very soon towards the alteration of the line there, and so assist the district by removing the danger of carrying the line through that particular part. There is another matter which concerns my district, and my constituents feel very warm about it, and that is the taking away from the Woolloongabba Railway Station its passenger traffic. Now, I think that the reinstatement of the passenger traffic to the Woolloongabba Railway Station is to be desired, and I hope it will take place as early as possible. There is no doubt that a great injustice was done to the district when it was taken away, and I think that all reasonable action should be taken to have the same reinstated. From time to time we hear a great deal about the extension of the wharage accommodation at Pinkenba, and the shipping of coal and other produce from that centre. What I want to emphasise is the desirableness of giving greater facilities for

shipping of coal and other products from the South Brisbane wharves. These wharves were constructed largely for that purpose; the extension of the railway has been carried round the river bank, and as the wharves are right in the centre of the city, where it is desirable they should be, those are sufficient reasons why this should be done. I noticed in the Press the other day that it is intended by the Government to enlarge the Ipswich workshops. I am speaking under correction, but I think that those workshops have cost £250,000.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are very good workshops.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: There is no doubt they are very good workshops, and the money spent there has been the means of catching a lot of votes.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: I do not want to see Ipswich denied the chance of getting workshops extended there, but I do think that other districts in the State should be given an opportunity of getting workshops also erected there.

Mr. PAULL: In the North.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: I do not think there is any necessity to increase the workshops at Ipswich. There are other centres in the State which have as much right to have a portion of the Government employment put in their districts as Ipswich has. So far as accommodation is concerned, and so far as the settlement is concerned, there is perhaps no better site for erecting Government workshops than at Woolloongabba. (Laughter.) Some hon. members of this House laugh, but I can only say they laugh because they do not know the facts. I remember many years ago hearing the late Sir Thomas McLivraith state to the electors what I am stating here, that he did not know of any position in and around Brisbane, or in the State, that was more suitable for erecting workshops than the areas available at Woolloongabba. (Hear, hear!) If we cannot have the Government workshops extended at Woolloongabba, I am one of those who think that so far as work can be given in the direction of carrying out works for the Government it should not all be concentrated at Ipswich. I see no reason why Ipswich should be helped in this direction, and I think that so far as the people are concerned, if we cannot have an extension of the Government workshops, then the foundries and the iron-working establishments in Brisbane should come in for a fair share of what is going. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MAUGHAN: They are getting a fair share.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: I do not think they are getting a fair share. On going through the Governor's Speech, I notice that the Government have decided to make a display of our products at the Anglo-French Exhibition to be held in London. That is a step in the right direction, and it is an opportunity that I am very pleased to see the Government avail themselves of. But in the past similar opportunities have been offered to the Government of which they did not avail themselves—I think, to the loss of this State. I trust that so far as such opportunities are concerned in the future, that whatever Government is in power they will seize upon every such opportunity for the purpose of exhibiting our products, because it is not only a step in the right direction, but it gives us an opportunity of advertising our State. What

Mr. Blocksidge.]

we want to do is to advertise our State, more particularly as regards our products. There is nothing that will do that better than the exhibition of what we can produce. Therefore, whenever the opportunity arises the Government of the day should do all they can to send exhibits of our products all over the world. I also notice in the Speech—and I am very pleased to see it there—that the Government proposes to improve and develop our educational system, more particularly in the direction of technical education. I am very pleased that the Government are striking out in the direction of giving better facilities for giving technical instruction within this State, and I am quite sure that this House will be with them in anything they may do in that direction.

Mr. KEOGH: What about a University?

Mr. BLOCKSIDE: I do not know whether the Government are in favour of a University or not. Possibly they think that the present is not an opportune time to introduce that matter, but I am inclined to think that many gentlemen—probably the members of the Ministry and others sitting behind them—are in favour of a University, and I hope that at an early period we will find the Government introducing such legislation as will give effect to the establishment of a University in Queensland.

Mr. MAUGHAN: At Woolloongabba.

Mr. BLOCKSIDE: No. I do not wish to see everything in Woolloongabba. Probably the hon. member would like to see it in his electorate. In this matter of technical education, I hope there is no intention of closing down the South Brisbane Technical College in the proposal to centralise the technical colleges of the State. I know that there was an intention on the part of the Government to close that institution, but I trust that no such intention now exists, because that institution has been doing splendid work. It serves a very large district on the south side, which includes my own district. For that reason I hope that there is no intention on the part of the Government to close down the South Brisbane Technical College, because I am safe in saying that, so far as results are concerned, it is the leading institution in the State at the present time. I am also pleased to note from the Speech that the Government have at last abolished the payments required from State school committees with respect to the founding and maintenance of State schools, with the exception of the one-fifth in connection with the erection of new schools. I think the former impost was absolutely unjustifiable, and I am pleased to see that a resolution of this House some time ago, practically giving a direction to the Government to discontinue this charge, has been given effect to, and that the people have not to pay the charge formerly imposed upon them in connection with the maintenance and the founding of schools after the erection. I think that charge was unjustifiable under our free system of education. Amongst the Bills mentioned is one to provide for old age pensions. That may be a step in the right direction, and I think it will be, if the legislation introduced is suitable. But what I want to know is, why the Government do not now do something more in the direction of providing indigence allowance. The administration of that department is certainly very perplexing, and hard to understand. To explain what I mean, I will give two or three instances: It was only last evening that I heard of a case which has just happened. An

old gentleman was taken to the General Hospital some few days ago. He was in that institution for one day, when by some means he evaded the nurses and got out, and was found drowned in an adjacent creek. It so happens that both that old gentleman and his wife had been receiving the indigent allowance. He happened to go to the hospital two or three days before the month had expired; he had been in his own house before. He went in there, and because he was found drowned two or three days before the month expired the Government stopped his allowance for that particular month; and I am also told that, in addition to stopping his allowance, they asked the old lady to pay 2s. 6d. towards some funeral expenses. That is one instance which can be verified.

Mr. KEOGH: You could not expect anything else from the present Administration.

Mr. BLOCKSIDE: I will give another instance that came under my own notice. Two old people were receiving the indigence allowance, and the old gentleman became an inmate of the hospital, immediately on which his allowance was stopped, and during the whole of the time he remained in the hospital the allowance was not paid to him. I do not understand why it was stopped. I know it was not stopped for the purpose of assisting the funds of the institution, because the institution never benefited one penny from the stoppage of the allowance. It is quite possible it was stopped for the purpose of swelling up the Treasurer's surplus. That may be the case; certainly there is no other explanation for it.

Hon. R. PHILP: Was it to pay for special trains?

Mr. BLOCKSIDE: No; I do not think it was that, but the probability is that there was an intention of swelling the Treasurer's surplus, and this may have been one means of doing it, just as the impost of 1s. on the children's annual savings in the Savings Bank is another illustration. I will give another case, and I feel rather keenly about this one. I know an old lady who is at present living in my electorate. She is seventy-five years of age, has been a colonist for thirty-five years, and has been a widow for many years. She is partly blind, and never has a candle or a fire lit in her house. On two different occasions during the last eighteen months she has applied to the department for the indigence allowance—or the old age pension, as she terms it—and she has been refused on both occasions. Why? Because she has been honest and straightforward enough to inform the department that she receives from some relatives of her late husband some slight assistance from the old country, and because of this, and because it appears to come to more than £13 a year, the Government absolutely refuse to give that poor old lady any assistance at all. I think any humane Government should assist a poor person like that. But the facts are, as far as we can find, that numbers who ought to receive some assistance, who have been worsted in the battle of life, do not receive it; and others, who ought not to receive it, are receiving it at the present time. It shows very clearly that, so far as the administration of the indigence allowance is concerned, it is necessary that something should be done towards causing the department to be administered in a better and more beneficial way. I know of another case that happened—not in connection with old people, but a young man and his wife and two chil-

[*Mr. Blockside.*]

dren. Through loss of work by the father, they were practically reduced to starvation. The wife was persuaded to go to the department and ask for a Government ration. When she went with fear and trembling she was told that no relief could be given till certain investigations had been made. I have seen it stated in the Press of Brisbane—and I think it was stated by the gentleman who was administering that department—that no one coming there under these circumstances were or would be turned away. But in this particular instance this woman was turned away. She waited several days. An investigation was made by the police, who reported to the department that she had a father, although the father was not on speaking terms with the woman, and did not in any way support or assist her. But the police reported that she had a father who ought to help them, and the assistance was refused. If it had not been for the action of the neighbours, they would practically have starved. That is not a state of things which ought to exist. I think where relief is given out it should be given on fair and square lines, and anyone—it does not matter who they are and where they come from—if they are in want should have a right to receive it. I know another case which has happened this last month, of a man of seventy years of age, living in my electorate with his wife, sixty-five years of age, colonists of thirty years' standing, who in the battle of life have had the worst of it, and when he became unable to work any longer he applied for the old age pension. The difficulty has been got over as far as the old man is concerned, because he has gone to Dunwich, but the old lady will not go there, and the result is that she is living in a room rented at a cost of 1s. 6d. a week, which is provided by others, and she receives the Government ration. Looked at from a humane point of view, I cannot congratulate the Government on such administration, for I think old people like this should be allowed, if possible, to spend the remainder of their lives together. I notice amongst the Bills to be introduced is one to amend the Factories and Shops Act. I am not aware in what direction this Bill will go, but I want to say that as far as I am personally concerned if it goes in the direction of stopping sweating in any form, and will assist more particularly the women and children to get a fair wage, it will have my support. I also notice that it is proposed to introduce a Wages Board Bill. This measure will receive my support, because I think that wages boards established on fair and reasonable lines will provide a method of settling industrial disputes which is more likely to lead to a satisfactory adjustment of the rights of both employers and employees than the application of compulsory arbitration. Now, in connection with electoral reform, I regret that no mention is made of the intention of the Government to introduce a measure dealing with a reduction in the number of members and a redistribution of seats. I certainly think there is no reason for the existence of a house of seventy-two members.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You do not want to wipe out Woolloongabba?

