

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 1909

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 5 NOVEMBER, 1909.

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

PAPERS.

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

- (1) Report on the Jubilee Sanatorium, Dalby, for the year ended on the 30th June, 1909.
- (2) Report on the Diamantina Hospital for Chronic Diseases for the year ended on the 30th June, 1909.
- (3) Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1908.
- (4) Annual report of the Chief Protector of Aborigines for the year 1908.

QUESTIONS.

TOWNSVILLE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AND GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. MANN asked the Home Secretary—

Will he cause inquiry to be made as to whether it is true, as alleged, that the Townsville Municipal Council is borrowing money from a private bank to pay interest and redemption on money loaned to said council by the Government?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

No.

Mr. MANN: Why?

PEARL AND BECHE-DE-MER FISHING.

Mr. MANN asked the Chief Secretary—
Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to make pearl and beche-de-mer fishing a white man's industry, and preserve our Northern seaboard for the white race?

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—
Yes.

INTELLIGENCE AND TOURIST BUREAU FOR CAIRNS.

Mr. MANN asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a branch of the Intelligence and Tourist Bureau in Cairns?

2. If so, will steps be taken to have said branch established as early as possible so as to cope with the inrush of visitors during next season?

The PREMIER replied—
1. Not at present.
2. See answer to No. 1.
(Government laughter.)

INEBRIATE ASYLUM.

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*) asked the Home Secretary—
Has anything been done in regard to establishing an inebriate asylum in Queensland?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—
Yes. An inebriate institution will be established at Peel Island about the end of the year.

CONSTITUTION AND COST OF WAGES BOARDS.

On the motion of Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing a list of wages boards now operating in the various districts, together with—

1. Name of board;
2. Date of constitution;
3. Number of members;
4. Date of appointment;
5. Name of chairman and date of appointment;
6. Date when determination has come into operation;
7. Total cost of fees paid to chairmen and members of all wages boards to date.

COST OF ELECTIONS IN 1908 AND 1909.

On the motion of Mr. LAND (*Balonne*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing—

1. The cost of the elections held in the years 1908 and 1909;
2. The cost in each electoral district in each year.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND BILL.

INTRODUCTION.

On the SPEAKER being formally moved out of the chair,

Mr. W. D. ARMSTRONG took his seat as Chairman of Committees amid cheers, and said: I desire to express my obligation to hon. members for the confidence placed in me by placing me in the position I now occupy. I hope that I shall so conduct the business of the House whilst I am the occupant of the chair, that it would reflect credit upon ourselves and all concerned.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Might he be permitted first of all to congratulate Mr. Armstrong upon the position he was assuming. He moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to incorporate and endow the University of Queensland.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution, and it was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The Bill was then read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday, the 9th instant.

MINING ON PRIVATE LAND BILL.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, which had been initiated in Committee, was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday, the 9th instant.

POLICE JURISDICTION AND SUMMARY OFFENCES BILL.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, this Bill, which had been initiated in Committee, was read a first time.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg to move—

That the second reading stand an Order of the Day for Tuesday, the 9th instant.

Mr. LESINA: I object to the motion for the Bill being read a second time on Tuesday next. This is a rather extensive alteration in the law, and I think hon. members should have an opportunity of studying the Bill before the second reading comes on. It is a large Bill, as far as I am able to judge, and I think it should be circulated immediately so that members may make themselves acquainted with its provisions.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Bill is practically a consolidation of the present law regulating these matters, with certain necessary amendments.

Mr. LESINA: It may be a very good Bill, but we want to see it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think the Bill is likely to come on before next Thursday.

Mr. LESINA: Will we get copies to-morrow?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Bill will go to the printer in about half an hour, and will be available as soon as it is possible to get it printed.

Question put and passed.

WORKERS' DWELLINGS BILL.

INITIATION.

The TREASURER: I move that the Speaker do now leave the chair.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I suppose the reply we got in reference to circulating the last Bill will apply to this.

The TREASURER: It will probably be circulated to-morrow morning.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to enable the Government to assist persons in receipt of small incomes to provide homes for themselves.

The PREMIER: As there was a number of Bills to be sent to the Government Printing Office, he might say at once that they would be available to hon. members this evening or to-morrow morning.

Mr. MANN: Perhaps the Treasurer would now give him the information he asked for yesterday—namely, whether the Bill provided that even if persons did not possess freeholds, but had leaseholds, they would be able to borrow on the leasehold security to erect homes for themselves.

After a pause,

Mr. MANN: He could not allow this to go through without a reply. If he received a reply he would allow the motion to go through; if not, he intended to detain the Committee until he got a reply, so that he might frame an amendment such as was framed by the late Minister for Mines, Mr. Jackson, providing that money can be borrowed on leaseholds as well as on freeholds.

The TREASURER: It was unusual to give such information at this stage. He would ask the hon. member to curb his impatience till a later stage, when he would get full information.

Mr. MANN: That was no answer to his question. No member on the other side, whether Treasurer or Premier, was going to sit on him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I may point out to the hon. member for Cairns that the question before the Committee at present is the desirableness of introducing the measure, not what the measure contains. The instruction to the Committee is to consider whether it is desirable to introduce the Bill or not, and I would ask him to confine himself to that question.

Mr. MANN: He was confining himself to it, but before allowing its introduction he wished to know its contents. If the Treasurer would give him an answer he would allow the Bill to go through; if he did not do so he would be only keeping the House from doing business. He insisted on knowing whether the Bill contained the provision to which he referred.

The PREMIER: You cannot insist on anything here.

* Mr. MULLAN thought the question asked by the hon. member for Cairns was a very pertinent one. It was not desirable

[4 p.m.] to introduce this Bill unless it made provision for building on leasehold as well as freeholds, and the Treasurer, in order to expedite the business of the House, should answer the question.

Question put.

Mr. MANN: If the Treasurer was wise he would yield to the wishes of this side of the House. They did not want another division like they had yesterday, but it was only fair when a member asked a question in a courteous manner that he should get a reply. During the late election word was sent up—he did not know whether it was sent by the late Government "Whip," the ex-member for Burke, or by whom—that he (Mr. Mann) was discourteous and rude to the heads of the departments.

The PREMIER: Very shocking.

Mr. MANN: A very shocking thing to say. It just showed how far the Chief Secretary had got on the path to what the *Bulletin* used to say of the old Philp party—fighting the election by unfair means—how he tried to bribe the electors,

and in an unfair way to belittle the character of the men who were standing in opposition to him. For that reason he desired to say that he had never been discourteous to any head of a department.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Cairns must know that he is going entirely outside the range of debate. I must ask him to confine himself to the question.

Mr. MANN: He was asking a question, and he had not got a reply to it. The Treasurer would be wise not to allow himself to be dominated by the Chief Secretary, but to give a courteous answer to the question. The House had every right to know whether the Bill would provide for a person who held a leasehold to get an advance under this Bill to secure a home.

Mr. MURPHY: Whether it will take in mining constituencies.

Mr. MANN: Whether it would take in mining constituencies or not, because such constituencies would be penalised if they received no benefit under the Bill. He had as much right as the member for Cairns to ask the question as the hon. member for Enoggera would have, and a right to receive an answer.

Mr. MURPHY: If he does not know, let him say so.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) pointed out that the information sought for was on a principle of the Bill, and not a mere detail of the Bill. It was not always customary to ask for information on the introductory stage, but, considering the importance of this measure, he thought the question of the hon. member for Cairns was a very fair one. It was a very important question to members of mining constituencies, and unless they knew whether the principle of advances to leaseholders was included, they would not know whether to vote for or against the Bill. If the Minister refused to answer the question of the hon. member for Cairns to-day, it might be the turn of any other hon. member another day. Minorities had rights and privileges, and it was quite right for any member or any minority of the House to ask for information in any Bill which was going to be introduced. The question was a fair one, and on an important principle of the Bill, and the information ought to be given.

The PREMIER thought that hon. members opposite would see that if they went into these matters they might just as well go over the whole province of the Bill at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. HAMILTON: This is a vital principle.

The PREMIER: They might have a discussion on every detail that could be included in the Bill, and the whole of the time occupied would be simply wasted. In about one minute the Bill would be laid on the table, and hon. members could see the information in it by simply asking the Clerk to look at it, and then they could oppose the Bill or arrange to have it amended. The fair thing was to permit the Bill to be introduced, then members could see what was in it, and could either accept it, object to it altogether, or amend it.

Mr. MURPHY: You often take objection at this stage.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) asked if there was no provision in the Bill to enable advances to be made in connection with leaseholds, would it be outside the order of leave to move an amendment in that direction?

Hon. R. PHILP: No; certainly not.

The PREMIER: You can amend the order of leave.

Mr. Ryland.]

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) pointed out that under the order of leave ample opportunity would be allowed in any direction that the Committee might consider necessary when the Bill was introduced.

Mr. MANN: What did you say when the Etheridge Railway was introduced?

Mr. LESINA: This was not a Railway Bill, but a Bill to enable persons with small incomes to provide homes for themselves.

The PREMIER: This is a Bill on which there is no dispute as to the principle.

Mr. LESINA was just as anxious to see persons with small incomes provide homes for themselves as the hon. member for Cairns was. His reading of this was that no member would be precluded from moving, in Committee, that persons could obtain money to build a home on the security of their leaseholds.

Mr. HAMILTON: It might provide for advances on freehold security only.

Mr. LESINA: It did not say certain persons who were freeholders, or certain persons who were leaseholders. He thought the order of leave would not exclude persons who only possessed a leasehold from the benefit of the measure when the matter came up for discussion in Committee; but, even if it did, and they challenged the Bill now, the only thing they could do was to vote against it, and they were not in sufficient numbers to prevent it being introduced. In the view that the Bill did not exclude leaseholders he should give it his assistance, but he did not believe that measures of this description ever did much good.

Mr. BLAIR differed from the hon. member who had just resumed his seat. The hon. member for Cairns in putting the question he had put to the Treasurer was only doing what members had been accustomed to do from time immemorial in matters of this kind. The question was perfectly legitimate and courteous, and all the debate which had taken place might have been avoided if the Treasurer had answered the question and stated whether or not the Bill comprehended leaseholders as well as freeholders. It was a matter of common sense that one of the elements by which the desirability of introducing the Bill was to be determined was whether it applied to the numerous class of people who followed the occupation of mining and were in receipt of only small incomes. A similar Bill which was introduced the session before last was defective in this respect, and that defect was discussed to such effect that the Bill was withdrawn. He submitted that it was a legitimate thing to ask if that defect had been cured in the Bill which it was now proposed to introduce, and he hoped the Treasurer would answer the question, and let them proceed with the business of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to a question which has been raised, I may say that the specification of this order of leave is so wide that it will not preclude any member of the House from moving an amendment later on to include building homes upon land held under any form of tenure.

Mr. MANN thought the Treasurer should take the advice of the hon. member for Ipswich, and give members the information he had asked for, because every member representing a mining electorate felt that the previous Bill did an injustice to a very deserving class of workers, in that it precluded leaseholders from participating in the benefit of its provisions. If the proposed Bill did not include leaseholders there would be a great deal of debate, and he expected to see every mining member, among whom he included

[*Mr. Lesina.*

himself, rise up and protest against such a defective measure. If the Bill did not include leaseholders, then not only would miners be placed at a disadvantage, but shearers and others who took up small leaseholds in the West would be prevented from borrowing money from the Government to provide homes for themselves. It was simply due to a bit of obstinacy on the part of the Treasurer that this debate had taken place. If the hon. gentleman had risen in his place and stated that the Bill did not include leaseholders, as from his reluctance to answer the question appeared to be the case, the question would have been put before that and a division taken, and he was sure that every man on that side would have voted against the introduction of the measure. He trusted that even at this late hour the Treasurer would answer the question, and inform the Committee whether the Bill did or did not include leaseholders. Surely the hon. gentleman would not allow his childish—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MANN: Well, he would say his school-boyish temper to prevent him answering a courteous question.

Question put and passed.

The TREASURER moved that the Chairman leave the chair, and report to the House that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Mr. MANN: Before the resolution was reported he would like to know whether members would be able to get a copy of the Bill at an early date. Seeing that the Government were rushing a number of Bills before the House it was desirable that they should be circulated as early as possible, so that members might have time to study their provisions, and he would like to see this particular measure as soon as practicable, so that he might have time to draft an amendment, if necessary.

The TREASURER said he had already informed the Committee that the Bill would go round to the printer immediately after it was introduced, with instructions to have copies available as soon as possible, and that information had been supplemented by the Premier. He could not say more than that.

Mr. MANN wished to thank the Treasurer for his courtesy in answering his question. (Laughter.)

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The Bill was then read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The HOME SECRETARY moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Local Authorities Act of 1902 in certain particulars, and for other purposes consequent thereon.

Mr. LENNON: I beg to move the omission of all the words after "1902," in order to widen the scope of the Bill. Hitherto we have found in connection with similar Bills that it has been intended to amend the Act of 1902 in trivial respects, and when members on this side desired

to see some larger amendments made in the Act, we were met with the objection that they were outside the order of leave.

The SPEAKER: I think the proper time for the hon. member to move his amendment will be in Committee or at the report stage.

Question put and passed.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The HOME SECRETARY moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Local Authorities Act of 1902 in certain particulars, and for other purposes consequent thereon.

Mr. LENNON: His previous amendment having been ruled out of order, he desired to amend the motion slightly, and he therefore moved the omission of the words "in certain particulars." If the Home Secretary would inform them what those "certain particulars" were, members on his side might be so satisfied that it would not be necessary to press the amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member must be aware that the information he now asked for was usually accorded on the second-reading stage. He had outlined the amendments to be proposed on a previous occasion. They were those which had been asked for by conferences of local authorities for the proper working of the Act, and beyond that he was not prepared to go.

Mr. RYLAND: Other Bills bearing the same title had been so restricted that members on the Opposition side had been informed that they had lost their opportunity of moving other amendments by not dealing with the matter at the proper time. One direction in which they wanted to amend the principal Act was in connection with the franchise, doing away with plural voting, and substituting the principle of one person one vote. There was also the method of valuing gold mining and other mining leases, and he would ask the Hon. the Home Secretary whether the Bill made any provision for amending the Act in that respect? At present the valuation was based on acreage. One 25-acre leasehold might be worthless, whilst another might be worth £1,000,000. Yet both would be assessed at the same value, and that was not fair.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): If every hon. member was to be allowed to bring forward any amendment he liked in connection with the Local Authorities Act, the whole of the session would be taken up in amending the Act.

Mr. LENNON: Are you a member of the Cabinet without portfolio?

Mr. FORSYTH was not a member of the Cabinet, but he had as much right to speak on the subject as the hon. member for Herbert. It was a very foolish question to ask. They all knew the length of time it took to pass the Local Authorities Act in 1902, and, if the order of leave were widened as proposed by the hon. member, it would mean that far too much time would have to be devoted to the Bill. It would probably take a month, and they all knew that there was a large number of Bills which they were anxious to pass this session.

Mr. LENNON: Are you Deputy Premier?

Mr. FORSYTH: He was not Deputy Premier. It was a mistake to introduce amendments at that stage, because it would be the means of opening up a very wide scope for the discussion of the Bill.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) did not know of any more important measure that could be brought before the House at the [4.30 p.m.] present time than a Local Authorities Bill. (Hear, hear!) As the Premier knew, when he was a member of the Labour party, it had always been the desire of that party to widen the franchise in connection with the local authorities. As to the Local Authorities' Convention which was held in Brisbane every year, he looked on such a convention with as much concern as he would look upon a progress association in one of the small towns.

