

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 20 JULY 1909

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 20 JULY, 1909.

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Annual report of the Department of Public Lands for the year 1908.

ELECTIONS TRIBUNAL ACT.

PANEL OF ASSESSORS.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to the requirements of the Elections Tribunal Act of 1886, I now, by leave of the House, lay on the table my warrant nominating the panel of assessors for the trial of election petitions during the present session.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, assenting, in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, to Appropriation Bill No. 1.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Fassifern*): I desire to make a personal explanation. In last Friday's *Courier* appeared the following:—

It is necessary to refer to Mr. Jenkinson, who voted for his own appointment as Speaker.

That is a malicious, deliberate, and unjustifiable perversion of the truth. On page 8 of *Hansard* is reported the speech which I made on the occasion of the election of Speaker, and I intend to repeat it to the House. I may mention that an extract from my speech conveying similar sentiments was published the following morning in the *Courier*, so that there is absolutely no justification for the statement it made about me. On page 8 of *Hansard* is the following report of what I said—

I merely rose now that I might make the statement that I was anxious to record my vote. On a subsequent occasion—I will not detain you now—but on a subsequent occasion I shall probably have the opportunity of telling you, as well as the country, why I did not want to support you, Sir. There are reasons why I am not doing it at the present juncture. I wanted to record that vote, and, as you know perfectly well, it could not be done unless there was some other nomination made. I announced to members sitting on the other side that I declined to take the position, even if the votes were sufficient to put me there, and I only consented to my name being submitted to the House in order to enable the vote to be recorded.

The hon. member for Brisbane South Mr. Airey, confirmed that statement in the following words:—

I think it is my duty to rise to confirm the statement just made by the hon. member for Fassifern. He came to me and said, "I am allowing myself to be nominated simply that a vote may be taken on the question of the candidature of the hon. member for Dalby. After that," he said, "I shall withdraw my nomination."

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A quibble.

Mr. Jenkinson.]

Mr. JENKINSON: It is a lie deliberately told.

Hon. R. PHILP: Did you never intend to submit your nomination?

Mr. JENKINSON: It was never submitted to the House.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. HUXHAM (*Brisbane South*), who was greeted with "Hear, hears" from Labour members, said: When I entered this House last year, besides the members of my own party, the members who made my advent more comfortable than it would have been otherwise were the late Speaker, yourself, Sir, the Minister for Lands, and the hon. member for Fassifern. It is very awkward for a new member when he enters a Chamber such as this, as he finds himself surrounded by men experienced in the forms and procedure of the House, which are quite new to him. I must say that to the late Speaker I owe my sincere thanks for the kindly manner in which he received many crudities which must have fallen from me during my first session. And it is in no mere formal manner that I make this acknowledgment of him, and that I also record my thanks for the generous treatment I have received at your hands, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I am pleased to see you occupying that chair in succession to the late Hon. John Leahy, and I hope during your tenure of office you will have the support of all hon. members of this House, and your duties will not be at all onerous, but a pleasure to you. Naturally in speaking from this side of the House, it will be expected that I shall support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition to the motion of the adoption of the Address in Reply. During the time I have been in this House, I have seen a gradual whittling away of support from the present Government—that the Government headed by the Premier has been gradually losing the confidence, not only of members of the House, but also of the electors. (Hear, hear!) Further than that, not only has he lost the confidence of the House, but if you take into consideration the reception the Government has received from the time the coalition was brought about up to the present, I feel perfectly satisfied that it has also lost the confidence of the country. We have had experience, as far as the Government is concerned, in the several addresses that have been made in the North, in the West, and also in South Brisbane. Of course, I cannot speak with any great amount of authority as far as the North and West is concerned, but I can speak with something like authority as to the treatment that was meted out to the Premier when he endeavoured to address a body of electors in South Brisbane, on that Saturday night some few weeks back, and I must admit I was never in an assembly of people where the reproach of the people was so pronounced—where the bitterness against the Chief Secretary was so marked—where he could have received a worse reception than he did at the hands of the electors of South Brisbane. One felt at the time a certain amount of pity—pity that the Premier did not recognise the dignity of his position—and that when he found the people would not hear him—would not listen to him—it would have been far better if he had simply retired from a false position of addressing electors who would not hear him, and who gave him an opportunity of retiring.

The TREASURER: The majority were anxious to hear him.

[*Mr. Jenkinson.*]

Mr. HUXHAM: I cannot understand how the Treasurer can say that the people were anxious to hear him.

The TREASURER: I was present.

Mr. HUXHAM: So was I present, and several other hon. members were also present. I do not say the hon. gentleman was not present, because I saw the hon. gentleman applauding very much on different points.

Mr. BOWMAN: He was in the dress circle. (Laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: Yes, he was in the dress circle, and seemed to be enjoying himself, but as far as the bulk of the audience was concerned, I must admit I was never at such a pandemonium.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Were you not ashamed of them?

Mr. HUXHAM: No. The people of South Brisbane recognised the Premier as one who had committed himself—he appealed to the electors as the protector of the constitutional question, and a few months afterwards he coalesced with the senior member for Townsville. We have to recognise this point: that when the Premier came out on the constitutional question, he had the bulk of the people behind him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He has them still.

Mr. BOWMAN: Don't you wish it was so?

Mr. HUXHAM: The Premier came out as the leader of the people on the great constitutional question, and we know very well, from then until just prior to the coalition being brought about, how the Premier was deliberately acting in the matter of dealing with them. But, going back to the time the Premier announced his famous programme, known as the "Rockhampton Programme," we recognised that there was not much in it to which anybody could take exception. That is the programme the Government is supposed to be supporting at the present time, whereas we know, from the utterances that were made during the election in the Moreton, that this programme is to be very largely cut into. The Premier opened his Rockhampton programme with the announcement that there should be no coalition with the Philp party. That was one of the fundamental factors. Further than that, we find that during the last election the people had some faith that the Premier would have adhered to his promise—that there should be absolutely no coalition with the Philp party. It was evident that on the constitutional question there was no love lost between the Premier and the hon. member for Townsville, but there was so little difference between the programmes, that we find the hon. member for Townsville was desirous of meeting and joining the coalition Government. We find that as soon as this coalition was formed—this coalition which was going to do such a great amount of good—the Government supporters have been gradually whittled away. At the time the coalition was brought about, six of his supporters—two Ministers of the Crown—deliberately left him. Immediately after we find three others left him, and, during the last recess, still others have left the hon. gentleman. The Premier, who started the coalition on the most favourable terms—with a following of forty-eight—thought that that state of affairs was likely to continue, but we find at the present time, instead of the strong Government that he was advocating so strenuously—that he believed

in so sincerely, and for which, I must say, he had been working most strenuously since 1907—has gradually dropped to a following at the present time, including himself, Sir, of some thirty-six members. What I consider the position of the Premier is this—that having so misled the country, having so taken advantage of the confidence reposed in him at the time of the last election—I think he must feel very keenly that the regard he was then held in has absolutely vanished, and that it is time for him to send in his resignation and give some other Government a chance of being formed.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: I do not see why the affairs of the country should be retarded by the Premier hanging on to the Treasury benches, when I believe that much good could be effected by a healthy change of his position from that side of the House to this. I am not going to say that at the present time any of us welcome an election, but at the same time I believe that were we to go to the country this side of the House would come back largely reinforced.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. HUNTER: I believe you would go out. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: As far as that is concerned, it is not a matter of great importance to me; if I met with defeat, I should not squeak, and if I met with a victory I should not be one to blow about it. I can take defeat as well as any man, and at the same time I think I can bear a victory with all becoming modesty, and if the hon. member for Woollongabba were as sure of his seat for Woollongabba as I am for Brisbane South he could go to bed and rest very quietly till to-morrow.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Why not take my offer?

Mr. HUXHAM: I am sure that as the hon. member deals so largely in dreams—

Mr. BOWMAN: And nightmares.

Mr. HUXHAM: And nightmares, he must have been having a most disquieting time of it. (Laughter.) If he takes the meeting in South Brisbane which I referred to as an indication of general disapproval, nobody could have a rockier time than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And you made a presentation to a man who was the greatest trouble at the meeting.

Mr. HUXHAM: The hon. gentleman is speaking of an old veteran in the Labour army whom the members of the South Brisbane Workers' Political Organisation delighted to honour. He is an old man, in his sixty-fourth year, and cannot hope to gain one iota out of any social recognition that may take place, but so devoted is this old gentleman to the Labour movement that he is working every ounce in him for others.

Mr. D. HUNTER: How was he acting at the meeting?

Mr. HUXHAM: Pardon me, I am speaking of a matter which I think the hon. member ought to listen very quietly to. I am paying honour to a worthy man; and if the hon. member were to give me the chance of laying my views before the Chamber as readily as I gave him the chance when he was speaking the other day, he would only be doing me justice. However, if the hon. member will not do it, of course I must put up with it; but to go back to my subject. This old man—who can gain nothing

out of the social reforms which I hope will eventuate in this House at an early date—was honoured by the Workers' Political Organisation by being given a present as a mark of their affection; and to hear the hon. member for Woollongabba trying to bring that old gentleman into ridicule is one of the scandals which have been perpetrated in this Chamber during this debate, and at the present time—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in speaking of the action of hon. members as scandalous, or of being engaged in scandals.

Mr. HUXHAM: I do not wish to infringe the forms of the House, but I feel very warmly on the subject. I beg to withdraw the remark. I say this much: that for the hon. member for Woollongabba to have drawn attention particularly to this old gentleman in the manner he has done, does not reflect any credit upon the hon. member. But I wish to deal with the hon. member with regard to the unseemly remark he made in this Chamber the other day, when he referred to that meeting of Labour members and their wives. Let him slate us as much as he likes—that is a part of the game, everybody is open to criticism here, and we are prepared to return it—but I maintain that where the wives of members are dragged in, it is not a fair thing to the hon. member whom he is addressing, nor to the wife to whom he is referring, and if the hon. member were to repeat that remark to me outside in ridicule of my wife, then there would be "wigs on the green." (Laughter.)

Mr. D. HUNTER: I will go out now if you like.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am prepared to meet you any time you like.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member did not particularise any one's wife.

Mr. HUXHAM: The hon. member made it so openly, and the jeer was so marked, because the hon. member, when the remark was made, seemed to gloat over the fact that I resented a remark which did not refer to my wife but to wives generally. I sincerely hope that I shall never utter anything in this House attributing either by ridicule or imputation anything against the wives of members on the other side of the House.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Or any other.

Mr. HUXHAM: It was offensive and scandalous, and I resented it very much.

Mr. D. HUNTER: No one mentioned your wife.

Mr. HUXHAM: You did not, but it was so very broad that I very naturally took exception to it, and the hon. member did not apologise at the time; he simply went on as much as to say, "It shot home, and I have not very much compassion for you for having been present with your wife."

Mr. D. HUNTER: The shoe seems to fit.

Mr. HUXHAM: It is just as well to deal with that matter now, because I think anyone who takes advantage of his position as a member of this Chamber to refer to people at a public meeting, when he is afraid to deal with them outside, is guilty of political cowardice. He also took advantage of the forms and precedents of this House to utter remarks against a gentleman simply because his utterances were not in accord with those of the hon. member for Woollongabba. He referred to a contractor. One contractor came to me—there were two present—and he told me that the hon. member

Mr. Huxham.]

for Woolloongabba was one of those who had, in 1890, in a trades society desired to cut the painter from the old country and to go on his own.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is a fable.

Mr. BOWMAN: True, all the same.

Mr. HUXHAM: He separated from the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters simply because he wanted the superannuation scheme that was then in force to be set aside, and to start on your own.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You had better go on facts.

Mr. HUXHAM: I have simply got to take the statements of this contractor himself, because he worked with the hon. member for Woolloongabba at the time, and it was carried by a bare majority that the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters should remain intact and [4 p.m.] keep affiliated with the society at home. If the hon. member was so smart in his business himself that he could point out to this contractor what to do, it is a wonder that he never became a contractor himself.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Don't miss the point. The point is that he was opposed to increasing the wages.

Mr. HUXHAM: As a matter of fact, the contractor referred to denies that at any time he paid a lower rate of wages than the rate fixed here. The hon. member said that a man who worked for this contractor complained that he did not pay him the ruling rate of wages.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is not the point. Come to the point. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: I cannot come to the point more deliberately than that. (Hear, hear!) He told me that he never paid lower than the ruling rate of wages.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is not the point.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would draw the attention of the hon. member for Woolloongabba to the fact that this is a parliamentary debate. The hon. member has the right, with the permission of the House, to rise and make a personal explanation if he wishes to do so, but it is quite against the forms of the House to sit down and make a running commentary on the speech of an hon. member.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: I will not go further into that matter. I have no wish to say anything that is not true, nor do I wish to say anything that will hurt the hon. member in any sense, but what I do say is this: That a member of this House should be careful about uttering statements in this Chamber which he would not utter outside when he has not got the privilege of this House to protect him. That is only a fair thing. I think that the hon. member for Woolloongabba should take the earliest opportunity to adjust his disagreements with this contractor in a manly sort of way, and the thing would then be settled. However, I have done my duty to the contractor, because I have his word for it that he never paid lower than the ruling rate of wages.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I would like to say something on the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Do I understand that the hon. member for Woolloongabba is rising to make a personal explanation?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Just so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the hon. member wishes to refer to some statement in regard to himself which he wishes to correct.

[Mr. Huxham.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Yes, that is so. I just want to inform the hon. member for Brisbane South that I never said that this man paid a lower rate. What I said was that when we were fighting for an increase of wages this man was the chief opponent of it.

Mr. HUXHAM: I will leave that matter now. I have only done the right thing by the man who told me about it. I was dealing with the question of the coalition. I must say that from the time this coalition was formed until the present time it has had chunks knocked off it. Its main buttresses have been carried away; Ministers have left it, and members have left it, until we find the Government having but a bare majority.

Mr. BOWMAN: It wants a new lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. HUXHAM: At the present time it wants a most radical change in the Government, and there should be an early transfer—

Mr. MULLAN: There should be a new Government altogether.

Mr. HUXHAM: There should be a transfer of the Government from the Treasury benches to this side of the House. (Hear, hear!) I believe that, if that were done, the country would be on the high road to prosperity. We hear at the present time of what is proposed to be done. A programme has been laid before us by the Government which, I admit, is very nice on paper, and there are some things in it which one can appreciate very much, as, for instance, the new Licensing Bill, a Wages Boards Act Amendment Bill, a Workers' Dwellings Bill, a Trade Disputes Bill, a Pure Food and Drugs Bill, and a Mining on Private Lands Bill. These are all good Bills, and, if they contain principles which are acceptable to the members of the Labour party, they will receive the very best attention of members on this side.

Mr. MULCAHY: It depends on the form in which they are brought in.

Mr. HUXHAM: The programme, as it appears, is a good one; but we do not accept it at its face value. We had an experience of that during the last session of Parliament when a Workers' Dwellings Bill was brought in, and we know that that Bill was nothing but a sham. Such a Bill could not be accepted by this side of the House or by anyone who wanted to bring about a better state of affairs so far as the workers are concerned. According to that Bill anyone who wanted to put up a house valued at £200 would need to have £50 in cash, and he also would need to have land valued at something like £30, so that he would have to supply at least two-fifths of the value of the place himself. It was never intended that the Bill, as framed, should answer such a purpose as supplying workers with homes at a low interest charge.

Mr. BOWMAN: Nor as it was advocated by the Treasurer.

The TREASURER: It could have been amended in Committee. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: As a matter of fact, we found that the Bill was inimical to the interests of the building societies; we saw deputations coming to the Government desirous of laying their case before them, and as a result the Bill was withdrawn. I was pleased to see it withdrawn myself. What hope have we got that it will be introduced this session in any better form than it was last session? At the present time I do not think that the Government means any business in connection with that Bill.

The TREASURER : You will get an opportunity of dealing with it this session.

Mr. MITCHELL : I do not think so.

Mr. HUXHAM : Whatever party it comes from no one would welcome it more than the Labour party if it were acceptable to us in supplying good homes for the workers. The Government cannot be too radical in its legislation for us. It absolutely cannot be too radical. We are prepared to take it up as well as other Bills and make them as grand measures as the people could wish to have. But if this Workers' Dwellings Bill is to be of the same form as the one introduced last year, and the other Bills are to be dealt with similarly, then there is nothing in them that we can welcome. When I see the Government bringing forward such an elaborate programme as this it reminds me very much of the man who scattered his cheques about and people began to be annoyed at these cheques coming back to them, so that when he presented another cheque it was not taken at its full value as there was no assurance of security. So we value this programme in the same way. It is apparently a good one when you first look at it, but when you come to analyse it we find there is nothing in it to make us feel at all pleased with the manner in which the Government has brought them forward. We do not trust the Government in this matter, and it is because of that that we think an opportunity should be given to the people of having a new Government which will bring in measures in accordance with the people's needs. Now, as far as the Government is concerned, there are not only sins of commission, but also sins of omission, and that in a very marked degree. As far as the Trades Disputes Bill is concerned, I could not help being struck by a cutting that appeared in the *Telegraph* of the 18th November, last year. This is what it said—

It has been stated by good authority that the Trade Disputes Bill will not contain any reference whatever to the safeguarding of funds accumulated for political purposes.

I do not know if this is to apply to the Trade Disputes Bill of this session—but it is not to give the trades unions the same security that operates in the Trade Unions Bill of Great Britain; but, if it is not on all-fours with the provisions of the Bill in the old country, it will not be acceptable to this House. We have had experience in the past of unions being mulcted of their money because certain members have committed themselves unknown to the unions, and the funds have thereby become impoverished; and no measure that will not give the unions immunity in that respect will be acceptable to this side. I now wish to refer to certain matters in connection with the loan. We had an idea at the time it was floated that it would possibly be floated at a premium. It was stated in the Press that it was anticipated that the loan in the early part of this year would go off at par or at a premium; but, when the Premier told us the other afternoon that the loan netted no more than £94 lls. 6d., it is one of those matters that must be derided from this side. On making an analysis, we find that it is the worst result that has taken place since 1887. The loan in that year was a very bad one. When the loan of 1902 was floated there was a great song made about the hon. member for Townsville's non-success of his loan, and though the price only amounted to £92 we find that the average went up remarkably well—it reached £95 16s. At the time that loan was floated things were exceedingly bad, and although much extravagance had taken place during the period of the continuous Government, I cannot blame the

1909—v

hon. member for Townsville, who was then Premier, for the non-success of that loan, because it was an unfortunate time to borrow. It must be borne in mind that we pay for the underwriting of our loan, and at the time this last loan was floated the condition of the London money market was not bad. If the Secretary for Lands were present, I would like to tell him he was in error in saying that the condition of the money market was bad. It was bad only to the State, because it was forced on the London money market, with the result that the subscribing public only came forward to take up 16 per cent. of the loan. When the hon. member for Nundah was speaking, the Treasurer interjected that the Canadian and Indian loans were worse, but that is not the case. Canada floated a loan of £6,500,000, which panned out at £98 10s., and the underwriters only had to take up 55 per cent.

The TREASURER : It did not pan out as well as that.

Mr. HUXHAM : That means that the subscribing public were willing to take up 45 per cent. which is absolutely favourable considering the higher price paid, and the confidence they had in the loan floated.

The TREASURER : It was a 3½ per cent. loan.

Mr. HUXHAM : No; it was a 3½ per cent. loan. I admit that the Canadian Government floated their loan on different lines; but that is a matter that could operate here by making the bonds sufficiently small for the general public to take them up. It would be an absolute saving to the State; and even if it were not a saving it is far better to encourage the local people to invest in the stock we have to offer, and so keep both interest and capital in the place. I wish now to say a word with reference to our finances generally. We find that Queensland at the present time is the only State that has not a sinking fund. I know that the question of a sinking fund does not appeal to hon. members generally; and one member has asked, "What are you going to do with your money if you establish a sinking fund—are you going to dig a hole in the ground and bury it?" A sinking fund is never used for that purpose. A sinking fund is established for the purpose of paying off loans as they mature. In five or six years we shall have loans maturing to the extent of something like £15,000,000; and it seems businesslike that we should provide a fund from which to meet those loans as they become due. We know that the Westralian Government has done good business as far as a sinking fund is concerned. She accumulated £2,000,000, but did not dig a hole and bury that money. What she does is to go into the London money market, and when her stock is floating about she takes it up at varying discounts up to 14 per cent. It means that she is simply buying back stock that she has floated, thereby improving her status in the money market. The debt interest per head of population is lower in Western Australia than in any other State in the Commonwealth, and considering the satisfactory results achieved by the establishment of a sinking fund, we cannot do better than follow her example. There are three reasons why a sinking fund should be established: Firstly, it is businesslike; secondly, it is expedient; and, thirdly, it is honest. In times of stress the man who has conducted his business on sound lines more readily obtains credit than the man who has not been so businesslike; and we should do in connection with the business of the State what we do in connection with our own business, and make ample provision in good times for times of crises. We float a loan for a term of fifty

Mr. Huxham.]

years. Some hon. members may say, "It is all very well, but at the end of fifty years we can renew the loan." But we might strike a very bad time at the end of that period. There were numerous financial crises and panics during the last century, and between 1866 and the present time Queensland herself has passed through several crises, and we should take warnings from the lessons of the past. During the year 1907 there was a terrible financial crisis which affected the money market of the world. Compared with the prices in 1897, British consols fell from 112½ to 86; French rentes from 102½ to 95; German funds from 96 to 86; Indian consols from 96 to 77½; and New South Wales stocks from 106½ to 95. That is, the respective falls were £26, £7, £10, £19, and £11. In Queensland we had a terrible time in 1866, and the Government of the day wanted to float some £300,000 worth of interminable "greenbacks." In 1890 money was tight, and we know how badly the State fared in 1893. I am well within the mark when I say that we are just recovering now from the effects of the crisis of 1893. If you were to go up and down Queen street at the present time, I am perfectly satisfied that 90 per cent. of the small shopkeepers—not those in a large way of business—would tell you that things were never so bad as now.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Business people always say that.