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: As far as I am personally concerned, and from what I have been able to observe, I am not so taken with being a member of Parliament that I would object to Woolloongabba being wiped out if it were for the good of the people of the State. My experience is that there is absolute waste of time—good time wasted—and if this

kind of thing continues I am very much afraid that the ambition I had to come here and serve the people will wane. At any rate, I hope this waste of time will not continue, and that we shall soon get straight to business.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Who is wasting time?

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: I am not here to say who is, but I am quite sure that members know, and I am quite certain the people outside know. I hope the number of members will be reduced by one-third at an early date. It would certainly tend to facilitate business, and save a great deal of money to the country. Probably there would be a number of individuals left without billets, but if they were it would be all the better for the State. As far as the redistribution of representation is concerned, no one can say the present representation is fair and equitable. We have had a section of the people clamouring for years for more equal representation—one vote one value—and I want to say on behalf of my constituents that I do not think they are getting a fair deal when they have only one representative for 5,400 people.

Mr. LENNON: Then you would increase the number.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: No; I think the number should be reduced; but it is not fair that 5,000 or 6,000 people should be represented by one man, when another only represents 1,000. I think the Government are to be congratulated on their intention to establish a Torres Strait steamship service. That certainly ought to meet with the support of all members. Such a service will stimulate trade along the whole of our coast, and will assist the producers to find direct oversea markets for their produce. It will also open up trade with the East, where we have profitable markets, and will enable us to do our business direct with the trading centres of the world without filtering it through the Southern States, which get the credit of it. I regret that more has not been disclosed in the Governor's Speech with reference to the land settlement policy of the Government. In that respect the Speech might have been much more explicit, but I presume that as the session progresses we shall find out what the intentions of the Government are. I think we should recognise that the prosperity of the State largely depends upon the policy adopted in the administration of our public estate. That policy, to my mind, should be as liberal as it is possible to make it, and our land laws should be such as not only to encourage people to come here, but to provide facilities for those already here to settle on the land. The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, who seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, largely represented my views on this matter when he said that, in addition to giving people inducements to come to this State, we should also particularly encourage young Queenslanders to settle on the land, and that when we had them settled on the land they should be given State assistance. Coming now to our land administration, one of the most unbusiness-like matters in connection with that administration

[8.30 p.m.] is the arrangement which has been entered into with certain agents to sell land on commission. There was no necessity for such an arrangement. I may alter my views later on, but at the present time I am under the impression that there was no necessity for the Government to enter into an arrangement with people outside the State to sell land in the State. The administration

Mr. Blocksidge.]

of the Lands Department, so far as the making of agreements with people outside the State for the sale of land is concerned, is an absolute scandal. I do not think anyone in his sober senses would imagine that a business man, such as we know the Secretary for Public Lands to be, would enter into such an arrangement as he has entered into with one of those special agents outside the State for the sale of land. I refer to the agent in New South Wales, Mr. Pulsford. We find that that gentleman had no interest in the State previously, and that he has no interest in it now, except what money he can take out of the State, and he is allowed, under a certain agreement, 3 per cent. on the business that he introduces to the Lands Department. Under the agreement made with that gentleman, all that it is necessary for him to do to earn his commission is simply to register—not to introduce, but simply to register—the names of people who may take up land in this State. From the return which was laid on the table of the House the other day it appears that he has already received the sum of £3,089, and that is only a moiety of what Mr. Pulsford is to be paid as commission earned up to the 30th June last. Under the agreement made with Mr. Pulsford and the other agents they are, I understand, to receive only half the commission when the land is taken up, and the balance is to be paid out of the first year's payments by the selectors. I am credibly informed that up to the present moment Mr. Pulsford has earned over £7,000 in commission on the sales of land in Queensland to outside people. I am also informed, and I believe it is correct, that at the present moment he has registered in the books of the department no less than 10,000 names, and I am further informed that a large number of those names were obtained from directories of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and New Zealand, that Mr. Pulsford made selections from those directories, circularised the people, and then sent on their names for registration by the Lands Department. The result of this will be that if any one of those people come to Queensland and select land within the next nine months, Mr. Pulsford will be entitled to commission on the price of land they select, although he may never have seen them, or have done anything more than send them a circular letter.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What were you thinking about?

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: I was thinking about honesty, and I think honesty is very far away from this agreement. It is not possible for a man in his way of business to have seen 10,000 people, and it is not possible for 10,000 people to have waited upon Mr. Pulsford and inquired about lands in Queensland. Therefore, I am forced to the conclusion that he used other means to get the names which he has registered. Such an arrangement is very unfair to men in this State, because if any of those individuals whose names are registered come along within the next nine months and are introduced by other agents to the department, those agents cannot get their commission for the reason that Mr. Pulsford has registered the names. It is, perhaps, just as well to give one or two illustrations of the way in which Mr. Pulsford may earn his commission. Assume that he introduces to the Lands Department a small group of twenty selectors; assume further that each member of the group takes up 620 acres—we were told by the Hon. the

[Mr. Blocksidge.

Secretary for Public Lands that each is entitled to take up 1,240 acres—and assume also that the minimum price is 10s. per acre, which is 2s. an acre below the average price stated by the Secretary for Public Lands—then, in that case Mr. Pulsford will earn the sum of £136, and all he has to do for that is to write letters to the department stating that Mr. So-and-so will be at the offices of the department for the purpose of looking at the list of lands open for selection. I think that is jolly good pay, and I am quite sure that agents in the State would like to have a cut at some of those good things. But for some reason or other, which I have not been able to fathom, they do not get a look at those plums. From all I can gather there is a sum of £10,000 due to these agents by way of commission. In my estimation, in a fairly short time they will be fairly well off, and will then be able to retire at the expense of the Government of this State. We are led to believe that in the Lands Department we have a fairly well-equipped department, but how many officers would that £10,000 employ to do the work which has been done by these outside agents? What benefit would accrue to this State from the payment of £10,000 in commissions to people who introduced selectors to the Lands Department? Possibly we may have an explanation of that matter later on. I am of opinion that the agreement which has been made with these southern agents is no credit to the Government, and that it casts a reflection on the Lands Department. It is an agreement which should be cancelled at the earliest possible opportunity, and the Government should adopt other means for settling the lands of the State. I cannot do better in this connection than read some extracts from a leading article which appeared in the *Courier* on the 7th of this month:—

The Minister for Lands promised long ago to fire off the powder and ammunition which he had reserved for the defence of his administration, and he has waited until he was given an easy task yesterday in evading the pointed shafts directed against the administration of his department in the form of questions respecting the employment of private land agents. The questions, of which notice had been given, dealt with the number of persons outside of the Lands Department who had been acting in Queensland and other States as agents for the sale of Crown lands and the introduction of intending settlers; the amount of commission paid to each up to the end of last financial year; the number of settlers introduced by means of such agents; the area of land selected; the number of passes issued to intending settlers, and the cost of such passes. To those who have carefully followed our criticisms respecting the fanning out of the most important work of the Lands Department it was at once obvious that the questions asked in Parliament would be answered in such a way as to constitute a powerful argument in favour of the continuation of the present system. Thus Mr. Bell found it easy to explain that outside the Lands Department thirty-one persons had acted in Queensland and the other States as agents for the sale of Crown lands and the introduction of intending settlers. In the case of the two chief private land agents the amounts paid in commission from 1st January, 1905, to 30th June, 1907, were respectively £3,089 and £1,655. The amounts paid to other agents were inconsiderable, the whole amount of commission being apparently represented by the sum of £5,047. The number of settlers introduced was 619, the area of land selected being 585,829 acres, and the value of the railway passes debited to the Lands Department £10,016.