Mr. COTTELL: That shows what you know about it.

Mr. HAMILTON: Delegates came from all over the State to attend the convention, but it was held at Exhibition time merely to give the delegates a trip to Brisbane at that particular time. He read the business-paper that was brought before the last convention held in Brisbane, and it was the most conservative affair that could be got anywhere. It had become a growing custom in the House of late to introduce Bills in Committee, and tie down the Committee to certain amendments which the Government proposed to introduce. As soon as the Bill was introduced, they were tied down to the order of leave, and, if the Bill did not contain a certain amendment they wished to see included, they could not introduce that amendment, because it was outside the order of leave. He protested against such a practice as that being allowed to continue. What he would like to see introduced was a real, up-to-date Local Authorities Bill. (Hear, hear!) They considered that it was an important Bill, so what did it matter if it did take a little time? It was about time that they took up some time in the House in discussing the legislation that was required for the country. (Hear, hear!) If the words were omitted as asked by the deputy leader of the Opposition, and the scope of the Bill widened, it would allow members to discuss it fully. If it was going to be a Bill framed on the lines of the Local Authorities' Convention, then he did not care if it never got on to the table of the House at all. He protested against the growing custom of always introducing Bills in Committee, and tying down the Committee to the circumscribed space within the order of leave.

The PREMIER: Perhaps the deputy leader of the Opposition might have learned that Rome was not built in a day.

Mr. MURPHY: We heard that from you.

The PREMIER: And perhaps they also heard from him that they could not do everything at once. And they had sometimes heard him say that half a loaf was better than no bread. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: And two motor-cars are better than one. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: Much better. The Local Authorities Act was a very comprehensive Act, running into some hundreds of clauses, and he would tell them frankly that the Government did not think of bringing in a general amendment of the Local Authorities Act this year. (Hear, hear!) If the hon. gentlemen opposite thought it was better to have no good at all if they could not get all good, of course they could vote against the introduction of the Bill. The Government was of the opinion that it was better to do a little good even if they could not get everything.

Mr. LESINA: Even if we cannot get the whole objective.

Hon. W. Kidston.]

The PREMIER: Even if they could not get the whole hog, it was better to get as much as would give them a breakfast. (Laughter.) That was the idea of putting in the words "in certain particulars," as it would limit the scope of the Bill. It was done exactly for the purpose of enabling the House to carry out a few amendments which were proposed in a very extensive measure without opening up the whole measure for discussion.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is a growing practice.

The PREMIER: A number of members might wish for particular amendments which the Bill did not provide for, and, when they saw the Bill, they might say that this should be done, and others might say that that should be done, but they could not enter into a general amendment of the Act. The Government thought it was better, under the circumstances, to propose to make a certain limited number of amendments which might be carried, and the Act improved in that respect. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MAUGHAN: Those who had any experience at all of local government affairs would realise that there was plenty of room for improvement in connection with the existing statute. The Home Secretary, in his opening remarks, ventured the opinion that this Bill had been prompted very largely by certain determinations arrived at by the Local Authorities' Convention, but he would remind that hon. gentleman that the Local Authorities' Convention was not the only body that took an interest in local government. At the last Labour Convention a great deal of time was spent in considering this important question of local government reform. For the benefit of the hon. member he might tell him in what direction they desired to see that reform carried. Amongst other things they advocated one adult one vote, no disfranchisement for arrears of rates, and election of mayors of municipalities and chairman of other local bodies by the ratepayers.

The HOME SECRETARY: No disfranchisement for arrears of rates. You want too much.

Mr. MAUGHAN trusted that the time was not far distant when the reforms he had mentioned would be embodied in the State's local government laws.

Mr. MANN noticed the dictatorial way in which the hon. member for Moreton attempted to lecture the House, when he said that if they went into this matter fully they would be there for a month. Why not? The question of local government was one of the biggest questions they had to deal with in Queensland, and it was only right that they should have a comprehensive, right up-to-date Local Authorities Bill introduced. He did not take much notice of what was said at the Local Authorities' Conventions, owing to the fact that he had been behind the scenes. The delegate from the Cairns Shire Council, when he went back to Cairns, made his report to the council, and he said he voted with the majority every time. (Laughter.) He just looked to see where the majority was, and he shot up his hand accordingly. (Laughter.) There was a great deal in what the hon. member for Gregory said—that they wanted a comprehensive Act passed, because, in his (Mr. Mann's) electorate he noticed many loopholes in connection with the present Act which paved the way for "cronk" voting. (Hear, hear!) There were men who neither own nor occupy allotments, who walk up cheerfully to the chairman or mayor and sign the declaration that they occupy the property for which they were voting, while "the man in the street" knows that they have not even a fowlhouse on it. While that

sort of thing was allowed, and when a commission agent, who was left in charge of a large number of vacant allotments, sent his clerks and servants to vote as actual occupiers of property they do not occupy, then the municipalities and shire councils were run, not by the people living in the district, but by absentee owners living, for all they knew, in England and other places. (Hear, hear!) It was a regular Tammany Hall business. Suppose it was desired to raise the rates in a town in order to make decent streets, and give decent lighting, or ordinary sanitary accommodation, those absentees, through their agents, simply rolled up in hundreds to block it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I must point out to the hon. member for Cairns that the whole details of the Local Authorities Act are not open to discussion. I have allowed hon. members a certain amount of liberty, but when it comes to discussing in detail what the provisions are, I think the hon. member will see he is going too far.

Mr. MANN: He was dealing with the remarks made by the Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say I think I committed an error in allowing hon. members on both sides rather too much latitude, but, having made one mistake, I do not see why I should allow it to be perpetuated.

Mr. MANN: Having made the mistake, you should allow it to continue to the end of the debate, and on a future occasion be more careful and confine members of the Committee within the four corners of the question. The line of thought set out by the amendment—

The CHAIRMAN: I must call the hon. member for Cairns to order again, and ask him to confine himself absolutely to the question before the Committee.

Mr. FORSYTH: He can't do it.

Mr. MANN: He would try to obey the ruling. He understood the motion before the Committee was to amend the resolution by omitting the words "in certain particulars."

The CHAIRMAN: For the information of the hon. member, I will read the question before the Committee. The question is—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Local Authorities Act of 1902 in certain particulars, and for other purposes consequent thereon.

I must ask the hon. member for Cairns to confine himself to that resolution.

Mr. MANN: Was he to understand that no amendment had been moved?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. MANN: Since no amendment had been moved, he would move that the motion be amended by omitting the words "in certain particulars," in order to allow full scope for discussion.

Mr. RYLAND: The leader of the Opposition has already moved a similar amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: The Labour party were not very courteous to him a short time before, but he would allow the leader of that party to move the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. LENNON: I did move that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. LENNON formally moved that the words "in certain particulars" be deleted.

Mr. LESINA: By taking out the words "in certain particulars" they left the door wide open,

and would make it a general Bill in the sense that every member of the Committee could move any amendment to the Local Authorities Act he thought fit. That was exactly what the leader of the Opposition wanted to do. He wanted to so arrange the matter that every member of the Committee could amend the Local Government Act in any direction in due course. The present Bill consisted of about a dozen clauses.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The present Bill?

THE PREMIER: The Act contains about 300 clauses.

MR. LESINA: He had not seen the Bill. All he knew was that it was proposed to amend the Local Authorities Act of 1902, which was a very big Act, and he was in the House when it was passed.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was so big that it was practically passed by a small committee.

MR. LESINA: The conference of local authorities had made certain suggestions, and he assumed that the Government had introduced into the Bill certain of those recommendations. The Minister had pointed that out. By knocking out the words "in certain particulars" they opened wide the door, not only to amendments the Government thought advisable to introduce into the Act, but to the many amendments hon. members on that side wished to introduce. He had sixteen amendments himself, which he had carefully incubated for years past—ever since the passage of the 1902 Act. The hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, was a special authority on local government, and would probably have fifty-two amendments.

MR. RYLAND: Only two.

MR. LESINA: They would be two vital amendments, and there would be numbers of amendments consequent thereon. Every member on that side would have amendments, and probably every member on the other side, and instead of fifty clauses they would have 150, with the amendments. What kind of a Bill would it be?

MR. HAMILTON: Why should we not make it a good Bill?

MR. LESINA: Of course they should, but it would be a patchwork Bill made up of amendments without any coherence. The great curse of our legislation was that it was patchwork legislation. Amendments were brought in, and rushed through at all hours in the morning. It was pointed out recently in a very fine leading article in the *South Australian Register*, that the reason why so much legislation was necessary was because so hurriedly were those amendments made that the Ministry in charge and the Parliamentary Draftsman had no time to co-ordinate them—no time to grasp their vital significance, and the next session half the time was taken up in amending legislation instead of being devoted to useful measures.

MR. LENNON: Does not the Upper House check legislation?

MR. LESINA: The Upper House did not check legislation. Everybody knew that it simply delayed legislation. Because he had sixteen amendments ready, he wanted to see the amendment carried, and he would vote for it. He wanted a chance of introducing those amendments, which were very democratic. During his tour in New Zealand he attended the Labour party's conference at which they carried a number of resolutions dealing with local authorities, and every one of those resolutions should

be incorporated in the Local Authorities Bill. He would have these amendments prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman and circulated; and if they could open the door to improving the Act by the passage of these amendments, he hoped to leave the impress of his name and fame on the legislation of the State. At the last conference of the Labour party certain amendments of the Local Authorities Act were suggested, and they wanted to amend the Bill on those lines. Members on both sides were concerned in local government, and he hoped they would give their assistance in getting the words eliminated from the motion.

* MR. MANN: He was glad to find there were other members who sometimes considered it was a good thing to know what a Bill contained before allowing it to be introduced. When a Bill was brought in he considered it was the property of the House, and every member should be in a position to move amendments with a view to its improvement. At the last Harbour Board election in Cairns for the Shire of Barron one man exercised six votes, which was an infringement of the Act, but it was allowed by the returning officer. It was for reasons like that that he desired the omission of these words, so that the Bill might leave the Chamber with the amendments they desired to introduce. He wanted the people to have the right to control local government matters. They could not do that with the present rotten franchise, under which absentees might control the destinies of a rising town or shire.

MR. COTTELL: How?

MR. MANN: The member for Toowong was a commission agent; he was agent for certain properties—

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I have before ruled the hon. member for Cairns out of order for discussing details, and I now ask him to obey my ruling.

MR. MANN: He was sorry he transgressed, but he was trying to reply to a question. He wanted to be in a position to move amendments to put into the hands of the ratepayers, the occupiers—into the hands of the people—the right to control the destinies of their shire or municipality.

MR. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*): The hon. member for Clermont intimated that he had in his possession sixteen or twenty amendments ready to introduce. So far as the Labour party was concerned, it did its business in a proper way, and any amendments to be introduced by the party in connection with this or any other Bill would filter through the executive channels of the party.

THE PREMIER: In a purely non-party manner.

MR. MAUGHAN: Yes; they did not represent party; they represented the people. So far as the Labour party was concerned in connection with this Bill, it would do everything it could to facilitate business and introduce reforms.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put and passed.

Original question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, which was adopted.

FIRST READING.

The Bill was then read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday, the 9th instant.

Mr. Maughan.]

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*) who, on rising, was received with Opposition "Hear, hears!" said: I have been in the habit of regarding this debate on the Address in Reply as an unnecessary waste of public time, but,

[5 p.m.] after the proceedings in the Chamber this evening, I have slightly modified that opinion. There are worse things than the debate on the Address in Reply. (Hear, hear!) Consequently, as a recognised occasion on which new members are expected to make their maiden effort, I suppose it will be just as well if I make a few remarks on the matter contained in the Governor's Speech, or perhaps on the omissions therefrom. We have been promised and shown a very fine list of proposed measures. They look very pretty, but I am sorry to say that a lot of them are "chestnuts." We have seen them often before, but I think the gilt is worn off the gingerbread in connection with them. Perhaps on this occasion the Premier, remembering his views when on the opposite side, may be inclined to push some of them through. Let us hope so; that is one of the things that remains to be seen. Will these Bills come up to the promise of their titles, or will they not? Perhaps not. I, for one, as a new member, and one who has not had any experience in this Chamber, am more than pleased to see that a Bill has been introduced and laid on the table to incorporate and endow the University of Queensland, but at the same time I sincerely hope that this measure will be found to be a good progressive measure. I hope that it will not be to found a University which will be but a slavish imitation of old-world Universities, which perhaps are ornamental, but are of very little use. I would sooner see a measure embodying an institution modelled on the lines of the newer American Universities—institutions which have the object of educating, and perhaps one might say creating, men and women of a serious turn of mind, who will be an asset to the State. Moreover, I hope and trust to see a clause embodied in this Bill that in the case of appointments, professorial or otherwise, preference must always be given to Australians. (Hear, hear!) I am an Australian—a bigoted Australian, if you wish—but I do not take second place to any man. Now, I had a short experience of the University of Sydney, and I have often wondered since why of all appointments it was found necessary on all professorial appointments to import a man from abroad, and another peculiar thing was that they mostly came from Scotland. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was to suit the Premier.

Mr. BRESLIN: It might suit the Premier, but it won't suit young Australia. (Hear, hear!) Now, why should those men always be brought from Scotland in the University of Sydney, and probably Melbourne?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The cream of this House is from Scotland, my friend. (Laughter.)

Mr. BRESLIN: I might illustrate the absurdity of this. There was Professor Durack, who was a Brisbane boy. He was born out here at the Albion, but he could never aspire to anything higher or greater at Sydney University than a junior lectureship. He was a senior lecturer at the University in London, and he is now a professor at the University of Hyderabad. He had no possible hope at Sydney University. He should have come from Scotland.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The Highlands, you mean.

[*Mr. Breslin.*]

Mr. BRESLIN: There was a professor, Grafton Elliott Smith.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: From Falkirk?

Mr. BRESLIN: No; not that far. He was a Sydney man, but he never had a hope in his native place. Yet he made a world-wide reputation at Cairo.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: A prophet has never any chance in his own country.

Mr. BRESLIN: But we want to have a chance in Queensland. He had never any chance in Sydney, in his own University. He was lost there; he had to go to Cairo to make his world-wide reputation. Now, why should that be? I hope that when we have our University in a concrete working form it will be an established fact that when an appointment is to be made, or a position becomes vacant, we must have one of our own graduates to fill that position. We have the men, and they have the brains. Australians have brains, and why should they not have the opportunity? At present there is only one chance for an Australian to get a professional position in Queensland, and that is to go abroad to be educated. The most recent appointment made by the Government is proof of that statement. There are better men in Australia, perhaps, than the man recently appointed to the position I refer to, but they had not been abroad. They were only Australians, or semi-Australians, and semi-Australians have always to take a back place. When this University Bill is introduced, I hope it will prove to be a democratic, progressive measure. If it is, I have no doubt it will receive hearty support from this side of the House. If, on the other hand, it is simply the prospectus of a factory for imparting a polish and adding a supercilious air to certain famous gentlemen with a tendency to snobbery, then I, for one, will be prepared to fight it by every possible means.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Is that what the Sydney University does?

Mr. BRESLIN: Yes. You will find a mighty lot of snobs there.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the hon. member that he must address the Chair exclusively.