Mr. HUXHAM: Considering that I have been trading for some years, I can say that I had a better time in 1894 and 1895 than at the present time. That is simply because competition is now so keen and bitter, and those men who have to meet their engagements by buying locally force people who are in a better way to come down to their low prices, so that things are very bad indeed as far as the small shopkeepers are concerned.

Mr. THORN: The one-man shopkeepers that you are crushing.

Mr. HUXHAM: The hon. member cannot mention one man who can point the finger at me.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: He doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am sure the hon. member for Aubigny does not make that statement from knowledge, but from imagination. I get on remarkably well with the small shopkeepers, because I have been a struggling man for too many years myself to have anything but sympathy for the small shopkeepers, and also with people who are earning wages, and I sincerely hope that my feelings in this direction will not alter as the years go by. I would impress upon the Government the necessity, in connection with the flotation of future loans, for making provision for the times of crisis that we must expect. It is just as well that I should read the extract from the *Telegraph*, from which I have obtained the figures I have already quoted in reference to the fall in the value of securities. The paper is dated 26th March, 1907—

Cable news concerning the condition of the world's money market points to the rapid ripening of a crisis.

Then it gave the fall in the "gilt-edged" securities in the ten years between 1897 and 1907 to which I have already alluded. Our underwriters are the Bank of England. Just imagine what may occur within the next five years. There are rumours of war, and war may break out at any moment—I am not going to say in what direction—but it may break out at any moment owing to the severe tension between European nations. Supposing that this eventu-

ates within five years, what will be our position if we have then to go upon the London money market to renew maturing loans? I have prepared a very interesting table from the very best authorities, showing how the Bank of England rate of discount has fluctuated. In 1844 the rate rose to 8 per cent.; in 1857 to 9 per cent.; between 1861 and 1864, during the time the American Civil War was raging, it ranged from 8 per cent. to 9 per cent.; in 1865 it was 7 per cent.; in 1866 it was 10 per cent.; and in 1873, 9 per cent. Although I am only a Queenslander by adoption, and not by birth, like the Home Secretary, neither the hon. gentleman nor the most devoted native-born Queenslander or Australian loves this country more than I do.

It is because I have the welfare [4.30 p.m.] of the State at heart that I believe it is right for us to consider the necessity of putting the State in a strong position, so that when a time of depression comes we shall be found to have sufficient reserve strength in ourselves, and so that by providing a sinking fund to meet our loans when they mature we shall be able to show people in London that we have dealt honestly with our finances and are a people in whom they can have confidence when we desire to borrow more money. There is another matter to which I should also refer, and that is the present system of immigration. This is a matter which has given rise to a great deal of discussion. Some hon. members say that we should secure an influx of immigrants, while others say, as members of the Labour party do, that immigrants should not be brought out in the manner in which they are being brought here by the Government. Immigrants are assisted to come here from the old country, and then they leave the place at the earliest opportunity. For instance, two immigrants who came to my own electorate, after staying two months skipped off to Sydney. In another case which has been brought under my notice, a man paid his passage home, where he has gone to be married, and, before going, he made arrangements for his wife and himself to be nominated as immigrants. That is the class of immigrants we are bringing to Queensland. We allow them to go home, and then pay their passages for them to come back. There is great room for improvement in that connection, and also in regard to the general quality of the immigrants who are introduced. Another case has been brought under my notice in which a first-class engine-driver with his daughter were brought out as immigrants. He was unable to get employment as an engine-driver or at any other work, and his daughter, who is a matured woman, is working in a city shop for the paltry sum of 4s. a week. Under such conditions as those, can anyone say that this place is ripe for an influx of immigrants, or even for the number that are coming at the present time? Let us absorb the labour we have here now before we introduce other labourers. Let us profit by the experience of older countries which have been introducing immigrants for a number of years back. The experience of America has been that if they had left their population to increase in a natural way, instead of bringing out immigrants from other lands, they would have had nearly the same population as they have to-day. In 1790 America had a population of 4,000,000, and in 1830, notwithstanding the small number of immigrants introduced, the population had increased to 14,000,000. As a matter of fact, these increases which are brought about by the introduction of immigrants are detrimental to the country, as the introduction of people from the old land simply dislocates our industrial and social conditions. The result is that people who are already in the country are

[Mr. Huxham.

alslutely driven out of employment in order that others may get work. As I have pointed out, the Americans have found that if they had allowed their increase of population to spring from the loins of the American people it would have been almost as great as it is at the present time with all their immigration. That is the opinion of officials who have studied this matter very closely. One of the superintendents of census in America has pointed out that, if the number of immigrants introduced were deducted from the total population, it would be found that in the years 1880, 1890, 1900 the actual increases was practically little more than the natural increase would have been during those years. The increase for those years, after deducting immigrants, was 25, 10, and 5 per cent. respectively. We are a young country, with under 600,000 people, so that we have the opportunity to grapple with this problem effectively, and it will be a wise thing for us to grapple with it, because the longer we delay doing so the more difficult will it become. I think we should seek to make the people now here sufficiently comfortable, to increase their material prosperity, and to depend upon our native-born people rather than upon immigrants who are brought here in a wholesale manner, dislocating the different lines of trade, and making our native-born outcasts in the community. If we do not grapple with this problem, the native-born themselves will do so. There are more native-born Australians in the Commonwealth than there are people who are not native-born, and they will recognise that it is not a good thing to allow their patrimony to be taken from them by people from other lands, as has been the case in America, where Britishers, Germans, Hungarians, and Poles have driven the native-born from their different means of livelihood. If the Home Secretary will consider this matter in the proper light, he will see that what we ought to do is to consider the welfare of the native-born before the welfare of immigrants. We have had the opinion of experts in regard to the physique of our men. No one can shut his eyes to the fact disclosed by Commander Blunt, when he stated that so many of our men were below the standard required for men to man the navy, and the opinion he then expressed is worth considering. Similar trouble exists in the old country. We may be sure that we are not getting the very best kind of people from the old country, where they need their best as much as we do. We are rather getting the outcasts of the old country—it is people whom the old country is glad to get rid of. I hope, therefore, as a result of wise counsels prevailing, there shall be at least a reduction in the number of immigrants coming to this State. The conditions are not good, and I hope there will be more care shown in the selection of the class of men coming out, and that they will not come out in such large numbers. There is another matter I wish to deal with—I am going to deal with it very briefly as the matter was dealt with by my colleague—that is, the appointment of inspector of schools. As to the appointment of Mr. Roe, I have to admit, from what I know of that gentleman, he is both a scholar and gentleman. Nobody has spoken against him in that respect, but at the same time I would rather have the opinion of my colleague in this matter than the opinion of any hon. member as to the treatment meted out to those public servants who have served in the department so faithfully and well. What could have been the motive that these gentlemen should have been overlooked I cannot understand. I am perfectly satisfied that men who have lived into the affairs of the department, as Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Shirley have done, that

their experience would have gone far to make the working of the department run more smoothly than a stranger brought in as Mr. Roe has been.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There was no motive whatever.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am not saying there is, but I do say that a large department—an intricate department such as the Education Department—would benefit very considerably by the experience of those gentlemen, who have served in the department for many years, and who know all its details—that they could have devised better plans for its working than a stranger.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I can satisfactorily explain all that you have mentioned.

Mr. KERR: You cannot explain it.

Mr. HUXHAM: I cannot see the reason of the condition that the man appointed should necessarily have a Master of Arts degree, because, if I know anything of the value of degrees, I suppose that the Bachelor of Sciences degree of the London University would be equal to an M.A. degree of Oxford or Cambridge University; and even then I do not see any reason why this question of degree should have been raised at all. It does not follow that a man lacks knowledge simply because he has not an M.A. degree. Take our legal profession, for instance. How many of the successful men have taken degrees in the Universities? Comparatively few. Again, as far as members of this House are concerned, how many of us have taken degrees? But we are all men of common sense. If you are going to value University degrees unduly, all you would have to do is to run to the Southern Universities and pick out the young men there and say, "You are just the sort of men to run the country, because you have University degrees." It has been my experience, as far as degrees are concerned—mind you, I do not decry education—I should like to have had a University education myself—but I do say this: I have seen far smarter men who had only passed through the ordinary schools than I have seen men who have had tacked on to them the M.A. or B.A. degree. In fact, there is a rather unfortunate man in the city at present, who took honours in the Dublin University, and he cannot get more than £1 10s. per week all the year round, and if the Minister desires to get a man who could be of great assistance to him, with high qualifications, I can recommend this gentleman to him. I shall be very pleased to bring him along, so that he can be appointed private secretary to any of the Ministers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Can you recommend him?

Mr. HUXHAM: Yes, I can highly recommend him. I think my colleague, the junior member for Brisbane South, dealt with this matter generously and with ability, and in the future, if there is anything to be given in the shape of rewards, the native-born Queenslander should be considered, whether they have degrees or not. Those who have grown old in the service of the State should be the ones first considered in the matter of any preferment, rather than looking to outsiders to fill these high positions that are at the offering of the Government. I have taken up sufficient time of the House, and I hope that as a result of this no-confidence debate the hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches will have to move to this side of the House. (Hear, hear!) I do not say this with any personal feeling, but it would be for the good of the State if we could make an early transfer of the gentlemen who are now on the Treasury bench to seats on the Opposition.

Mr. Huxham.]

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I do not wish to protract the congratulations, at the same time I should be very sorry indeed to be the only member of the House to refrain from extending to you, Mr. Speaker, the congratulations that you deserve. Indeed, I feel sure there is a very much larger number of hon. members in the House than the vote indicated who are favourable to your elevation to the high position which you so eminently fill. In fact, you have already given the very best evidence of your ability to conduct the duties which have to do with the Chair. I would also like to say my sympathies go out to those who have suffered loss by the death of your predecessor—a gentleman who filled so satisfactorily to this House the high position to which he was called. I am sure of this: from the opening ceremony—from the opening service to the closing of the House—no fault whatever could be found; but the highest appreciation went forth from every individual in this House for the way in which he conducted the business. To the relatives of my good friend, the late Mr. Campbell, I also extend my greatest sympathy. This afternoon we have again listened to some criticisms on the present position of affairs from the hon. junior member for Brisbane South.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Senior member.

Mr. HUXHAM: I wish to add, Mr. Speaker, that I am the senior member for Brisbane South. I would like the distinction made between senior and junior, so that there can be no confusion, as otherwise Mr. Airey might be saddled with a lot of my misdemeanours, and I should be very sorry.

The SPEAKER: I do not recall the figures, but of course the hon. member who received the highest number of votes is the senior member.

Mr. HUXHAM: That is my position—the senior member.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am exceedingly sorry that I made the slight error; I was under the impression that Mr. Airey was the senior member. I wish to refer to the fact that the hon. member seemed to dwell on the fact that the country was suffering at the present time, and is likely to suffer in the future, in consequence of the present party retaining the Treasury benches. Well, certainly the ordinary observer can scarcely be misled. It will be odd reasoning indeed to imagine that a party so strangely divided as the Opposition, so strangely made up, could carry on the affairs of the country to greater advantage than a party which is united and stable.

Mr. KERR: Are you united over there?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Yes; undoubtedly so. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: You make me smile.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: We stand thirty-six strong, and certainly thirty-six against thirty-five—

Mr. KERR: What if someone takes one of them away?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: We are loyal and true. Just imagine, on one point alone, the strange arguments that are presented by the hon. gentlemen opposite, who would array themselves before us as a solid body. Take the arguments we have just listened to regarding immigration! Compare them with the effusions of the hon. senior member for Toowoomba and other members on the opposite side, and you can scarcely imagine that the party holding views so diverse would ever have the temerity to think that they could occupy to advantage the Treasury benches of this House.

[*Mr. G. P. Barnes.*

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I would like to congratulate the leader of the Opposition on the manner in which he framed his remarks in his criticisms—in the way he brought forward his no-confidence motion. I am sure we notice the very much higher tone adopted by the leader of the Opposition in those criticisms, and I am sure he set an example which should be emulated, and this House would be the better for it. However, the leader of the Opposition admitted that the Government had a big programme, but apparently he and others affected to believe that the Government are insincere in their desire to carry out the various proposals in that programme.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is where they are wrong.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Yes, and I am going to prove that not only are their statements totally and wholly discredited, but I am going to prove that, at the very moment when objections of that kind are being raised, the Government are in the act of carrying out that policy in its entirety. A fear seems to have been expressed, and to have seized some people, that, on account of the fusion of the parties, the country was going to lose thereby, and that instead of democratic and progressive legislation, we would have stagnation. Why, if this had been the case—if this had been the object of the Philp party—it surely could have been accomplished by other means, and certainly by means which would not have meant the loss to the old Philp party of political prestige. There would have been other means of doing that, but we ourselves know, and every man who joined the Government is aware, that we were altogether animated by a motive distinctly higher than that. Our motive simply was that we realised that the intentions of the country, the common good, were going to be served by carrying out the idea of fusion. An interjection comes now and then that the Government cannot rely on the support of those who have taken this action. All I can say is that, so long as the programme of the Government is carried out, so long as evidence is given that the Government are prepared to do good work for the country, so long can they rely upon and depend upon the support of every man who came over from the opposite side and joined them. Why, we were returned to do business, and I think that the sole object of the members making up the one whole undivided party is to do stable and useful work for the country. We have no other object or aim than of serving the country by developing our various resources, and of raising up a prosperous and a contented people, and so long as evidence is forthcoming in this direction, so long will the supporters of the Government stand true to them.

Mr. KERR: Is this the burial service?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: This is not the burial service. I think, if I am not mistaken, the interjector has possibly performed that service more than once.

Mr. KERR: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: At any rate, politically, he certainly has performed his own burial service; and it is a pity that the sleep [5 p.m.] of the dead, politically, has not overtaken the hon. member. Regarding the obstructive tactics, those tactics are going to have the effect of binding more closely together those who have formed the compact that we now see. At any rate, I have stated before, and I state it again, that we stand thirty-

six strong. How can an Opposition of thirty-five, made up of all sorts and kinds, be likely to do better work for the country than thirty-six who are solid and stable and true.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

MR. MANN : We will now sing the Doxology. (Laughter.)

MR. G. P. BARNES : In one particular, no doubt, and it is only in one particular in which the Opposition, who occupy a different platform, are solid, and that one particular is to—

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : Down Kidston.

MR. G. P. BARNES : To down the Premier. You can find no general expression of union which can lead you to conclude otherwise than that their main object—their main aim—is simply to down one man. But in other respects—in the party, or the three parties—you can discover no political affinity. You cannot do it. I have looked them up and down, and there is no affinity to be found between them in any sense. There is no agreement between the Opposition proper and the independent Opposition, who are made up of sections and sub-sections—possibly of no section at all—and it is impossible for us to conceive that these gentlemen can present a united front. Well, what can the people think of men thus using the positions they occupy in this House for the purpose of downing another man. They begun by seceding—

MR. AIRRY : No, no !

MR. G. P. BARNES : What do the people think of those hon. members who were returned to this place to carry out what was supposed to be for the country's good. The question really comes to one, "Is it possible that portfolios in many cases would have made any difference?" (Government laughter.) There would not have been the least objection to the Premier then. He would have been the best man in the world then in the eyes of some members if they had been elevated to some position which some of their fellows now enjoy.

MR. MACKINTOSH : Hear, hear !

MR. G. P. BARNES : The matter of the defection does not alter the feeling of the country one iota. The seceding members had their remedy. They should have gone to the country. They should have gone to their constituents, and if they felt that their constituents were in sympathy with them, they need not have possessed the slightest fear as to what the consequences would have been. They could have gone to their constituents in confidence, and they would have known what the result would have been ; but in no instance throughout the length and breadth of the State—not in one electorate of the seventy-two—have the electors spontaneously risen either to express themselves as opposed to the programme of the Premier, or to the Premier in person, or to the fusion of the two parties on the Government side.

MR. COYNE : Did they express themselves in favour of it.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : Yes.

MR. G. P. BARNES : A majority of their representatives have expressed themselves in favour of it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

MR. G. P. BARNES : And the Press of the State pretty well, with a few exceptions, have expressed themselves as favourable to it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

MR. BARBER : The boodle Press.

MR. G. P. BARNES : Here and there hon. gentlemen have tried to stir up feeling in their various electorates, and we know that in almost every instance where an attempt has been made—and they have even gone into other electorates—but where the attempt has been made to stir up feeling—to try to feel the pulse of the people—they have altogether failed in their desire.

MR. MACKINTOSH : They will fail again, too.

MR. G. P. BARNES : The absurdity of talking about the programme of the parties being conserved by the fusion of the Philp and Kidston parties can well be imagined. It is too ridiculous. The absurdity of this is seen in the fact that not only have we got the programme before us, but it is seen in the fact that some of the Bills are already before the House ; it is seen in the fact that the programme is at present being carried out, and it is seen, because it is understood that the desire of the Government is to do useful work for the country. The charge apparently is that the Philp party, who walked over here to help them, are indirectly going to obstruct the carrying out of the policy, which is admittedly a good one—a big one the leader of the Opposition called it—but it is a good one for the country. The gentlemen, in particular, who walked across the House—they, and they alone, are the true obstructionists.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear ;

MR. G. P. BARNES : The Kidston party were returned to support the Rockhampton programme, and the Philp party were returned to support the Townsville programme, and it was common property at the time that the two policies were so near to each other that you could scarcely tell one from the other.

MR. KENNA : Neither of those programmes has any lawful visible means of support. (Opposition laughter.)

MR. G. P. BARNES : I will show you the support that is being accorded to them. It is not on paper alone, but the support that is accorded to them may be seen every day of our lives. Good work is going on. Such development is visible to our eyes as we have not witnessed in this land before. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the electors of the State have approved of the Kidston and Philp policies. Two-thirds of the members of this House, if true to their election pledges, and if true to their caucus pledges—

MR. MANN : Have you got caucus pledges ?

MR. G. P. BARNES : Would be striving to give effect to the people's wishes to-day.

MR. MANN (*Cairns*) : I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Warwick in order in reading his speech to the House ?

THE SPEAKER : If the hon. member for Warwick is reading his speech to the House he is certainly out of order. (Hear, hear!) But I confess that I should like to have some evidence of it before I ask him to discontinue.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

MR. G. P. BARNES : I admit that I have got copious notes—(Opposition laughter)—but I should be very sorry indeed if I could not add my own opinions as I go along. It is singular that the hon. member who has interjected should find fault with me in this particular direction, and that he should be so blind as not to see the attitude of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, and who preceded me in this debate. He had notes equally as voluminous as my own. It suits the hon. member for Cairns in one case to deprecate my attitude, but he is

Mr. G. P. Barnes. }

altogether blind and ignorant when it comes to anything that proceeds from his own side of the House.

Mr. KENNA: That settles it.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The wonder that strikes most people who gaze at what has taken place, is how hon. gentlemen who profess allegiance to party, who practically pledged themselves to the support of the party—how they can reconcile their actions, their course of conduct, in not trying to sustain the Government in carrying out their policy. The hon. member for Cook the other evening attempted, but completely failed, to justify his change of front. In November last, when the Government had trouble in obtaining Supply, he then said, as will be seen in *Hansard* for 1908, page 140—

For that reason, I hold that the Government as at present constituted should be supported by a majority of members of this House.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, we were discussing at this particular time a motion not altogether identical, but almost identical, with the motion being discussed now; and this is what the hon. member for Cook said then—

In saying that I do not imply anything detrimental to the Labour party. I do not wish to labour this question. I rose merely to explain the position I find myself in with regard to the amendment before the House. Arguments have been brought forward in support of the amendment which I cannot assent to. The present constitution of the Government may not be entirely satisfactory to some members sitting on this side of the House, but it has the approval of the majority; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to give it my loyal support—more particularly in view of the financial difficulties we have to face in connection with the Federal Parliament. When measures such as the Trade Disputes Bill come before us for consideration we shall, no doubt, be able to put them through. After all, democratic measures are very often given by what may be termed Conservative Governments.