That is, in addition to the £10,000 to be paid by way of commission, the country has spent in railway fares, to carry these people about the country, no less than £10,016. And I would like to digress here to say that I know of a case where three or four young men—I shall not mention the exact number—came from the Northern Rivers district, obtained passes to go about to various parts of the country to see the

land. Certainly they made misrepresentations, and said they were looking for land; but they came here on a holiday, and they had a jolly good holiday, flying about at the country's expense, and then went home laughing up their sleeves. They never purchased any land, and never had any intention of doing so; and I am afraid a number of others have done the same thing—

These figures, however, when carefully analysed, prove nothing, though they imply that there has been a monopoly in the work entrusted to private land agents. In the case of the sum of £3,089 paid to one of the agents, at least the amount does not represent the money actually owing to that agent, or the further amount which may yet be paid to him as the result of transactions which have already taken place. It is absolutely necessary to emphasise this distinction in order to explain the working of the present system, and show how the most serious abuses may arise. The specific agreement made with one of the land agents is, that the commission shall be paid in moieties on the payment by the selector of the first and second year's rents respectively, except in the case of prickly pear selections, in which case the first moiety will be paid on the acceptance of the application, and the second when the first year's clearing has been done. Thus payment of £3,089 only represents a proportion of a total indebtedness of £5,000.

A second consideration must be taken into account in estimating the indebtedness of the Lands Department to private land agents for work already done or presumed to have been done. The agreement made with one of the agents provides that he shall keep a list of the names and addresses of all persons who shall inquire at his office, either personally or by letter, and of all persons to whom, or on whose behalf, he has supplied information respecting Queensland, and that a copy of such list shall be forwarded to the Lands Department every month or oftener. Every person whose name is on these lists, and who within nine months selects land in Queensland, is regarded as having selected through the private land agent, the latter being, therefore, credited with the commission. We do not pretend to know how the agents have actually gone about their business, but it is obvious that under the system the printing of circulars and the use of a country directory or electoral list might easily enable a land agent to earn commission on account of people whom he had never seen and who had never communicated with him. A fortnight ago it was reported in our columns that one of the agents had shown such remarkable activity recently that he was able to register an additional five thousand names with the Lands Department, making a total of ten thousand persons for whom he might claim commission in the event of their selecting land in Queensland. A sum in simple proportion will show that if a total commission of £5,047 has been paid for 649 selectors, the sum of between £70,000 and £80,000 would have to be paid on 10,030 settlers whose names are already on the land agents' lists as supplied to the Lands Department. Even were these land agents to retire from actual business at the present moment, they might still earn big sums as commissions for the names they have sent in. The list of names are supposed to hold good for a period of nine months, but as an application was made for the re-registration of the hold-over names for a further period of nine months, one would like to know what concession has been given. In any case the total commission of £5,047 may represent three or four times that amount, the payment of which has already been incurred by the Lands Department, which has mortgaged the future in addition to surrendering its present responsibilities.

It is not necessary for me to quote any further from the article. I think I have read sufficient to show that, so far as the administration of the Lands Department and its system of employing outside land agents is concerned, their methods want altering very materially.

Mr. CAMPBELL: And the Labour party are supporting private enterprise.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: They certainly are. I do not wish to continue my remarks any longer. I thank the House for having listened to me so attentively, and for having given me an opportunity of speaking. I wish to say that I hope everything will be done that can possibly be done to restore confidence within the State, and I

trust that there will be disclosed to us during the session what we may consider a vigorous policy of land settlement.

Mr. HUNTER: Suggest something.

Mr. BLOCKSIDGE: It is not for me to suggest something. I am not a member of the Government. I am sitting in the cold shades of Opposition—one of those fortunate individuals who are here to criticise. I presume, when the opportunity is given us to criticise the land policy of the Government, we shall be quite willing to do it, and I trust we shall do it to the satisfaction of our friends in the corner. In conclusion, what we want is three things. We want a vigorous policy of land settlement; we want a bold policy of railway construction; and we want a generous policy of immigration. If the Government will introduce legislation that will bring this about, then they deserve support. If they do not, then I do not think they deserve support. What I think we want is less legislation and better and sounder administration than we have had in the past. I thank the members of the House for having listened so patiently to me.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. W. Blair, *Ipswich*), who was received with cheers, said: I desire, first of all, to congratulate the hon. member for Cook, the mover of the Address in Reply, on the very able address which he made to this Chamber. I also desire to felicitate the hon. the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba for the equally able address in which he seconded it. I venture the opinion that the House will agree with me when I say that these two hon. members will prove an undoubted addition to the intellectual strength and ability and the debating power of the House, and eventually make their mark.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Now, we have just come through an election, and I do not propose to deal to any great extent with the various phases of thought that occurred to us during that election—at all events, not more than is consistent with my duty as a member of the Government in saying something in its favour. I deprecate any recrudescences of the hostility which was indulged in at that time. Speaking for myself, I fought the election on a broad platform—a platform not of personality or personalities, but of principles. And whatever I said, I made myself particularly clear that if the Government could not succeed by the inherent strength of the principles of their platform, then they had no right whatever to occupy these benches and I stand to that position to-night. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. CAMPBELL: Where is your majority?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The majority will be here whenever it is required.

LABOUR and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member had an example of it the other day, and I think that during the course of this session there will be many more opportunities given him.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: At all events, we are here ready to meet any challenge from the Opposition, whenever it may come.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CAMPBELL: You are very confident.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am no more confident than the facts warrant confidence. The history of the movement, to which I shall allude very briefly, has gone to show this:

Hon. J. W. Blair.]

That although it has brought about what is known as "the three-party system," that is by no means new. It is not new to us in Queensland, and it is not new to other Legislatures. It is in the Commonwealth Parliament to-day, and it is also in the Imperial Parliament—the House of Commons.

Mr. KENNA: There are four parties in the House of Commons.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I believe there are four parties in the House of Commons, and there are numbers of parties in the German Imperial Parliament—the Reichstag.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Fourteen.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Be that as it may, what I want to emphasise is this: There is nothing new in this cry of three parties. We have had it as long as I have known anything about politics, and I have no doubt will continue to have it for a greater length of time. I wish to remind hon. members of what the position really is, and what it has been. The coalition Government came into existence in 1903, when the continuous Ministry were driven into "the cold shades of Opposition," which the hon. member for Woollongabba seems to enjoy so much. It was formed of a union of Liberal members and Labourites. The Labourites at that time were the preponderating power, and it is no use shutting our eyes to the fact, or attempting to disguise it, that we depended for our existence on their support. And we got from them loyal support, and I believe that we shall continue to get from them such a sufficiency of support as will enable us to carry out our programme and go into recess. (Hear, hear!) It may be said, "Why don't they sit on the same side?" That is a matter entirely for them to consider. All we ask them to do is to sit on this side when we need them in a division, and I believe that when we require them they will be found sitting at the back of this Government.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CAMPBELL: It is all pretence.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member interjects that "It is all pretence." I can assure him that there is no pretence about solid support in a division. (Hear, hear!) There is nothing flimsy about a number of men coming across the floor of the House and sitting behind you when you need them. If it is pretence, then I ask for it, and welcome it whenever we can get it. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. CAMPBELL: What about no divided allegiance?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The only thing that has occurred so far as I can see is this: During the election campaign each party had its own programme. Each had a distinct policy; each had a leader of a certain following, and each strove to support that leader and to return him to Parliament with a sufficient majority to carry on the King's Government. As it turned out, so far no leader has got a majority, and we are returned practically in the same position as we were in at the time the Morgan-Browne coalition took place. There are three parties to-day, and neither party has a sufficient following to allow them to carry on business "on its own," so to speak. But, speaking for the Government, we have a definite policy, and it is our duty, so far as we can, to carry that policy into effect until an adverse vote overtakes us. It is true that to-day, instead of Liberals, Labourites, and Oppositionists, we have Kidstonites, Labourites, and Oppositionists. What is the difference in principle?

Mr. CAMPBELL: You have no principle.

[Hon. J. W. Blair.]

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am perfectly certain of this: That the hon. member is not serious in attributing want of principle to us to-day. It is just one of those interjections made for the sake of interjecting.

Mr. KENNA: What did you want to coalesce for if there is no principle?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We have principles, and I hope the hon. member who interjected will be found voting with us on occasions to carry these principles into effect.