Mr. BRESLIN: I apologise, Sir; I am only a new member. However, we must see the University Bill before we can pronounce any opinion upon it. We have had experience this afternoon which shows that it is no use asking what is in a Bill. We have to wait until we get it. Passing on to other matters in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, I find that we are promised a Bill to amend the land laws. We want amendments of the land laws badly. I hope that there will also be an improvement in the lands administration. We had a case in my electorate some time back, in which land was thrown open for selection after two years' persistent battling by the people of the district to get the land thrown open. When the land was thrown open they applied for it. But what happened? A few minutes, as one may say, before the applications were dealt with, that land was withdrawn, and it was offered to a group from Laidley at a lower rate. I have given notice of a question on this matter, and will not go into it any further until I get a reply from the Minister. Yesterday the hon. member for Fitzroy went very carefully into the proposed amendment of the Mining Act, and the Mining or Private Land Bill. I have only to say that I fully agree with his remarks in every particular. In a district like Port Curtis, where land was granted in large areas in the early days, very large areas were obtained on grant, and some

at 5s. an acre, before anyone would look at it. On some of those blocks men could probably make a handsome living by mining, but there is a great big notice put up, as one might say, warning people to "keep off the grass" and "beware of the dogs," because it is private property. There is one matter that the hon. member for Fitzroy did not touch upon, and that is the need for appointing additional mining inspectors. From my limited experience of mining it seems to me that we are in need of a great many more inspectors. I am not reflecting in any way on the present inspectors. They do their best, and are excellent officers in their way, but it is impossible for them to maintain proper and efficient supervision of mines scattered over such an enormous district. I consider that if you had an efficient mining inspector stationed at Mount Morgan there would not be nearly so many accidents as there have been in that mine. In some cases the inspectors pay periodic visits at long intervals, so that their supervision cannot be efficient. I know that when Glassford Creek Mine was working the inspector was there only once in eighteen months. How could he be expected to know what happened during the long period he did not see the mine? We want more inspectors, and we want to have them elected, as the hon. member for Fitzroy said, by the popular vote of the miners, making due provision for the qualification of the candidates. We do not want everybody to be allowed to become candidates. We make it a condition that a candidate must possess the necessary qualifications. The hon. member for Fitzroy went deeply into this matter, so that I need not further discuss it. Referring again to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, I, in common with other members, very much regret the omission from the Speech of a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. In my limited experience I have seen cases in which employers, owing to the existence of loopholes in the Act, have wriggled out of their obligations, and I am sorry to say that the most recent case in which an employer wriggled out of his obligations, that employer was the Government. They wriggled out of an obligation of £2—a whole £2! Therefore, it is with regret that I notice the absence from the Government programme of any proposal to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. In common with other members I was unable, during my election campaign, to promise half or quarter of the things which the Government candidate was able to offer. One of the things promised by the Government candidate was that the Premier would make an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act almost the first measure to be submitted to the new Parliament. However, he did not get in, and probably that is one of the reasons why it is left out, and I am here. The senior member for Maryborough, in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, expressed himself strongly in favour of immigration. He did not specify what kind of immigration, but simply said immigration—indiscriminate immigration. Probably he has not the sad knowledge that I have gained in the southern portion of my electorate, where a community of German people are settled. They were brought out here under goodness knows what promises. They cannot speak English, and I cannot speak German, so that I could not get down to the depth of their trouble. They were ignorant of our customs, our conditions, our habits, and they were sent to settle on the poor miserable land at Baffle Creek. They were sent there without money, without tools, without horses, without appliances of any kind, and there, being unable to speak our language, they are lost, hopelessly lost. If they wanted a horse and dray to carry any

little provisions they were able to obtain, they were required to work four days a week to the neighbouring man, who lent them a horse and dray to work it out. Those people's crops have been a failure, and what is going to happen? They have not the means to erect fences to keep out the scrub wallabies. They have no appliances. They are there, and what is going to happen? The Bundaberg merchants have simply turned round—and I must say they have gone farther than most business people would feel justified in going—the Bundaberg merchants, and principally one firm, have kept those people in "tucker," one might say, for some months; but they have now turned round, and they say, "We cannot supply you any longer." The women and children are starving. I am not concerned about the men—I am looking to the women and children. They are starving on Baffle Creek—the country was not fit to settle anybody on.

Mr. LENNON: Is that the present condition of things?

Mr. BRESLIN: It was the condition of things last Saturday night. They are starving there, and the Government simply turn round and say, "It is none of our business. We did not force them to go there. They wanted land, and we gave it to them." If that is the kind of immigration that the senior member for Maryborough is in favour of, I most decidedly am not. Is he in favour of that? I do not know. Perhaps he thinks it is good for the country. Probably the Government consider it the first step towards that pauper labour which is so beloved by the capitalist and the sweater. The Premier and the Secretary for Railways have given us a fine list of railway proposals. I hope at the same time that they will take care—or we will take care—and I hope there will be enough fair-minded men on the Government side—to see that it will be necessary to debar any intimidation at election times, such as took place during the recent election on the Boyne Railway. The Hon. the Secretary for Railways no doubt knows nothing about it. I do not blame Mr. Munro, the engineer in charge, but at the same time intimidation took place all up and down the railway line to force those men to vote for a Government candidate. An election notice calling on the men to vote for a Government candidate was posted up in the Government sawmill; and if I told hon. members the remark that was put underneath it I might shock them. I do not intend to detain the House any longer. We have had an example this afternoon of how anxious the Government are to push on with the business. The Treasurer gave an example of that when he could not say "Yes" or "No." They are very anxious to push on with the business, so I will conclude with saying I have been sent here by Port Curtis. You have had other members from Port Curtis before. I have been sent down here for Port Curtis as a member of this party which has the honour of sitting on the Opposition benches. I have been sent down to carry out my pledges. I have been sent down to do my best. I have been sent down to support democratic progressive legislation whenever proposed, and to the best of my ability I will.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*): There is rather a large band of new members making their bow before this Parliament, and I can assure hon. members that I address the Chair with feelings of great diffidence. At the very outset I would like to record my disagreement with what I might call the flummery attaching to the ceremony of opening Parliament. The electors, as a whole, have no idea of this display, or this show,

Mr. Ferricks.]

that takes place at the opening of Parliament. I cannot see why it is necessary for you, Sir, in your high office of Speaker, in obedience to custom, to be compelled to open the proceedings of this Chamber half a dozen times and close its proceedings half a dozen times within the space of an hour, as was done yesterday. The trooping of members of this Chamber to the other Chamber and back again is equally without sense or reason, to my mind. I think the whole performance savours more of the pantomime than of the serious business of Parliament.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: This farce—for to my mind it is a farce—may be only a small thing, but it is distinctly un-Australian; and I hope we shall see the day when this display will be swept away in favour of some simpler and yet some equally efficacious method of formally opening Parliament. In common with the rest of my colleagues who have spoken, I must express regret at the omission from the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech of any reference to an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. Members on the other side must realise that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction throughout Queensland owing to the incompleteness of the present law. The greatest injustice is that stipulation which provides that a person meeting with an accident cannot obtain compensation until he has been incapacitated for a fortnight. I have had some little experience in this connection. Some few years ago, prior to the passage of the Workers' Compensation Act, I acted in the capacity of secretary to the board of a miners' accident association, and my experience was that 75 per cent. of the accidents on mining fields do not extend over a fortnight's duration. That is to say, that 75 per cent. of the men meeting with those accidents were not entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. I think that hon. members will agree that that is an injustice that should be removed. There is another very unfair phase of the Act. That is, it practically debars a partially incapacitated person from earning a livelihood. To illustrate what I mean, let me quote the case of a man I know intimately. Unfortunately, he has only one arm. Yet I have seen that man cut his 3 tons of cane per day alongside the best of them. I have seen him cut as much cordwood as the average axeman. Of course he only achieved such good average results by working very hard. He is prepared to go on working very hard for the privilege of earning a livelihood, but he is not permitted to do so, because nobody will employ him for the simple reason that it is impossible to insure such a person under the present Act. Members on both sides will agree with me that a person with one eye is, to all intents and purposes, not an incapacitated person. Yet such a person under the existing Act is debarred from obtaining employment by virtue of the impossibility of having him insured. I mention these specific cases as I am acquainted with them; but they are by no means isolated. I am sure every hon. member can call to mind with very little effort something similar in his own surroundings. I say that these people should not be debarred from following their ordinary vocations, and that the Government should have

[5.30 p.m.] announced their intention of bringing forward an amendment of the existing Workers' Compensation Act. There is another phase of this question which I presume will be fully dealt with by the mining representatives, at least, on this side, and that is the question of bringing miners' phthisis under the scope of the Bill.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear

[Mr. Ferricks.

Mr. FERRICKS: This is a question that has more serious import than a great majority of us are likely to attach to it. This miners' phthisis is the most devastating accident—as it is an accident—which can befall a man.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: It comes along and attacks a man without his knowledge, and I hope that the Government, when they bring forward their amendments, will see their way to include miners' phthisis as an accident under the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Blair had a Bill prepared, and it was included.

Mr. FERRICKS: We will hear from Mr. Blair again. I can assure hon. members that miners' phthisis is making great inroads into our national life.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: I have had personal experience of it, and I will have something more to say about it when the Mines Estimates come forward. Assuming that these three disabilities were removed or rectified, I would say that the Workers' Compensation Act would then be a very comprehensive and very passable half measure. But it would only be a half measure after all, for no statute relating to workers' compensation can be complete without the presence of its natural corollary—State insurance.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: We know that employers throughout the country—employers in all callings—are complaining, and rightly so, against the heavy premiums they are asked to pay for insuring their employees.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: These high premiums go to swell the dividends of the very many mushroom insurance companies that have sprung up all over the State since the passage of this Act. Employers should be able to insure their employees, and the only way to do that, and by doing it deprive these parasites of their unearned dividends, is by establishing a system of State insurance.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: Under such a system an employer would enjoy a privilege which he does not enjoy now in existing institutions. Those employers whom I might term, for the sake of illustration, one man or two men employers, those men are so situated that they have to pay premiums to the insurance company for their one or two employees, but if either employer fell himself and broke his leg then he has no redress. We contend that it should be equally possible for the small employer to insure himself as well as one or two employees whom he might employ. I hope when the Government brings along the amending Bill—and let me assure hon. members opposite that it will have to be brought in or the country will want to know the reason why—I hope it will contain the amendments which I have referred to. During the recent general elections we had the spectacle of the Chief Secretary and his various candidates on the hustings, promising an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act almost as soon as the assembling of Parliament. This is a matter on which the dissatisfaction throughout Queensland is far more widespread than the city dweller might imagine. The Government will have to bring in this measure, and, when they do so, I hope the few disabilities I have mentioned, in common with those which other members of the House know of, will be removed.

Mr. MURPHY: It is more important than a University Bill.

Mr. FERRICKS: It is a great deal. In glancing down the Government programme a wave of satisfaction came over me when I beheld mention of the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the prevention of the leasing of lands to aliens.

Mr. MANN: It is a long way down the list.

Mr. FERRICKS: That feeling of satisfaction, however, was only short lived. It was swept away with the remembrance that I had previously seen similarly worded intentions in Government programmes many times, and, as my friend, the hon. member for Cairns, said, "it is a long way down the list." It is unnecessary for me to assure this House that, if such a Bill were introduced, it would receive warm and enthusiastic support from every member on this side of the House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: I believe that it may also commend itself to some members on the other side of the House if—and it is a mighty big if—we can only get such a Bill introduced. (Hear, hear!) I say "if we get such a Bill introduced," because I recognise that this proposal for the prevention of the leasing of lands to aliens has been there so long, and has been repeated so many times, that it has become a runner-up to that proposal known as the Mining or Private Property Bill. It has become a runner-up to that proposal in hoary-headedness, and if either one or both of those proposals are not taken up and put into effect then either one or both of them will qualify for an old-age pension. (Laughter.) In order to show the importance of something being done in this matter in case there might be some Southern members, particularly the metropolitan members, who might not fully realise the great national importance of this question, I will endeavour to put the position before them. To my mind it is this: Throughout a great many parts of Northern Queensland the Chinese are invading us. They are flocking down very thickly, and in some instances they are elbowing the white farmer out of his occupation. We have had experience of them in my district. In the Bowen electorate the Chinese are largely increasing in numbers. It is easy for them to get on the land. As soon as some of the land monopolists there know that there is an immigrant Chinaman in town they almost run after him to get him to take up a piece of land. Why is that? It is because a Chinaman can go on that land at a rental, and under conditions under which no white farmer or white grower can survive. Some hon. members on the other side might say that if an industrious Chinaman can outdo the white man, good luck to him. If they do not say it, some of them think it. I say that the white farmer can outdo the Chinese gardener at gardening, and can beat him easily at fruitgrowing or as an agriculturist, but I say, thank goodness that the white farmer does not descend to the level of the Chinese standard of living in that competition.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: The Chinaman, as you know, works in a great many instances, seven days a week, and if the white man did the same as a custom he would very soon be brought before the court of law. Again, the Chinese settler has no churches and no schools of arts and kindred institutions to maintain or assist, and, as a rule, he has no children to clothe and send to school. All his energies are therefore directed to the one thing, and that is to turn his product into good Australian gold, which he carts out of the country with him and takes away to China. There he will live in retirement and wealth, and he will be able to subscribe

towards the education of the patriotic sons of his country and assist in the awakening of China, so that they may one day descend upon Queensland and Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: Who is it that gives these people such a welcome to our shores? The land monopolists every time. In the absence of the operation of a land value tax, they do not use their great holdings. They will not part with them—they prefer to lease them to Chinese at exorbitant rentals and under very oppressive conditions. This is very clearly illustrated in my own district a dozen times over, and not only does the Chinese and the alien come in conflict with the white man commercially, but he actually dominates him in local government matters. When the hon. member for Cairns was speaking about the abuses under our present Local Authorities Act, I know that what he said is only too true. I know that for many years past unnaturalised Chinese and other aliens have been voting at shire council and local government elections in my district in direct contravention of the Local Authorities Act. I also know that sometimes the privilege of voting for an unnaturalised alien was passed on. One man went home to China, and another man took Ah Sin's papers and voted for him. This occurred in my own district, and I took the names of unnaturalised aliens who were voting, and when the question was looked into it was found that a lot of those recent voters had been in China years ago, and yet their names were kept on the rolls, and their votes were generally recorded at local government elections by the supporters of the monopolists who leased the land to the aliens. I know the hon. member for Cairns and the hon. member for Herbert will bear me out when I say this is not an exceptional state of affairs. In parts of their districts, especially Atherton and Geraldton, they have "the yellow curse" in a far more aggravated form than we have. In some places there are Chinamen who cannot speak a word of English. Where do these men come from? How do they get into Queensland? Across the Northern Territory, where they have been landed from their smuggling junks. And why do they come to Queensland? Because they have been told that the Queensland Government in the past had been very good friends of theirs, and that as soon as they get to Queensland, the Government will allow them to lease land to farm in opposition to the white farmer—to enter into competition with the white farmer—and so in a few years' time they are able to return to China comparatively wealthy men. We realise thoroughly that the exclusion of these people is a Federal matter, but I say the encouraging of these people to come here is a State matter. The Government in the past has been guilty, as accessories, in violation of the Aliens Restriction Act, in inducing these people to come to Queensland and practically offering them land as soon as they arrive here, because that is practically what the question amounts to. I trust the Government of the day will do something to remedy this very pressing evil. This question is of great and vital importance, and I hope, if the Government of the day does not do something in this matter, that the people will very soon realise it. It is a question that has to be grappled with by the State Parliament, and unless the Government have a firm hand and do something in this matter, we might have no University, or no children to send to our University in a very few years. I was quite taken up by the remarks of the senior member for Maryborough on the Address in Reply. He expressed his fears about our unprotected shores and unprotected coasts. What he did not say on