Mr. NEVITT: Will you give them?

Mr. DOUGLAS: I fully believe they will be given by the Government. There is not much more I wish to say. I have endeavoured to give my view of the position, and when the division bell rings I will support the present Ministry.

That is what the hon. member said in November last, and later than that the hon. member was found in every division, pretty well, that took place, backing up the loyalty which he at that time professed. The senior member for Toowoomba admitted in his speech the other night that he had in caucus advocated coalition; and if hon. members will look at *Hansard* of this session, page 63, they will find this—

Mr. REDWOOD: Here let me say that I have been accused throughout the country of being at that meeting a very warm advocate for the coalition.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: So you were.

Mr. REDWOOD: At that meeting I said that I believed in William Kidston, that I believed in our leader, that the last session had been a most productive one in good legislation for the country, and that I saw no reason to desert our chief. I also said that if the Philp party were all behind the Kidston party as Kidstonites, accepting our policy, and accepting our leader, William Kidston, or rather the Premier, it would be a good thing for the country. What was the result? Mr. Kidston gave us no alternative, remember. He simply said, "If you do not accept this, you can get a new leader." That was the alternative given to us.

And this statement is confirmed, for in December last the fusion of parties had taken place; and after the formation of the Cabinet, after the retirement of three members of the late Cabinet, the hon. member spoke as follows—in December last:—

Mr. REDWOOD: He was very pleased indeed to see this vote of £50,000 placed on the Estimates. Personally, he should like to see more. He had always been a very keen advocate for immigration, believing that it was absolutely imperative to populate this great State. It

was with very keen satisfaction that he saw the Government were dealing with the matter in a very earnest manner. He honestly thought that the present Ministry would do their best to advance settlement by immigration, land settlement, and railway construction.

Further on he said—

The question of immigration was discussed in Toowoomba, and a scheme was unanimously carried which was backed up by both the local papers. That scheme was submitted to the Premier, and in it they advocated strongly the introduction of a desirable class of settlers. He was pleased the Government had carried out the Franco-British Exhibition exhibit. It was an excellent advertisement for Queensland, and it was time the people of Queensland realised the fact that they had to settle this country or else somebody else would. No reasonable man could show him by logical arguments how the influx of desirable people was going to interfere with the present rate of wages. The more people they brought here, the more work there would be for labour, provided they were placed on the land if possible when they got here.

Mr. MULCAHY: Hear, hear! That's the point.

Mr. REDWOOD: That was a very important factor, and it was receiving the earnest consideration of the Government. Likewise the Premier showed he was thoroughly alive to his position by sending Mr. Graham, of the Lands Department, to Canada to find out the excellent methods that were adopted there for settling their immigrants on the land.

Such were the ideas of the senior member for Toowoomba no later than the last sitting, pretty well, of the last session of this Parliament.

Mr. REDWOOD: What's wrong about that?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: There was nothing wrong about that, only this—and that makes a very big wrong: The hon. gentleman then supported the party on this side of the House; he professed to believe in their policy; he said he was loyal to the party, and he proved his loyalty by voting with them; but he has now walked across the floor of the House.

Mr. REDWOOD: I have not said a word against that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: My point is that in December last the Premier and his party enjoyed the confidence of the hon. member—

Mr. REDWOOD: Exactly; but they do not enjoy it now.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I want to know what has happened since to cause any reaction in the feelings of the hon. member.

Mr. REDWOOD: Well, I admit that something has happened.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I desire to say to the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba that it is his parliamentary duty to observe my calls to order, and it is quite out of order for him to make a running commentary on the speech of another hon. member.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Every hon. member applauds the ideas that the hon. member gave expression to in December last with regard to immigration, land settlement, and railway construction. Those are the cardinal points upon which the hon. member dwelt so strongly then and on many other occasions. I remember reading a speech which he delivered before the Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce one or two years ago in which he dilated at considerable length upon these matters, and I applauded him, and every other man must applaud him.

Mr. REDWOOD: But I have not changed.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The action of the Government in these matters is faultless.

Mr. MANN: Even the Government themselves do not believe in their immigration policy.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

Mr. MANN: They do not believe in the scalp money system.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: If the hon. member is not satisfied with the action of the Government in this respect during the last six months, then it will be exceedingly difficult to satisfy him. In 1905, 114 immigrants were introduced into Queensland; in 1906, 379; in 1907, 655; in 1908, 1,153; and for the first six months of this year, and up to 21st July—including the "Waipara" immigrants—no less than 2,431 have landed or are about to land on our shores from the old country.

Mr. MANN: Where are they to-day?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They are everywhere. I am fortunate in having one of them in my employ, and certainly a finer fellow I have never come across. For the four years ending on 31st December, 1908, 2,301 immigrants arrived, whilst this year, including those about to land from the "Waipara," the number is 2,431; so that on that score the hon. member for Toowoomba should be immensely satisfied. Then take land settlement—another point on which the hon. member laid great stress. The area selected in 1908 was five times greater than the area selected in 1903. For the first five months of this year the area selected was 350,000 acres more than the area selected during the first five months of last year. Taking the figures for the six months ending 31st May, during the three years I am about to compare, the area selected in 1907 was 1,464,815 acres; in 1908, 2,385,971 acres; and for the six months ending 31st May of this year, 2,861,866 acres; or 475,895 acres more than the area selected in the previous year. The revenue received is equally favourable. For the three different periods it was £11,015 10s. 10d., £16,515 12s. 6d., and £20,821 4s. 7d.

Mr. JONES: There was a decrease in agricultural settlement.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I believe that is so, but who will object to that decrease being more than made up by the increase in grazing selection? Is it not a fact that, unless we construct more railways, it is impossible to secure agricultural settlement? The Under Secretary for Lands, in his report two years ago, stated that, in order to continue to carry out settlement as fast as we had been doing, we must build more railways. In regard to railway construction, for the years 1904 to 31st March, 1908, the mileage of new lines opened totalled 362 miles. From April, 1908, to the present time we have authorised a total mileage of 586 miles, and most of the lines are now under construction. In addition to that, we have been informed that some 400 miles more are proposed to be added this session, the plans of some of the new lines having been already laid on the table of the House. At the end of 1907 we had 3,400 miles of railway in the State, and the figures I have just enumerated show another 1,000 miles within the last eighteen months. Why, that is a mighty act! That is a wonderful accomplishment! That is a gigantic proposal! However much hon. members opposite may depreciate what has been done, to me it is a truly marvellous thing that we should, in a short eighteen months, add to our railway mileage new lines equal to about 30 per cent. of the mileage already constructed. On the grounds I have already referred to—on the ground of carrying out ideas so dear to the heart of the senior member for Toowoomba—no possible complaint can be made against the Government. In our memory, we have never witnessed the carrying-out of a policy which means so much material advancement and development.

Instead of obstructing that policy, the hon. member should lend a hand to carry out a policy of such high importance to the country. The question should be: Is the policy outlined in the programme of the Government satisfactory to the country, and is there any evidence—is there sufficient evidence—

Mr. MACKINTOSH: None whatever.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Yes, in the direction I am speaking of there is abundant evidence that that policy is being carried out. The speech of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba and the speeches of many other [5.30 p.m.] members who have spoken in this debate simply express distrust and disappointment. I maintain—and this is the great point which should be made—that if there was sufficient in the promise given in December last that certain things would be done to warrant their loyalty and support, then the activity shown in the carrying out of that promise, as evidenced by immigrants arriving, by land being settled, and by railways being constructed, is surely enough to warrant whole-hearted support being given by those gentlemen to the policy of the Government. But we have other evidences that the Government are alive to the necessities of the State. In the speech delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor we read—

Two years ago funds were provided for the appointment of a staff of engineers for the surveying of some of our principal river basins, and collecting such other data as would be necessary before we could properly utilise the services of an expert in water conservation, and I am glad to be able to say that so much progress has been made with the work that my advisers are now taking steps to secure the services of such an expert.

I have long advocated the conservation of water, believing that water conservation is a matter of the highest importance in a country like this, subject to such varying climatic conditions. All the greatest countries in the world have given, and are giving, their first consideration and foremost attention to the subject of water conservation, and the results of their efforts are truly wonderful. In India, Egypt, and the United States untold wonders have been accomplished in this connection, and in the sister States of New South Wales and Victoria we find that success has attended their efforts to store water for irrigation purposes—a success which is truly striking and truly wonderful. While I do not wish to detain the House unnecessarily, the great importance of this subject leads me to quote an extract from a lecture delivered by the Victorian expert, Mr. Ellwood Mead. He says—

The new pump at Koondrook will supply four times as much water as the one it displaces. At Cohuna the water supply was doubled last year, and it needs to be doubled again, for closer settlement and better methods of cultivation only wait on an ample supply of water. In these districts alone a great irrigation development is being made possible. If it succeeds, think of the broader opportunity it opens up to the home-seekers of the State. The average size of the holdings in the older districts is over 500 acres. On this basis White Cliffs would provide farms for only ten families; on the closer settlement plan it provides farms for more than 100 families. I have no fears of the result. I have seen too many prosperous districts of this character in other lands to have any misgivings, but those who doubt need not look elsewhere to be reassured. The prosperity of the 20-acre farm at Mildura, where water costs 30s. an acre; the value of the 10-acre farms at Baccinus Marsh, where land sells for £100 an acre; or the profits from the 10-acre orchards and gardens of the Coliban system, shows that Victoria is to be no exception to the experience of other countries). These three districts, widely separated, differing widely in soil, and only alike in having small farm units and good cultivation, have land values higher and social conditions better than in many of the districts where holdings are large, although in some of the latter the soil and climate are equally good, and water for irrigation is much cheaper.

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

I have no objection to large holdings under irrigation if the owner will spend the money and employ the labour required to grade and cultivate these holdings as irrigated land should be cultivated. But there is a decided objection to the State building costly storage works and then losing the water they hold, carrying it past unirrigated land, or having it wasted on land poorly prepared. The value of water in irrigation is measured by the crop it produces. One of the most unfortunate features of Northern irrigation is that more than half of the water is now applied to the irrigation of native grass. If to this is added the lucerne grown for pasture the percentage becomes considerably more than half. We are, therefore, operating a system, costly to build and maintain, to grow the poorest possible crops in the crudest possible way. If we are to have 500,000 people in these Northern districts we must begin growing crops of higher acreage value. The opportunities to do this under irrigation are remarkable. Last summer I kept notes of the returns from the different crops, and here are some of the results: The tomatoes grown on 6 acres near EchUCA sold for £800. The tomatoes grown on 3 acres near this city sold for £700. The lucerne hay from one farm sold for £33 an acre; from another farm for £26 an acre. The irrigated part of a wheat field yielded eight bags; the unirrigated part yielded three bags. The value of native grass cannot be fixed definitely, but no estimate was over £1 per acre. Now, it took as much water to irrigate an acre of grass as it did to irrigate an acre of tomatoes, but the crop from 1 acre of tomatoes was worth the crop from 130 acres of grass.

I should like to read also a letter which I have received from Mr. Elwood Mead in connection with this matter. It was my good fortune to meet him in Melbourne some few months back, and I asked him for information on the subject of water conservation and irrigation. He writes as follows:—

Dear Sir,—In compliance with the promise made to you and Senator McCall, I am sending you, under separate cover, a number of reports on irrigation matters published by the United States Department of Agriculture while I was in charge of that work, and abstracts from two addresses dealing with the situation here.

While these papers may not apply directly to your conditions, I hope they will prove suggestive. The story of California's misfit water laws at least carries a warning you ought to heed. The almost invariable mistake in irrigation development is to leave the framing of water laws until after considerable money has been spent and time lost in abortive experiments.

One feature in Victoria's experience is of value to Queensland. The attempt to develop irrigation where land is in private ownership and in large holdings has proved a failure, and it will continue to be a failure until conditions are created suited to intensive cultivation. The experience of Victoria was the same experience as that of the United States. So far as I am informed, the attempt to develop irrigation, where the land was under one ownership and the canal under another, has proved a failure. In every case the owners of the land either refused to use water, or combined to force down prices for its delivery below the cost of operation. When the Federal Government of the United States began, in 1902, the construction of irrigation works it refused to irrigate private lands until the owner had mortgaged them to the Government for a proportionate share of the cost of the works, and, in addition, had entered into a written obligation to subdivide those lands and sell them in tracts not to exceed 160 acres. If this has not been done in five years the Government itself is authorised to make the subdivision and sell the lands for whatever they will bring.

I regard the policy of purchasing the estate by the Government and their subdivision into small holdings as the most hopeful and necessary feature of irrigation development in this State. The first step in your State of the framing of a water law should be to acquire the ownership of the land to be irrigated. Then the money spent on canals either enhances the State's own property or that of the purchaser from the State. Another essential benefit of State ownership of the land to be irrigated is that the settlers can be selected from those who want to irrigate and who are willing to conform to needed regulations. The large landowner who does not want to irrigate is a constant source of trouble.

I am, etc.,

ELWOOD MEAD.

G. P. Barnes, Esq., M.L.A., Glen Brae, Warwick, Queensland.

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

I make no apology for reading that very fine letter. It will certainly guide us in connection with any move we may make in this particular way.

Mr. JONES: It is very largely in favour of the nationalisation of land.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No; it is not exactly that—it is in favour of the small holder. It is pointing out that the small selector can do as well upon a small area with irrigation as he can if he were to take up a very much larger area without irrigation. It is pointing out the value of intense cultivation, and the wisdom of the country having that land in their own hands before they attempt to give it to the people in this way. The hon. member for Warrego, in his speech the other night, referred to another aspect of the subject, and with which I think every party in this House should be in the fullest sympathy. But in this particular direction, when figures are sought, I find that good work is being done. The Government are engaged in good work in this way. During 1908 no less than eleven bores and seven wells were sunk, and from the 1st January this year till 30th June, nine bores and four wells have been sunk; whilst at the present time three bores and two wells are being sunk. So that in this respect good work is being done for the State. Indeed, I take it, the only way we can, with any degree of confidence, forward the settlement of the vast areas of land in our Western parts—the only way we can successfully do it—is by providing water for the necessary requirements of the small grazier. The question of water conservation and the tapping of our underground supplies is, perhaps, one of the greatest that we could possibly conceive or have to do with, and this, we are glad to know, is being placed under the supervision of an expert. Land settlement is going on apace. I am sure every hon. member in the House will be ready to congratulate the department upon their latest move. Had I spoken last week, I intended to make some suggestions. Strange to say, those very ideas which I had in my head are now being carried out by the department. I was going to suggest that a directory, such as is now presented to hon. members and the people of Queensland, should be printed and distributed. Now we have this splendid directory before us, containing information that will be new to many men. There can be no better advertisement. In connection with land settlement, there are no men who are so frequently assailed as to what we have or as to what we have not, as members of Parliament, and here we have exact information. We knew that our country was of such-and-such an extent—that we had vast areas of land that we wanted to settle; but I am prepared to say that no hon. member of the House, however well informed he might be, had the slightest knowledge as to what areas were available or as to where they were. In this directory—which is splendidly compiled—no doubt there is room for improvement in some particular directions, but here we have stated, in readable form, the areas of the various districts which are now available for selection. Apart from that we have a very clear digest of the land laws of the State. In addition to that, we have also set out land which in the course of a month or so will be available for selection. The figures are simply wonderful. When we find that hon. members and the people outside are wondering where land is to be obtained, and are going about trying to find land open for selection and finding none, we can only come to the conclusion that the fault does not rest with the department. I asked the department this morning if they would kindly make up for me the total area of

land which is at present available for selection under the various heads, and the figures come out thus: At the present moment there is open for agricultural settlement no less an area than 3,085,572 acres; there is open for grazing farm selection no less an area than 5,300,994 acres; and there is open for prickly pear selection an area of 1,041,158 acres, or a total of 9,427,724 acres. Facts of that description are a complete answer to the arguments which have been raised by some hon. members opposite, that the Lands Department is not doing its duty. I am aware that in some respects, perhaps where land is wanted abutting on to railways, we are not level with the demand, but the department is certainly making a brave attempt to get even with the demand, and I take it we will not have achieved the end which we should have achieved—we will not be in the position we ought to be in, until we have our railways running in different directions, and the land ready and available for people to settle on, because it is not everyone who is ready to go out to distant places. Our prickly pear lands are being dealt with. Perhaps that might be improved upon. My friend, Senator McColl, has issued a very fine report in connection with his experience in the States of America, and I take a little credit to myself in connection with this matter, because it was I who suggested to Senator McColl, when visiting America in connection with dry soil cultivation, that he should include within the sphere of his examination the matter of dealing with prickly pear. We are now in possession of his report—a report of extreme value. However, I do not think that in publishing that report we have, after all, gone far enough. We want something more authoritative still from the people who are taking up prickly pear country. When that report is read it will be found that in some countries they are cultivating prickly pear; in other countries it is treated as we are treating it here—as a great nuisance. We want some finality in the matter, and I am sure, considering it is a matter of infinite importance, the Government of the day—in fact, I say this, I waited several times on the Premier last year, and urged the wisdom of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole of the matters connected with prickly pear destruction. It may be that we have something of very great commercial value, and surely when we know that the country is going to the bad, in a monetary sense, by the spread of prickly pear, to the extent of a couple of millions a year at least—when we know the alarming extent to which it grows—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you pessimistic about it?

MR. G. P. BARNES: No; I believe some good is going to come out of it, but you can only find that out by appointing experts to experiment in connection with it. You require to have an expert chemist, and if there is anything of value in it, by all means let us know what it is.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Those inquiries have already been made.

MR. G. P. BARNES: When the inquiries come to the light of day it will be the better for the country.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is not a great success.

MR. G. P. BARNES: There is nothing authoritative, but we want to arrive at some conclusion, so that people may be advised as to the best course to pursue, and what is the policy of the country. In connection with this matter, it has struck me many times that if destruction is to be the order of the day, the labour of

destroying the pear by some of the specifics might, with advantage, be taken part in by many old people of this land, who still are healthy and strong—we might have small colonies of our pensioners settled in various parts, who would be very glad to supplement their pension income. They could do it without a great deal of labour, and would be paid for it by the results achieved. It would be a matter of their own choice; it is not a matter of dictation.

MR. BLAIR: Pear cutting?

MR. G. P. BARNES: The hon. gentleman says pear cutting. No; we have arrived at a stage now when it is not necessary to destroy it by cutting it down.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Pear poisoning.

MR. G. P. BARNES: Pear poisoning; a man can proceed to do that without any very great strain on his strength.

MR. KERR: Are you aware that many men that are in that work have been poisoned themselves?

MR. G. P. BARNES: I am not aware of it. It may have been, and I can conceive that a man with sores upon his hands and getting poison in them would be very likely to suffer.

MR. BOWMAN: You find that existing where men are shearing sheep in prickly pear districts.