Mr. KENNA: They wanted to coalesce with us.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is possible, as the hon. member for Bowen reminds me, that they wanted to coalesce with us.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have nothing whatever to say on that matter. That is a matter for the Opposition to consider, and for us to consider at the proper time. I am only speaking of the position as I find it to-day. I am pointing out that the three-party business is by no means new. We have heard the arguments about the three elevens in the field; but we must take the position as we find it, and endeavour to make the best of it. And in making the best of it, it will be our duty to carry our programme into effect—to carry those measures mentioned in the Governor's Speech, and yield to the desires of the people.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yield to the Labour party.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: At present they have accorded us general support.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; distinctly no!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are an independent party, but parties to-day are mutually interdependent, and so long as they give us that general support we are entitled to take it. We are entitled to get support from any quarter from which it may be offered, and we are entitled to ask for that support if they believe in our measures. (Hear, hear!) There is no personal obligation on either side. There is no personal obligation on the members of the Labour party, neither is there any personal obligation on the members of the Government party.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There is no bond between us. The only bond is a bond of sympathy for progressive and democratic legislation; and that bond will never be broken.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And I believe that the times are marching forward now for the formation of a democratic party that will do away with all ideas and necessities for coalitions.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are you not an anti-socialistic party?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It may be asked of what kind is this support? I put it no higher than this: that it suits the [9 p.m.] Labour party to support us, and it suits us to accept that support, just as it would suit us to accept the support of any individual, or any unit of any party, who believed in the measures which we are placing before the House. (Hear, hear!) Some Ministers during the recent elections opposed Labour members, and some were opposed by Labour members; but apart from that, the members returned by the people are returned pledged to a definite and distinct policy, and we call—I, as a member of the Government, call—on all those individuals, no matter on what side they sit, or what particular tenets they hold, to

yield to us most generous support to the most democratic policy that has ever been put before the Parliament of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Nothing has changed in the political attitude or relationship of the Government; there is still the same mutual interdependence of parties, and the same requirements for party preservation. But, despite all these differences, I venture to say that the people of Queensland have so cast their votes as to indicate beyond the shadow of doubt that their favour and their will is towards a progressive policy. (Hear, hear!) The majority of votes polled during that election have been cast on the side of Progressivists, and not on the side of the old Conservatives at all.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It may be that there is a split between the parties, that they sit on different sides. But there is no split—and I say this to the House and through the House to the country—on principle. (Hear, hear!) The country is just as much united now as it ever was on progressive and democratic lines, and although men have come back to this House supporting different parties, holding different tenets, yet the country calls on those men to be true to their principles, and to support those measures in favour of which the country has unhesitatingly pronounced.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There can be no gainsaying the fact that a majority in this House have been returned by the people of Queensland pledged to a policy of democratic progress—to a policy for the amelioration of social evils.

Hon. R. PHILP: Social evils?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, social evils. To a policy which is bound up in seeing to the welfare of the industrial masses of Queensland—(hear, hear!)—and as long as the measures brought forward contain such elements as go to alleviate and elevate poor, frail, suffering humanity, to elevate the masses that we represent, then I say it is the unhesitating duty of every democrat in this House to give his undivided and unswerving allegiance in endeavouring to pass these measures into law.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We are encouraged by a recent division to go on in our endeavour to crystallise into law the aims and aspirations of the people as represented by the votes cast in our favour. We are encouraged to go on and to proceed with an administration which, as far as I, with ordinary intelligence have been able to claim, has won the undoubted approval of the majority of the electors of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Hon. R. PHILP: Why, you would retire from politics to-morrow on certain conditions.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I understand that reference perfectly. I understand that it is a reference that to-morrow, if a vacancy occurs on a certain tribunal, I would retire from politics and assume that seat. Possibly that may be so. If it were considered that by any little service of mine to my country I were entitled to that recognition, then I say that I would only be getting my due in doing so.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: At all events, I think it would be in good taste for the leader of the Opposition to wait until such an opportunity occurs, and to see then how the matter would be treated.

Hon. R. PHILP: You would not refuse it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Let there be no mistake about it. I say that such a position is my right. If a vacancy occurred to-morrow, I say unhesitatingly here, and through the House to the country, it would be my claim, and it would be for me to waive that claim, and not for members of the Opposition to waive it for me. (Hear, hear!) Apart from that, I say that the general consensus of liberal opinion—I care not in what party that opinion is entertained—calls upon us to do our duty, and to put before the country the programme which they undoubtedly approve. (Hear, hear!) I ask for assistance—and I care not from what side of the House that assistance comes—in endeavouring to pass into law measures which I believe will be for the benefit of the humanity of Queensland.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The country will tell you all about it later on.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The country, I am told, will tell us all about it later on. I am content not to hurry history; I am content to wait. (Laughter.) But I am perfectly ready to meet my electors to-morrow if necessary, perfectly ready to go through the country as I did before, and perfectly assured that I will always get the same courteous, attentive, and impartial hearing that I did before. I am perfectly certain that the country is well able to distinguish the chaff from the grain, and to adopt the residue of what is good. I am perfectly willing at any time to meet my electors. I have met them already; they have renewed their confidence in me, and I have no doubt that, should I meet them again to-morrow, I should come back here pledged to carry out what they have instructed me to do. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. CAMPBELL: Where would your party be?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Here. I claim that whatever party gives the Government policy assistance merely does so because it believes in that policy. We are under no personal obligation to any people who belong to a different party though they assist us, neither are they under any personal obligation to us. They cast their votes for legislation which we introduce because they believe in it. We accept their votes and assistance because we believe in that policy, and because we think it is right to introduce it and pass it into law. (Hear, hear!) A party, therefore, accepting help under these circumstances is in no sense under any personal obligation, is in no sense bound to the party that gives it help. We have been taunted—I am tired of hearing the taunts—that we are here to retain place and pay on any condition—it does not matter how mean or how ignominious—that we cling to office like limpets to a rock.

Hon. R. PHILP: Quite correct.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That nothing can possibly shift us; that we are so degraded that we are ready to take assistance from people whose methods we have condemned. I have never condemned the methods of the Labour party. They are entitled to their methods and to their own views, and it is a poor individual who cannot yield honesty of purpose and sincerity of motive to a party simply because they differ from him.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And as long as they are honest in their convictions, all I say

Hon. J. W. Blair.]

is "God speed" to them in their efforts. That is my worst wish for the Labour party. I have had their assistance time and again, and in the future I shall no doubt have their assistance, and this Government will have their assistance. (Hear, hear!) So far from holding office dependent on them in any mean spirit, we hold office only so long as they will vote for us with a conscientious belief in the righteousness of the measures we introduce. (Hear, hear!) As long as they believe in that legislation and vote for us, I claim their votes, and only so long do we make any appeal to them. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KEOGH: You admit they are socialists, do you not?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am not a socialist.

Mr. KEOGH: They are.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They may be, and they may be better than I am. I do not agree with them as far as their socialistic views go, but I have gone as far as most Labour men, and I think as far as I have gone I have endeavoured to give the best of my intelligence to measures of a sound and democratic nature. (Hear, hear!) I say, without any undue desire to reiterate myself, that it must be apparent to every individual in the community—it must be apparent to every individual in the House—if he looks at the election returns—that the large majority of votes have been cast for the two parties which represent democratic and advanced thought. No matter how those parties may differ now—although they may sit on different sides of the House—yet their pledges to their electors call on them to endeavour to fulfil the policy which is placed before them now; call on them to support that policy as far as they can honestly believe in it. That is the attitude of the Government to-day. They have felt that they were bound to go on and submit a policy to the House. We have a definite policy; it is our desire to crystallise that policy into law, and so long as there is a chance of carrying out our programme—carrying it out in honour to ourselves and in conformity with our pledges to the community and the country—then it is our duty to occupy these benches, and we will occupy them while we can get that support which I believe we will get. (Hear, hear!) So long as this Government can lead it will lead, and if the day comes when we cannot with honour occupy our present position, then we will most cheerfully go into Opposition. But I believe from my knowledge of the House, from my knowledge of the personal attitude of members towards the Government, that that day is far distant. (Hear, hear!) I hope it is no further off than the good of the country needs, and if it were necessary for us to retire to-morrow, I for one would be no obstacle in the way. We will lead so long as we think we can lead with honour to ourselves, and so far from meriting the comments, and criticisms, and insulting epithets that have been showered upon us by the metropolitan Press, and by other newspapers and politicians, I say we have adopted a position which is dignity itself in comparison with the position of those who attack us. (Hear, hear!) We have adopted a position which must commend itself to every right thinking individual—a position that so long as we can lead with honour we will lead, and the moment we cannot do that, rather than suffer dishonour, we will cross over and take up our position in Opposition.

Mr. KEOGH: You occupy your position by the aid of the socialists.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I propose now very briefly to allude to one or two criticisms of the Opposition, and first of all I desire to allude

[Hon. J. W. Blair.

to a criticism passed upon me by the leader of the Opposition. I am rather sorry that he descended to make such a criticism.

Hon. R. PHILP: Do not apologise for me.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not intend to apologise for the hon. member. I believe he is perfectly capable and able to apologise for himself, and, if necessary, to take care of himself. But the hon. gentleman went so far as to attribute to me a personal attack on himself. I assure this House that I never on any platform made a personal attack on the hon. gentleman—

Hon. R. PHILP: You did on several occasions.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Or on any other hon. member. What I said was this: The leader of the Opposition, when occupying the Treasury benches, was authorised by Parliament to borrow £2,250,000; that so far from being able to float that loan he tried to float £750,000.

Hon. R. PHILP: I did not try to float the loan.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He was unable to get £750,000 of that amount. He told the House sitting here that the financial advisers of the Government advised him that the time was not opportune. Those were the words he used. Someone present interjected: "Why not try the Australian market?" and it was reiterated that the time was not opportune. The inference I drew was this: That when the great State of Queensland, with all its resources and its magnificent wealth, its magnificent possibilities and probabilities, could not get £750,000—

Hon. R. PHILP: We got £750,000.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Then I was justified in saying that we were perilously near national insolvency. That was my attitude. Those were the words used, and I appeal to hon. members to say whether it is fair play to accuse me in that of having made a personal attack on the hon. gentleman?