Mr. Ferricks.]

the matter—I presume it was an omission—he did not say anything about the Chinese invasion which is coming down upon us now, and which is being accentuated day by day, and which is being encouraged by our Governments who allow these men to lease land. I hope the Government at least will realise the importance of this question. There are other places than Brisbane, and unless the Government make themselves a broad and expansive Government, and endeavour to alter the above state of affairs, then they are not acting in the best interests of Queensland. There was another omission that I noticed in His Excellency's Speech, and that was a proposal to amend the Agricultural Bank Act. Now, that is a question that is of the greatest importance to the settler, and the struggling settler in particular. It is well known that the Agricultural Bank Act, as at present administered, is a failure. One of the worst features of it, in my opinion, is that provision which compels a prospective borrower to pay down the sum of £3 for the privilege of asking for a loan. That is not required in other places. Surely when a farmer or settler comes along and offers his security, he should be entitled to do that without being charged for it? However, he is charged, as I will endeavour to show you. First, I say he pays down £3 as a deposit, and if his request for a loan be refused, one would naturally expect that that £3 would be refunded. But it is not. £1 10s., I understand, is deducted for some reason or another. A person applies for a loan; he is refused the loan, and he is charged £1 10s. for the honour of the refusal. I say this is an imposition, and I hope the Government, at the earliest opportunity, will take steps to remove it. Another thing: In my own and the outside districts I know it is the custom that the valuator under the Act need not necessarily be a public servant—not necessarily a man responsible to the Government—he may be the village blacksmith or the town storekeeper. It needs no imagination on this point for hon. members to realise how open such a system is to abuse. I have heard it jestingly said—and there may be more than jest in it—that all the man in need of a loan had to do was to buy a ton of corrugated iron from the storekeeper, or get a wagon built by the village blacksmith, and the thing was done. In each case, one of those two gentlemen would be the valuator under the Act. I do not say this has been done; but I say it is very apparent, and the possibility—I might even go so far as to say the probability of this being done, is as likely as not, and I say that the Government should remove this and similar features at the earliest opportunity. I thought the present session would have been a good opportunity. Evidently this is not the time. I hope early in the next session this matter will be brought forward and these abuses removed. I welcome the proposal, or the mention of the proposal, to amend the Fisheries Act. That is a question that may not appeal to a great many people, and I hope I will be given this credit, at any rate: that I am not electioneering in mentioning it, as it will be realised there is a very small amount of fishing in my district. There is no Act on the statute-book, in my opinion, that needs amending more than our present Fisheries Act. Here again the gentle alien crops up. In various parts of North Queensland I have seen aliens underselling the white fishermen by 1d. per pound. Again, the Chinaman is the gentleman who is the chief offender regarding the size of fish caught. A Chinaman will catch anything from a sprat up to a dugong, and will take it home, sun dry it, and turn it into a very dainty, although very mysterious, dish—it would be so changed that it would be impossible to tell

[*Mr. Ferricks.*

the size of that fish. Men who have been to Northern Queensland have seen heaps and heaps of fish there, and they could form no idea as to the size of those fish when they were caught. The Chinese are not particular as to the size of the fish they catch. I have seen them getting in everything that could wear a scale. There are also many anomalies in the Act, and some of them do not come before the public very often. A couple of years ago, however, one of them came out in the Bowen district. A man was fishing for whiting, and of course he had to use the prescribed whiting net. Unfortunately, a couple of trevalli, which is a much larger fish, got into the net. The trevalli were landed, and the fisherman put them into his basket, and the result was that he was convicted and punished. The law does not stipulate how he was to keep the bigger fish out of the net with the smaller mesh. There is an outlet for the smaller fish, and the only thing would have been for him to go into the water with a shovel or a stockwhip and keep the bigger fish away. He was fined, and had to pay £2 2s. professional costs. Too much attention is paid to the question of meshes in the Fisheries Act; but the size and weight of fishes ought to be considered. When this matter comes to be dealt with, I hope the few things I have mentioned will not be overlooked, and that the disabilities will be removed. Now I wish to refer to a matter which, while affecting my electorate, is of very great moment to the State of Queensland. I refer to the question of cold storage for the export of produce from the North. I understand there is an agreement between the Government and the Adelaide Shipping Company which enables one of the Adelaide boats to call at Bowen on the weekly trip, and I think the subsidy is £600 a year.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: £500 a year.

Mr. FERRICKS: They are paid £500 a year, not for calling at Bowen, but for the provision of cold storage accommodation. In their newspaper announcement the company give dates and times of the sailing of their boats, and there is a footnote saying that the "Marloo" and the "Wallowra" have refrigerating space. For some time past neither the "Wallowra" nor the "Marloo" has been calling at Bowen—I understand they have been on the West Australian trade—so the exporters of perishable produce from Bowen have been without cold storage accommodation. In this agreement also, I understand, it is provided that the shippers shall guarantee the company that they will utilise 5 tons of space, otherwise the company will not cool down sufficiently; and that 5 tons minimum is the cause of serious trouble to the farmers. If the exporters and shippers and farmers of the Bowen district were assured that the shipping company would have the refrigerating space at their disposal every week regularly, I say that 25 tons would be nearer the quantity sent away than 5 tons.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They only sent away 28½ tons for the last ten months.

Mr. FERRICKS: For this reason: Farmers do not live within a stone's throw of each other; and it is not easy for Smith to run over to Jones and Brown and the others every time to find out if they are shipping in the cool chamber so that they may make up 5 tons between them. That is not convenient; but until the company get the 5 tons guarantee they will not cool down the chambers. I contend that there should be more sympathetic tolerance between the shippers and the shipping company. If the company made it known that they were prepared to have cool chamber accommodation at the Bowen jetty every week for three months—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: So they have.

Mr. FERRICKS: Without the stipulation of the 5 tons, I say that 25 tons would be available every week. The removal of the 5 tons minimum is merely a suggestion, but I hope it will be considered. It is a most vital question not only to Bowen but right through the North.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am trying to help them all I can, but I cannot get the people to ship their produce.

Mr. FERRICKS: Take the mango, for instance. That is a fruit which has to be left on the tree until it reaches maturity, otherwise it loses flavour and becomes shrunken and practically worthless. Only this day I priced some mangoes in the city and was asked 2d. each. In the North tons and tons go to rot every year for want of shipping accommodation, though mangoes sent from Bowen in cool chambers have realised 8s. 6d. a case in the Southern markets. What I have said with regard to the cool storage accommodation also applies to the tomato. Hundreds of cases of reddening and ripening tomatoes from Bowen could be placed on the Southern markets if we were always sure of cold storage accommodation. When tomatoes are carried on deck it is necessary that they should be green when shipped, and the least tendency towards reddening or ripening precludes their shipment. If the farmers and tomato-growers were assured of cold storage accommodation without any stipulation as to a minimum, neither the company nor the Department of Agriculture would have reason to complain of lack of support. We hope the department will not hesitate to renew the agreement when the term expires. If this 5-ton minimum were excluded from the stipulation or agreement with the shipping company there would be no difficulty in

[7 p.m.] getting four or five times the actual minimum shipped from Bowen each week. If this convenience were always at the disposal of shippers the export trade in the Bowen district—I think the average is something like 100,000 packages annually—that average would, I am sure, be increased nearly 50 per cent., mainly in relation to the export of mangoes and tomatoes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The matter is largely in their own hands.

Mr. FERRICKS: The growers realise that the department have done their part in the past, but I maintain that there is not enough mutual sympathy between the shippers and the shipping company.

Mr. LENNON: That is what is wanted.

Mr. FERRICKS: If the position were better understood there would be no question raised about the cool chamber accommodation available having been insufficiently taken advantage of, and, as I said before tea, I trust that when this matter comes before the department again the Minister will, in fixing up the new agreement, do his best to remove some of these disabilities and make matters smoother between the shipper and the shipping company. This is not a matter that affects Bowen only; it is a matter of national importance, because right on the eastern coast of Australia at least, Bowen products, especially fruit and vegetables, have acquired a recognised standing, and it is to the interests of the State as a whole that that splendid status should be improved upon, and the expansion and standard increased. I leave that matter with confidence in the hands of the department, and in the hands of our people in Bowen. I believe the matter will be amicably arranged between them, and if it is it will be a great impetus to one of the chief industries of North Queensland, and

one of the industries which is open to almost unlimited expansion. I regret that the question of amending the Factories and Shops Act has also been omitted from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. Why I so much regret that omission is because I realise it will be by that means only that the question of the employment of aliens in privately-owned sugar-mills or factories can be dealt with. Up in my district, in the Burdekin, there are two privately-owned mills. They have employed in the mills in various capacities various aliens and Chinese. The question of the employment of these people in the fields, of course, is a Federal matter, but surely the State could step in and prohibit these millowners from employing these people in the manufacture of sugar. Now, it must be apparent to hon. members that such a step would be wholly in the interests of the people as a whole. There are hundreds of good, sober, industrious white men—hundreds of them I know personally—knocking about the sugar districts looking for work in the slack season. On the other hand, you see Chinese and Japanese employed during the slack season. We say it will be wholly in the interests of the people and the State if these caneworkers who are forced to leave the sugar districts after the crushing season could be installed in the maintenance and overhauling of the work of the sugar-mills, that it would conduce to the settlement of a white population in the sugar districts. The sugar industry will never be on a sound basis in Queensland until we can get men to go into that industry as they go into the mining industry. Young fellows leave cities and towns to go into the mining fields; they work on the ground, build homes for themselves, and get married, but in sugar districts they cannot do that, because their employment there is only intermittent. At the end of three or four months they have to pack up and be off, and become members of a floating population. I say that this matter is in the hands of the State Government, and I trust the day is not far distant when the Cabinet will bring forth an amendment of the Factories and Shops Act and remove this stigma of the employment of aliens in privately-owned sugar-mills. This is not peculiar to my own district. Some four or five years ago, as one of a party, I was being shown through the Hambleton Mill, in the electorate of the hon. member for Cairns. I made it my business to fall behind, and I questioned a lot of the employees as to their nationality. I was told by one that he was an Afghan, by another that he was a Hindoo. There were also Javanese, Japanese, Chinese, and about fifteen other "ees." The conglomeration of the world was there, and yet white men were humping their swags looking for work.

Mr. LENNON: The conglomeration of the coloured world, of course.

Mr. FERRICKS: There were very few white men, of course. The Hambleton Mill is owned by the Colonial Sugar Refining monopoly, but I beseech the Government to try and do something to bring this state of affairs to an end, for until that is done we shall never have the sugar industry on a sound basis. It is not only in the interests of the workers but in the interests of the people to have good men earning good money circulating in the sugar districts. It is to the interests of the farmers to always have a good supply of sober and industrious white and reliable labour at hand. It is to the interests of everybody. Apart from his few yards of dungaree, or an occasional bag of rice, the Chinese are no good to anybody, and when he does require those necessities he goes to a Chinese storekeeper to

get them. When you come to realise the great benefit that accrues from the employment of white labour, it is marvellous how this state of affairs has been tolerated so long. One need only look at any of our central mills in Queensland to see what expansion in settlement has been brought about, due in a great many instances to the employees. You see men go to a central mill, obtain employment, stay there for a few years, cast their eyes round until they find a suitable piece of land, select and settle on it, and in a few years they are fairly large sugar-growers themselves. That is why I speak so freely on this matter. That is why our party realises that great settlement will so come about, and that is why I ask the Cabinet once more to do something in this most necessary connection. Now, there is another disability under which the farmers in one part of my electorate are heavily handicapped. We hear a lot about consideration for the man on the land, and the evil which would follow the imposition of a land value tax, but the farmers in my district, especially the exporters of fruit and vegetables, are very heavily land taxed just at present. I refer to the collection of those stamp duties. In the present position it is necessary for an exporter to pay stamp duty on every consignment of stuff he sends away. A man who ships to various places will have ten or a dozen shipments in a week, so that a charge of 6d. stamp duty for each shipment amounts to 5s. or 6s. per week during the fruit and vegetable season. I do not think a great amount of revenue can accrue to the Treasury from that source, or that the amount received compensates for the imposition placed on the struggling farmer, and I trust it will not be long before the Government see fit to remove this iniquitous stamp duty. Representations have been made to the Treasurer on the subject at different times, and his reply has been sympathetic. I hope that he will express that sympathy in a practical way, and that he will do so very shortly. I am pleased to notice from statements made by the Premier and other Ministers, and from speeches made by parliamentary candidates, that the Government intend to enter upon a policy of railway construction. In speaking on this subject I may be accused of parochialism when I call attention to the state of affairs in connection with the Bowen Railway. But I do not refer to it in any spirit of parochialism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: Instead of "Hear, hears!" I expected to hear a laugh when I mentioned this matter, because almost the first greeting I received on coming to Brisbane was, "Is the 37-mile peg still in the same place?" Past Governments who have tolerated the present lamentable state of affairs, and allowed it to exist so long, have not worked in the best interests of Queensland. For the benefit of those members who are not conversant with the facts, I may mention that the railway from Bowen runs out 48 miles, and terminates at the historical gum-tree—terminates in a wilderness, terminates where there is no settlement or population. Twenty-five miles further on there is very good land in the Burdekin district, which is one of the most productive spots in North Queensland. As a cane-producing centre it is without a peer in Queensland. The Mulgrave district, the Isis district, and other districts which might be mentioned are not equal to the Lower Burdekin district as sugar-producing districts, whether you consider them from the point of view of the density of the cane weight or the uniformity of the crops. In those respects the Lower Burdekin stands alone. And this splendid distance is 25 miles from the place

[Mr. Ferricks.