MR. G. P. BARNES: That may be so, but it is not generally the case. A great many people are engaged in the destruction by poisoning, and, until now, certainly no word of anything of this kind happening to individuals has come under my notice. Well, now, hon. members who have seceded from the Liberal ranks, and who are going to support the want of confidence amendment, what reasons are they going to find for their action? So far, no arguments that can be sustained have been forthcoming that in any way justify the action taken by various seceding members. In many instances they have claimed that progressive work has not been done, and is not likely to be done, but the figures I have brought before the House this afternoon are the best of proof that no better work was ever being done in connection with the material advancement and development of our country than is being done at the present time.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. P. BARNES: It is not enough that some dislike the Premier; it is not enough that some may have changed their minds, as they seem to have done, regarding the wisdom of the fusion; it is not enough to say that the party is being conservatised. As a matter of fact, I know of no Conservatives in the House whatever. The seceding members have no standing; they have entirely failed to prove their case, and their position, so far as one can judge, is altogether untenable. The hon. member for Cook and the hon. senior member for Toowoomba cannot justify their conduct. They cannot justify it on the score that the policy of the Government is stagnant one. And the hon. member for Fassifern is quite at sea in connection with the particular stand he takes. He took the stand that he was going to follow principles, not men. I would like to ask, Are the principles of the hon. member for Fassifern found embodied in the principles of the leader of the Opposition and the gentlemen who immediately follow him? Have his principles undergone such a change that the hon. member finds that the principles which he now possesses are identical with the principles which are held by the leader of

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

the Opposition, and those who immediately follow him? Principles, said he, not men, he intended to support. His principles must be extremely elastic if they have undergone such a change as will enable him, after speaking as he has done about them, to step over to the other side, and signify by so doing that his principles are identical with those of the leader of the Opposition, whom he is now supporting. But not only the hon. member for Fassfern, but all the seceding members who voted for the coalition—we want to know if they intend adopting the platform of the Opposition side of the House. I think the hon. junior member for Charters Towers is to be thanked by the House for having the other night placed before the House so clearly and fully the actual teachings of the party with whom he is identified. There was no beating about the bush with him—he told straight out from the shoulder exactly what the objective was. The hon. junior member for Charters Towers enlightened us the other night on the aims and objects of the Socialistic party. He claimed that both the State and Federal

7 p.m.] objectives were unmistakably socialistic, and on page 281 of *Hansard*, speaking in reply to an interjection of the Secretary for Mines as to how he was going to nationalise the industries, Mr. Mullan went on—

To describe in detail to the hon. gentleman the methods by which we would proceed to nationalise the whole of the industries would necessitate a very protracted explanation. I give the hon. gentleman the credit of being well posted in the Labour movement, and it is on that account that I blame him for leaving the Labour party. The hon. gentleman must know that our progress in that direction must be step by step. It was never intended by our party that an Act of Parliament should be passed providing that on a given future day we are to extend absolutely the socialistic and economic functions of the State. That would be absurd. Our movement is not a revolutionary movement; it is an evolutionary movement. We must grow, and we must never advance further than the people whom we are supposed to represent. To do so would spell disaster to the movement, and therefore to tell the hon. gentleman how we are going to extend in the minutest detail at the present moment would be premature and absurd in the sublime. We are now extending. If the hon. gentleman will look back over the last fifteen years of Australian history, he will find that month by month, and year by year, the functions of State and municipality have been growing.

And further on, page 282, he went on—

We are not afraid to acknowledge what our ultimate aim is. We are not frightened to shoulder the responsibility of that aim. That aim is "the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange." We have already nationalised the means of distribution to some extent by nationalising our railways. We can also nationalise the means of exchange in many spheres, perhaps beginning by nationalising our banks. We might commence to nationalise the means of production in a very large degree by nationalising our land, because, after all, the means of production lie more than anywhere else in our lands.

Only in April last the Labour Congress, sitting in Sydney, passed a motion in regard to the prevention of food exports. This motion simply means that an export duty is to be placed upon our products. I would like to know what effect such a movement is likely to have upon the toilers on the land, or in the world? What a discouragement it would be to them. What effect would it have upon the miners, and in fact upon all who have to do with the production of the necessities of life as well as the wealth which abounds everywhere. What this House wishes to know is whether the Independent Opposition are in full sympathy with that aim? What is the position? What position do they intend to take with regard to the aims and objects of the Socialistic party? I maintain that certainly they were never returned to carry out such purposes, and they are not acting true to their elec-

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

tion pledges by supporting, even in an indirect way, the party whose aims and objects are as stated. However, it will be for their constituents to deal with them, and I am inclined to think, from all one can hear in touching country life, that they will deal in no uncertain fashion with the men who have proved untrue to the obligations they are under to render unto the country faithful and true service. I am sure I do not wish for one moment to say one word that would hurt in the least degree our friends opposite. That is not my aim or my intention. They apparently, to some extent, all of them, are sincere. Many of them are sincere in carrying out the objective which they have set before them, which one would respect and does respect very fully, but we cannot but feel that they are going on wrong lines in trying to bring men down to one common level.

Mr. JONES: No.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The nationalising of all things will have that effect. The highest and best means to adopt would be to endeavour to lift men up.

Mr. JONES: Ours is a lifting-up process. That is our policy.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You are bringing down.

Mr. BARBER: No.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The aim of every member sitting on this side of the House is to give every man a better chance, and to inculcate within them some of the nobler feelings and aspirations which will lead a man to strike away from things down below, as it were, to those higher up. To me it is an absurdity that in a young free land like this we should attempt, as we are doing—as the Socialistic party are doing—to regulate the aims and ambitions of men, and thus neutralise all their efforts in life in order to bring them down. Here we are in a free country with opportunities abounding on every hand. The man who desires to succeed, if he places that object before him, will undoubtedly succeed. Every man, if he has ambition, and if he is blessed with strength and industry, is bound to succeed. When you look back over the past and realise that only fifty years of our life as a State has gone by; when you think that fifty years ago we had a population of only 20,000, and to-day we number 560,000 people; when you think of the wonders wrought; when you think of the development that has taken place; when you think of the wealth that has been harvested by these few souls; and when you look out into the future and make a calculation on the same basis and say that practically we are twenty-eight times greater in population than we were fifty years ago, then, in the same ratio, in another fifty years our population should be 16,000,000; when you remember that we have but just touched the fringe of this country, and that we have made but a poor attack on the vast developing resources of our country; when we remember the obligations we are under to people this great land and do our best for it, it seems a positive absurdity for men to band themselves together in order to bring about a cessation of that progress and prosperity we are at present enjoying.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): In common with the members who have preceded me, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having been chosen to fill the distinguished office you now occupy. The conduct of the present Parliament has been of an exceptional character, and one that I hope will be maintained to the end of the session,

whether it be long or short. I also join with other hon. members in the sentiment of regret they have expressed at the departure from our midst of two members who took an active part in our deliberations, and who proved themselves excellent citizens apart from political matters, and I also desire to express my feelings of sympathy towards their relations. I have just seen a copy of the *Peak Downs Telegram*, which circulates somewhat briefly in my electorate, and takes a more or less active interest in politics on the negative side. It is a squatters' journal, and is supposed to express the squatters' sentiments, and at election times it generally opposes me. On the only occasion on which there has been a contest in my electorate for the past few years it supported my opponent, Mr. Risien. This paper points out that, judging by the reports of what has taken place in this Chamber, it would be in the public interest that some mighty person armed with a large axe should be let loose in this Chamber. The sentiment expressed by the editor may not be a common one in the country, but I am inclined to think it is pretty common amongst newspaper men, who compare our conduct in this Chamber with our conduct at the banquet we attended last night. Members of all classes of society and all shades of political opinion sat together in harmony last night at the banquet tendered to the Governor-General; and why should not the same harmony prevail on every occasion where public men foregather? For the last three or four weeks I have sat here and listened carefully and attentively to an exhibition which words fail me to describe accurately. We have had charges and countercharges; we have had allegations made by men who stand equally well in the community as against each other; we have had revelations with respect to the conduct of members connected with the Independent Opposition, the Government, and the old Philip party, which has since been absorbed by the present Government. In all these cases we have had members getting up and making serious allegations against each other with respect to offers of portfolios and political preferment, until the man in the street—the man who reads the newspaper—who regards this deliberative assembly as a legislative holy of holies, has come to the conclusion that we are simply a gang of political adventurers; that we are here simply to get as much as we can for ourselves; that it is our desire to replace others with profit to ourselves. That is the impression of the man in the street—that the majority of members seem to be engaged in this remarkable occupation. The statement has been made frequently in this Chamber that portfolios have been hawked up and down the street, and it has become a Queen street saying that every second man you meet has a new Cabinet in his right-hand pocket, and a piece of blue metal in his left to float a mine. (Laughter.) If this kind of thing is to go on, the man in the street, who is a most important person, will begin to suspect the value of parliamentary institutions. And he will probably go further—he will demand the absolute abolition of our State Parliament.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: This thing is going in the direction of unification; and the present position of affairs does not give hope to those who do not think the abolition of our State Parliament will be an improvement. Down below there is just the same kind of thing—not a bit of work has been done this session in the Federal Parliament. Parties are divided, and almost every politician is more or less satisfied that he is as good as the next man, if not better, and anxious to prove it by securing office, and prepared to do anything

to get there. This sort of thing seems characteristic now of Australian Parliaments, and it seems as if our institutions are becoming Americanised in the worst sense of the term. Nearly all the States in America have Parliaments. Some of them meet only once, and some meet only twice or three times in three years. They are practically controlled by big men outside. All the appointments are practically sold, and they manage to exercise influence even on the Supreme Court judges. If that sort of thing comes about in Australia it will be a sorry thing. It is not altogether owing to the fact that we have British institutions in Australia that we have hitherto been proof against those corrupt influences, because the Americans came from English stock originally; but I regret to say that there is apparently a tendency in Australia to-day to Americanise our political institutions. There is amongst some politicians the attempt, covert and overt, to make a profit out of Parliament. I don't say there is a deliberate attempt to corrupt our institutions in order to put profit into their pockets, but there is a tendency in the direction of considering official preference of more importance than the public interest. That is a most regrettable thing. It is not confined to any one party; but, if any party has set its face against it, it is the party sitting on this side of the Chamber—I am not correct there—the party which is known as His Majesty's Constitutional Opposition—the party which for years past has been known to the country as the Parliamentary Labour party. I hope that party will always set its face against political patronage. The leader of the Opposition, as he was in duty bound to do—and as I am very pleased to see he has done well and ably—has moved a vote of no confidence in the Government, as an amendment to the Address in Reply. In this motion of no confidence he challenges the existence of the Government, as he has a perfect right to do, as he should do as leader of the Opposition, if there is any business in the Opposition. We are now debating that motion of no confidence, and I think we should confine ourselves entirely to that subject. The Address in Reply does not concern me a bit at the present moment, and I do not intend to refer to it. When we come to it, as we shall after a division, I propose to deal with the Address in Reply in my own time and in my own way. The motion of the leader of the Opposition will be determined by a vote of the House. Hon. members have the matter entirely in their own hands, and they will declare it by a vote either for or against the proposition. There is a great deal to be said in favour of such a motion, and I propose to say some of the things that can be said in its favour. Later on I propose to deal, as circumspcctly as I possibly can, with the results that may accrue from the carrying of the amendment. First and foremost, I would like to point out that an Opposition that knows its duty could not but act in the way in which the leader of the Opposition has acted. Government by declamation ought practically to have reached its end in these days. The government of a country cannot be carried on by fine declamation. It cannot be carried on by fine speeches. It must be carried on in a business-like way; and if it is not being carried on in a businesslike way, is the duty of the Opposition, sent here by the country—or by a number of voters in the country—to challenge the existence of that Government. If the Opposition is weak, it is a disadvantage to the Government. If there is a strong Opposition, it not only creates confidence in the country, but it is a distinct advantage to the country. It is also a most distinct advantage to the Government to have a strong Opposition. For many years in the British House of Commons Labour was

Mr. Lesina.]

represented by a number of men, who, although some of them gained considerable distinction—I might mention amongst them Sir Francis Burdett—their representation of the wage-earning classes appears to have been guided by the principle that they could only effectively display it by notoriety in declamation. One of the best authorities on parliamentary law, Walter Bagehot, speaking of the Unreformed Parliament in his work on "Parliamentary Reform," has a paragraph which I shall read and apply to the party sitting on this side, known as His Majesty's Constitutional Opposition, but better and more favourably as the Parliamentary Labour Party—

In one respect, however, the representation of the working classes which we formerly had in this country may be considered to have been successful. The towns in which the suffrage was practically universal at times sent to the House of Commons, not spokesmen of their own grievances, but spokesmen of grievances in general. Sir Francis Burdett is but the type, and the best-known instance, of a whole class of members who, in former times, were always ready to state anyone's complaints, without much inquiry whether they were true; to bring forward a case, without much asking whether it were very well founded; to make a general declamation about the sufferings of the country which was a kind of *carrot* against abuses in general, and might be construed as a protest against any particular one which chanced to occur. Such indiscriminating and vague invectives had their use. They prevented gross instances of administrative harshness—at least they tended to prevent them. They prevented the air of politics from becoming stagnant; they broke the monotony of class domination. But it may be questioned whether, on the whole, their influence was beneficial. These reckless orators had but little moral weight; they were too ready with their statements to get them trusted, they were too indiscriminating in their objections for those objections to have influence. A weak Opposition is commonly said to be more advantageous to a Government than no Opposition at all; it gives an impression to the public that all which can be said against the plans of the Cabinet has been said; it gives an impression that what is unchecked is checked, that what is uncontrolled is controlled. It diminishes the practical responsibility of an Administration by diminishing the popular conception of its power.

That is written with reference to the democrats who sat in the House of Commons as the class representatives of an exclusive section of the working classes some few years ago, but who did not effectively represent the labouring classes as they ought to be represented. The party sitting on this side of the Chamber are many years ahead of that. The Labour organisations throughout the Australian States—and even of that larger organisation to-day moving on parallel lines throughout the civilised world wherever the franchise has been granted to the people as a whole—have had the effect of bringing into existence in all the various Parliaments a strong and coherent party pledged to reform, and whose principle characteristic is its unswerving solidarity and adherence to principle, and its determination under no circumstances to traffic in those principles, but to stand by them, in weal and in woe, in fair weather and in foul, against any combination, if it be necessary, if their principles demand it. It appears to me that in this party sitting here twenty-three strong we have a splendid example of that unifying solidarity which makes them a coherent party, and which makes them a coherent and intelligent Opposition which can be of use to the Government, as well as a danger to the Government, if that Government errs in any direction in its administration of the public affairs. Even if this Government may not go out of office, if the country is satisfied that there is in this Opposition an intelligent body of men who are prepared to watch carefully the administration of public affairs, it gives confidence to the country, a confidence which can be given in no other way, except by the translation of the

[Mr. Lesina.

party opposite to these benches, and by the translation of this party to the benches opposite. But short of that, if we can prove by our adherence and attachment to principle that we are intelligent and honest critics of the Government and their administration, we have gone a long way towards establishing public affairs on a sound basis. This leads up to the point that I desire to make. The introduction of the Labour party into Queensland politics—as into all the other State Parliaments, and even into the Federal Parliament—an introduction which has since been paralleled by the introduction into the mother of Parliaments of a strong and united Labour party, is clear evidence that cannot be set aside that the great mass of the enfranchised workers were dissatisfied, and continue to be dissatisfied, with class representation—the class representation of the workers in the past of which I have already spoken, by which employers have been the representatives of employees, when there is no community of interests between employers and employed. I know employers will question that fact, but we, in our class consciousness, have come to realise that it is impossible for an employer in Parliament adequately to represent an employee out of Parliament. The employees, numbering, as they do, the big majority of the enfranchised workers in the Australian communities, can only be represented by and through themselves. The men who sit here to-day have been selected because of that belief, whether that belief be well or ill founded. The fact remains that we have here a party, twenty-three strong, elected by many thousands of voters, put here to represent and to voice and to vote for the needs of the working classes. The people had lost faith in those sitting—I do not say sitting on the Government side of the House, or on the back Opposition cross benches even—but they have lost confidence in those persons who are not workers representing any body of workers. No man can sit on the Government side and be a worker, though he may be an active worker in his trade. Unless he is inside the bonds of the Labour party he is not a true representative of labour. The Labour party is like "Kipling's Cat" that walked by himself. The Labour [7.30 p.m.] party walks by itself. It knows no other party; it has absolutely no knowledge of any other party. Its constitution prevents it having any knowledge of any other party, and it has to fight any party opposed to its platform. I propose to prove that clearly and conclusively, not only from the platform of the party, but from the last manifesto on which the party here were elected—a manifesto which was published over the signatures of my friend, the leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Mat. Reid. This party—I do not speak of the Labour party in a specific sense, but in a general sense as representing the great army of Labour—this party, I say, has some very good reasons for its existence. I have just quoted an extract from Mr. Walter Bagehot. I propose now to quote a further paragraph from the writings of that gentleman dealing with the representation of Labour. It is just as well to make the ground solid step by step, to lay down my premises firmly before drawing my conclusions. Mr. Bagehot is a Tory, and his opinions will no doubt be particularly acceptable to hon. members sitting on the other side of the House. He is a constitutional writer of repute, and he is careful and conservative. I do not care to quote any other kind of writer, otherwise I might have it thrown in my face that I am quoting from a revolutionary writer who was merely talking to the gallery.

Mr. KENNA: Bagehot was always anti-Labour.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, and I am going to quote him for that reason, and because he is a good constitutional writer. What Walter Bagehot can admit, surely hon. members sitting on the other side of the House can admit. And this is what he says—

“Parliament should know what each section in the nation thinks before it gives the national decision. This is the true reason for admitting the working classes to a share in the representation. A great many ideas, a great many feelings have gathered among artisans—a peculiarly intellectual life has sprung up among them. They believe that they have interests which are misconceived or neglected; that they know something which others do not know; that the thoughts of Parliament are not as their thoughts. They ought to be allowed to try to convince Parliament; their notions ought to be stated as those of other classes are stated; their advocates should be heard as other people's advocates are heard. . . . As long as a great class, congregated in political localities, and known to have political thoughts and wishes, is without notorious and palpable advocates in Parliament, we may prove on paper that our representation is adequate, but the world will not believe it. . . . It is vain to demonstrate that the working classes have no grievances; that the middle classes have done all possible for them, and so on, with a crowd of arguments which I need not repeat, for the newspapers keep them in type, and we know them by heart. . . . but so long as there are no evident, incessant representatives to speak the wants of artisans, there will be a diffused dissatisfaction. Every body must say now, ‘our representative system must be imperfect, for an immense class has no members to speak for it.’ . . . The way to stop the complaint that artisans have no members is to give them members—to create a body of representatives, chosen by artisans, believing, as Mr. Carlyle would say, ‘that artisanism is the one thing needful.’”

Now I shall give another quotation from an entirely different source. I quoted just now a Tory whose arguments should carry conviction into the ranks of the enemy. Now we shall have a quotation from an entirely different source—a quotation from the Knights of Labour. I have the honour of being the only member of this House who is a member of that body. I am a full-blown member of that great organisation, and it is an excellent organisation. This is what the Knights of Labour say—

Labour has never assumed governmental control because it believed its cause just and its means of securing justice adequate. The cause remains just, but the means have failed. A political party, organised for the express and specific purpose of permanently settling the difficulties existing between capital and labour, without any alliances or entanglements with any other party, will not only be certain of success, but will be of inestimable benefit to peace and social perpetuity.

There you have two statements—one by an organisation which numbers nearly 1,000,000 members, and the other from a conservative constitutional writer. Each approaches the question from opposite poles of thought, and both arrive at the same conclusion. That ought to be convincing that the Labour organisation has a right to be represented by members in Parliament, members who will represent the interests of the working classes and voice their wants and needs, because other representatives have so far failed to represent those wants and needs. We have a number of members in this Chamber pledged to represent the interests of the working classes. When a man joins the Labour party he wants to know what he is expected to do, and he is told plainly what is expected of him. A man joining the Labour party joins it with his eyes wide open.

Mr. KEOGH: No, no—by caucus.

Mr. LESINA: He does not join, as the hon. member for Rosewood did, with both eyes shut. (Laughter.) When we join the Labour movement we know precisely what is expected of us; what political dogmas we have to express our

faith in; what particular gospel we have to accept; what particular principles we have to advocate. There is no mystery about the thing. A man is not initiated in the dark, but walks into the thing with his eyes wide open in broad daylight. If he does not like it he can turn back; but once in he must stick, and stick fast and firm to every jot and tittle of the platform—not a cross must be removed from a “t” nor a dot from an “i.” No single shaving must be taken off the platform. (Laughter.) This has been stated on previous occasions by other members better, perhaps, than I am stating it to-night. In our principles we are dogmatic. Our supporters must sign the whole platform—they must go the whole hog with that platform. There is no escape. There is no room in our ranks for slippery, Laodæcean, rail-straddlers. If you use the party for awhile you cannot use it permanently, for, when the party realises that it is being used, out goes the person who is using it. Let us see exactly what we have got. I have here a paper which I do not altogether care about. It is a paper which represents the exploiting classes; it is a capitalistic production. It advocates the class interests of capital, of profit-mongers, and of interest-mongers—the three classes which prey upon labour—the *Courier*. (Laughter.) This paper, on the 17th April, 1907, devoted an enormous amount of space to the publication of the Labour manifesto—the platform upon which the Labour party stand. You, Sir, will remember that there was an election in 1907, and, on some mysterious issue, which I have never been able to grasp, there was another election in 1908. If I am right in my recollection of that matter, the hon. member for Ipswich said the other night that the issue at that election was a bogus one

Mr. BLAIR: That is my opinion.