Hon. R. PHILP: You said I left the State in a condition of insolvency.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said nothing of the kind. I said when a State like Queensland could not raise an amount like that it looked perilously like national insolvency, and then, forsooth! I am twitted with belonging to "the stinking fish party," and with decrying my native land.

Hon. R. PHILP: So you were.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No man can righteously accuse me of such a thing. I believe in Queensland. I believe it is destined to be the finest State of the group, and I shall use all my energies and abilities to urge its advancement. I believe it will advance, and that it is destined to be the foremost of the whole Australian group of States. I repudiate with all the strength of which I am capable—

Hon. R. PHILP: You said it, all the same.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And with all the scorn of which I am capable, any remark which would attribute to me a desire to decry my native land. There is another matter to which I wish to allude, and that is, some comment indulged in by the hon. member for Clermont with regard to certain fees and taxes alleged to have been imposed on mining by this Government. Let me say this, and it does not admit of any contradiction at all: Any fees or taxation chargeable on mining tenements, and on claims under the Act of 1898, have not been imposed by us at all. I am not for a moment saying that that Act is a bad Act, or that the fees were not legitimate. I think they are perfectly legiti-

mate. I think the Act has been a good one as far as it has gone; but I want to point out that the very charges which we are collecting now, so far from having been imposed by the present Government, were imposed long before we got into power.

Hon. R. PHILP: Did you not alter the regulations?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No; I do not think we did as to fees.

Hon. R. PHILP: You did in some respects.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I want to point out that there is a fee of 5s. collected under the Mining Act for the transfer of all mining tenements, except land on which a higher transfer fee is charged. There is stamp duty on the sale of property, which is payable under the Stamp Act passed long before we came into office. It has been in existence for years. Where the amount of consideration does not exceed £50, the charge is 7s. 6d.; does not exceed £100, 15s.; exceeds £100, for every £100, 15s. We are charged with introducing that and imposing those fees, and I mention that they have been in existence many years before we came into office. Now, in regard to the transfer under the Mining Act of a claim where the amount does not exceed £50, it is exempt from stamp duty. Where no consideration passes, a stamp duty of 10s. is payable in all cases, and I want to impress upon members this particular paragraph, because an impression has arisen in the mind of the hon. member for Clermont which I think will be dispelled on perusing this section. I would impress this upon the hon. member that—

A claim includes a water right if that water right is used for mining purposes, but not a well used for domestic purposes.

Nor even a residence claim, so that in the case of the surrender of any tenement, although that tenement may have been useless to the man, if he notifies the warden of such surrender he must pay a duty of 10s.

Mr. CREAGH: Can you tell us the year that that was enforced under the regulations?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The regulations were promulgated immediately after the passing of the Mining Act of 1898. In such a case there is no duty to notify; but if the person concerned notifies the surrender of his mining tenement he has to pay a duty of 10s. To make insurance doubly sure on this point, I wired to the warden at Clermont to ascertain what he is doing. I understand that he is an old and tried officer of the department, and that he is only carrying out the law as it exists, and I can assure the House that he will not do anything which would cause hardship to miners. While speaking on mining, I am glad to be able to say that although there is a falling off in the gold returns, yet there is an increase in the yield of metals other than gold, and that the mining industry, taken as a whole, is looking more prosperous now than it has been for some time past. The policy of the Government in building the Etheridge Railway and in going on with the Cloncurry extension has induced wonderful activity in those fields, and I believe that a larger measure of prosperity is before them than we have ever dreamt of previously. And if this Government remains in office, I venture to say that as long as the control and management of such lines are vested in the Government, and the ownership is to be eventually in the Government, we shall see the development of districts as prolific in mineral resources as any on the face of the earth. Now, I think it is necessary that some word should be said on behalf of the Government—as to what we have done and what are our claims to support in the

future, as to what has been our policy and what is to be our policy. I know that all this was said during the election, but I think it is my duty to get it into *Hansard*, and let it go throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, in order that the people may see what are the incontrovertible and indisputable facts. This Government has a history of which any Government might well be proud. We have done certain things which entitle us to the support of the manhood and womanhood of Queensland. We have done things which entitle us to credence in our promises that we will go on with the policy which we have mapped out for ourselves—a policy which should command the support of all people who hold democratic views. (Hear, hear!) It is necessary, in justification—in vindication—of the Government, that I should briefly refer to these matters, and I do not intend to do so at any length.

Hon. R. PHILP: You must be in a bad way, surely.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No, we are not in a bad way. We are able to stand on our past deeds—on what we have done. (Hear, hear!) We have laid a foundation which will not fail should the opportunity come for putting that foundation to the test. It is not a foundation that is built on sand; and although we may possibly to-day resemble “a house divided against itself,” yet it is a division which is more apparent than real, and our foundation is just as solid as ever it was.

Mr. CAMPBELL: A foundation of broken promises.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Let me remind the hon. member what we promised and what we have done. The coalition was formed particularly for two purposes—to bring in adult suffrage—

Hon. R. PHILP: No.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And to adjust the finances. The hon. member may deny it, but if you turn up the manifesto of that time you will find that the two purposes were to adjust the finances and to bring in adult suffrage. How have we kept our promises? To-day adult suffrage is the law of the land, and every man and every woman over twenty-one years of age has the right to vote. There have been men occupying these benches continuously for thirteen years; they were continually talking about adult suffrage, but never did anything. I say that our record is, beyond all doubt, one of which any Government might well be proud. (Hear, hear!) Universal suffrage is the law of the land to-day, and to whom is that due? To the much-despised Morgan-Labour coalition, the Liberal-Labour coalition, which was to last no time, which was oil and water that could not mix. This Government brought about more reform in their three years' tenure of office than we have had here during the last thirty years, and if the people are true to their principles and to a democratic policy we may yet rival New Zealand in this respect.

Mr. KEOGH: You went to the country as a Kidstonite.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I certainly went to the country as a Kidstonite. I came back as a Kidstonite, and I will serve my leader loyally and faithfully. If I went to the country again to-morrow, I would go as a Kidstonite.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You have not always been loyal to your leader.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: My answer to that is that I am here with him, and that during the election I went round the country and fought my best to serve the party. But

Hon. J. W. Blair.]

possibly charges of that kind are levelled in the hope that, like dirt, some of them will stick. I can, however, assure hon. members that there is no truth whatever in the statement. There may have been differences of opinion, as there will always be differences of opinion, but as long as those opinions are honest a charge of that kind is as flimsy as it is false. The Government endeavoured to carry out their promise to adjust the finances, and what has been the result? It is perfectly true that we have been favoured somewhat by good seasons.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: "Somewhat"?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will go further and say largely favoured, that Providence, seeing what a good party it was, and what a good Ministry it was, smiled on us—(laughter)—and brought about that prosperity of which we are proud to-day.

Hon. R. PHILP: Providence will turn you out, too.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I hope that if Providence turns us out the other party will not. I say that, although yielding to the leader of the Opposition, as I did on every platform from which I spoke, that he had bad seasons to contend with, that he had a dislocation of the finances brought about by federation, and that he had other troubles in connection with stock and cattle, yet the wheat yield during his term of office was larger than it was under the present Government, and the hon. gentleman had more money to spend. But we so adjusted affairs that with the help of Providence we arrived at a small surplus—the first in the history of Queensland for many years—and the year which has just closed we had a surplus of over £250,000, and that without adding a penny to the public debt, a matter of which all Queenslanders, no matter on which side of the House they may sit, ought to be proud. I say, and I say it with all modesty, we have done sufficiently well to deserve well of those who are ready to criticise us impartially.

Hon. R. PHILP: The electors did not think so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The electors did not think much more of the hon. gentleman and his party. The only difference between us is the difference between twenty-eight and twenty-five, although the Opposition had a power and influence which we had not. (Hear, hear!) Money, the Press, and everything were working on their side, and what happened? They came back twenty-eight strong, though a few weeks before they prophesied that they would have forty-two members. How are the mighty fallen! There they sit still in Opposition, and there they will be sitting for many years to come. (Laughter.)

Hon. R. PHILP: Is that honourable?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am not saying one word about honour or dishonour. I deprecate hon. members using those terms as freely as they do, and imputing motives to other hon. members. I am no better than the ordinary average individual.

Hon. R. PHILP: A lot worse.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have my own faults and foibles, but with all those I hesitate to cast up things of this kind and make slurs upon and impute motives to hon. members like the leader of the Opposition. I [9.30 p.m.] contend, beyond all doubt, that we can conduct ourselves here—we can conduct our political discussions, and no matter how hard we may hit or how hard we may be hit in return, we can, at all events, preserve personal friendships. I, for one, would be very sorry to think that anything I might say here

[Hon. J. W. Blair.

to-night or in the future, or anything I have said, would interfere with personal friendships. Life is too short for that kind of thing, and, although we may differ politically, in God's name let our differences be restricted to political differences.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. PHILP: You don't mind hitting below the belt, but you don't like being hit yourself.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I appeal to hon. members whether I hit below the belt.