where the existing line terminates in the wilderness. It really passes the comprehension of the casual observer why this state of affairs should be allowed to exist. When the senior member for Townsville went to the country as Premier last year, he told the people throughout my electorate that he was prepared to extend the railway to Ayr, *vid* The Rocks. The present Premier, when in the district this year, was questioned on the subject, and he replied that his Government were prepared to extend the railway along a route which would open up the greatest extent of Crown lands. The question of route naturally crops up in a matter of this kind, but I contend that under the circumstances the question of rival routes should not be decided by any one man. It should not be decided by the Hon. the Premier or by the senior member for Townsville or by any one expert, because so much evidence for and against the different routes can be adduced. I hold that the most reasonable and feasible way out of the difficulty would be for the Government to appoint a board of experts to decide upon the route. If that course was taken, I think the result would be satisfactory to all concerned. I do trust, however, that the present Government will do something to terminate the present farcical state of affairs. The country between the existing railway terminus and the garden of the North which I speak of, along the proposed route, *vid* The Rocks, comprises a large area of available Crown land, some of which is good cultivation land, and all of which is admirably fitted for grazing. The great objection raised against this route is that 10 or 12 miles lower down there is first-class agricultural land. Granted that there is that land, and that the land is as good as it is represented to be, and granted that the Crown land is not so good as people make out, I say that people who are 10 or 12 miles from a railway are not without railway communication. We cannot expect a railway to be made to every man's backyard, and if by going 10 or 12 miles up the river a good permanent crossing over the Burdekin can be obtained, that would be a sufficient reason for taking the line by that route in preference to a route where you would have to build a bridge across a sandy stretch a mile long. Any man who has seen the Burdekin in flood knows what that means. A proposal has been made by the Ayr Tramway Board to construct a low-level bridge across that sandy stretch, but there is nothing in their proposal about the maintenance of that bridge or about replacing it after a flood. Assuming that such a bridge was built, who would replace it after a flood? It would require to be replaced. At this particular crossing of the river sinking has been carried on to a depth of 70 feet, when they struck clay. Anyone will admit that it is impossible to construct a bridge under such conditions, and if there is any proposal brought forward in connection with the route I have indicated, some guarantee will have to be entered into for the maintenance and replacement of the bridge. I am not speaking parochially on this matter. I am speaking as a member of a national party. I look at this question of rival routes from the point of view of what will best suit the interests of the State. This party contend that whatever is best in the interest of the people of Queensland should be done. That is our attitude. That is the attitude which I took up on the hustings, and that is the attitude I intend to maintain. Just prior to election day I was very pleased to read of the senior member for Townsville having expressed his belief in the extension of our splendid system of central mills. The hon. member said in Townsville that there was room in Queensland for four or five more central mills,

and the candidates of his party in various places made use of that statement. I am very much in favour of the extension and the expansion of the system. I know what the establishment of one central mill has done in the Proserpine district. One mill there has actually dependent upon it seven or eight small communities. It handles 50,000 or 60,000 tons of cane per annum, and it is hardly necessary for me to remind hon. members of what revenue that creates. The Burdekin district is particularly applicable to the extension of this splendid system. The two privately-owned mills there cannot cope with the present output of cane. The crops are so prolific, settlement is extending to such an extent, that those two mills are taxed to their utmost to drag along somehow or other. Consequently progress is retarded. There would be no speculation about the matter. It would be one of the soundest investments possible for the Government if they could see their way to advance the money for the establishment of a central mill in the district known as Airdale. In that district it is a common thing to see cane surprisingly heavy and surprisingly big. People there have 500 or 600 acres of land, and they are only able to put 50 or 60 acres under cane for the simple reason that, if they put more under cane, they have no guarantee from the privately-owned mills that they will get their cane crushed. We contend that there is room for two central mills in the Airdale district. Some sceptics may say, "Yes, but we have some central mills which have not paid their indebtedness to the Government." Well, I hold that if every one of the central mills established had never paid one penny of that principal back, they would have been a good investment for the State all the same. The condition of things now existing on the Lower Burdekin is a parallel state of affairs to that which caused the initiation of the central mill system in 1885. I think hon. members will remember the congestion in that year in the Mackay district was so keen; private mill owners were dominating the growers to such an extent that the latter were forced into co-operation. They waited on the then Premier, Sir Samuel Griffith, and asked for £30,000 for the establishment of a mill on co-operative lines. That was the beginning of our splendid system of central mills. A similar state of things prevails at present on the Lower Burdekin. I understand that the Johnston River is also languishing for want of a central mill; and, if the Government would advance the money for four, five, or half a dozen central mills, if they never got the money back, it would be sound business all the same. I intend to follow the example of my colleagues by being brief. I can only say as a member of this national party that I shall endeavour to lend my support to any projects that are brought forward that are in the interests of the people. Any measures which are democratic enough will have my whole-hearted support. When we come to discuss the Railway Estimates I intend to have something to say regarding the wise decision of the Government not to deviate from that splendid line of conduct which has been for so many years advocated by the Labour party, and that they will control and maintain all the railways. I shall have something to say if there is the least deviation from that line of conduct in the direction of giving the supreme control of construction into the hands of the local governing bodies. That is a question particularly applicable to my district. I trust that the Government will not advance £80,000 or £90,000 to any coterie or ring without making due inquiries into their capacity to handle such a sum. The ratepayers in the benefited district in my electorate are complaining, and I trust the Government will stick to their guns, and

will not deviate from the principles of the Labour party, in regard to the construction of railways. There is another slight matter upon which I wished to speak, but, as I have promised to be brief, I shall conclude by expressing the hope that the Government will give the lie direct to the statements that have been made about their becoming conservatised. The omission of the proposals I have mentioned from their programme gives some grounds for the belief; and, if they do not continue on the even tenor of their announced way, it will be for the people to answer, and I know how they will answer.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): I rise to support my colleagues on the Address in Reply. I am very sorry that the Government should have omitted from their programme measures for the benefit of the workers which were promised by their candidates at the last election. I am here as a representative of the workers, and I trust that I shall be able, by the support given to my party, to bring about some reforms for the benefit of the workers. The gentleman whom I defeated in the Kennedy held forth very eloquently—as far as he could—on the great reforms that this Government have been able to place on the statute-book, and the one that he held forth most eloquently on was this: that they were about to bring in an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. The various speakers on this side have voiced the regrets of our party at the omission of that amendment from the programme. As a party, not only are we pleading for the miners, but we are pleading for all men who live by their labour. It is a principle with us that all trades or callings must support all those persons following those trades or callings who are injured at their work, and, in the event of death, that their dependants must be provided for by the Government. Now, this is a young country, and we as a party wish to see this young country go forward and take its place amongst the other [7.30 p.m.] States of the federation and to compete with them and to develop our resources, whether it be our primary or secondary industries. We therefore think that this amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act should take in those trades and callings that we will undoubtedly have to establish in this country for the growing needs of it. There are a number of trades and callings that bring about those terrible diseases equally as much as miners' phthisis does. You know that the chemical works brings about a sickness amongst those employed in it, and you know that in the different factories the employees suffer from sickness which they get from them, and therefore it is only right, just, and necessary in the name of humanity that those sicknesses should be incorporated in this Workers' Compensation Act. The very fact that a man must be killed before his dependants can get any assistance is a terrible indictment against the want of this being placed on the statute-book. When a miner is suffering from miners' phthisis he is dying practically by inches. He has the added agony of seeing those who are dependant on him suffering privations because he, as a breadwinner, has been cut off from being able to follow his usual employment. That is a worse state for a man to be in really than if he fell down a shaft and was killed, or if an explosion occurred which cast him suddenly into eternity.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It seems a strange thing that our Ministers who draw up these Acts should be so neglectful of these obvious things that should appeal to any man of humanitarian

Mr. O'Sullivan.]

ideas. I maintain that when any Minister is about to draw up any Act, whether for the ventilation of mines or anything else, he should get the best legislation extant in other countries or in our sister States. What would you think of a manager whom you put in to look after your business or mine, if he came before you with an obsolete scheme of installing some old machinery that is something like twenty years out of date, when he could get the latest and most up-to-date machinery to carry on the business which you placed him there to do? I maintain that it is the duty of any Minister, whoever he may be, to look to those countries that already have these Acts on their statute-books. It does not matter whether we go to the old country or to the sister States. I hope when this amending Bill comes forward that the Minister in charge of the measure will bear in mind these remarks which I have made. If there is an Act in any civilised country, or in any country which professes to be civilised, and it contains something that is of advantage to us, or has an Act that is right up to date, then we should not fear in copying that Act. Supposing we had a Workers' Compensation Act as generous as that which exists in the old country, it would be a far better Bill than the one we have got now. Our opponents tell us that they have not got time to attend to these matters, but it is easy for the Minister in charge of it to acquaint himself with the measures extant in other countries. I do not wish to go further into this matter; but I must express the great regret of the members on this side of the House, and of those persons who voted for me and my colleagues around me here, and also the many thousands who voted for the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that such a measure is not included in the programme. I saw the smug complacency on the countenances of hon. gentlemen over there when my friend, the hon. member for Fitzroy, was giving us a graphic description of the terrible conditions that prevail in that mine at Mount Morgan, and I am sure if any worker could have seen the complacency on the countenances of hon. gentlemen opposite at that particular time, then he would never vote for other than Labour. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) I have had dealings in friendly societies, and I know that the various secretaries of these societies and the district secretaries have called attention to the great amount of sickness that prevails on the mining fields. One gentleman who had a vast experience, going back practically twenty years, who was in the society I was then in, called attention to these things and said: "When I was a young man the health of the miner was something above the average, and our sick pay-sheets were less than, unfortunately, they are to-day on the mining fields." I answered that gentleman by saying, "You, as a man who are living in the centre of mining, ought to know that when you were a young man you were only scratching the surface, but now we have to go down in many instances 1,000 feet or 2,000 feet." That is one of the reasons why our friendly societies funds are being depleted by the sicknesses of those who are cut off in their early manhood and cast into early graves.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They smoke too many cigarettes.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I remember one case where a man working in a mine said that although there was plenty of air about, caused by the ventilation, it was not pure air, and did not do him any good at all. I think such things as these should be included in the Workers' Compensation Act. In the interests of the great mining industry the Government should

[Mr. O'Sullivan.

come to its assistance in some way. The mining industry has come to the assistance of this State before, and it was one of the country's greatest helps during the time of the great drought. Another thing that affects the mining members of this House is the Mining on Private Property Bill mentioned in the Government programme. This Bill has been dangled before us for a long time, but I hope now that it is introduced that it will not be hampered by too many restrictions, which will only make it an abortion. Miners in my district tell me that they hope there will not be any of that red-tapeism about it which will compel a man to go a roundabout way when he can go in a direct line where there are reefs. If there is anything of that sort of restriction about it, it will only be retarding the development of the mining industry. And again, I do not see in any of the forecasts of the Government or on the business-sheet submitted to us at the commencement of the session, that there is any hope held out of assistance to prospectors. I hope the Government will see their way clear to place on the Estimates a fair amount of money to be devoted to this purpose.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: They want it for the University.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Unfortunately, the preponderance of the voting power in this end of the State is so great that they can get those things that are really not to the advantage of the class I represent. - I have nothing to say against the University Bill. I hope and trust we will have a University here that will do us credit. Those two hon. members who preceded me—the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Port Curtis—can speak from practical experience. We want to see that every facility is given for the sons of those who, like ourselves, cannot afford to go to a great expense in the education of our children, but would wish to give them the highest education that the State can possibly give. I hope that everything will be laid out on the broadest possible lines, so as to give those young boys who are proven by examination fit and able to take advantage of a higher education, whether it is a University or whatever it may be. I hope that will not be lost sight of in the framing of the University Bill. I would like to have seen an amendment to the Mining Machinery Advances Act. That is an Act which does not really benefit what I term the *bona fide* worker. It is more on the lines of capitalistic socialism. Hon. members opposite have twitted us with being socialists, but I notice when there is anything in the way of socialism that they can grab they grab it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: In this instance you have to plank down the amount of money in hard cash before you can avail yourself of the provisions of the Act.

Hon. R. PHILP: Did you not get something out of the deep sinking fund? You did the grab then.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I am not speaking about that; I am referring to advances under the Mining Machinery Advances Act.

Hon. R. PHILP: You said we grab everything.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I am not speaking about the hon. member; I am speaking about the Mining Machinery Advances Act.

Hon. R. PHILP: You referred to me.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: When you interjected and misquoted me.

Hon. R. PHILP: You are the sinner, not I.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Say a body of men, or one man, wished to develop his property, or he wished to put machinery on that property to the value of £1,000. He may have come to that stage where he requires the aid of a winding plant, and so forth. He may have assets valued at something like £700 or £800, or even £1,000 in plant to develop his property, when he finds he needs a battery or cyanide plant, or he may need a little smelting plant. Well, he cannot get any advance under this Act on those assets. If he wants to avail himself of the provisions of this Act, he has, as I stated before, to plank down half the amount in hard cash, and he may not be able to do it. I know there are little parties who need assistance in my electorate, but they cannot put down the first amount of money, and they are tempted—I know of one case where a party was tempted to give a lot of their interests away to bring a person in who could afford to plank down the money. I would like to see an amendment of the Act so as to allow the assets on those properties to be taken as a guarantee, like a bank or private gentleman would take them, for the amount of money advanced. I see on the Government programme that we have an amendment to the Local Authorities Act, and here I thought there would be an opportunity of some amendments being made to that Act that would make it broader. For instance, we all know the franchise the local authorities work under, and we on this side maintain that a broader franchise should be given, so that we can have the whole of the community represented on the local authorities. I know in my own Central place that the gentlemen who are members of the local government body—if we had a broader franchise they would not be there to-day, and well they know it; and speaking about these things this evening drew my attention to the fact that those who are sent down here to local authorities' conventions or conferences, may be men who want a cheap trip or a picnic. I believe if they placed themselves in the hands of the ratepayers, or the adults of the constituencies or place where the local authority is, they would not gain 20 per cent. of the votes. I thought again that a Local Authorities Amendment Bill meant something that would put new life into the local authorities. I see here in this great city of Brisbane, that Dr. Turner has drawn attention to the great loss of infant life owing to the need of a proper supervision of the milk supply. The whole gist of his appeal really means that if he had sufficient supervision and sufficient funds at his disposal to be able to supervise the distribution of milk to infants, there would be a great saving of infant life. (Hear, hear!) One of the first things done should be to provide the city fathers with machinery to deal with this matter. I think it would have been a greater and more fitting thing to celebrate the jubilee of Queensland by passing such an Act as this. (Hear, hear!) It would be of more lasting benefit to us—the saving of infants from these maladies that can be prevented would mean the saving of the best immigrants that can arrive in any country—that is, the native born. There is another Bill which has a fine sounding name. It is an old friend, too, that is the Workers' Dwellings Bill. Judging by the manner in which the Government withheld information in connection with this Bill this afternoon, and their refusal to accept an amendment in connection with the introduction of the Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill, I have my doubts about the genuineness of their Bill. I trust, however, that

when this Bill gets into Committee it will be so amended that those having leasehold property only may be able to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act; otherwise I will oppose the measure, because it will not be of the slightest benefit to 90 per cent. of the workers in my electorate. In the cities, too, there are very few workers who possess freeholds, and if the Government are genuine in this matter they will not insist on an applicant first owning an allotment before giving him assistance to erect a dwelling. If he has no more than the humble shilling there should be machinery in the Act by which he should be able to obtain a dwelling, whether he possesses a freehold or only a leasehold.