Mr. LESINA: Anyhow, we quite believed there was something in the issue, that our rights and privilege were being taken away by the cold-blooded statesman then in power. We may have been misled. Others have been misled before us, and others will be misled after we have shifted off “this mortal coil.” However, during the elections of 1908, this platform was still in existence, and it will remain in existence until the convention in 1910 in Townsville is held. This manifesto was issued then on behalf of the party. It reads—

Amidst the mimic clash of rival manifestoes which might readily have been united under one leader, so little do they differ in essential policy—

There was very little difference between the manifesto of the hon. member for Townsville and the manifesto issued by the present head of the Government, as leader of the then known Kidston party. I pointed it out to the House. In fact, I showed the points of agreement, so there was absolutely no trouble about them coalescing.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: The manifesto goes on—

it is important that the Labour party should lay before the electors, for their guidance, a fuller exposition than is usual in this form of the programme and principles which, with increasing influence upon public affairs, have held the field of politics since the memorable elections of 1893.

Then they proceed to give the history of the formation of this party. That has been dealt with very fully by the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Mullan, and other hon. members have referred to it. Other hon. members on the other side have quoted fragments of the platform, and all this shows that until the present time there has been a coherent policy observed

Mr. Lesina.]

by the men behind the machine—that the men behind the Labour machine have one particular object in view. All the political action taken since then in this House and outside has been taken with the one desire to achieve that particular objective. Only recently it has been put in plain English, to which I shall refer later on. The manifesto then goes on to say—

The Labour movement then first definitely disentangled itself from the out-worn creed of liberalism, and stood upright upon its feet.

What it is desired to stress here is the industrial character of its origin. The Labour party was brought into being to assert the claims of the working class to economic justice and social equality. It has no other reason for its existence. Such being the case, it can never become merged in another party, nor can it enter into an alliance of any kind except as a means to the end which it must ever keep in view. No other party can take up its work and mission. It was the demonstrated failure of liberalism as the professed friend of the workers, and its treacherous servility to the enemies of the people, that brought clearly home to organised Labour the necessity for direct representation in the Legislature.

Under every flag and form of government, liberalism has proved itself to possess a false tongue, to talk glibly of friendship for Labour, and a quick hand to stab Labour in the back at the bidding of its capitalistic masters.

There is no gainsaying that fact. It is absolutely true along the whole line. Every man outside the planks of the Labour party who is liberal—he may be prepared to use the Labour party for some time in order that he may promote the particular programme that he himself has in view, or to seek personal advancement—which is more frequently the object of a majority of politicians. (Hear, hear!) My point is this: The time must eventually come when Labour must stand alone. That is the history of the world. The Knights of Labour is in exactly the same state of affairs. At conventions held in various parts of Europe precisely similar results have been pointed out—they have pointed out that instead of Labour and Liberalism working together, in the long run they have had to fight Labour, or Labour has fought them. This is illustrated by the fact that on a socialist taking office in the French Cabinet, within three weeks he has to instruct the troops to fire upon miners on strike or he has to leave the Cabinet. Does he leave the Cabinet? No, he directs the military to fire upon those unfortunate strikers. That is the danger. Labour ought to remain in opposition until the people outside send a sufficient number of men into Parliament to make it possible to form a straight-out Labour Government. The Labour party has grown year by year until the number is twenty-three. There was a time when the number was thirty-five; but owing to certain weak Labourites being seduced, it was reduced down to fourteen. Only fourteen members were prepared to sign a document electing the present leader to that position. Only seven could be got in this House to do it. I was one of the seven; but then we got seven others, so that ultimately there were fourteen who agreed to select the present leader of the Opposition as the leader of the Labour party. We went to the country, and came back seventeen strong, then twenty-two strong, and now we are twenty-three strong, and when the people of Queensland are prepared for a Labour Government—so far they are evidently not prepared for a Labour Government—they will return not twenty-three but forty-three. Until that time comes—I repeat it boldly, I have said it outside the House just as boldly—that the people of Queensland do not want a Labour Government, and until they do we must fight on. They have had the finest, broadest, and freest franchise any people have ever possessed for the last six or seven years.

[*Mr. Lesina.*

Mr. MULLAN: Wait till they get another chance.

Mr. LESINA: I hope they will take advantage of the next chance. I am going to refer to that later on. But up to the present time, with a franchise in the hands of every man and woman, and 80 per cent. of the people here are workers—employees—whose bread depends upon a job being given to them by some employer, there are only twenty-three representatives of the worker. The rest are all—I won't say hostile to Labour, but are representatives of Labour in the narrow sense as I have expressed it—that is in the party sense—that they are outside the bounds of our caucus.

Mr. SUMNER: What do you mean? Why, some of your best friends in Queensland are employers.

Mr. LESINA: I believe that some of them are friendly to the Labour movement.

Mr. SUMNER: I mean in connection with the movement.

Mr. LESINA: But they do not understand the principles of the movement.

Mr. SUMNER: Better than you do.

Mr. LESINA: I do not say the hon. member does not understand them. He is an employer of labour, and, I believe, a very good employer—but he is not sympathetic enough to sign the platform and come inside the ranks. There are a lot of "as good as Labour men," but although they may get the support of Labour at election time, they evidently are not good enough to sign the platform.

Mr. SUMNER: I am not speaking of myself.

Mr. LESINA: I am not singling out the hon. member for Nundah. I simply say that it is exactly the kind of a man who means well, who is to-day one of the weakening factors of the Labour movement. It is this "good as Labourism" which is the whole force of our weakness. While the Labour party is perfectly willing to accept support, if that support be given freely, in securing the triumphs of our principles, we can do no more than accept that support. We are prepared to take it. As a matter of fact, if this motion is successful—I hope it will be successful—and the Government is defeated, or if they take the proper course and resign their positions, then, of course, His Excellency may send for either the leader of the Opposition or the leader of the other party. Lowell, who is probably one of the best authorities on this question, says either of these courses may be pursued in the event of this motion being carried. Mr. Lowell says, on page 34—

If the party that has obtained a majority in Parliament has no recognised leader, the Crown may intrust the formation of a Ministry to any one of its chief men who is willing to undertake the task; or, if, as is sometimes the case, the parties have become more or less disintegrated, so that only a coalition Ministry can be formed, the Crown can send for the head of any one of the various groups.

There are only two groups on this side—one led by the hon. member for Ipswich, and one led by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. His Excellency, in accordance with this statement, might send for either. But if the Government are defeated and they resign their position, and the leader of the Opposition is sent for, and the Government is formed by him, we should naturally expect the support of those members who say they are as good as Labour men. That is obvious; it requires no logic to prove that. If a man is as good as a Labour man, he naturally votes for measures which the Labour Government propose to put in operation. I do not propose to try and pierce the future as to what may

take place under a set of given circumstances which may never arise; but, if they should arise, I anticipate that the hon. member for Nundah, who is as good as a Labour man, will assist this party by loyally carrying out the programme they were elected on. (Hear, hear!) I think that ought to be clear and obvious, and if he does not do that he is not as good as a Labour man, and proves it quickly and lively the first time he votes against us.

Mr. SUMNER: You are very ingenious; I admire you. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: Even if two members of that party voted against this party if they formed a Government, it would simply lead to the defeat of the Labour Government, and in that case they could not be as good as Labour men, because they had not supported a Labour man. Obviously, if we formed a Government as the result of the carrying of this motion, that Government must be kept in office by the support of hon. gentlemen on this side who are as good as Labour men. It requires no ingenuity to prove such a simple proposition as that.

Mr. KEOGH: Not your land taxation, though.

Mr. LESINA: I am going to refer to what the programme says in a moment. I was somewhat interested just now, when this diversion took place, in the programme itself. Another point was made here; the hon. member for Warwick, who preceded me, devoted some time to the objective of the Labour party—the objective which is set forth in this manifesto which was issued by the convention in 1905, and which is part of the constitution of the Labour party. That objective is not pushed too frequently to the front; and, although I deny a good deal of what was involved in the argument of the hon. member for Warwick, I want to point out that the members of the Labour party are not called upon specifically to sign that objective.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You cannot be a Labour man without accepting that objective.

Mr. LESINA: I entirely agree with the hon. member for Kennedy that, if he is a legitimate Labour man, he will not vote without signing the objective.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is a part of your constitution.

Mr. LESINA: He is not compelled to do so, technically; he may shelter himself by taking a technical objection. It may be that the executive is not in the platform. That is correct. But the executive governs the movement.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: It is the machinery of the movement—a necessary part of the superstructure, and it cannot be eliminated. I might be accused of misrepresenting the facts of the case, so I will put the statement as it appears in the manifesto in the possession of the House. Then they will see what we do desire. I am reading from the manifesto signed by the leader of this party, and Mr. Mat. Reid, president of the executive—

If the Labour-in-politics movement is to be successful in its mission, it must ever keep in the forefront that great ideal which makes for the industrial as well as the political freedom of the people. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the Labour party should jealously safeguard its integrity as a separate and distinct factor in politics, keeping ever its fundamental principles in view. Not to do so would be to deceive the constituencies, and bring disaster upon the organisation which has been built up after years of strenuous effort and self-sacrificing zeal.

Mr. Kerr, and some other of the one-time representatives of Labour, have since been induced to surrender that honourable independence. But Labour itself can never do so. It can never consent to be made subservient to the schemes of politicians. It is the mouth-piece of the people. It is the instrument of progress.

For this reason it must emphatically repudiate the attempts now being made to overthrow its organisation, to set at naught its disciplinary pledge, rescind its vitalist declarations of principle, and render the Parliamentary supreme, with the rank and file as mere "followers."

There is little in the defection of these individuals to occasion surprise, however much it may excite regret. It is part of the experience through which all progressive movements have to pass. Always, for those who are lifted up suddenly from lowly stations to high positions in public life, there is the temptation to forget that it is not to personal desert they owe their exaltation. Not all are strong enough to withstand the strain, but upon Labour is cast the imperative duty of teaching them that as it made so can it unmake; that it can never tolerate the pretensions to mastership put forward by those whom it honoured in the call to its service.

Repeating the words of the manifesto addressed to the electors at the last general elections, "The Labour party goes to the country" now, as then, "on the same platform, animated by the same desire and determination to jealously safeguard its integrity as a separate and distinct factor in politics, keeping ever its fundamental principles in view."

And now with respect to that objective, which appears to have caused so much trouble and turmoil to the minds of certain hon. gentlemen sitting in this chamber. We have the hon. member for Warwick, a most respectable representative of the shopkeeping class in politics, a man who takes a shopkeeper's view of political questions. These men do not take a broad and wide view of those fundamental principles which are the basis of the Labour movement. These fundamentals are placed very clearly in our objective—in such plain and simple English that he who runs may read—

The objective or ultimate aim of the Labour party is to secure the full results of their labour to wealth producers.

There it is in plain English. Before I dwell upon that for a moment, it behoves this party, when it seeks to put a party with a definite object out of office, to put another party in its place, and we are prepared to do that. We are frequently called smashers and revolutionists, persons who have no desire at all except to smash up existing conditions; that we propose to pull down a certain structure which has served society well for many centuries, and that we offer to put nothing in its place. This manifesto—our programme—does propose to put something in its place. We do not propose to fire this Government out of office with a no-confidence motion merely; we are prepared to put something in its place quite as good in principle and in detail as what they propose. And first let me say what the object is once more.

To secure the full result of their industry to the wealth producer—

That is putting it briefly. You may have the whole objective, if you like, but that in plain English is the thing itself—

To secure the full results of their industry to the 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.

Cultivation of an Australian sentiment, based on the maintenance of racial purity and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

That is the whole of our objective. And the manifesto says this—

It is incumbent upon the opponents of Labour to show on what grounds conformable to reason the justice of such an objective can be disputed. That those who do the work are entitled to the products of the work is a truth so self-evident that, only by resorting to the grossest misrepresentations and falsehoods as malicious as unfounded, can its clear meaning be obscured by the classes whose objective is "To secure to themselves the fruits of other people's industry."

The Labour party does not propose to suddenly

Mr. Lesina.]

swoop down on existing arrangements of society and wipe them out. It does not propose to go out, like some modern Samson, and pull down the people's temple and leave it in ruins, and to set the masses of the people rebuilding up its temple from these ruins. It proposes to go step by step, so that by degrees we will be able to take over all these sources of wealth production. The landholders at the present time constitute a small class of the community, but they are the most powerful class in the community—

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: And we maintain that the land question is the basic, the fundamental principle of our movement, and that is why we propose to nationalise it. That is the big question with us. We do not want to be piling up palliatives and doing nothing else. We have dozens of palliatives in our platform, I know. We have a number of people who are asking us to give them these palliatives, and we put them in and give them to them, but we know that these palliatives will not produce substantial results to Labour so long as the land monopoly is left to a few people. And we propose to take it over gradually. We do not propose to swoop down on the landholders and expropriate their land, but we propose to take their land and tax it so that we will tax them out of their position.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is straight enough.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Publicly created land values.

Mr. LESINA: We propose to tax the land monopolist out of his position.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is it—the land monopolist.

Mr. LESINA: We want to tax the man who holds land to the exclusion of everyone else. The earth was not made for the benefit of one class only, and yet only one class have got it. It is owned all over the civilised world to-day by a few, to the exclusion of everyone else. The storehouse of labour, the footstool of industry, and the sources of supply of the necessities of life are locked up to-day as the privilege of one class, who, for centuries past, have made the laws of the land, who have governed Parliaments and Senates—

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: And always will do.

Mr. LESINA: And they have set their will upon the great masses of the people. In addition to the ownership of land is the ownership of machinery. That makes another class privilege in the giving of employment—another monopoly in the source of employment. The land being monopolised and the jobs monopolised by those who give them, there necessarily arises a class who have no jobs and no land. And it is a big class, ever growing, and they must sue to the land monopolist and to the monopolist of capital for a job. They must ask these monopolists for working room, standing room, and living room; and just so much as they press for these needs of existence, a higher tribute is demanded by the landowner and by the capital-owner, and their wealth tends to grow, whilst the masses of the people tend to sink lower and lower into poverty. The Labour party, therefore, set this up as their objective, and in order to bring about the necessary change we intend to take from the exploiters of land the value of that land by taxation.

Mr. KEOGH: You draw the line at £300?

Mr. LESINA: In its wisdom the Labour Convention adopted a programme dealing with land value taxation, and they adopted a land

value tax with an exemption of £300 as their objective. Personally, I do not believe in any exemptions at all, and I never refrained from saying so for years both here and in New South Wales. The workman in Woolloongabba who owns an allotment and who takes £50 of unearned increment to himself is just as guilty of taking money from the community as the man who takes thousands. (Hear, hear!) It is only a variation of value, but the principle is the same right through. I was very pleased to see that in New South Wales the other day the freetrade party—the liberal association—in adopting a programme to submit to the country at the elections adopted a policy of land value taxation without any exemption whatever.

Mr. KEOGH: Then you will tax him completely out of it. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: This thing will not be done suddenly. Nothing is done suddenly except revolutions and explosions, and they do more harm than good. We do not intend to proceed in an explosive or in a revolutionary way.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Step by step.

Mr. LESINA: Yes; we propose to take one step at a time. We will take as long a step as we can each time, but we will also make sure that the ground we are treading on is firm and sure under our feet before we take another. If we are going to swerve off, it only means more trouble.

Mr. KEOGH: You ask people to come out here and take up land, and then you propose to tax them out of it. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I should like the hon. member for Clermont to discuss the question before the House.

Mr. LESINA: Yes; I want to arraign the Government on this point. I say that this Government has not got the confidence of the people because it has not introduced a tax for the purpose of breaking up land monopoly. (Government laughter.) And I was just going to point out that if we supplanted them our duty will be to introduce a land tax for that purpose. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KEOGH: All right, my friend. (Laughter.)

Mr. KENNA: Your ultimate aim is land nationalisation?

Mr. LESINA: Yes, it is. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, said that it was a mistake that any land was alienated in Queensland at all. That is not a great deal alienated here. We have an enormous amount of land of varying value which is not alienated at all. There are miles of it of no value. But we have alienated some of our land, and the true Labour man does not believe in the alienation of any land at all. That led to the trouble between the Labour party and the leader of the present Government. He would persist in selling the people's territory for revenue purposes, and we objected to it. It is not so much for our sakes, although we required it, but for the sake of the children in the schools and those in the cradles who have not yet been enfranchised. By and by when they come to manhood they will look on our action in parting with the public estate as supineness or absence of fight, or lacking adhesion to principles, and they will say that we gave away the land without entering our protest. The protest we made has had this effect: That the Government since that time have not gone in for selling the public estate. We not only say that the Government should not sell the land, but they should go a step further, and get back from the landholders the land that has already been sold. The Government made a step in that direction by the introduction of the land monopoly tax, and by

[Mr. Lesina.]

the introduction of the betterment tax, but from my point of view they were all more or less weak attempts to tackle the giant of land monopoly. In fighting for those two Bills a man could not buckle on his armour and fight with that vim that he would introduce into it if he knew he were going to deal with the whole subject of land monopoly. There were very few estates that would have come under that Land Monopoly Tax Bill. I think there were fourteen mentioned, but I am not sure of that. Then the betterment tax was only to touch certain districts.

Mr. AIREY: No; all land. The original Bill would have affected all land.

Mr. LESINA: I stand corrected. I understood that it only took in future lands that were dealt with, whereas a straight-out land tax would take in all lands. If a man who purchased an allotment of land here some years ago for a small sum and went to England, came back and sold it for £10,000 and returned to England, what has he done. Absolutely nothing. It is that kind of thing that is the justification for the taxation of land values; and our manifesto in 1907 made a land tax the first plank in our platform. It is a regrettable thing that a progressive Government, led by a gentleman who was at one time deputy leader of our party, should bring down a programme that does not include a tax on land values; but I venture to tell the democracy of Queensland that I will do my best to see that a tax of 3d. in the £1 is imposed on all values over £360, so as to provide land for people who want the opportunity to make homes for themselves.

Mr. KEOGH: Do you mean alienated land?

Mr. LESINA: On all land leased and land alienated in fee-simple to private owners.

Mr. KEOGH: What about the land in the hands of the Government?

Mr. LESINA: Anyone would think the hon. gentleman was a large landowner. (Laughter.) I can tell him that his only hope of getting in for Rosewood is by supporting this plank of our platform. While we advocate a land tax and the breaking up of land monopoly, we also advocate strongly the extension of the leasing principle, and the Government deserve some credit for what they have done in the direction of leasing land. But we had to drive them with our pikes in this matter, and many a nasty prod Ministers got to induce them to get up steam and adopt the principle.

Mr. KENNA: They did not put it into operation.

Mr. LESINA: The gentleman who was responsible for adopting the principle was pushed out of the Cabinet, and that is a guarantee to the people who do not believe in land taxation and the extension of the leasing principle that they will get no more of this if the present Government remain in power. In the case of leased lands the Government get something back from the holders and the public benefits; but we do not get anything like the value of those leased holdings. The hon. member for Gregory tells me that we only get one-tenth.

Hon. R. PHILP: Take a lease up and try it.

Mr. LESINA: If we only get one-tenth, a considerable part of the value goes into the pockets of private individuals, instead of into the Treasury. If we part with the freehold the land is gone for ever—though Williams on Real Property says there is no such thing as private property in land—that

1909—w

a person only holds an estate in fee-simple. If we part with a freehold for £5, and it increases in value to £500, that is regarded as the property of the person who bought the land, though that value was not the result of his individual exertions. He may have been an absentee, and the increased value may have been the result of railway construction or other public works for which the whole population is taxed. From the Labour point of view, the increased value in such a case belongs to the community, and should be taken by the community. But the moment we propose to take it by means of a land tax we are told we want to confiscate the land. With a leasehold it is different. A lease is subject to a certain rent, which is periodically re-appraised. We may not get the full value, but whatever it is it goes into the Treasury, and everyone gets a share. In the case of the freeholder, I do not say he draws out the increased value in the form of sovereigns, but he gets it in the form of some product which is exported, and for which he gets value.

Mr. KEOGH: Will you give any credit to the pioneers who went out into the country, and made the country?

Mr. LESINA: I do not object to the pioneers. The Labour party is the best friend the pioneers ever had, and we will prove it a hundred thousand times by our votes in this and other legislative chambers. We contend that what this country wants is a thumping tax on land values; and if we get into power we would be false to our principles if we did not make the attempt to put a tax on land values. What assistance can we rely on getting from other members? I know the hon. member for Bowen will assist us, because he has always been an honest advocate of land taxation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He did not tell the Bowen people that.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. members for Woothakata, Barcoo, South Brisbane (Mr. Airey), and Cairns are all pledged to the taxation of land values.

Mr. ALLEN: And what about the Premier?

Mr. LESINA: The Premier himself has been pledged. He might assist by not dividing the House on the matter. I do not suppose he will; but I am going to rebut the charge that this party has no constructive programme. We have a constructive programme, and the first plank in that programme is a tax on land values.