Hon. R. PHILP: Yes, you do.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I may have done so unconsciously, but I have never intended to do so; and, if I have wounded any man's feelings by a blow of that kind, I apologise for it fully and freely. It may be, as has just been suggested to me, that the belt has been shifted, and I mistook the zone. (Laughter.) However, assuming there has been no mistake, if I have unconsciously done anything of that kind, I am genuinely sorry for it. This Government went further, and restored wages to railway men. It restored salaries to the public servants—not all at one time, but as we had the opportunity, and we kept our promises faithfully.

Hon. R. PHILP: No.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We restored automatic increases, and the railway men have for some time been enjoying their automatic increases, and are in the position to-day that they should have been in three years ago. And they owe that, no matter how they may vote, and despite assertions to the contrary, they owe that to this much-despised Government which is occupying the Treasury benches.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They owe it to the good seasons.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Possibly to the good seasons, which have enabled us to find the money. But we have kept all our pledges, and we have restored those salaries and those wages. We have gone further. We assisted the junior member for Brisbane North when he brought forward his Railway Appeal Bill. We have not denied to those men the right to appeal where a sense of injustice oppressed them. We have given them the appeal that was denied for years. We have put in Government contracts a minimum wage provision, and we have established an eight hour day. (Hear, hear!) Where, I say, is there any record that can compare with ours on that matter? Am I wrong in saying that a record such as that entitles us to the support of all democrats—aye, and of the Labour party itself? Why, many of those measures are planks of their own platform. (Hear, hear!) I say may the day be far distant when they will be so devoid of conscience as to fail to support the party that has given them these things, because they believed in their intrinsic rectitude, because they believed in them of their inherent value, because they believed that they were desired by the people. We are here as far as possible to remedy injustices, and to do what we can to ameliorate social conditions and remove social evils. We have gone further. We have considered the housing conditions of the shearer and the sugar-worker, and we have doubled the grant to establish libraries for those men. What party previously ever cared whether those men received any intellectual development, whether they had any solace in their spare hours after their work? What party previously looked after their housing? Why, time and again when the hon. member for Gregory brought in his Bill for the protection of shearers and sugar-workers, how was it treated?

LABOUR MEMBERS: Talked out.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : Yes, talked out.

Hon. R. PHILP : Only once.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : Well, that was once too often.

Mr. HARDAIRE : Twice.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : When we had the opportunity we passed that measure into law. And yet I have been twitted with using the words of Kipling's "Recessional"—"Lest we forget." I repeat them again to-night advisedly. We are too prone to forget these things.

Hon. R. PHILP : You will not let anybody forget them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : No, I will not let them forget them. So long as I have the power I will remind them every opportunity I have. I will din them into their ears until they become part of their very being. People are too apt to forget all this party has done, and I hope the people will be keenly sensitive to our past history before they pass any vote condemnatory of us. If they take the trouble to look into the records of the past, and to scrutinise what we have done, they will find in that record an absolute guarantee of the fulfilment of our promises for the future. If they want to know what those promises are, let them look at His Excellency's Speech, and I challenge anybody to say that there has ever been placed before this House a more liberal, a more democratic, or a more progressive policy—a policy which includes education, which includes financial arrangements, a policy which goes to the root of social evils, which goes to help the down-trodden and the fallen; and I challenge any member to show that ever has such a programme previously been submitted for the consideration of any House—aye, within the Commonwealth.

Mr. KEOGH : And you stole that from our side of the House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : We stole that from your side of the House! (Laughter.) One must smile answering an interjection of that kind. You cannot steal anything from an empty Treasury—you cannot steal anything from an empty programme. (Laughter.) I challenge the hon. member—and he is a friend of mine—to point out one thing contained in the Government programme that we have filched from that side, and his answer must be—silence! He must be in the position of the man who came to the wedding feast without a wedding garment. (Laughter.) The question will be, "Friend, how canst thou in hither?" (Laughter.) There are other matters, perhaps small in themselves, but I have a very vivid recollection of the dramatic and intense appeal that was made to the manhood and womanhood of Queensland to return the leader of the Opposition and those supporting him. An appeal was made to the womanhood that they should vote for them. On what ground was that appeal based? What had they ever done for womankind when they were in office?

Hon. R. PHILP : A great deal more than you have done.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS : They offered them the baby vote. (Laughter.)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : Did they give them a vote? No; they juggled with the vote. They pretended with one hand to give, and at the same time they kept it well back with the other.

Mr. CAMPBELL : They never wanted it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : On the principle of true charity, they never let their right hand know what their left hand was doing.

But the people of Queensland found them out eventually. The day dawned when the people were dissatisfied with their continual promises and their non-fulfilment, and, as the result of the dawn of that day, they are in the position they occupy now. I believe they will long occupy that position. They take their defeat so cheerfully and so jollily—if I may use such a term—all Britishers take their pleasure, it is said, sadly—that it would be a crime to disturb them in the enjoyment of the place they now occupy.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR laughter.

Hon. R. PHILP : You are very funny.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : It may be funny, but the hon. gentleman does not seem very much amused. (Renewed laughter.) Whether it is funny or whether it is the reverse, it is true.

Hon. R. PHILP : Is it? You are not a truthful man—oh, no!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : I may not be a truthful man. That is another charge; but I am used to these charges. I am used to anything nowadays; I am not surprised at anything. But no matter whether I am untruthful; no matter whether I have no character—practically, since I entered politics I got a character. (Laughter.) And I advise anybody in search of a character, if they have not got one, to come into this House, and it will not be long before they will get one, though it is quite another matter whether it will do them any good after they get it. They may be like the child reaching for Pears's soap—they won't be happy till they get it. (Laughter.) However, I pass over all that kind of thing. Whether I have practically a character or not, at all events my constituents sent me here; and, until they come to be of the hon. member's opinion, and show that they have that opinion by their votes, I think I will stop here. I was going on to ask on what was the appeal of the hon. gentlemen opposite for the support of womankind based? So far from passing any measure of protection for womankind or children, there was a terrible paucity of measures of that nature on the statute-book when we took office. But we went as far as we could. We only found certain measures in the Criminal Code, which were passed not specifically for them; and I defy hon. members to point out any other measure dealing with the womankind of Queensland than the Criminal Code. We went further, and passed a small Bill. It was a small thing in its way—an Act to prevent distress for rent in certain cases. (Hear, hear!) We found that in many cases unfortunate women who were earning their living by using the mangle and sewing machine and typewriter were in this position—I know of cases myself where the landlord came in, seized their things and sold them, and those people were then left to promiscuous charity, or to the pittance doled out by a Government Relief Department. This sort of thing continued for years, and it cried aloud for rectification. Was there any rectification from the other side? No; there were many promises, but they were unfulfilled. We passed that law, and to-day women are in that position that their mangles, their sewing machines, and their typewriters are safe to the extent of £10, and their household and wearing apparel as well.

Mr. KEOGH : Did we not help you to pass that measure?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : If you did, all honour to you. That is one of the things we did in the way of entitling us to claim the support of the womanhood of Queensland. We have gone further, and we have passed a Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. J. W. Blair.]

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : It is true—and I always endeavour to be fair—that the Attorney-General for the hon. the leader of the Opposition introduced a measure of that kind, but it did not pass.

Mr. MULCAHY : It was no good.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : It is true that the leader of the Opposition and those associated with him supported our measure. But, whether they supported it or not, to this Government belongs the credit of passing that measure into law.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : And you will remember the seething agitation that was got up outside the walls of this House, and in the country—how it was stated that we had sealed our political death warrants by such a measure. But sense has begun to triumph, and intelligent understanding of the Bill has proved that never was a more humane or more righteous measure passed in any Parliament in the world. (Hear, hear !) All that it practically claims to do is to put flesh and blood on a level with merchandise, to put flesh and blood on a level with implements of husbandry, to put flesh and blood on a level with the machinery in the workshops and to protect the unfortunate miner who delves at his work deep in the mine. (Hear, hear !) He goes forth morning after morning and never knows, as we do not know, whether it will be his last time, because he is subject to the perils of an inrush of water or explosion of firedamp. All it seeks to do it has accomplished. It sees that where a breadwinner is taken away, and the women and children are left behind, something is granted them whereby they will be able to face the world without depending on the promiscuous charity, without depending on the concert got up for their benefit, and the proceeds handed to them, without depending on the dole of the Home Department, or on the sum raised by passing round the hat amongst his fellow-workmen, but on an absolutely fixed sum. (Hear, hear !) Hon. members know, and the country knows, how the employees fared in the Railway Department in the old days. I have known cases where men lost an eye, and they got amounts granted to them ranging from £3 to £69. The records of the Railway Department will show this. Now, under this Act I know a case in particular where a man lost an eye. And what occurred? The Government gave that man a pass to Sydney to enable him to consult an oculist. The Government also gave him a free pass back again. They also allowed him to go back to work at the same rate of wages he was getting before the accident in the Railway Department, and they gave him £250 in addition.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : There is another man in the Ipswich workshops, who just before the election lost an eye through a splinter of steel flying up from the machine or the metal at which he was working, and he also got his £250. (Hear, hear !) Where, I say, has any measure of that kind been passed by the Opposition?