Mr. WHITE: How is the country to be protected?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I hope the Pure Food and Drugs Bill will be of some benefit to the community; and I trust that when it gets on the statute-book its administration will be such that the penalties inflicted for the sale of improper food will be so exemplary that no one will persist in the sale of anything that comes under its castigation. Dr. Ham was a very able and scientific man, but I am sure he was hampered in his work by the apathy shown in the administration of the Act. He was the means of getting several prosecutions for the infringement of the Act, but, owing to the want of encouragement from those administering the Act, and the magistrates inflicting small fines, it practically broke his heart in trying to bring about a better administration of the Act. I hope and trust, in the name of humanity, that this will not be so in the case of the Bill now foreshadowed. There is also a Land Act Amendment Bill foreshadowed. I do not think I will have much to say on this Bill until we see it. There seems to be a conspiracy on the part of the Government to keep everything in darkness until it has passed its first reading. I would like to call the attention of the Minister for Lands to the fact that there has been a closing up of many areas in the mining district of Kennedy, much against the wish of the residents. In a place called Mount Leyshon, in my electorate, there have been big blocks leased or locked up in one way or another, and that has curtailed the happiness of the residents of this place. I was informed by an old resident there that previous to the locking up of these big blocks there were many families who, with a few cows, were able to supply themselves with butter and milk, but owing to the curtailment of the areas on which they could graze a cow or two this source of income has been denied to them; and I will oppose by all the means in my power anything that will lead to the leasing of big blocks about our goldfields. My opponent was in favour of leasing big blocks, which met with the strenuous opposition of the residents. They knew from the platform I had signed, and from the fact that I was a Labour man, that I would oppose it; there was no need for them to ask me if I was opposed to the alienation or leasing of big blocks of land round about goldfields; and that was one of the chief reasons why I was able to poll such a splendid vote in the Kennedy. Another thing I wish to call attention to is the administration of the Railway Department. There are in that department various grades, and I see that the lengthsmen, who are the hard grafters, are placed in the worst position. Should a lengthsmen be under orders to leave his home, and go any distance entailing his absence from home for the night, he has the great sum of 6d. allowed him. In the higher grades there are men getting 7s. 6d. if they have to be away for the night, and there

Mr. O'Sullivan.]

are gradations down to 2s. 6d. per night. This is a thing that cuts into the happiness and comfort of the lowest paid men in the Railway Department, and when the Estimates come up I shall have a little more to say on the matter, and voice the need for some more generous provision being made for lower-grade public servants. The hon. member for Bowen was speaking about sugar-mills, and the employees round about sugar-mills, and I can bear out his remarks. I was in the Lower Burdekin myself, and through one of the mills, and I saw there Chinese working in one department of the mill, and Japanese in another department of the mill, and I maintain that these things should be abolished. If we want to settle people on the land we should insist that all these mills shall employ no other than white labour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: A hundred or two of these Asiatics work for something like 19s. or 19s. 6d. a week, and displace white [8 p.m.] men, who are more entitled to share in the work of the sugar industry than in any other industry, because we have assured the position of that industry by legislation.

Mr. COYNE: We are the consumers also.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We are consumers also, and had we not, as a party, insisted on this legislation, in season and out of season, the industry would not be in the position it is in today. I wish to make a few remarks on the attitude of the Premier to the financial agreement that is now before the Federal Parliament. During the last election this was undoubtedly used in many electorates, and in my own electorate I foreshadowed that the present Premier would use this agreement as a stalking-horse to hide other things that are not apparent to the casual observer. The Federal Labour party is the only national party in politics that is insisting on conditions which are conducive to the happiness of white Australians, as against the party opposed to it, comprising the old black labour crowd, on the one hand, assisted by the sweating manufacturer and the cheap importing class. That is practically the party that is now opposed to the Federal Labour party, because they know in their hearts that the Labour party are out for better conditions for the worker, which means, of course, that the federated employers and the cheap importers want to get the best of the bargain. Should these clauses, which are now insisted on by our opponents, become the law of the land, it will entail on the worker a load of indirect taxation, which he should not have to carry. That is why we cannot agree to any length of time being given, or anything that can be adduced as an argument that we are in favour of an indirect taxation on the whole of the people of Australia to the extent of £1 5s. per head. Our opponents know that the trend of politics is against the raising of such a great amount of money by the Customs, because it would mean that the people of the Commonwealth would have to raise something like £4,500,000 per year on the present population, through the Customs alone, to satisfy the demands of the States. We maintain that, should this come about, other sources of revenue which should bear this taxation will escape. I maintain that, by this means, our opponents are trying to bring about a permanency of indirect taxation that is very detrimental to the worker, because he is the least able to bear this taxation. It is an old dodge of the Tories to raise the revenue by indirect taxation. You all remember the time when the poll tax of the continuous Ministry was inflicted

[Mr. O'Sullivan.

on the poor people of Queensland, and how the people in their indignation practically swept away the Administration which had imposed it. Now you are going to bring about a poll tax of another kind—that is £1 5s. for every person in the Commonwealth, which means a lot to a man with a wife and family who is simply dependent on his labour for his living. I hope the people of Australia will see clearly through this and resent the manner in which the opponents of Labour want to throw dust in the eyes of the people. I notice there is a Police Offences Bill promised, and I hope we shall have time to discuss that measure, because there are many anomalies which want removing in the Police Force. I shall have something to say on the matter when the Bill comes before the House. The Police Force in this State have, I believe, not been treated fairly. There are many grievances which cause discontent. One grievance in the North is that they have no tropical allowance given them. The clerks of petty sessions, and officers of that class, have a tropical allowance, and this allowance should be added to the salaries of officers in the Police Force as well, in order to bring about an equitable arrangement with that force. I do not intend to detain the House much longer as other members wish to speak, but I must congratulate hon. members on the other side on the way they have conducted themselves. They have kept themselves to the crack of the whip very well; evidently they are very pleased, like all the old Tories are, that no discussion should take place. It is always like this—Tories do not like to discuss matters for fear they let something out. I trust when the Bills come before the House that the so-called liberals will fully discuss them. I believe there are some liberals on the other side—I take that by implication, in regard to the hon. member for Brisbane South who said there were Tories on both sides of the House—I suppose he meant there were some Liberals there, too, but I am afraid the Tory element is predominant. I thank hon. members for the kind attention they have given me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY (*Townsville*), who was greeted with "Hear, hears!" from the Opposition benches, said: Like those members who have preceded me, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words on the programme submitted by the Government. I should like to congratulate the other side on the acquisition of the two gentlemen who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I think any party should be proud to have two such intelligent gentlemen associated with them. There are a number of measures enumerated in the Government programme, and on their face they appear to be of a democratic nature, but whether they will turn out to be such when they come before the House in a printed form remains to be seen. Personally, I do not think this House can expect very much of a democratic nature from the present Government, because when the fusion between the Kidston and Philp parties took place, the Premier stated that the legislation to be brought forward in the future would necessarily be coloured by the opinions of those who sat behind him. That being so, I do not think we can expect that any measures brought forward this session will contain very much that is democratic. The first measure mentioned in the Government programme is the Queensland University Bill, which speakers on this side of the House have mostly approved of. In fact, I do not know that any sensible Queenslander conscientiously objects to establishing a University in Queens-

land. The platform of our party provides for the highest education procurable for the people of Queensland. Our platform contains a plank which reads that education shall be free, secular, and compulsory—elementary compulsory, higher optional—so that we believe in the very highest education being extended to the people who can avail themselves of it. We do not say that higher education should be compulsory, because we admit that a large number of working people, whose children would perhaps distinguish themselves at a University, are unable to send them there, owing to their impecuniosity. We are in favour of the State assisting to educate intelligent and deserving children in cases where the parents cannot afford to do it. If the proposed University Bill provides for the establishment of a University on anything like the lines I have indicated, I feel sure that it will receive the fullest support from members on this side of the House. The third Bill mentioned in the list is a Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill. When I saw that Bill in the list, I felt rather pleased, because I thought it would give me a chance to get passed into law an amendment which I failed to get the local authority of which I am a member—namely, the Townsville Municipal Council—to agree to. A short time ago we were appointing delegates from our council to attend the conference of local authorities which was recently held in Brisbane, and, in order that I might infuse some democracy into the council, I proposed that our delegates should bring forward at the conference in Brisbane a resolution affirming the desirableness of simplifying the municipal franchise by adopting the roll of electors for members of Parliament. (Hear, hear!) For the life of me I cannot see why any man renting a house from one of the fat aldermen who have a large number of houses to let should not be entitled to a vote in the election of aldermen as well as any man whose name happens to be on the municipal roll. I claim that any man who lives in a town and pays rent to a landlord, and pays his bills, helps to keep the town going just as much as the man who pays rates direct to the municipal council; and for that reason I hold that every man who has been a resident of a town for six months should be entitled to vote for a member of the local authority. So I asked the council, when instructing their delegates, to direct them to bring forward a motion of the description I have mentioned. And would you believe it? The whole of the members of the council simply laughed at me. I could not even get a man to second my proposition—not one. Therefore, when I came to Brisbane as a member of Parliament, and saw that the Government intended to amend the Local Authorities Act, I thought, "Now is my chance; I shall be able to get that amendment inserted in the Act." But I find that the Bill which the Government propose to introduce deals only with certain amendments, and they will not even tell us what those amendments are, so as to give us an idea whether they are such as we can support. Of course we shall get that information later on when the Bill is presented to the House. But it seems to me that the amendments proposed by the Government will not be any more democratic than the propositions put before the conference that was recently held in Brisbane, which was composed of men who have no democracy in them, and who have no use for the worker in any shape or form except to make a profit out of him. Then we have in this list a Licensing Bill. I have no idea what kind of a Licensing Bill the Government intend to bring forward, but I trust that provision will be made in it to allow the people by popular vote to say whether they

will have public-houses or not. I do not think the present Act is sufficiently democratic to deal with the drink evil as we know it. The people who are most concerned in this are the workers themselves; and any question affecting the drink traffic, whether it be the appointment of magistrates to administer the Act, or whether it be the granting of licenses, or the closing of public-houses, or any matter connected with the traffic, I think the Government should make provision in any Bill they may bring forward that the people shall be the final tribunal. The present system of appointing licensing justices is a bad one, and one that is calculated to put it in the power of some men to make a very good living. I will just tell the House of a little matter that happened in my own experience in this connection. Some years ago, when I was created a licensing justice, a commission agent, who was then resident in Townsville, but who has since left, was very eager to procure the position of licensing justice. He said to me one day, "I wish you would give me a letter of introduction to one of the Ministers so that I could get his influence to bear with a view to getting me created a licensing justice." I asked him why he was so anxious to be made a licensing justice, and he said, "Why, man, if I had that it would be worth £250 a year to me." I was anxious to know how that could be, because it made not the slightest difference to me; and he pointed out that, if he were a member of the licensing bench, he could influence the publicans to give him their business, and that would mean at least £250 a year to him. That is the evil of allowing men of this description to be appointed to these positions. If it is necessary to have a bench of magistrates to grant licenses or refuse them—which I do not believe it is—they should be just as amenable to the people as anybody else, and they should be elected by the people just as well as the members of any other local bodies. I think that the duties of licensing magistrates should be entrusted to police magistrates, and to police magistrates only, and they should have the power to grant or to refuse licenses as they think fit. I trust that the Government in bringing in a Licensing Bill, will see that all the power necessary to carry on the drink traffic or to do away with it, if necessary, is placed in the hands of the people as a whole. Then in the list of Bills is a Trades Disputes Bill. When that was first suggested in Queensland, it was intended to be a very democratic measure. The object of a Trades Disputes Bill is that the law shall be called into operation to protect the funds of a trades union in the event of a strike taking place, and any of the officers or members of the union doing something contrary to the wishes of the majority of the union, and the union being sued for the offences of its members. Most hon. members will remember the action that was taken with regard to the Taff Vale Railway dispute some years ago in the old country. There a large union was out on strike, and because some of its members did something contrary to the spirit of the members of the union they were summoned, and the union was sued for damages they were not responsible for. The result was that the union was mulct in a large sum of money through no fault of its own, but entirely through the fault of one or two unruly members. Since then a Trades Disputes Act has been placed on the statute-book in the old country to protect unions against any such happenings in the future. What is wanted, and what we have asked for, is that a similar measure shall be placed on our statute-book. We have a Bill promised to us. It has been promised before, but it has been dropped on one or two occasions for reasons, I suppose, best known to

Mr. Foley.]

the Premier. But I trust that whatever shape his Trades Disputes Bill may be in this time, he will not drop it, but that he will at least bring it before the House so that we may have a cut at it. However, I am reminded again of the Premier's remarks, when the fusion took place, that legislation in the future would necessarily be coloured by the opinions of those who were supporting the Government. Hence I think that the Trades Disputes Bill will be very different from what we expected it to be when it was first spoken of in Queensland. I hope that the Premier will bring it forward, whatever shape it may be in, because if we get it placed on the statute-book at all, the time is not far distant when the party on this side will be in a position to make such a Bill of it that it will be worth having. I am very pleased to see also that the Government are going in for a Pure Food and Drugs Bill. If there is one thing that the Government should look after more than another it is a pure food supply. We know and we have heard and read of hundreds of cases of people dying from ptomaine poisoning and eating bad food. The hon. member for Kennedy told us of numbers of cases of children dying from the use of impure milk, and there are a hundred and one ways in which a Pure Food and Drugs Act could be used for the protection of the people generally. I am pleased that the Government in their wisdom have found it necessary to bring forward such a Bill, and I trust it will be of such a nature that we can support it heartily, and that it will become the law of the land. Another Bill we are promised is a Police Offences Bill. I do not exactly know what this Bill means—whether it deals with offences committed by the police, or whether it relates to offences committed by the Government against the police. But there are certainly complaints on behalf of the police that the Government should remedy. In order to corroborate that statement, I want to bring before the House some of the conditions under which the Queensland police are suffering to-day. In the first place, I would like the House to know who is eligible and who is qualified to become a policeman in Queensland. When I [8.30 p.m.] show you the kind of man the Government expects to have as a police constable, I feel sure that you will agree with me that the wages paid to those men are quite inadequate for the duties and onerous work that they have to perform. It says in "The Qualifications required by Candidates for the Police Force of Queensland"—

Candidates must be at least 5 feet 8 inches in height, 36 inches minimum chest measurement, with expansion to not less than 38 inches, of strong constitution, and free from any bodily complaint. To ascertain this they will be examined by the Government Medical Officer.

They will have to pass a short examination in reading, writing from dictation, and the first four rules in elementary arithmetic—viz., addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division.

All candidates must be accustomed to horses, and able to ride well, to test which they will be examined in horsemanship at the depot.

They must produce satisfactory testimonials of character, including one from local or other police officer, and those candidates who have served in any other force must produce their discharges therefrom.

Candidates are not appointed to the force when over the age of thirty, unless they have served in some other Police Force.

I want to show this House the wages that are paid to these men. A man of an average height of 5 feet 8 inches, with a 36-inch to 38-inch chest measurement, are men who are able to take their place in any walk of life. (Hear, hear!) And the pay offered to men of this stamp by the Government is this: For a probationary period at the police

depôt, 5s. per diem. For the first two years they get £108 per annum, which is equal to £22 per week. For another two years they get £122 per annum, and after four years' service they get £126 per annum. They put in four years at that, and after eight years' service they get £130 per annum.

Anything in the nature of expenses incurred by members of the force for purchase of uniform or for messing at a police mess are first charges against their salaries; and when such charges are not duly liquidated by any such member, the amount thereof may be deducted from any salary accruing to such member.

We ask members of the Police Force to be fit and sound men—men of physique necessary to do any amount of manual labour—and for this we offer them 5s. a day to start with, and for the first two years' service we offer them £2 a week. Out of that they have to find their own rations and uniforms, which reduces their pay, after paying for their rations and other things, to 5s. 8d. per day. Fancy an able-bodied man of 5 feet 8 inches in height, with a chest measurement of 38 inches, getting 5s. 8d. per day! At the end of four years, after paying 4 per cent. to the superannuation fund and 2s. for duty stamps, their wages amount to 6s. 5d. a day. During the second four years their wages amount to 6s. 7d. a day. After doing eight years' service all the wages that a policeman has due to him is 6s. 10d. per day, not £2 2s. a week. After doing eight years' service in the Police Force, just fancy him getting the enormous sum of 6s. 10d. a day! I think that the Minister having this branch of the department under his charge should at least see that these men are paid a living wage. (Hear, hear!) It is only fair to ask that a policeman should be treated at least as reasonably as a navy. You cannot get a navy with all the physique and everything else I have described here—you could not get him to work after eight years' service for 6s. 10d. a day. He wants 9s. and 10s. a day for a start. The policeman who has practically to look after the interests of the people and look after men in high places and men with large houses should be paid at least a living wage. These men are liable to be called out any hour of the night or day to attend to their duty, and the Government should see that their grievances are redressed by paying them an amount equal to what other branches of the service get. (Hear, hear!) Here is another matter in connection with the police which I was not aware of until this election. I find that the policemen are the only men in the Government service who are not granted an allowance for extra cost of living in the Northern districts and far Western districts. Every other branch of the service are allowed so much a year extra cost of living, as it is called, for going north of Mackay, but the policemen for some reason are debarred from getting this extra cost of living. The policeman in Townsville—and also in Hughenden, I understand—does not get any more than the policeman in Brisbane. I think that any hon. member sitting in this Chamber will admit that the extra cost of living, and the climatic conditions under which these men have to work in the far North, are so much worse than those in Brisbane, that some extra allowance should be given to the men who are shifted up to do duty in that part of Queensland as members of the Police Force. Perhaps some Minister can explain the reason; but I cannot understand why it is that the police, of all the service, are selected to undergo this treatment.