Mr. KEOGH: If you went before the electors you would not have a ghost of a show of coming back. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: We will take our chance. Another point in our condemnation of the Government is this: A member on this side referred to the unemployed and took exception to the Government programme because the introduction of immigrants has the effect of increasing land values by increasing the demand for land, and of decreasing wages by increasing the competition for work. If you introduce 100 men when there are only jobs for twenty men the competition for those jobs brings wages down. As has been said before, when two masters run after one man, wages rise; and if you introduce a large number of unemployed without increasing the number of jobs, the competition for the job will bring down wages. And the demand for land caused by bringing out more people will bring up rents—the very competition that brings down wages has the effect of sending rents up. So that they have less

Mr. Lesina.]

wages to pay more rent, which simply means that they are poorer. Under those circumstances we naturally oppose immigration. I will deal with that when we come to the Address in Reply, or, more properly, when we come to the vote on the estimates for immigration. At present I content myself with saying that it forms another count in the indictment against the Government that they are doing nothing for the unemployed. We think that the unemployed question is, next to the land question, the greatest question that can engage the attention of any Government. It is really a phase of the land question. Given private landownership, with a monopoly of the means of production; given capital monopoly and limited opportunities for employment, and you necessarily have a large number of people known as surplus labour. That surplus labour is used to end a strike, to bring down wages. By introducing immigrants, you are simply adding to the existing distress. Our contention is that the Government should tackle this question. Ever since I entered this Chamber nothing has been done, honestly and sincerely, to deal with the great question of unemployment.

Mr. BOWMAN: And it exists throughout Australia.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, right throughout Australia, nearly as badly as it does in New Zealand, where it is perhaps more accentuated than in any other part of Australasia. The settlement of the problem is of the greatest importance. Have the Government done anything in that direction? Do they propose to do anything except putting these four railways before the House—which will certainly add to the number of employed? It appears to me that the question must be tackled in some other way. I do not think that anything that can be done under existing circumstances will settle the question satisfactorily or permanently. Nothing will settle it permanently so long as society is constituted as at present on a monopoly, first and foremost of the earth, and then a monopoly by custom and by luck and by gambling in the machinery of production. The great mass of the people own nothing, and will never own anything, and never have any chance of owning anything. Members like the hon. member for Cambooya come into this House and tell us that they landed in Queensland forty or fifty years ago without a shilling in their pockets, that they walked to Warwick, settled down, and amassed a fortune. The hon. member was prepared to work for a low wage. I give the hon. member credit for all he has done, but he only succeeded by trampling others underfoot. He may have given adventitious aid to some persons, but he has only succeeded by trampling others underfoot. That may not be so true in regard to the primary industries in the country as in regard to the secondary industries springing up in the towns, but how many men can land from one of the immigrant boats nowadays without a shilling, walk to Warwick, and succeed as the hon. member for Cambooya has done? The chances are gone.

Mr. GRAYSON: They are greater than ever.

Mr. LESINA: We cannot all get front seats.

Mr. GRAYSON: Much better conditions exist now than there were then.

Mr. LESINA: It is surprising the number of immigrants there are in this House—six or seven of them. The hon. member for Cun-

[*Mr. Lesina.*

ningham and the hon. member for Cambooya are both stalwart samples of the early pioneer who started with nothing, and to-day have something. I give the hon. members every credit for their success. I do not begrudge it to them in the slightest degree—nobody does; but we maintain that the opportunities they got are not open to-day to the ordinary worker who arrives from the old country.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: There are 10,000,000 acres open for settlement.

Mr. LESINA: A man wants capital to take up land now. Some of the conditions might be made easier than they are. If that were done, many of those who have now but little chance of success would be enabled to succeed. But, just as the first-comers at the theatre get the front seats, so do the first-comers in a new country get the best seats. The late-comers have got to be content with the worst seats, and the last-comers with no seats at all. The hon. member for Mitchell reminds me of a fact that he brought under my notice a week or so ago that there is such a demand for land in Central Queensland that deputations anxiously wait upon the Secretary for Public Lands and petition the Government to buy Saltern Creek—a big station out there—and cut it up for closer settlement.

Mr. HAMILTON: Because members on the other side tied it up for thirty or forty years.

Mr. KERR: Not to buy it; to resume it.

Mr. LESINA: To resume it upon payment of compensation to the lessees.

Mr. HAMILTON: Who passed that Act? Members on the other side.

Mr. LESINA: Members sitting on the other side passed the Act of 1902, while members on this side opposed it strenuously.

Mr. BOWMAN: The present Secretary for Public Lands considers it the greatest mistake ever made by Parliament.

Mr. LESINA: It is pleasant to get such an admission from the Secretary for Public Lands, for, while he is in that frame of mind, he is not likely to introduce another Bill proposing to give extensions of leases in Queensland. I have thus dealt with some of the things that characterise the Government programme, and we believe that, if this House, in its wisdom, determines to eject the Government from office, we shall be afforded an opportunity of attempting to put into practice some of that programme that we have had before the country for years. For fifteen or sixteen years the Labour party, on scores of platforms, in scores of newspapers, and in speeches delivered in this Chamber and outside, have been preaching the urgent need which exists for carrying out this programme, and every man who votes for us honestly believes that we are going to carry it out when the opportunity offers. If we take the votes of men in the bush, who busy themselves with their avocations throughout the year, and have not much time to devote to politics in this Chamber—if those men honestly give us their votes at election time under the impression that we are going to strive to put our programme on the statute-book, and we do not carry out that programme when the opportunity offers, then we are simply deceiving them, and no excuse will mitigate our offence. We shall be guilty of deliberate dishonesty to come here as a body of delegates of the workers outside, pledged to do their work—which practically means putting on the statuto-

book certain principles contained in our fighting platform and in our general programme—and then, when the opportunity offers, skulk away in a cowardly fashion, and neglect to carry out our pledges. Certainly, with twenty-three men we can do little; but if there are men in this Chamber who believe in the Labour party—who believe that the Labour party should be given a chance to carry out their programme, now is their opportunity. The Fisher Government were afforded an opportunity. I did not think at the time that a Government dependent upon the Deakin party had much show. I did not think it a wise thing to undertake the government under the circumstances; but many things have happened since then which incline me to alter my opinion. It has afforded an object lesson of the utter impossibility of the Labour party, either in the Federal Parliament or in any of the State Parliaments, carrying out its programme that has been so long before the country that every schoolboy is acquainted with it, unless the country is prepared, by the exercise of the broadest franchise enjoyed by any people in the world, to put into the House a sufficiently strong party to carry out that policy. Until the country does that, I am prepared to admit that it does not want a Labour Government, although it may be possible for the Labour party, under certain circumstances, to form an effective Government if they receive some assurance of support. What assurance of support have we in the event of this motion of want of confidence being carried? It may be said, and I think correctly, that that is a matter which will be

determined when the contingency [8.30 p.m.] arises—that when the doctor is called in that will be the time to prescribe. We are not moving this amendment expressing want of confidence in the Government for fun, merely to let off sky-rockets, to indulge in a little fireworks in order to amuse the electors outside. I know that electors are easily amused at times. We have heaps of evidence of that in the papers at the period of an election. But we are not now letting off a few fireworks to amuse electors outside. What we are anxious to do is to have this programme carried out, and we challenge the Government because we believe this programme cannot be carried out unless they are defeated. Therefore, we hail with satisfaction every offer of support that comes from members in this Chamber. I have listened with considerable pleasure to the speeches made by hon. members on the back benches, and although many personal elements might have been eliminated from those speeches to the strengthening of the speeches themselves, still I was pleased to hear that they will vote for the motion proposed by the leader of the Opposition. If they do that, it is possible that the reign of the present Government will not last much longer, and in the event of the Government being defeated we shall be able to form a Government which will carry out the radical programme I have indicated—the programme contained in the Labour platform and in the manifesto issued by the party in 1907. We want a land tax, and we want the abolition of the Legislative Council. A Government which stands in the way of the abolition of that Chamber should not be permitted to hold office any longer. We also want a Trade Disputes Bill of a kind which will be satisfactory to Labour. We are anxious to secure such a measure, but a Trade Disputes Bill, prepared by a Labour Government, is the only

kind of Trade Disputes Bill which is likely to satisfy Labour outside. Then there is an Old-age Pensions Bill. What have the Labour party done with regard to such a measure? They were instrumental in getting the present Act passed. But the outdoor allowance should be raised from 5s. to 10s. a week. One of the first things the Labour party would do if they were in office would be to raise the indigence allowance from 5s. to 10s. a week. A Compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration Bill is badly needed. What hope is there of getting such a measure unless the present Government are fired out and the Labour party are placed in power? Then we further desire to see a public sugar refinery and smelting works established. Those are things which are very much needed, and which have been advocated by this party for a long time past. They will no doubt cost a great deal of money, but a tax on land values will raise that money. We want pure food by legislation and administration. The Government have promised us a Bill dealing with this matter, and as it is not a matter to be dealt with on party lines we may be able to agree with them on the basic principles of that legislation. Another thing required is the immediate stoppage of all further sales of Crown lands, fixity of tenure, leaseholds not freeholds. We cannot get those things without the removal of this Government from the Treasury bench, and members on the back benches must assist us to get them. If they do that, they will deserve the confidence of their electors. I hope the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba will do his best to bring about the advent of a Government which will apply that principle in our land administration. If he does that, I am sure the electors of Drayton and Toowoomba will send him back here with a bigger majority than he has yet realised. His opportunity has now arrived. Then again, we want a State bank with loans to settlers and miners. We want to lend money to farmers to establish silos. We have a long programme of reform that we are anxious to put on the statute-book for the benefit of the farmers, if the farmers will only assist us. But the farming representatives in this House will not assist us in getting those reforms. We also want in elections for members of local authorities the application of the principle of one adult one vote, no one being disfranchised for arrears of rates. We want the mayors and chairmen of local bodies to be elected by the general body of electors, and members of all hospital committees to be elected in the same way. We want to nationalise the public health. It should be a national consideration, as is the care of our lunatic asylums and of our prisons which are in the hands of the State, and the revenue for their upkeep should be derived from a swingeing tax on land values. The hon. member for Cairns laughs, but I know he at one time supported a tax on land values, and I hope he will support such a tax to bring about the reforms I have mentioned.

Mr. MANN: How would it do to tax "Bung"?

Mr. LESINA: Tax vacant allotments. Then we want constitutional reform. We want a whole host of things, but it is not necessary to particularise them. We can, however, only secure those reforms with the assistance of hon. members sitting on the back benches. Those members, judging from their utterances, are prepared, I believe, to bring about the downfall of this Government. I am with

Mr. Lesina.]

them the whole way in pulling down the present Government and packing its members about their business.

The TREASURER: You will all want the portfolios.

Mr. LESINA: Our platform provides against that, and prohibits alliances that are likely to injure the solidarity of the party. But it also provides that we may form a Government with the assistance of any other party, provided we have a majority of the portfolios. I think that is a very wise provision, because in the past, when two or three members of our party were permitted to enter a Cabinet in alliance with members of another party, their democratic principles rapidly wilted. The one exception to this experience was the late Hon. W. Browne, who represented this party in the Morgan Government, in which he was Minister for Mines. He was unswervingly honest to his principles to the last breath he drew. But other members who had the confidence of the Labour party, when they entered a Cabinet with members of another party, departed from their principles. In fact, their defection was so gross that we had to issue special manifestoes against them. The hon. member for Barcoo was specially selected as a horrible example in this connection. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the Premier.

Mr. LESINA: The Premier has been repeatedly mentioned as a frightful example of those persons who have been lifted up from humble positions and placed on elevated pedestals, and who have become—I do not know exactly the word which describes the situation—but who have become giddy by their elevation, who have lost their heads—or have developed big heads—that is a very expressive phrase. (Laughter.) And when a man develops a big head he rapidly loses sight of the party who made him, like the person who climbs to a certain position on the ladder resting on the bent backs of a large number of toilers, then places his foot on the top rung, and gives the ladder a contemptuous kick and throws it down. On the top of the wall, with the golden fruit within easy reach, he puts his fingers to his nose, and says good-bye to those down below. (Laughter.) We had to single out specially one or two members in the past, and history has a tendency to repeat itself. The chances are that if the present Government are put out and a new Government is formed from a new alliance, the members of that alliance will be clutching each other's throats before very many weeks have elapsed. How else can it be? This party is a class-conscious party; it is a working-class party. It has no room for anything except class legislation on the principles I have indicated. Other parties may come and go, but this party goes on for ever. (Laughter.) Other platforms are made to suit certain political contingencies—certain political exigencies—and then as soon as the contingency or the situation has been met, the platform is promptly chucked up. That cannot happen with our platform. Our platform is eternal. It is not immutable. It may change from time to time, but only with the consent of the people who make it—its parents sometimes refashion it. The platforms of all other political parties are the products of half a dozen irresponsible men who represent no organisation, and those platforms spring into existence, as I saw one spring into existence in this Chamber only a few nights ago, which was a rehash of

Labourism and Liberalism, which largely consisted of principles taken from our platform. It appears to me that, after all, democracy outside has no truer guard or guide than the party which sits here on the front Opposition benches, and the men behind it. The Labour party is the only political party the people can trust to do its work. It is not here for office. There is no lust in the Labour ranks for office. We believe in office honestly achieved, if it may be. Office at any price we do not want. Office that can only be obtained by a sacrifice of our principles is not worth the sacrifice. Office that can only be got by stooping in the political gutter is not worth having. If we can achieve office honourably, in a square, fair fight, we shall achieve it. Our electors outside expect us to achieve it; and then, when we meet, if the House is against our programme we can just as honestly and honourably walk across the floor again, and tell our electors that the House is not prepared for us, and never will be prepared for us until the electors outside send into this Chamber, not twenty-three, but forty-three representatives. (Hear, hear!) With forty or forty-three men we can carry out our programme year by year, and take credit for doing it honourably; but, until that is done, to make any step forward at all we may have to take certain action. What is that action? I just want to briefly refer to that action because it deals with the formation of the coalition. The whole question involved in the motion of no confidence is this: What right has the present Government to occupy the Treasury benches? From a Labour standpoint, they have no right to occupy them at all. I suppose it will take me to prove that statement more time than I have at my disposal to-night, and therefore I will not dwell too much upon it. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier came back from England he made arrangements with the late leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Townsville, to form an alliance. That matter was discussed in the Chamber for two or three nights, and the question arose: When was this alliance first mooted? When was this alliance first begun? The beginnings of alliances are at any time most difficult to prove. They are a most difficult thing to see. The beginnings are so small as to be almost infinitesimal, almost microscopic. Nevertheless, there were one or two small occurrences leading up to the gradual development of the coalition. Coalition, as we understand it, is the union of two parties—the coalition of two forces. Those two forces must have something in common, or they cannot coalesce. Oil and water will not mix. Boiling water may be partially mixed with oil by excessive agitation, but in the end the factors find themselves separate—when things become quietened down. Now, there must be something in common—some feature or characteristic common to those two parties, otherwise they could not have coalesced. I pointed out what that feature was a couple of years ago, and I did not need any inspiration to do it either, although some hon. members thought I was preaching a new doctrine at the time. I simply went on a careful reading of the manifestoes of the two parties, and I showed to-night in reading the first paragraph of the Labour manifesto to which I once more call attention, so as to prove my case. It reads—

Amidst the mimic clash of rival manifestoes which might readily have been united under one leader and one party, so little do they differ in essential policy.

The manifesto of the party pointed out that there was no difference between the pro-

[Mr. Lesina.]

grammes of the two leaders—the one sitting on that side, and the one sitting here. Both issued programmes to the country and in their leading features both those programmes were similar.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That does not fit in with the argument of the leader that we were getting conservatised.

Mr. LESINA: I want to devote a little time to that matter. It is important to understand it clearly. I am stating the case as I understand it, not as the hon. member does—I am merely stating my own view. As I pointed out to the House, I could not for the life of me see why the party led by the hon. member for Rockhampton and that led by the hon. member for Townsville should not, very much earlier in our parliamentary history, have become united under one leader, because so far as their programmes were concerned, there was nothing in them vitally opposed to each other.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: So far as the Labour party were concerned, both were conservative, only one was a little more conservative than the other. That is the Labour point of view. That is why we issued our own manifesto to show our own ideas, which we stated as fully as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The electors pronounced against you, that is all.

Mr. LESINA: I say our party stated its position as against both the other parties, and we told the electors not to be bamboozled by these two wily old political leaders, because although both of them were fighting a sham battle, their principles practically co-ordinated. We told the people, "Don't you be misled by the hon. member for Townsville. Do not be misled by the wily old politician, the hon. member for Rockhampton. Both of these men will bamboozle you to the profit of their own party." We told them to be careful. We stated our policy clearly, and if they thought there was any danger, they could find shelter in the ranks of the Labour party. When the numbers went up we found that not a very large number had taken shelter in our ranks—they did not return a sufficient number to enable us to undertake the administration of affairs, if we got the chance, but we secured about one-third of the votes of the people.

Mr. MULLAN: They returned seventeen members.

Mr. LESINA: We went out fourteen strong and we came back seventeen strong. That was in 1907. Then there occurred, a little later on, the battle for constitutional freedom, and that kind of thing, and as a result we came back with an increase of five more members. That was twenty-two strong, and the by-election recently won one, so that we have not gone back one since the election of 1907. We have grown all the time; we are the only party that has consistently grown. Our idea is this: that if the present position of affairs does not permit of this House being governed by the present Cabinet, then we shall appeal to the electors. The Premier indicated as much as that some time ago in Rockhampton, when he told the people there that if he could not pass legislation and administer public affairs he would appeal to the people. That is the proper thing to do.

Mr. COYNE: He may not be allowed to do so.

Mr. LESINA: Whoever gets the opportunity, anyhow, will find this ultimate appeal to

the people inevitable. To get back to the point. The other two leaders got back two-thirds of the members returned at the 1907 election, and in the manifesto issued by the Labour party there was no difference in their programme. If the *Worker* manifesto was right—and I stand by that—then those who make any divisions are wrong. What was the difference between the hon. member who then sat where he sits to-day as leader of the Government and the hon. member who sat here as leader of the Opposition? What did divide them? When there is an Opposition confronting the Government, as there should always be in any properly constituted Parliament, that Opposition should always have an alternative policy to place before the House in the event of the defeat of the Government of the day. Did the hon. member for Townsville have an alternative policy? Certainly he had. Did the Government have a policy? Yes; and when the elections took place, both placed their policy before the country, and in its leading features it practically dovetailed. The hon. member for Townsville in his programme preached immigration, the hon. member for Rockhampton preached immigration; the hon. member for Townsville preached a progressive railway policy, the hon. member for Rockhampton preached a progressive railway policy.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: An elective Upper House.

Mr. LESINA: I have the two programmes here. Both advocated in their programmes assistance being given to private syndicates to construct railways, but advocated security to the prospector as well as to the investor; both advocated fair wages to the working miner; both advocated the development of mining fields, the introduction of fresh capital for construction of railways; both advocated the establishment of schools of mines; both advocated the export of State products by fostering their transport to overseas markets.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: All very good.

Mr. LESINA: I do not say that these things are not good, with the single exception of immigration and syndicate railways. Both advocated conservation of State forests; both advocated revision of harbour dues so that many ports on our coast might be better roadways for our expanding trade, and the inhabitants of Queensland should be put on equal terms with those of other States; both advocated a reduction in the number of members of the Legislative Assembly—in fact, right through the programme down to details, it would seem as though the two programmes had been privately arranged in one room, and then altered somewhat in phraseology and presented to the country by the rival leaders.

Mr. LENNON: What about the Upper House?

Mr. LESINA: Yes, the Upper House; but leaving aside some details of form, on which there was no agreement, but the larger questions, the questions of policy which now dominate the Cabinet, with the single exception of the Trade Disputes Bill, the chances are that careful analysis of both programmes will clearly show that the two leaders were seeing eye to eye. As a matter of fact, I always thought—and I think so still—that it was a prearranged plan on the part of both these old political leaders to combine against the Labour party. They had two hands against our one. Each appealed to his own particular section of the country, both threw themselves into each others arms, and threw the Labour party into opposition—that is exactly what

Mr. Lesina. }

took place. The point which has been raised during the debate is, when did this reapproachment begin to be observable? At what particular point did the two parties draw together like corks in a bath? The period was the moment when the hon. member who leads the Government introduced certain railways. I stood on the cross bench and spoke six hours against the syndicate railway measure introduced by the hon. gentleman's Government.

The PREMIER: The member for Barcoo—I did not introduce any.

Mr. LESINA: Well, the hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. member for Barcoo, now sitting on this side of the Chamber.