Hon. R. PHILP : We introduced a similar measure.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : I can only say that when you had the opportunity nothing was forthcoming to show your genuineness.

Hon. R. PHILP : That is not correct.

[Hon. J. W. Blair.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : I have already pointed out that a Workers' Compensation Act, of which I did not approve in all its details, was brought in by the leader of the Opposition's late Attorney-General—

Mr. MAUGHAN : It was a bad one, too.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : It did not get through. Now, what I declare is this : that we had an opportunity of passing a measure of this kind—fortuitously, if you like—and we seized it and passed the measure into law, and this is how it is operating now.

Mr. KEOGH : What about the unfortunate fellow who fell in the other day ?

The SPEAKER : Order, order !

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : We cannot discuss a case that is under consideration by the Supreme Court, but I may say that that unfortunate man was not an employee of the Government, and the Workers' Compensation Act does not apply to him. What I want to further point out is this : That I share with all hon. members genuine regret for the sad death of the late hon. member for Cook. His end was unforeseen, and under peculiar circumstances which I think excite pity in the minds and breasts of all those who know them. When that boat went down there were men on board who were employees of the Government, and it was their duty to act in that boat on the coast and see to the lights on the coast in order that people trading up and down the coast might do so with safety. That boat went down with those employees on board, and under this Act the Government was able to give certain amounts to their wives and children.

The PREMIER : The Government was not compelled to pay that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : As I am reminded, the Government had an absolute right to give that compensation to the widows and children ; but they were Government employees, and the Government paid these unfortunate people amounts ranging from £300 downwards.

Mr. CAMPBELL : I know a few cases where the Government treat men unfairly, and I will bring them up when I get an opportunity.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : If the hon. gentleman knows any cases that have not been fairly treated by the Government, I shall be glad to hear the particulars from him.

Mr. CAMPBELL : The Premier refused to interview them.

The PREMIER : The Premier refused to allow members of Parliament to bulldoze him.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : I will be glad to hear the details of that case. I will say this of the Premier—that if anyone brings any case before the Premier—

Mr. MACARTNEY : A supporter?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL : No, anybody. I have no doubt what the result will be. The hon. members for Gympie and Charters Towers, and members for other districts, and I, in my own district, know how wonderfully this Act is working in regard to miners, how formerly when accidents occurred no compensation was given to them, and how, since the passage of this Act, whenever an accident occurred, compensation has been secured to the wife and children who are left otherwise unprovided for. (Hear, hear !) I could go on enumerating cases of this sort, but I will give another where an accident occurred. The engine of an unfortunate driver of a train on the loop line on the Bundamba line came into collision with

a cow on the line, the engine was practically overturned, and the man killed. Under the old law what would his wife and children have had to rely on? Simply, as I said before, promiscuous charity. Under this Act the Railway Department paid that man's widow £400. I do not intend to labour this any further in order to show what the Government has done, but for this Ministry I claim a just meed of consideration and liberal support from all those people who have the welfare of humanity at heart. (Hear, hear!) We have gone further. Although the old Government enabled children to be boarded out, we have enabled the mother herself to take charge of these children. (Hear, hear!) We have put the mother, at all events, on as high a plane as the foster-mother, and enabled her to have her children round her in the home, so that her life may be brightened, and that she may have all that she is entitled to have, and bring them up as she would like them to be. (Hear, hear!) As far as we can go, we have established a record of which any Government might be proud. We intend to go further, and to go on in the path we have mapped out—on the path of social and industrial advancement. Our watchword is "Gang forward," and we intend to be true to that watchword. We will be assisted, I am certain, by all liberal-minded people in this House, and by the bulk of the people outside, and have the country at our back; and as long as we have the moral support of our supporters outside, and the actual support of those people who think with us in this House, then, I say, we have nothing to fear. We can go on, not fearing what is before us, not fearing any difficulties that may beset us, but feeling sure that a right policy and a right course will eventually meet the reward which is always held out to policies of that kind. (Hear, hear!) Now, very briefly, what does this programme hold forth? What is there in this programme that entitles me to stand here and claim support—aye, from the Opposition?

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are pretty sanguine.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are entitled to ask us what there is in that policy which enables us to come here and ask for support. I say this: That we have there a policy which will go largely to make Queensland the finest State in the whole group. We have a policy of linking up existing systems of lines, and building other agricultural lines.

HON. R. PHILP: You have had that before.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We have a policy of building lines to develop that portion of Queensland wherein our mineral resources are; we have a policy of extending lines to agricultural centres; and we ask assistance from all those who want to see Queensland go ahead to carry out that system. We have a lands policy; and, so far from the Minister for Lands being adversely criticised on that policy, I think—if he will pardon me for saying it—he deserves eulogy for attracting a desirable class of people. We have attracted here a desirable class—they are coming here, and Queensland is all the better for them. Queensland is advancing through their presence. And we are endeavouring to augment and increase the number of agricultural and dairy farms; and I venture to think that the policy being pursued now will eventually result in making Queensland an El Dorado of settlement.

HON. R. PHILP: In what way are you getting farmers?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman has only to turn to the records of the department to find out from the statistics the number of farms, and the method in which they

are being got. We have a policy of attracting here the right kind of settler, and we have also a policy, which I believe will be carried into effect, of encouraging the native Queenslanders, encouraging the sons of the people who have come here and given of their best to develop this State. I hope that the time is not far distant when a proposal of that kind will be foreshadowed and put upon the table of the House. I have always had the belief, and always will have it, that native Queenslanders ought to be given facilities the same as any other people.

MR. KEOGH: They have not had it.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are being given, and will continue to be given, that, and have, I hope, a grant of free land as well. We have passed a Closer Settlement Act. I do not know how to speak of that matter—whether it will work satisfactorily or not. We are now endeavouring to adopt some method of conservation of water. In a State like Queensland, where there is in some places a paucity of rainfall—an irregular rainfall—it behoves us, as custodians of the public welfare, to endeavour to do something in the way of looking after the conservation of water, so that when the times come—if they do come again—when there will not be a bountiful fall of rain, we may have a sure water supply. We have also a policy of immigration, and let me say, very shortly, what my views on this immigration policy are. I am not one who believes in the indiscriminate introduction of immigrants into Queensland. I will be no party to any policy which does not carefully scrutinise those people who are coming here, and which does not see that before anybody comes here there is work ready for each individual when he comes. (Hear, hear!) I do not believe in flooding the labour market by introducing people here, and so cutting down wages. I believe in a steady and a regular flow of immigration to those districts which need men of a certain type to develop them, and as long as I have any voice or say in the matter I will support any policy of that kind. But it should be under proper safeguards and restrictions, and I am glad to say the Government is prepared to give the same facilities to ordinary individuals who may want labour as they have already given to other individuals. I want to point out that, although there has been a great cry for immigrants, up to the present time the supply has practically more than exceeded the demand—that the demand, at all events, when put face to face with concrete proposals, with definite offers of contract, has so shrunken in its dimensions as to be almost normal.

MR. CAMPBELL: What about filling up the country, as the Premier was talking about?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Premier has been speaking about filling up the country, and, as I understand his policy, it is exactly on the lines I have endeavoured to indicate—under proper safeguards and proper conditions. We have indicated a direct European service, *viâ* Torres Straits, which I hope to see eventuate, and I also hope to see the Orient service retained, and Brisbane made a port of call. I intend to hurry very rapidly over many matters to which I would like to have alluded. The House and the country is already aware of the Government's intentions with regard to electoral reform. They have already seen the Bill, and although there may be some arguments for the retention of the postal vote, yet I say blot out the postal vote altogether rather than retain the iniquities which prevail under that system.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Civil servants have not been forgotten in this programme. There is a scheme for superannuation—a scheme which will not press unduly on the other members of the State, and which will rest for its support on moneys contributed by themselves. Touching upon that, there is also an important passage in the Speech which calls attention to State rights—to the possible encroachment of the Commonwealth Parliament on those State rights—I allude to the matter of the Federal servants' incomes. Why should a Federal servant, simply because he is employed in the Commonwealth service, be immune from all income tax? An ordinary individual, A, may occupy premises by the side of B; A may be a Commonwealth servant, and B a State servant. A gets all the protection of the State laws equally with B, and yet he does not pay a penny towards the cost of administering those laws. They may look at it, as they do in the example given, from different premises, but it is not a thing which ought to be allowed to continue. Although the High Court has given a decision, it is not a matter which ought to be looked at with anything but deep concern, because the Commonwealth Parliament in passing laws of that kind may, if we are not careful, infringe State rights. I make that passing allusion because it is a matter to which I think attention should be called. Then we have a scheme for education. It is perfectly true that no University is foreshadowed at this time, but I hope the day will come when we shall have a Queensland University. But I believe at the present time the wants of the many are more pressing than the wants of the few. (Hear, hear!) A University will come, and I hope