The TREASURER: The hon. member is following you.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member for Barcoo is not following me; the hon. member follows no man now. (Laughter.) On that occasion the hon. member for Barcoo introduced a syndicate railway Bill which we considered was diametrically hostile to the interests of the wage workers of Queensland, and opposed to our programme, opposed to the pledges we gave our electors, and against the fundamental principles of our programme and the policy we determined to fight. We put up an excellent fight on that occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You did not fight in 1906 when the Etheridge Railway was passed.

Mr. LESINA: I am not discussing that matter. That was a lapse from those sturdy principles which characterised us as a party.

The PREMIER: You have got conservatised since that.

Mr. LESINA: However, that Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Barcoo, and we naturally fought. Then lo and behold! a most remarkable thing came to pass. That Bill could only be passed with the assistance of the Opposition, led by the hon. member for Townsville, who had gone to the country on a similar programme. He advocated a similar system of railway construction, and when the Labour party, at the call of their leader, divided the House, who were the gentlemen who crossed that Chamber and assisted to pass that legislation? The hon. member for Townsville, and the party now sitting with him over there. They crossed the Chamber, not once, but several times, and for the remainder of the session, in passing Supply, and again in discussion on Supply, they sat over there with the present leader of the Government, and practically constituted themselves that coalition which has come to pass. That is the moment that coalition took place, and the most astounding thing to me is that the men who sought the assistance of the Philp party to pass these railway Bills and gag discussion on the passage of Supply, are the very men who to-day are protesting against the coalition. I objected to the thing all along, but it appears to me that the best possible thing happened for the Labour party when the coalition was formed. The night they went home and voted for that syndicate railway, and the hon. member for Rockhampton drove us, his old colleagues, into the cold shades of Opposition rather than withdraw that Bill—that moment the coalition was formed.

The PREMIER: I drove you into the cold shade of Opposition! You went there of your own will.

[Mr. Lesina.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. gentleman might have kept us as his honest and sincere supporters if he had not compelled [9 p.m.] us to violate our platform pledges. No member of the

House knew better, and knows better to-day, than he does that we are tied hand and foot to our programme. The hon. gentleman knows that when he tried to make us assist him and his colleagues in passing a syndicate railway that we could not do it. We could not do it, and he knew we could not do it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Barcoo had charge of it.

Mr. LESINA: But we knew that the hon. member for Barcoo did not initiate it. It was the Premier who drove the hon. member for Barcoo in that matter. Perhaps it might not have been very hard to drive the hon. member for Barcoo, because as a matter of fact he said that it was a good Bill.

The PREMIER: And so it was a good Bill, a very good Bill.

Mr. LESINA: I am not going to discuss that Bill now. It is part of our law now, and I would be out of order in discussing it. The hon. gentleman, knowing our platform and our pledges to the Labour electors, knew that he should not have introduced that syndicate railway Bill at all, because he knew we could not support him. But he was tired of us; we were not good enough for him, and he drove us out. He drove us out of his camp and took into coalition with himself the very men with whom he is sitting to-day. No one was happier than I was when that coalition was formed, because I saw that we had all our enemies in the one camp. And that will be splendid for us when we go to the elections—

The TREASURER: You have got some of them back.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, we have some converts, and I am very glad to see it. Men are coming back to us recognising that they made a mistake in trusting too much to the hon. gentleman. And they are willing to confess it. They have confessed that they made a mistake.

Mr. HARDACRE: Mortifying!

Mr. LESINA: Mortifying! Yes, it is very mortifying to have to confess that you made a mistake, but it is better to do it openly and straightforwardly than to go on year after year trying to cover it up, and I am glad those hon. members did it. I honour the men who have come over here to assist us in putting our platform into legislative effect. (Loud Government laughter.) And during the coming elections—I understand that there is bound to be an election within the next month or two—I hope to be able to assist a number of these members who are going to assist us, but who are at present outside our movement. Of course I can only do that with the permission of the organisation. If the organisation objects to my assisting men outside our party, I cannot offer that assistance. I hope that their constituents will deal with them tenderly—(Government laughter)—because they have had their eyes opened to the perfidy of the hon. gentleman—a perfidy worthy of a Machiavelli—such as the hon. gentleman was guilty of when he tried to induce us to forsake our principles, to seduce us from the sacredness of our platform; and, when he found he could not do that, he drove us right out of his camp and took his enemies to his bosom, and to-day they sit in one camp together. As I said before, I am very pleased that that has taken place. What happened after the Premier

came back from England? We are told that he commenced to make negotiations with the hon. member for Townsville for a coalition. But the coalition was already formed, and all that was necessary to do was to give it the semblance of real life. All that was necessary at that time was that it should be carefully nurtured. The Premier had to carefully nurture it, that was all. When the House met after the Premier's return from England the leader of the Labour party did the proper thing. You will find in *Hansard* for 1908 that he challenged the Government with this amendment—

That the constitution of the present Ministry—

That is the same Ministry which I see before me to-night—

is a violation of the will of the people as expressed at the ballot box last February, and the Government does not, therefore, possess the confidence of the House.

That was a dragnet amendment. It has been so described, and it was really so. It was couched in such broad terms that it gave every man in this House who had the faintest grievance against the Government a chance to show his grievance and vote against the Government. Anybody reading that amendment could see that it mattered not what particular reason a member had for losing his faith in the Government, all he had to do was to state that he had lost his faith in the Government and back it up by recording his vote against them. After such an explicit statement and amendment by the leader of the Labour party, pointing out that the constitution of the Government was a violation of the will of the people as shown at the February election, and after several nights' debate, the amendment was put to the vote and everyone knew what they were voting on. The wording of the amendment was—

That the constitution of the Government is a violation of the will of the people, as expressed at the ballot at the elections last February.

How did the House vote on that motion? After a full debate, extending over some nights, the amendment was rejected by thirty-nine to twenty-nine. That made sixty-eight members, and, with the Speaker, sixty-nine members were accounted for. Two of the three absent members later on said that if they had been present they would have recorded their votes against the amendment. Therefore, thirty-nine members in the House, and two more by profession later on, declared that they approved of the fusion between the Kidston and Philp parties. They declared deliberately, by their votes in this House, that that fusion was justifiable. There was no violation of the ballot-box according to these members at that time, and the fusion was justifiable. What has happened in the meantime to alter the situation? I maintain—and I have looked the matter fairly and squarely in the face—I cannot ascertain where the situation has altered one iota.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. LENNON: All the applause comes from the other side.

Mr. LESINA: I do not care where the applause comes from. That is a fact.

Mr. ALLEN: The constituents had not been asked then.

Mr. LESINA: Well, two elections have been held since then. The Labour party succeeded in securing a victory in one, and obtained a Labour representative where formerly the Government had a representa-

tive; and in the other election the Government retained the seat they held. So, if anything, the Labour party came off better than ever.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: That justified more than ever the attitude which the Labour party took up. We opposed the Government not because they formed a coalition—we told them that last year—but because they are a Government which represents monopoly; because they are against land taxation. And because they are against these necessities which are for the welfare of the people, we say, "That Government should go down." (Hear, hear!) That is the only ground on which I vote against this Government. I vote against them because they represent the employing interests and the capitalistic interest—

The PREMIER: And because you want your own party in their place.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, and because I want to see the Labour party in their place, and that would enable this party to get over there.

The PREMIER: That is quite fair. We have no grievance against you wishing to occupy this position.

Mr. LESINA: I have no grievance against individual members. I have not asked for a portfolio, and do not expect to get one. I have not earwigged members in the hope of getting a portfolio; I have not drunk with anyone in the hope of getting something; I have not gone round buttonholing members trying to get them to do this, that, and the other. I have not traded or trafficked or promised any member that I would do anything; but I oppose this Government because they are opposed to land taxation; because they are against all the reforms which we are advocating in the Labour platform. I have made my position perfectly clear. That is my reason for opposing the present Government, and my reason for voting for the present amendment before the House. When we come to the Address in Reply, I will deal with a number of other matters, principally in connection with measures which have been omitted from the present Government programme. I recognise that this coalition is opposed to the Labour movement.

Mr. HARDACRE: Which the people pronounced against.

Mr. LESINA: They did to a certain extent.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, they did it emphatically.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member for Leichhardt says that the people pronounced against this coalition. In a sense they did, but I would remind the hon. member of one point.

Hon. R. PHILP: They pronounced against wages boards.

Mr. LESINA: I do not think they pronounced against the legislation of the Government of which the leader of this Government is one of the survivors. I do not say that that legislation will be regarded as hostile at the present time by the electors. Perhaps the syndicate railway measure might be the only one where we, as Labour members, would be able to get any support from the country at all. I doubt whether we should be able to do that where the railway is built; but in any other properly represented constituency I believe they would carry a vote against the Government on the question of syndicate railways.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They were condemned at public meetings.

Mr. Lesina.]

Mr. LESINA: I begin to lose faith in resolutions carried at public meetings. It is astonishing the resolutions you can get carried at a public meeting. (Laughter.) The decision come to is haphazard; it has no finality; and it is like a Chinese cracker that hops all over the place. In South Brisbane, for instance, they will carry a resolution one night in favour of the Labour party, another night in favour of the Government; and then the hon. member for South Brisbane and his friends will carry a resolution in favour of their attitude. The ordinary man who goes to a public meeting does not think as carefully as the trained politician, and is not particular whether he holds up his hand for or against a resolution. If a man were fined for voting in favour of a resolution one night and against it another night, he would be more careful. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: So would politicians.

The PREMIER: You might try it first in the House.

Mr. LESINA: I think it might be better to make the experiment here. (Laughter.) Since the fusion of parties on the other side, a number of members have left the party opposite. They have given their reasons for doing so; and they are entitled to have their reasons regarded by members in this Chamber as honest reasons. I am not concerned with those reasons; but the principal one was the fear that the fusion would lead to the conservatising of the Kidston party. I do not attach much importance to that, because their programmes agreed in almost every detail, and I do not see how one party could become more conservatised than the other. As the hon. member for Leichhardt said, the programme of the hon. member for Townsville was more conservative in some respects than the programme of the hon. member for Rockhampton, in which the constitutional issue was raised.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A bogus issue!

Mr. LESINA: One member tells us that it was a bogus issue by which the electors were deceived. That shows how careful people want to be when issues are raised. The chief advocate of the fusion of parties was the senior member for Townsville, who was the victim of the statements made at the time of the election. In 1907 these two wily old politicians arranged programmes within a few days of each other, and each scooped his own supporters with a majority against Labour. In 1908, when there was a chance of Labour coming on top, one raises a bogus issue, and they go to the country. Labour throws in its force with the principal villain in the piece—(laughter)—if I may be pardoned for putting it that way; and we find that he gets back again, and his friend gets back; and we get five men extra, but we are still two to one behind.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You have got one adult one vote.

Mr. LESINA: We have made certain reforms, but they were not got without the assistance of this party. How they were got is ancient history, and there is no good in raking the matter up. As to the members who crossed the floor on account of the fear they had of the Kidston party becoming conservatised, as the *Rockhampton Bulletin* points out, they might as well have waited until there was evidence of the conservatising influence which they fear

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Lesina.

Mr. LESINA: But whatever may be the result of the fusion of parties on the other side, there will be no conservatising of this party by members sitting on the back cross benches. There is a strong antidote here to any conservatising influence that may emanate from those benches. Most of us have been a long time in politics; but there are some members who have not been so long in politics who on two or three occasions have made statements outside, and repeated statements inside, which practically mean a fusion on this side, if such a thing be desired. I don't believe the organisations of Labour have spoken on the matter; but I know they would not agree to any fusion that would have the effect of watering down Labour principles, or conservatising the Labour party. (Hear, hear!) If it is an important thing that the Liberal party should not be conservatised by the Philp party, it is equally important that this party should see that its radicalism is not conservatised by association with men who until the last week or two sat with the Liberal party, and voted for syndicate railways, and voted with that party to gag this party. All these things must be kept in mind, for the leopard can't change his spots. At least he can in one sense—that is, he can shift from one spot to another. (Loud laughter.) The paper called the *Cooktown Independent*, which is published in the electorate of the hon. member for Cook, has a three-column report of an address delivered at Cooktown by that hon. member. According to that report, the hon. member gives a very fair statement of his position—I think it was a very carefully prepared statement. He says it may be necessary for the Liberal party to use the Labour party for a little time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh! Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: He states it most emphatically in these words—

I believe Queensland will demand, if necessary at the ballot-box, that the Liberal party shall be predominant, even though it may for some time require the assistance of straight Labour.

How are they to get the assistance of straight Labour unless they use us?

Mr. LENNON: That is not the expression you used.

Mr. LESINA: Here is the hon. member's statement that for some little time it may be necessary to require the assistance of straight Labour.

The PREMIER: Why; don't you want to use them, just as they are prepared to use you?

Mr. BOWMAN: You used us.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LESINA: If there is any one thing that should warn us against relying on any other party for assistance, it is the bitter experience we have had of the Premier. He used this party for five or six years to shape his policy and put that policy on the statute-book.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And you thought you were using him, evidently.

Mr. LESINA: We are not so innocent today as we were then. We are not so guileless as we were then. Hon. members remember all the years we sat here in the cold shades of Opposition. Never, except for one short day, for ten or more years did this party get into the sunshine of the benches on the other side. Never except for one brief day did our party sit on those soft and comfortable cushions. (Laughter.) All the time

we sat in the cold shades of Opposition, fighting the battle of reform and never making any progress. Well, we made progress in this sense: that we prevented many jobs being done. I published a list I made out, at the time our party did go over to the other side, of all the wrong and bad things done by the old Philp Government—it filled about two columns. (Laughter.) All those things are forgotten to-day, but they were done by that Government, and I suppose it was alleged by themselves that they were done in the interests of the people. Although we were protesting year after year, they persisted in doing them. That was the curious thing. We got up here. The present leader of the Government was sitting alongside us; he got up and made solemn, earnest protests. He made a special study of financial questions—worked like a draught horse week after week so as to equip himself on every point to attack members on that side; and he did it effectively. He made fine speeches, but we never got any further forward. A splendid smashing criticism from his lips on a Financial Statement would be followed the next day by the purchase of a Seaforth Estate. A glorious criticism from the lips of the late Senator Dawson or the present Federal Labour leader—a splendid, keen analytical criticism of some act of maladministration—would be rewarded next day by the purchase of a dredge that would not work. (Laughter.) So this kind of thing went on year after year, and we never seemed to make any progress until at last a coalition was formed which enabled us to enjoy the sunshine in which those benches are said to be bathed. The one point of agreement in that coalition was that we should get electoral reform.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was expressly stated that we should get old-age pensions, too.

Mr. LESINA: I am not sure that that was expressed. It was implied.

The PREMIER: There were only two things mentioned. There was never a word said about the other.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was fought a whole day, and you know it.

Mr. LESINA: Hon. members can fight it out now if they like, though there is no profit in fighting over it now, as the situation is changed. Our contention is that the present Government are unworthy to occupy office—not because they have fused with our other enemies. It is a good thing for us to have all our enemies in front, instead of having some of them behind or beside us. Our objection to the Government is not that all our enemies are now in the one camp, but because they are opposed to the principles we believe in, and we can never get those principles given legislative effect until we get rid of them. Harking back again to the statement made by the hon. member for Cook, who is now in the Chamber, I ask him what he means when he says—

I believe Queensland will demand, if necessary at the ballot-box, that the Liberal party shall be predominant, even though it may for some time require the assistance of straight Labour.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Why didn't you say that at first, instead of misconstruing my remarks?

Mr. LESINA: I did not willfully misquote the hon. member. At the moment I could not lay my hand on the paper, and spoke from memory; but as soon as I secured the paper I quoted his exact words. Now, what does he mean by those words? In what way are we to assist the Liberal party?

Mr. DOUGLAS: The Liberal party and the Labour party worked together at the last election.

Mr. LESINA: On what lines? If there is to be a constitutional issue at stake, it may be possible for all the friends of constitutionalism to get into one camp. But when it comes to mere material reform—when it comes to certain reforms which are laid down in our programme—are we to work together when the hon. member and his colleagues have stated in the country, and in this House, that they believe in certain things which are diametrically opposed to our programme? For instance, the hon. member for Toowoomba states most emphatically that he will not tolerate a land tax. I, who believe that land monopoly is the curse of Queensland and of all the civilised world, would find it impossible to get a land tax if I were prepared to join with the hon. member for Toowoomba.

Mr. HARDACRE: You have less chance of getting it from the other side.

Mr. LESINA: I cannot expect any assistance in getting a land tax from members on that side, it is true, but that does not put me in any better position. There is no other plank in our platform which it is so necessary to obtain just now. There is no other State in Australia but has got it. We are the only State that lags behind.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: How much better are they off in New Zealand, for example?

Mr. LESINA: They are better off to the extent that they have broken land monopoly. It has not been altogether broken, but it has been weakened to a limited extent. The full effects of this glorious reform are not so far realisable. We are the only party in this House pledged to a land tax. That is the position. Will the Liberal party assist us to a land tax, if they do not believe in it? If they tell us they will not give us a land tax, then we are putting out the Government to put in another party that will not give us a land tax. I will be prepared to go any length if we can get a party to assist us to put on a land tax. Even if I am not sure of getting a land tax, I am prepared to vote this Government out of office. Even if I am not going to secure a land tax by putting this Government out, I am prepared to put them out and trust to luck.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: But would it not be much better if, once the Government were deposed from office, we were able to secure the support of men who would not go over there and play the same game again under the guise of Liberalism, but would pledge themselves to give us a land tax? We do not want office. We are not hungering after portfolios. (Laughter.) We are not hungering to shake the fruit of the pagoda-tree for our own profit. We have no particular desire to get fortune for ourselves, but we can open the way to fortune for other men. We can open the way to profit for other politicians if, in return, they will give us something. They want office—

Mr. HARDACRE: Give the people something.

Mr. LESINA: Yes; the people can get nothing unless they get it from this House in the shape of enactments, and those enactments can only be passed by a constitutional responsible Government. Before you can get a Government to give you a land tax you have to constitute your Government. Before you

Mr. Lesina.]

cook your hare you have to catch it. Before you get your new Government you have to kill this Government—(laughter)—and before you get your new Government this Government has to go out. And when the new Government comes in, on what terms does it come in?

The PREMIER: Any terms you like. State your terms, and they will promise to give them to you.

Mr. BOWMAN: You made many promises, and broke them just as freely.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. LESINA: The Labour party is bound to go along on the lines laid down in that manifesto. I stand by that manifesto [9.30 p.m.] festo in every line. It has not been recalled by the organisation. It has not been declared *ultra vires* by the Central Political Executive.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Have you not broken it?

Mr. LESINA: I never broke a platform in my life, except a little one—(laughter)—and I have felt guilty ever since.

Mr. MANN: Have you repented?

Mr. LESINA: Yes, but what must the conscience of the hon. member be like?

Mr. MANN: It is elastic.

Mr. LESINA: It is a perfectly new one; it has never been used. (Laughter.) If we have an election to-morrow a new manifesto may be issued. But the present platform is not *ultra vires*; it is still in force, and if a new manifesto is not issued it will be in force at the next election. It strikes me that if a new manifesto were issued, it would be more insistent upon these important points of policy than the last one was, and it is necessary that it should be, because the only thing which enables this party to live is the keeping of the platform intact. Only in that way can this party, like Kipling's cat, walk by itself.

Mr. MANN: It may fall overboard.

Mr. LESINA: This party will not fall overboard, and if it did it has a sufficiently large platform to enable it to float ashore. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba is opposed to a land tax, but he desires office, and I hope he may get it. If he can get office by my voting that the present Government should go out, he may have it, but not on the terms under which the present Government have held office—sitting there drawing their salaries, and doing as little as possible. If we have a Liberal Government, or a Labour-Liberal Government, it must do work—the work which for fifteen years the people have sent us here to do, and which they have paid us to do. I know of one man in the bush who has got grey headed waiting for a land tax—(laughter)—and I know of others who have walked miles through the bush—in new bluchers too—to vote for a candidate who was in favour of a land tax. Those people want a land tax, and, like the little boy in the advertisement, they will not be satisfied until they get it. I should hail with joy and with glad acclamation the fact that the hon. member for Cook or the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba. Mr. Redwood, was the chosen saviour to lead this Parliament into the promised land of a land tax. Let the honour, the glory, and the profit be theirs. I want none of those things. I only want a land tax, and the other things

[Mr. Lesina.

we have in our programme. If the hon. member wants office, let him take it and give us those reforms.

The PREMIER: Those are your terms?

Mr. LESINA: Exactly the terms on which the present Premier went into office, and he cannot grumble at such an arrangement—the terms upon which the hon. gentleman was enabled to place his fat carcass on the Treasury bench.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must know that that is not a use of seemly language, and I hope he will not continue in that strain.

Mr. LESINA: I beg pardon for the lapse. I say, did we not assist the hon. gentleman to take his seat on those benches on precisely those terms?

The PREMIER: I am glad you have condemned yourselves for doing it; and now you are doing it again.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. gentleman does not state the position correctly. He is wrong there. We placed the hon. gentleman on those benches on certain specific terms.

The PREMIER: And now you are going to put somebody else there on certain specific terms.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. gentleman does not know what we are going to do. We do not know ourselves. Nobody knows what we are going to do. We have not talked about the matter like the hon. gentleman's caucus. What we are going to do is sealed up until the time arrives, and then the seals will be broken with due ceremony. I want once more to repeat that we placed the hon. gentleman on the front Treasury bench to do certain things. The first thing we asked him to do was to give us adult suffrage. He did so, and we supported him, but the hon. gentleman now forgets those poor men who toiled patiently behind him up the steep way he had to traverse in order to obtain for the people adult suffrage. We made other conditions, which the hon. gentleman observed; and then, feeling his position fairly solid, and getting rid of other men whom he had undermined in that fashion which is characteristic of him, he threw off the trammels. No longer would he be tied to our chariot wheels, and he left the path of political rectitude, and followed devious ways—the crooked ways which Chapman and Alexander described in vivid terms in the Exhibition Building a week or two ago. (Laughter.) But I shall not dwell on the hon. gentleman's want of faith. Let the electors deal with him—as they will deal with him in time. It is now proposed that the hon. gentleman, who has violated the arrangement with us, as he has also attempted to make us violate our platform, shall die the death. The fiat has gone forth. The leader of the Opposition has declared the time, the place, the opportunity, and the executioner is ready to do his work. I do not think there are a sufficient number of members in favour of the amendment to make the death absolutely and irrevocably final, but the hon. gentleman must die the death. When he dies the death and has passed away as a responsible administrator in Queensland, which is inevitable—he need not flatter himself with the belief that he is immortal—his place must be taken by another. Who that other may be I cannot say. It may be the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, it may be the senior

member for Ipswich—and we might do worse than have that hon. member—or it may be the hon. member for Cook, or the hon. member for Woothakata. (Laughter.) No one can say who it will be; but when the time comes to make another agreement between this and any other party, that agreement will, I hope in the interests of democracy, be in black and white. There must be no verbal messages, no hoarse whispers in the cold passages in this building. There must be no secrets in Irish whispers to each other at the refreshment-room bar. (Laughter.) It must be clearly stated in black and white what the terms of that agreement are, and the terms having been stated we as a party may walk calmly with our eyes wide open. Though not a member of this party has a portfolio; though not a member of the party who has worked years and years to achieve that distinction is rewarded with a portfolio; though this party has worked years and years to justify the country trusting them and placing confidence in their administrative capacity, yet we will support the new Government, the head of which will—Cinquivalli-like—bring from mysterious and almost inaccessible places a Land Tax Bill, a Trade Disputes Bill, an Eight Hour Bill, and all those Bills we have been paid to get passed, for which we have drawn our salaries and yet have not got. We want a Government to give those measures to us. Now, any offer? (Loud laughter.) Any offers, Mr. Speaker, to use an auctioneer phrase? If we get these offers we must in duty bound accept them, and I shall give a loyal and hearty support to the members of the Independent Liberal party, who will come here, take us by the hand, and lead us over there so that we may garner in the sheaves. We have got a garnering spirit very strong upon us just now. We want to garner in reforms, and at present it is impossible to get one solitary reform from the present reactionary Government—reactionaries from every part of Queensland—types of defunct politicians, the old dead and gone political parties dragged together neck and crop from the ends of the earth, planted on those benches prepared to do anything to justify their political existence, except do work. (Laughter.) Prepared to do anything except pass reforms. I say I have no use for any other party outside the Labour party—no time for any other party except on the conditions I have stated. Those conditions are very plain. I say we can expect no reform from the present Government. They have a programme which we have discussed. It contains a nice list and very fine phraseology, but I do not think there is any business in it. Honestly, I do not believe there is any business in it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, yes.

Mr. LESINA: The Minister without portfolio says there is business in it. I will not argue the point at this late hour; but I say honestly, this party can expect no reform from the present Government. The only thing we must do, as we believe that honestly and sincerely, is to vote for the amendment on the Address in Reply moved by the leader of the Opposition. That amendment sets forth plainly and clearly that this Government has not got the confidence of the House. That is a matter that can be settled by counting heads. Perhaps argument will not alter a single vote. If facts were piled mountains high, it will probably make no difference in the ultimate determination of this question. The Secretary for Public Lands told us the other day that, so far as his party was con-

cerned, there were thirty-six men on that side, and that they were absolutely solid. I heard to-day that the hon. member for Lockyer was not solid. (Government laughter.) It is common talk in the city that the hon. member for Lockyer is not solid.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: He is all right.

Mr. LESINA: Who guarantees the hon. member? (Laughter.)

Mr. THORN: I will vouch for him.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: This is a matter that will be determined in a short time—when the division bell rings.

Mr. COTTELL: What about the solid party over there?

Mr. LESINA: The Labour party are solid. I hope before the division bell rings some hon. members who represent agricultural constituencies, having at heart the interests of their constituents, will carefully consider our propositions, and come and help us to achieve them. (Government laughter.)

Mr. THORN: Not at all. No land tax.

Mr. LESINA: I do not desire to be drawn off my subject. A land tax requires no apology.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: And if any hon. member wants an apology for a land tax he can call on the librarian, who will give him shelves of literature on the matter, and he can study it at leisure. I have put the position as briefly as possible. At present the situation is this: If there is any hope of securing reform legislation in Queensland, it can only result from the defeat of the present Government. (Government laughter.) The Government and some of its supporters appear to be very cheerful, but their cheerfulness is largely assumed.

Mr. WHITE: Not at all.

Mr. LESINA: A great deal of this cheerfulness is assumed. It does not really typify the feelings that palpitate in their bosoms. I can only believe that, if an election takes place just now, half the members sitting on the Government benches would lose their seats. (Government laughter.) I firmly believe that.

Mr. WHITE: The wish is father to the thought.

Mr. LESINA: I can tell the hon. member who represent the Townsville electorate it will take him all his time to win against the Labour man this time.

Mr. HARDACRE: There is no postal vote this time.

Mr. LESINA: There is no postal vote, and a straight-out Labour man against him, who is very likely to capture that seat; also the seat of the hon. member for Kennedy.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am stronger than ever.

Mr. LESINA: Also the hon. member for Bundamba. However, I will not pursue that line of argument, as I shall probably be out of order. But I maintain if those hon. members are so firm in the faith which they have been professing in this Chamber, and out of it at sundry meetings in the country, when this vote takes place, and they have only a majority of one, that what they should do is to promptly and cheerfully resign their position.

Mr. THORN: They will go to the country.

Mr. Lesina.]

Mr. LESINA: Yes, that is the proper situation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: If the hon. gentlemen are firm in the faith which they say they possess, and the majority they are likely to secure, which I believe has been estimated is one—is no greater—the proper thing for them to do is to resign their position, and let the leader of the Opposition be sent for. Let the resources of the House be exhausted, as His Excellency must exhaust them, and if it be impossible to form a Government, then I think the matter should be referred to the constituents. The electors by that time will be prepared for a general election. They will be prepared to settle this issue, and I feel sure the Labour party will come out on top.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: This party ought to increase its number to between thirty and forty members. (Hear, hear!) There is no need to cover any of its principles. It has always preached a straight-out land tax and other reforms. In fact, we never have been accused of covering up our principles. No member of the party has been accused, and never once in this House has the party been accused of it. Sometimes we might meet a man outside who says, "Hush! Don't advocate a land tax too hard, or too loudly, or you will frighten away Bill Smith, who has a farm down the creek, and who is sympathetic towards the movement." If Bill Smith is not prepared to advocate a land tax and other reforms, he is of no use to the Labour party. We should put our foot down promptly on that sort of thing, and the same principle should guide us in dealing with the sympathiser who is not prepared to go the whole hog. This party has boldly and unhesitatingly advocated a land tax in this State, and they must make converts. Although the farmers' representatives, like the hon. member for Cunningham, may smile derisively at the idea of a land tax, they have a land tax in New South Wales and in New Zealand, which is almost exclusively a farming country.

Mr. GRAYSON: We have a land tax here.

Mr. LESINA: What the hon. gentleman refers to as existent here is not a land tax, but simply a payment for services rendered. The tax they pay comes back to them in better roads, in various State improvements. That is not a land tax at all. What we must have is that tax; and, in addition to that tax, to take the place of other pettifogging taxes, we must tax land values.

Mr. GRAYSON: Tax them off the land altogether.

Mr. LESINA: It will not tax them off the land. The hon. gentleman appears to regard this as absurd; but, if he puts a tax on land values, and renders it impossible to keep the land idle, the land must be cut up.

Mr. GRAYSON: There is only 4 per cent. of the land sold in Queensland.

Mr. LESINA: These little points are worthy of more than passing consideration. The majority of members on this side of the House will support a land tax. Every member of the Labour party will, and some members who at one time belonged to our party, and have come back again, are bound to support it. The land tax in their district is an important thing. They may have been forgiven by their constituents at two elections for supporting the member for Rockhampton, but these constituents have not forgotten demo-

cratic principles yet. In our platform, we have the platform of the men who joined the Morgan-Kidston coalition: and, in time to come, in the selection of old members or the reselection of new members, those planks must be pushed to the front once more, and the hon. member for Woothakata and other hon. members with him may be found voting with the Labour party when it comes to a land tax. And every hon. member who wants to help forward the prosperity of Queensland must vote for a land tax. It will help the citizens of the towns as well as the country. How many of the people in Ipswich, and how many of the people in Brisbane are suffering from high rents? Nearly a third of their wages, in some cases, are taken away for payment of the rent for imperfect dwellings. That is really due to land monopoly. A tax on land monopoly would bring down high rents, which many working men pay in Ipswich, Maryborough, Bundaberg, and other places.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You said they pay bigger rents in New Zealand with a land tax.

Mr. LESINA: Oh, yes; the land tax has not been put on to the full extent yet; it is only partially applied. (Government laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: One-eighth of a penny.

Mr. LESINA: It is only one-eighth of a penny on the capital value. When you get it up to 3d. or 6d. or 1s. in the £ on the capital value of the land—(Government laughter)—then it will take the whole annual rental which is not due to improvements. I do not desire to labour that question. It is something which we can discuss on the Financial Statement. If that Statement does not make provision for imposing a land tax, the Labour party should move an amendment in that direction. I think after this vote is disposed of, an attempt should be made by the leader of the Opposition, acting on behalf of the whole of the joint party—both the Independent party and this party—to instruct the Government that, if no provision is made in the Financial Statement to raise revenue by taxing land monopolies, we will bring down a proposal to impose a tax for that purpose. We must not let the grass grow under our feet, for time is precious. The stronger the stand which we take now, the stronger will be the support we shall receive in the country from those who believe in a land tax. It is now or never with us. We shall sink down to the meanest depth, if we do not grasp our principles firmly and go to the country and fight for them the whole way. I am prepared to stand the consequences. If the farmers in my district do not want a land tax, they can throw me out neck and crop; but, if they return me, I will promise them if I get a chance there will be a tax on land values. I told them that, and if they don't like it they may lump it, and vote against me. I have been returned every time, and the farmers know that. They are not scared by a bogey like the hon. member for Cunningham rakes up. He goes romancing, and scares every cocky within 100 miles.

Mr. GRAYSON: How many farmers have you got in your district?

Mr. LESINA: There are a good many there. I have not explored all the recesses of my district hidden away in the valleys and mountains, but they are there. (Laughter.) They are pioneers; they are developing the latent resources of this magnificent country,

[Mr. Lesina.]

and they have every belief in a land tax. (Loud Government laughter.) I say again we must take this matter in hand, and on this vote of no confidence we have a ready opportunity. Let every man rally to our banner who believes it. Leave the doors ajar to walk in; no man will be barred. (Laughter.) Every man who believes in the principle of the taxation of land values, which the wisdom of many thinkers has enshrined in our platform, will receive from these men outside unwavering loyalty and support. This question should be pushed to the front—pushed and pushed to the front.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: With a motor-car.

Mr. LESINA: I shall be satisfied when the time comes to deal with the motor-cars. The Government will get "hot pie" on the Estimates over the motor-cars. I know the people outside like to hear about the motor-cars, and a speech on that subject, delivered in my customary theatrical fashion, is calculated to bring down the House every time. (Laughter.) But men who listen to that do not help the Labour movement a little bit. In its proper time and place, the motor-cars will get "fits" as far as I am concerned, but people who will cheer you when you go into motor-cars want to drive you out of the country when you advocate a land tax. That is the difference. There are quite a number of grievances which we can urge against the Government in the proper place, and take them right down to the root, in order that the country may have satisfaction as the outcome of this debate. But as a member of the reform party in Australia, and cousin german to all the reform parties throughout the world to-day, that great forward movement of the Socialistic party—of which this party is but one moving phase—that party to have any justification at all for its existence must place its feet solidly on bedrock principle. Motor-cars are neither here nor there in a matter like that. It is fundamental principles they want, not mere accidental principles, or divergencies that crop up from time to time in the political history of this country—and in this speech, which I believe will be read carefully by my constituents—(laughter)—I appeal to them particularly. The constituencies of other members I only appeal to in so far as I am anxious to secure the triumph of this great principle—the principle of Henry George, made popular in England and throughout the English speaking world, and which has been popularised by the writings of Alfred Russell Wallace, one of the ablest, most consistent, and best informed political economists and general scientists in the world, to-day.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Is this only a stepping stone to socialism—the nationalisation of all means of production?

Mr. LESINA: That is why, in speaking of the objective to-night, I said that it simply represents an idea we have to keep in view.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Is that practicable, then?

Mr. LESINA: If the hon. member reads my speech to-morrow he will notice that we propose to go a step at a time. The first step is a land value tax. That is only a small step. I do not think it is such a great deal to get [10 p.m.] a land tax. They have got it in other States, and it has not made such a great alteration, because it has not been sufficiently well applied. Our objective is so

large that a man would require all night to deal with that one question alone. Perhaps on the Address in Reply I may be able to bring some more remarks to bear on some of the propositions which the Government have in their programme mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. If I can I will do so, but if not I will wait until a more convenient opportunity. I do not desire to keep hon. members any longer this evening. In conclusion, I may say that I dwelt on this aspect of the question because I think it has been too long neglected. The junior member for Ipswich, Mr. Maughan, is one of those members of our party who has made it a practice for years to travel right round the Ipswich district, visiting all the farming centres, and preaching this doctrine of land taxation to the farmers. I do not say that he is the only member of the party who has done it, but he is the only one who occurs to me just now who has consistently done it for years, and he has made a special feature of it.

Mr. GRAYSON: The farmers won't take it on.

Mr. LESINA: They listened to it, and in many cases when they afterwards spoke to Mr. Maughan they shook him by the hand, and said that if that was the land tax proposed by the Labour party, and they had known it before, they would never have opposed the party.

Mr. THORN: Your own supporters on the railway are opposed to it.

Mr. LESINA: That is owing to their ignorance.

Mr. THORN: They say they will never support a land tax. You would not support a land tax either if you had any land.

Mr. LESINA: How do you know that I have not got a station somewhere? (Laughter.) However, I will not go further into that question to-night. Look at the hundreds of men who have got no land at all! I am surprised to hear that the men working on our railways are opposed to a land tax. The hon. member for Aubigny owns a little bit of land, and he looks on this question from a selfish point of view. It is a pity he could not rise to more patriotic ideals. I hope that his constituents will deal with him, when he comes before them for re-election, because of his opposition to a land tax. As it is not possible for anyone else to speak to-night, and as I have got in all I want to say on this question, I will bring my remarks to a conclusion. In conclusion, I will just say that I hope that those hon. members with whom I have crossed swords to-night will take my remarks in the spirit in which they were meant. (Hear, hear!) I hope that the good humour and banter which so far has characterised this debate will not be departed from. (Laughter.) I think that a party like ours can rise superior to personalities on an occasion like this. We do not want any more statements that anyone has gone back on their election pledges; we do not want to say anything about the perfidy of any hon. member—(laughter)—and we do not want to make charges of corruption—(laughter)—or any statements about being offered portfolios, or of revealing caucus secrets. (Laughter.) We can rise higher than that. I hope that the people outside, who have been watching this debate with interest, and with a certain amount of enjoyment, will read my statements about a land tax, and they will see that my plea is a reasonable one. I hope then when the election comes round they will seek out those candidates who are opposed to land taxation and quietly score out their names. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. Lesina.]

Mr. JONES (*Burnett*): 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 to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. I would just like to say that we have now entered the fourth week of the session, and it might be well if hon. members would enable us to close the discussion and take a vote on this question this week.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS dissenting,

Mr. MANN: Next week.

Mr. MAY: Let us all get in our electioneering speeches first.

The PREMIER: It may be very desirable to defeat the Government; but it is certainly not desirable to hang up the business of the country.

Laughter from Independent Opposition.

Mr. BLAIR: The business of the country!

Mr. MANN: You spoke for three hours yourself.

The PREMIER: A statement of the case against the Government can surely be made in four weeks.

Mr. BLAIR: This is only the ninth day.

The PREMIER: If hon. members are not anxious to get on with business I cannot help it.

Mr. AIREY: We are just as anxious as you are.

Mr. MANN: Why didn't you call the House together in May, as you promised you would?

The PREMIER: If members do not want to get on with business I cannot help it. I may be able to help it, of course, but it is not desirable on a motion of this kind. While I do not desire to block anyone who has anything to say against the Government, I think it is a fair thing that we should bring the debate on this no-confidence motion to a close this week. I hope hon. members will endeavour to do that. There is no special advantage to the Government why we should stop the debate.

Mr. WOODS: We want to hear some of the Ministers replying.

The PREMIER: If the Ministers who have been attacked are willing to let the case go, surely those who have been so eloquent and have such confidence in their own case need not complain.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I only put it to the House that much more time will have to be taken up on the Address in Reply after this motion is disposed of.

Mr. MAY: Suppose you are defeated on it?

The PREMIER: I think it is a fair thing to take the vote this week.

Mr. BLAIR (*Ipswich*): Speaking on the motion for adjournment, I would like to say, on behalf of this party at all events, that there is no desire whatever to interfere with the business of the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: That is an old gag that has been trotted out on various occasions. (Hear, hear!) It has been trotted out so often that it has

[*Mr. Jones.*

practically been worn threadbare. (Hear, hear!) If the Premier had been so anxious to expedite business and get on with the affairs of the country, why on earth did he not meet the House early, according to his promise?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: It will be within the memory of every member of this House that there were proclamations issued by the Premier from week to week announcing that Parliament would meet on a certain day, yet finally it was put off for two months. I, for one, protest against such hypocrisy—(Government laughter)—yes, hypocrisy—(laughter)—on the other side. It is nothing but hypocrisy in saying that they want to get on with the business of the country. The Premier declares that this is the fourth week, but if he spoke accurately he would say that we are only entering on the ninth day of the debate. If he is very anxious to get on with the business of the country, why not have an extra sitting, or even sit two extra days a week? (Hear, hear!) We are perfectly willing to help him if he will do that. What is the use of getting up and making use of a political parrot cry in order to delude the people? We are ready and willing to get to work and finish this debate. But I protest against anyone being deprived of the right to speak, or of being interfered with in the slightest degree. (Hear, hear!) I hope that we have heard the last of this shibboleth about the business of the country. It is nauseous in the extreme.

Government laughter, and "Hear, hears!" from OPPOSITION MEMBERS.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*): The Premier seems to be particularly anxious to bring this debate to a close. I think the hon. gentleman showed the House an example by the length of the speech he delivered. I think it was of three hours' duration; and anyone can see the object of the speech. It was simply a statement of the case on behalf of the Government, so that in the event of a dissolution taking place his remarks would go to the country. And members on this side cannot be blamed for putting their side of the case before the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: So far as the Labour party is concerned, I think ten or eleven members have spoken; and I think the same applies to the Government side; and there have been five or six speakers from the Independent Opposition; and I don't think any very lengthy speech has been made apart from the Premier himself, who made the longest speech that has been made since the motion was moved by myself. As I told the hon. gentleman last Thursday afternoon, we are going to deal with this question in our own way and in our own time, and I refuse point blank to pull down any member on this side who wants to ventilate his opinions or give his reasons for voting on the motion; and I don't think it is right for the Premier to ask that any man should curtail his remarks merely to please him.

The PREMIER: It is not to please me at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: Evidently he is displeased because we will not bring this to a termination to suit himself. We are going to please ourselves on this question; and when we think it necessary to go to a division we will do so without asking the leave of the hon. gentleman now leading the Government.

Question put and passed.

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