[10 p.m.] at no distant date, but our scheme for the present is such a one as will command the attention of every individual member of this House, and tend to the welfare of every citizen in the community. We are endeavouring to improve our primary system, and we are linking up the technical colleges with the central technical college; and we are also endeavouring to do what is more important, and that is to extend what are known as the continuation classes. I have not had the advantage of a University education. Many a man has not had a grammar school education; many a man has not had a primary school education, and yet there are many men who will gladly and willingly come to classes, if provided for them, and endeavour to make up for what they have lost in their youth. There are many young fellows, obliged to face the world at an early age, who will welcome as a boon these continuation classes, whereby they may study at night and get the reward which honest toil in intellect always provides. (Hear, hear!) That is, shortly, the system of education which we have foreshadowed, and where, I ask, is there anything in that programme which does not command absolute support from every man in the House? It may not go as far as some members would like; it may fall far short of what some would like; but, as far as it goes, I challenge any member to say that there is anything in it which would prevent him from extending to it his support. We have abolished all payments on account of schools save the one-fifth contribution for new schools. We have shown that we are honest in our endeavours to broaden education, and give opportunities and facilities for education where opportunities and facilities have not previously existed, and we have not been unmindful of the cry of the children of the bush. We have heard the cry and doubled the number of travelling teachers. (Hear, hear!)

Hon. R. PHILP: How many are there now?

[Hon. J. W. Blair.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I could not say, but we have doubled the number whatever it was. When a number of these things have been accomplished, surely we have established a reasonable claim for consideration at the hands of the members of this House. I am reminded by the Premier that when the number of travelling teachers is doubled we will then have three times the number we found when we went into office. Now, what promise is there for the people generally? On the platform there were people who advocated the repeal of the Income Tax Act. I never advocated any such repeal, because I believed it had come to stay. The leader of the Opposition advocated that, and when he was asked a straight question by an elector, as reported in the *Courier*, whether he intended to abolish the income tax if returned to power, he said he would if funds permitted. (Laughter.) Well, we have never made any condition about this. As far as I know, the Government policy was practically that the income tax was necessary, practically that it had come to stay, but we promised that we would provide an exemption applicable to all incomes, and that when the time came we would revise the incidence of the tax.

Hon. R. PHILP: Did you promise that?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, we promised that. I promised it from every platform from which I spoke, and when the time comes it will be seen that we have redeemed that promise. The incidence of the whole scheme will have been revised, and an exemption will be provided, so that the measure will, I believe, largely commend itself to every individual in the House. We have also considered the position with regard to railway receipts and earnings, and, as foreshadowed, there is to be a reduction in freights and fares. I say that no Government could possibly have done more than this Government, and many a Government that I know of has done considerably less.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A measure has also been promised to amend the licensing laws. The details of it will be unfolded at the proper time, and when they are I venture to say that people will find there has been a genuine attempt to regulate and settle difficulties which have arisen in the administration of the licensing laws. In this programme there are measures—human measures—touching particularly the welfare of the lives of those who are working at dangerous avocations. There is to be a measure dealing with the inspection of boilers and machinery; a Factory and Shops Act Amendment Bill; a Children's Court Bill; a Poor Prisoners' Defence Bill; and several others. I do not intend to deal with those in detail, because an opportunity will be afforded for members to give their views upon them at the proper time. We have foreshadowed an Old Age Pensions Bill, and I want to say one or two words upon that. I believe that some scheme should be passed into law by which men and women over a certain age, who have given of their best in building up this State, should be able to get, as a matter of right, a certain allowance—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: So much per week during the time they remain on this earth—that the amount should only be alterable, or reduced, or increased by sanction of Parliament, and that they should not have to go, cap in hand, to any Government for aid in their need. They will have a privilege, when once they have conformed to the conditions laid down in the Act, to get their pensions as a matter of right. That

is why I welcome this system. Many individuals with whom we are personally acquainted have gone through their lives; they have borne the heat, and toil, and burden of the day, and at the close of their lives, when their sun is dipping to the west, they have to come and ask for a dole from a Government department. I say that, although that system is a good system as far as it goes, and although properly administered it has done incalculable good, yet we think there should be an old age pensions scheme in addition, and I am proud to be a member of a Government, proud to follow a Premier who has had the courage to intimate that a measure of that kind will be part of his policy, and which if he remains, as he will remain, on the Treasury benches, will be passed into law. These old people will then get their bounden right, and the wherewithal to pass their old age in some semblance of comfort. I am one who believes that the proper administration of a system of this kind can be better conducted by a State department than under Federal administration; but whether there be differences of opinion upon that point or not, I welcome the heralding of this measure, and hope it will not be long after its introduction before it becomes the law of the land.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have alluded to the Workers' Compensation Act, and I want very shortly to allude to the State Insurance Bill and the Wages Boards Bill. The Government have always been earnest with regard to workers' compensation, and, if any evidence was wanting beyond that which I have given, I would call hon. members' attention to the Executive minute passed in the Chief Secretary's office by which compensation is given to all Government employees, whether in the railways, the dock, the Harbours and Rivers Department, or elsewhere.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: An amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act is foreshadowed, of which I will not give the details. A State Insurance Bill is also foreshadowed, and I believe, with those two measures and a Wages Boards Bill, we will have a trinity of measures which will go far to protect both employer and employee, and to secure to each the natural rights of both. With regard to wages boards, I should like to say, in conclusion, that, as far as I understand the measure for the establishment of wages boards, it is framed for the gradual—the "slow, but sure"—achievement of fairer hours, fairer rates of wages, and fairer conditions of labour. (Hear, hear!) Shut our eyes to the fact as we may, there exists in Queensland systems which are unfair, both as to the duration of hours, the wages for labour, and the conditions of labour. These things a wages board would remedy, and I would remind hon. members that wages boards were hinted at for the first time in the Premier's manifesto, and that we find no trace of it in the policy of the leader of the Opposition and those associated with him during the time he was in power—no trace of any measure to secure the rights of employers and employees alike.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You know that his manifesto includes that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The manifesto of the leader of the Opposition includes wages boards; but I mention the fact that the first manifesto to include that measure was the manifesto of the Premier.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The measure was supported by both sides last session.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was supported by both sides of the House. It was passed with the co-operation of the Opposition, and I hope it will be passed with their co-operation this session. My only regret is that it was thrown out in another Chamber. It is a measure which will commend itself to every humane and thoughtful employer. There are, however, other employers who have not those qualities, and I am afraid there are some of that description in Queensland. It is a measure framed to put down sweating, to put both employer and employee in a proper condition, and to secure to each equal justice. I do not propose to detain the House any further. This Government have a programme to carry into effect; it is their duty to see that that programme is carried into law; and they ask—I am sure they will not ask in vain—for the support of all democratic and fairly inclined individuals to assist them in passing that programme into law. (Hear, hear!) They believe they have a policy which commends itself to the great majority of thinking individuals in this House and outside this House, a policy which will have the moral support of those outside the House and the actual support of those in the House, and that before the session ends practically all those measures, or the majority of them, will become the law of the land. (Hear, hear!) I am not so fond as to imagine, nor so foolish as to think, that we have not a difficult way before us. The way may be long; the way may be difficult; difficulties may crop up from day to day; obstacles almost insurmountable may confront us, but we are going forward, and we shall deal with those difficulties as they arise, and I have no doubt we shall deal with them successfully. We have been twitted as to our motives and as to the integrity of our aims, but I claim unhesitatingly that our aims are honest. Our aims may be lofty, but they are honest. We believe, as I am reminded, that we have a right to be judged by results. The results of our policy and administration are before the House and before the country. I say the time has come when it does not behove any Government to remain deaf to the cries of struggling humanity, to the cries of those who are labouring under a sense of inequality and injustice, and who are groping blindly for an amelioration of those evils from which they are suffering.

Hon. R. PHILP: The Minister for Lands laughs at you.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, no!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Minister for Lands may smile, and the Opposition may smile; but there are those who will read these words, and who will believe in my undoubted sincerity and honesty of purpose, and who believe that throughout my life, to the best of my ability, I have done what I could to ameliorate the condition of those around me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There are men who are now stretching out for a helping hand; it behoves us to extend that helping hand to them, and as long as we have the opportunity and the power we will gladly and willingly give them that help. (Hear, hear!) They are entitled to some promise of betterment, to some promise of advancement, and I make this closing appeal in all confidence; that in the programme submitted by the Government there is sufficient to entitle them to the support of every right-thinking individual in this Chamber and outside the Chamber; that there is in it that which, if it becomes law, will make Queensland the better for it, and will make the condition of the

Hon. J. W. Blair.]

industrial worker and of all classes more peaceful and more prosperous, and will lead to that time when there will be no complaining in our streets.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*) : I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER : I move that the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday next.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at nineteen minutes past 10 o'clock.