Mr. COYNE: Because they are not allowed to organise. That is the reason.

Mr. FOLEY: The Government have found it necessary to allow this extra cost of living to

[Mr. Foley.]

public servants in other departments who are transferred to the North, and rightly so, I think; but seeing that they have done it in other cases, why in the name of fair play do they not think it is necessary to extend it to the Police Force? I am sure that no reason can be given to show that the policemen are not entitled to this extra cost of living just the same as other branches of the public service. I hope the Minister will endeavour to rectify these grievances, and give the police in the North the same treatment as other members of the public service. In order to show the House the difference between a policeman's pay and a soldier's pay, it is necessary for me to read this little bit of information which I have here—

At present the Police Force is undermanned for the want of suitable recruits, which can easily be accounted for by a comparison of the monthly wages of a soldier and a constable. Take the North, for instance. Townsville, where a constable gets £8 12s. 8d. per month, pays £3 monthly for his rations, about 10s. or 14s. monthly for washing, buys his uniform and boots out of the £5, he will not have £4 left, while the private soldier gets £5 18s. monthly with rations and washing allowance, boots, and four suits of uniform yearly, has much less work, worry, and responsibility than a policeman, and more leisure, it is not to be wondered at that the young men do not rush the police service for employment.

Hon. members, I think, will agree to that proposition—that the reason why the Police Force is so short of recruits is because it is more profitable to be a soldier. A soldier gets £5 18s. a month, besides washing allowance, boots, and four uniforms a year, while the policeman gets £8 12s. per month, and has to pay for his rations, uniform, washing, and his own boots. No wonder the young men want to be soldiers rather than policemen. That should be altered, and the conditions could be made such as would enable us to get a most efficient Police Force. There is no reason why the Government should not make the policeman's salary at least equal to the soldier's. There is just one other matter I wish to call attention to in this business, because I shall have a lot more to say on this matter when the Estimates are before the House. I was reminded of this particular when the Premier interjected while the leader of the Opposition was speaking on the Workers' Compensation Act. Some reference was made to the policemen in that discussion, and the leader of the Opposition mentioned that the policeman does not even come under the Workers' Compensation Act, and that if he got killed in the execution of his duty, his dependants would not be entitled to the amount due to other workers under the Workers' Compensation Act. The Premier interjected in that connection that the police had been left out of that Act in order that they might come under a better principle and a better regulation. My information is that should a policeman get killed in the execution of his duty, he gets one year's full salary—£128 or £130. Now, in the case of a workman, no matter how humble he may be, or in what capacity he earns his living, his dependants may get £400 if he meets his death through an accident while following his employment. But supposing a burglar has broken into the Premier's house, we may say, and is getting away with all the silver plate and other valuables he can lay his hands to, the Premier wakes up in the middle of the night, and, finding a visitor in his room, would naturally get up to see what he wanted, and the next thing he gets a tap on the head with a jimmy and is knocked out. But our policeman is outside waiting for this gentleman to come out. Immediately he makes his appearance the policeman tackles him, and the burglar, rather than be arrested and taken into court, shoots down the policeman with a revolver, or knocks his brains

out with a jimmy. Now, that policeman may have a wife and five children dependent upon him, and all they are entitled to under the police regulations is £128 or £130, whichever salary he may be getting. He is only entitled to one year's salary as compensation for having lost his life in protecting property. I think the least the Government can do is to put the policeman on the same footing, as regards this matter, with other workers. The police are drawn from the workers. It is no use saying a policeman is different to any other man. Take off his uniform and he is the same as one of us; he is a worker. I say that the police should be paid at least a reasonable wage, and when we put such conditions as this on to him—that he is to be a man 5 feet 8 inches in height, of the chest measurement of 36 inches to 38 inches, besides other bodily and physical capabilities—of being able to do almost any kind of work, and able to ride a horse well, and other things, I say we should at least provide a wage equitable to those requirements. I ask the Government to seriously consider these matters when the Police Estimates are under consideration this year, in order that these injustices shall be rectified. There are one or two other matters that I will briefly touch upon, because I suppose this will be the only opportunity I shall have of referring to them. I notice that all the previous speakers have left the recent elections severely alone. They seem to have no fault to find with the way the recent elections were carried out. Whether I stand by myself or not, I am going to make very serious complaints to this House about the way this election has been conducted.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY: Amongst other things, the method in which officers are appointed to carry out the elections should be altered. Of course I know the custom, or system, is to appoint a returning officer for each district, and that returning officer is then at liberty to appoint his subordinates—his presiding officers and poll clerks—as he chooses. These appointments are generally made from those who are of the same political opinions as the returning officer, and for that reason I think it is wrong, because we do not know how soon the Labour party may get into power, and we may happen to appoint a returning officer who will have the power of appointing his presiding officers, and who may appoint people who are entirely on the other side. What I think is this: That the conduct of the elections should be entrusted in every case to public servants, who are paid by the State or the Commonwealth—who are paid a yearly salary, and who have no interest in the result of the election. Now, in Townsville, the returning officer there appointed six presiding officers and six poll clerks, and I am free to say that not one of those twelve gentlemen could be accused of voting for the Labour candidates. Those men were biased on behalf of the other side, and I say that it takes a certain amount of influence on to that side when you have all the presiding officers and poll clerks actually soliciting for that side. It is an unfair start to the other side, and I say in order to avoid anything like that, the Government should insist that the presiding officers and poll clerks should be appointed from the Government officers or other public servants. There are any amount that could be well spared for the one day to carry out the duties connected with an election, and everybody would feel more satisfaction. I feel sure that even members on the other side would feel more satisfied to have elections conducted by officers who were unbiased. It has been remarked many times that

Mr. Foley.]

there are a number of these gentlemen hanging about in Townsville, always ready to preside at elections, and never do a day's work otherwise.

Hon. R. PHILP: They all work just as hard as you do.

Mr. FOLEY: It is a long time ago.

Hon. R. PHILP: It's a long time since you did hard work.

Mr. FOLEY: You get the same poll clerks and presiding officers at every election—municipal, State, or Federal—in Townsville, and it has become a byword that they are given these billets for services rendered. I hope the Premier will rise to the occasion and have public officers appointed for the purpose of conducting elections.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: He has to do as he is told.

Mr. FOLEY: Another thing I have to complain about is the iniquitous system of canvassing allowed under the Act. I say it should be abolished.

Mr. WHITE: The Labour party would not be much good if it was abolished.

Mr. FOLEY: In Townsville the candidates on the other side were going from house to house canvassing for votes, and to any shop or factory where two or three men were employed.

Hon. R. PHILP: Untrue.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member knows better, and I know better.

Hon. R. PHILP: I never asked a man for a vote for myself in my life, and it is quite untrue to say that I went about from house to house canvassing for votes.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member has thought fit to deny that he has ever done any canvassing; but I have seen him going into the shops, and I have been told by the employees in the shops that he has come up to them and asked them for their votes.

Hon. R. PHILP: Not true.

Mr. FORSYTH: You must accept the denial.

Mr. FOLEY: Of course I will accept the denial. That, I think, is the usual form, but I can have my opinion all the same. The senior member for Townsville was not present at the declaration of the poll, or he would have been obliged to hear all I had to say, and his denial would not have been of much account there, because there were people there who knew that what I say is absolutely true. And even his colleague, who was present, did not deny one word; in fact, he admitted that he had been canvassing. When candidates go into shops and ask employees how they are going to vote, is it fair that they should be asked to answer the question in front of the employer? In front of his boss he feels bound to say "Yes," and I say the system is likely to create a nation of liars, because men will tell a lie to save their job.

Hon. R. PHILP: You cannot bring a single one to say that I asked for his vote.

Mr. FOLEY: I say it should be made a criminal matter to canvass for votes. What becomes of the secrecy of the ballot if we are allowed to ask a man how he is going to vote? The ballot is given to people so that they may record their votes in such a way that only God and themselves know how they vote. That is the secrecy of the ballot, and that is what I claim for every man and woman. Perhaps the senior member for Townsville will say this is not true also: I will ask him if it is not a fact that he accompanied an old lady and gentleman into

the booth, taking the old lady by the arm and telling the returning officer that the pair wanted to vote for Philp and Fenwick?

Hon. R. PHILP: Not true.

Mr. FOLEY: Is it not a fact also, that when the old man was asked, he said he wanted a card, and he pointed out the two names, "Austin" and "Foley" on the ballot-paper; and the presiding officer, who was a friend of Mr. Philp's, asked him if those were the names he wanted to be struck out. My scrutineer, who was alive to his duties, told Mr. Philp and told the presiding officer that he had no business to ask the old man what names he wanted to strike out. He told him the old man was pointing to the names he wanted left in, but the presiding officer seemed unwilling to strike out "Fenwick" and "Philp," and asked the old man a second time. Then the old lady stepped forward and told the presiding officer, in the presence of the senior member for Townsville, that she wanted to vote for Foley and Austin.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY: During the discussion and argument that took place, Mr. Philp arguing for the votes, the returning officer came in, and it was only through him that the matter was settled, because the old lady insisted that she must have her vote for the Labour candidates.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Good old lady! and laughter.

Hon. R. PHILP: Mr. Foley was not present. There was an old man and his wife, neither of whom could speak at all.

[9 p.m.] They went into the booth, and I recognised them and took them where they could vote. I saw the two vote for Foley and Austin. I did not open my mouth to ask them who they would vote for.

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall be glad if hon. members will recognise that when an hon. member rises to make a personal explanation he must confine himself as briefly as possible to a denial.

Mr. FOLEY: I was going to ask when the hon. member for Townsville was speaking, whether it was he or I who was making this speech.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a song with a chorus. (Laughter.)

Mr. FOLEY: However, Mr. Philp has not denied this. He has practically admitted what I have said in this matter.

Hon. R. PHILP: No, I do not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member says that neither of the old people could speak.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is so.

Mr. FOLEY: I think he is wrong in that, because the old lady, my scrutineer informed me—I was not present myself, Mr. Speaker,—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh! oh!

Mr. FOLEY: At the time that it happened, but my scrutineer informed me—and he was just as good as if I had been there myself—that when the argument between the old man and the returning officer had been going on, and the old man was pointing out the names he wanted in, the old lady simply came round from the hon. member for Townsville, and told the presiding officer that she wanted to vote for Foley and Austin.

Mr. COYNE: Did the old lady go out on the senior member's arm also?

Hon. R. PHILP: She was not on my arm at all. (Laughter.)

[Mr. Foley.]

Mr. FOLEY: I think I have shown the necessity for doing away with this canvassing and soliciting of votes.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY: It is a bad practice, and certainly an influence that should not be used on men, and women, too, who are not able to defend themselves. In order to make our elections as pure as possible, and that men of the people's choice shall come to this Chamber to make laws, it is necessary that this canvassing should be abolished, and I think the time has come when the Government should bring in an amendment of the Elections Act with that object. I ask for that because, as I said, the influence may be used in the near future on the other side. I would not be accountable for any influence that was used on our side if we got the power, and in order to prevent any such influence being used it is time that this should be stopped. It has gone to such a length in Townsville—I do not know about other electorates—that it is time it was stopped, and stopped for ever. I have kept the House longer than I intended on this my maiden speech, but there is just another matter in connection with the election that I want to mention. I have already put it before the Home Secretary, and he has promised to make inquiries into it, still I think that the House should know something about my grievances. A number of absent votes came to Townsville from a place called Ayr, about 48 miles from Townsville. The presiding officer at Ayr, who was attending to the absent votes in that district, had run out of official ballot-papers.

Mr. RYLAND: That was the same way all over the State.

Mr. FOLEY: In order that the men who went there to vote should not be deprived of their votes, the presiding officer took the trouble to write out the declaration contained on the printed envelope, but because he omitted to write on the ballot-paper inside the envelope the necessary instructions to the voter, the votes were rejected. The presiding officer, I suppose, thought it was not necessary to write those instructions on the inside of the ballot-paper, seeing that he had written all the declaration on the envelope, and he simply gave the voter a plain sheet of paper to vote on. Those votes came up to Townsville as absent votes, and the returning officer in Townsville, after looking on the declaration written on the envelope, said there was something wrong. He opened the first one in order to make sure the inside ballot-paper was all right, and he found the writing on the ballot-paper had been omitted, and he declined to accept that vote. There were nineteen of those votes, the whole of which were rejected. I am egotistical enough to believe that if those votes had been accepted, Foley would have been the senior member for Townsville.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY: They were rejected in the face of the fact that we informed our returning officer that similar votes received from the same place at other electorates had been received and accepted. The hon. member for Charters Towers had votes sent from Ayr in the same way as those sent to Townsville, and also the hon. member for Herbert, and the votes were accepted by their returning officers. I have reported this matter to the Home Secretary, who has promised to ask the returning officer in Townsville to furnish a report on the matter. I do not know whether these votes will be allowed now, but it is not my intention to present a petition to the Elections Tribunal asking that they should be, because I hardly think it worth while to spend

£100 or £200 for the purpose of becoming the senior member for Townsville. Those are some of the reasons why I think some improvement should be made in the conduct of elections. In addition to this there were scores of votes received in Townsville that were rejected because the presiding officers in other places had neglected to sign the declaration on the envelopes. Out of about 330 absent votes received in Townsville, there were sixty-six declared informal. In most cases the informality was due to the presiding officer having neglected to sign or initial the declaration of the voter on the outside of the envelope. There is no doubt that something should be done to secure the appointment of suitable persons as presiding officers. At present there appears to be a sort of family of presiding officers running right through the State. However, the matter to which I have alluded is one in which the department should make a searching inquiry. If my speech this evening does nothing more than bring about some purification of matters in this respect at the next election, it will not have been made in vain. I thank hon. members for the patient way in which they have listened to my first speech in the House. (Hear, hear!)

* Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*): I intend to follow the advice of the hon. member for Cambooya, and cut my speech very short. I may say that had I got an answer to a question which I put to the Home Secretary yesterday I should not have been on my feet to-night. However, the hon. gentleman has thrown out to me a challenge to attack a public officer, and although it is very distasteful to me to attack any public officer, I accept his challenge, in the interest of justice and fair play. At Windorah there is an officer in charge of the police who is a kind of little Czar. I believe the Government will soon be called upon to erect a gaol at Windorah in order to accommodate the criminals in that district, as this officer appears to have a wonderful knack of manufacturing criminals. I want to refer to the Windorah licensing case. The Home Secretary will remember the hotel over which this trouble has taken place. The licensee keeps the hotel in a first-class manner, for an outback hotel. The Home Secretary will, I think, bear me out in that statement, and so, I am sure, will the hon. member for Mitchell and the hon. member for Gympie. For some cause or other this officer of police took offence at one of the licensee's employees. I do not intend to mention the cause of that offence, but I may say that the fault lay with the official. If what I am told is true, it was a serious fault on his part. He informed the licensee of the matter, and asked her to dismiss the employee in question. Her reply was that the employee did the work required to be done to her satisfaction, and that she could see no reason why she should dismiss the employee. The policeman said, "Well, I will make you jump for that." At any rate, he gave her a considerable amount of trouble, and it cost her £22, and it cost somebody else something as well. This took place in the early part of this year. I may remark here that in my constituency the licensing bench is generally composed of a scratch number of justices of the peace. Anyone they can rope in is shunted on to the bench, and in this particular case it appears to me that the police official was able to work the justices as he pleased. However, he served a notice on the licensee to the effect that he was going to oppose the renewal of her license. He charged her with drunkenness, which was absolutely untrue, as every person in that district can testify. He charged her with not keeping her house properly, which was another untruth. I can call upon the

Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

Home Secretary to bear me out in that statement as regards the way in which the hotel was kept at the time he was out at Windorah. The hon. member for Mitchell and the hon. member for Gympie can also bear me out in this. Between the time when this notice was served and the day when the licensing court sat, this officer approached, I think, the son of the licensee, and told him that he had a buyer for his mother's hotel, if she would sell it. You see—a licensing inspector and a hotel broker. The court duly sat. The licensee did not understand very much about the matter. She did not realise the seriousness of the position, and did not attend the court. There is no lawyer at Windorah, so that she could get no advice.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is a good thing.

Mr. ALLEN: It may be a good thing, but you want an army of lawyers to watch this policeman.

Hon. R. PHILP: He is a good man.

Mr. ALLEN: I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Townsville say that he is a good man.

Mr. PAYNE: If he knew him as well as I do he would not call him a good man.

Mr. ALLEN: The evidence was taken, and the renewal of the license was refused.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Why?

Mr. ALLEN: Because this officer wanted to vent his spleen on the licensee of the hotel for not dismissing an employee at his demand. The matter did not end there. The licensee consulted her solicitor, and the result was that there was an appeal against the decision of the bench.

Hon. R. PHILP: I thought there was no lawyer there.

Mr. ALLEN: This lawyer was in Rockhampton. The appeal came on, and was allowed against the Crown, with £40 expenses. I am sure the public of Queensland will be indignant at having to pay £40 in order that this policeman might vent his spleen against the licensee.

Mr. PETRIE: Is she a widow?

Mr. ALLEN: No. Another case happened out there, and there is to be an appeal in that also, and I am assured, on the best authority, that the Crown is bound to fall in for further expense, so that this policeman is an expensive officer. When addressing my constituents, I was asked this question: "Mr. Allen, do you consider that a just law which will punish me for giving a bagman a bit of beef?" I said, "No." Well, said the questioner, "the law is being administered in that way in the Windorah district. If a bagman comes along to my run, and wants a bit of beef, I cannot give him a bit unless I have a license. It does not suit me to have a license, because I kill anywhere on my run, and the result will be that if I give him beef I shall be fined, and if I don't give him some he will go out and kill something." That is making criminals.

Hon. R. PHILP: You can always give a man a bit of beef, but you cannot sell it.

Mr. ALLEN: Well, I am going to give an example. This official's persecution of this licensee is something cruel. In the course of some bickering one day—I think it was on the veranda in front of her hotel—he went round to the back, and there he saw a leg of mutton hanging up. There is no butcher in Windorah, and the people have to depend for a bit of mutton or a bit of beef on the surrounding stations and selections. The official said, "Where did you get that mutton?" She mentioned the

name of a selector who lived a few miles out, and said, "He gave it to me." He said, "Oh, well, I'll fix him up. I'll see that he doesn't give away meat without a license." He could not prosecute the woman, so he prosecuted the man. He was convicted, but no fine was imposed, save the cost of the summons. That is the way in which the law is administered in Windorah. This is not the first time that this official has given trouble. If the hon. member for Balonne were here, he could bear me out, and so could the hon. member for Warrego. This man was stationed at Bollon some years ago, and an inquiry was held into his conduct. He was charged with drunkenness, both on the racecourse and in the town, gambling with cards and dice in the courthouse, bookmaking in the town, and with faking the electoral roll. To each of these charges he pleaded guilty. He was brought down to town, but by some oversight he got another station. I take this course very reluctantly. I had hoped that he had learned a lesson from what had happened at the other place. But no! He is going to rule the roost. Why, the people out there might as well be in Russia as where they are. A man is dismissed from the police for getting married before the specified time, and yet this officer is allowed to carry on in this way, and put the Crown to a lot of expense in order that he may vent his spleen and let the people see he is master of the situation. Another thing I want to refer to is the lack of itinerant teachers in the West. The Premier in his Rockhampton speech, amid the plaudits of the throng, said that the Government have increased the number of itinerant teachers, and now the children in the West were receiving four visits a year from these teachers. One itinerant teacher who goes into my district has 147 children on his books. He can only visit them twice a year, and there are some children he cannot visit at all. How does that coincide with what the Premier said? The other teacher has 91 children on his books, and he is able to visit them three times a year. So you see it is a matter of the number of children. If the Government wish to do what they told the people of Queensland they were doing, it is their bounden duty at once to increase the number of itinerant teachers in the West, so that each child shall receive at least four visits a year. I think the children of the West are entitled to every consideration. All over my electorate parents are loud in praise of the conscientious manner in which the visiting teachers are carrying out their duties, and I am very pleased to be able to endorse their praise by what I have seen myself. Another trouble to me is the way in which the leased lands are being dealt with in my electorate. When I was returned to this House I found that it was the intention of the Secretary for Public Lands to cut up Norley, Thargomindah, and Bulloo Downs into smaller blocks, and throw them open to lease. I made certain representations to him, pointing out that it was the desire of the people in the district that a good portion of those runs should be thrown open to selection. The Hon. the Minister was good enough to meet me in a certain way, but he did not go far enough. My contention then was, and still is, that the portion of land which is reserved for selection will be readily snapped up, but that is not my complaint at all. What is to happen once the selections are taken up? The other portions will be thrown back into lease before the selection business is given a chance, so that all that the district can hope for is twenty selections and no more. I do not know the exact date when the blocks are to be thrown open to lease, but I think it is 6th December. In coming here with this complaint—it is not my complaint, it is the complaint of my constituents. I have in my hand

[Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

a wire I have received from a resident of Thargomindah—a man who has been engaged in pastoral and commercial pursuits out there for many years, and who is recognised as the best authority in the district on land matters. The wire I received from this gentleman reads as follows:—

See map Notice balance Norley Thargomindah Bulloo Downs open lease competition Brisbane December sixth Time too short and should be Thargomindah No chance fresh men Not sufficient reserved grazing farms.

That is the opinion of a gentleman who is recognised as the best authority on land matters in that district. I do not know what authority has been obtained for saying that the

[9.30 p.m.] time is sufficient. I cannot see it.

I contend that at least three months' notice should have been given instead of six weeks. These lands should have been extensively advertised, so as to give an opportunity to fresh men to come into the district; and further, the land should be thrown open at the local place, so that the local men there could have a chance of taking it up. I know a man there, who is in a small way compared with the huge pastoral companies, and he would be able to compete if the leases were thrown open locally. These leases are being thrown open in Brisbane instead.

Mr. PAYNE: Why are they not cut up for selections?

Mr. ALLEN: There are some cut up for selections and others for leasehold, and the leaseholds will be thrown open first. It does not matter how keen the department may be to get selections now, because they are throwing back the land into leaseholds again, and there will be no possible chance of expansion in the shape of selections. So far as I can gather, all the land there has been thrown open for lease in Thargomindah. Speaking from memory, I believe one was thrown open at 10s. per mile, and it brought something like £1 5s. per mile. It was not a grazing farm, but a pastoral lease. Yet we are told that Brisbane is a better market than Thargomindah! If the land was offered at Thargomindah, new men would be able to go out and view the land and go into Thargomindah on the day the land was to be thrown open, and compete for it in the open market. The result is this: That if people want to compete for that land in Brisbane they will have to come from Thargomindah, which is 140 miles from a railway, and even then is over 600 miles from Brisbane. And they are expected to come down here to compete for that country.

Mr. MURPHY: Or else employ an agent.

Mr. ALLEN: It appears to me that this land is being thrown open principally for absentees.

Mr. PAYNE: For the benefit of the big men.

Mr. ALLEN: They are being thrown open for the benefit of the big men.

Mr. MURPHY: This is the dress circle Government.

Mr. ALLEN: Men who have worked their way up out there are not to be considered at all. I may say that I received a letter this morning from a grazing farmer out there. He has been getting on exceptionally well of late years, and is prepared to strike out on a larger scale, and it would be a great inconvenience to him to come down to Brisbane. Some of the people out there consider that they ought to get passes to come down to Brisbane. Another thing which I have to complain about is the administration of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act. It appears to me that an inspector will come along to a shed and make certain com-

plaints, but he is told that he had better try somewhere else, as exemption has been granted there. What is the good of sending an inspector along if exemptions can be granted like that?

Mr. LENNON: On what grounds are the exemptions granted?

Mr. ALLEN: I do not know. These complaints have been made to me by shearers personally, and they contend that if his neighbour can fulfil certain conditions, there is no reason why another man should not do the same.

Mr. PAYNE: Exemptions from homesteads?

Mr. ALLEN: No; exemption from complying with the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act. With these few words I will conclude my remarks.

After a pause,

* Mr. MANN: As I know that members on the other side have expressed a wish to finish the debate to-night, and as I wish to say a word or two before the Address in Reply closes, I had better speak now.

Mr. MURPHY: Someone on the Government side might wish to speak.

Mr. MANN: If they do, I will be glad to give place to them. They have been told over on the other side by the Premier that he does not wish any criticism of his speech put into the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor. The Premier has cracked the whip over members of his party, and as it has been said that the Government are to be the sole judges of what is the fit and proper thing to be done in this Parliament, he intends to run this solely and purely by the Government, and he has warned his followers that they must not speak on this occasion. Of course, two of the new members who came into the House had to move and second the adoption of the Address in Reply. I may take this opportunity, being an older member, just in passing, of congratulating in all sincerity the new members who have come into this House, and who have made most impressive speeches, and I can say that they will be an ornament to this Chamber as soon as they feel their feet and get into the way of debate. On this side of the House there are several new members who did excellently well. If I may be allowed to do so, I must also congratulate the Government on the two members who moved and seconded the Address in Reply, inasmuch as they have in them two good solid Conservatives, who will never do anything to hurt the Government or hurt the party sitting behind this Government—the party of privilege and power. I have some things to say about the speech of the senior member for Maryborough, Mr. Corser, but I will deal with that later on. I hear the hon. gentleman interjecting. I am sorry that I should hurt a new member. In the gentleman who moved the adoption of the Address in Reply, the senior member for South Brisbane, the Government have discovered a wonderful and fearful genius. There is no doubt that that hon. gentleman's idea of cutting up the electorates of Queensland, if put into operation, will have the effect of wiping out every democrat in this Parliament. I believe his idea was that every member should represent part of a town and part of a country electorate. In following out this idea, I suppose he would take a certain portion of Enoggera and add to it a strip of Burke. Then he would take a bit of my electorate away and give me in return a piece of Moreton. They will then be able to deal with the electorates in such a way that the leader of the Government will say that every member returned is a supporter of what the Premier once called the coherent, progressive, homogeneous, and democratic Government. (Opposition.)

Mr. Mann.

laughter.) The gentleman who seconded the Address in Reply said that Canada was such a wonderfully progressive country because it had no Labour party there and no Labour legislation.

Mr. CORSER : I said no socialists.

Mr. MANN : There is not a country in the world to-day that has not got some Labour legislation, or even what the hon. gentleman terms socialistic legislation. There is not a country under the sun to-day that has not got some socialistic legislation, and that is not all the better for having it. Even in the old country the hon. member for Maryborough, if he reads, would find on the statute-book a Trades Disputes Bill very much more advanced than the one that went through this Assembly some years ago, and was thrown out by the Upper House. They have other legislation that is far in advance of what we have in Queensland in the shape of workers' compensation; and in the old country, in spite of what the hon. member for Maryborough said, some of the municipalities have gone in for so much socialism that I expect in a short time to see all the functions run by the municipalities. In Glasgow city they have free music halls, dairies, laundries, and almost everything you like to mention is run by the municipality for the benefit of the people of the city of Glasgow. To mention another matter the hon. member dealt with: He said there were 8,000,000 acres of land in the Burnett district to be selected, and he claimed that 4,000,000 acres of that were as good as any land in the whole of Queensland. Now, twenty years ago, when I came to Queensland, in the district I represent you could not find anywhere near a railway at that time a single piece of land of any extent—up to 200 acres—available for selection. Right along the whole of the route of the railway every piece of land of any value whatsoever was taken up. As a matter of fact, so keen was the rush that land was taken up there that was absolutely of no value whatsoever, and I can safely say that two years after the line was finished, when that source from which the settlers derived their living—that is, the construction of the line—when that source of revenue was taken from them, numbers of selections were thrown up and deserted and left to ruin. The reason why the land was not thrown open in the Burnett and taken up long ago was because it was a long way from a railway, and if a man took it up, no matter how good the land was, how great the crops the land produced, if he had no means of getting that produce to market the land was of no value.

Mr. CORSER : That is so.

Mr. MANN : When we say there is such a big area of good land still to be taken up in Queensland, I wish the people to clearly understand the reason why it was not taken up long ago was because the people could not get on it. For example, the Atherton Scrub lands are perhaps some of the best lands in the whole of Queensland. I remember twenty years ago the farmers there sent English potatoes down to Kamerunga, but the price they realised was so small owing to competition with the Southern potatoes that they gave up in disgust the growing of potatoes, and for many years the settlers in the Atherton district were kept back owing to the fact of the great distance to the nearest railway—that is at Mareeba—and the farmers could not go there and make a living. To-day, in spite of the fact that the hon. member for Maryborough is supporting this Government, and urging, what every patriotic Queenslander should urge, the settlement of our land, to-day we have in the Atherton district 300 people still waiting to get on the land, and many of them

have been waiting for a period of eighteen months or two years. I had a letter from a friend of mine the other day who had been left a legacy of some hundreds of pounds. He applied for a piece of land some eighteen months ago, and the last letter I had from him was to say he had given up the idea in disgust. He has got a job, and should he be notified by the representative of the Lands Department he has a selection for him, he intends to tell him to keep it. The demand has been so keen that people who want Atherton land have been sent out to the Evelyn Scrub, which is a very long way from a market. When this line is built it will only touch the fringe of the scrub, and the settlers a long way from the railway will have great difficulty in making a livelihood, owing to the fact that it will cost them so much to transport their goods to the railway to take to the nearest market. I just wish to say a word or two in regard to what dropped from the lips of the deputy leader of the Opposition in regard to the inspection of sugar-mills and the quarters of the men who worked at those mills, both in the field and in the mill, and I think he said there was no inspection at Cairns.

Mr. LENNON : I did not say so.

Mr. MANN : I am glad the hon. member did not say so. There is an inspector there—a very good man, Mr. Connelly, who, I believe, attends to his duties, and would make the mill-owners and other people who employ sugar workers come up to the scratch if he were backed up by the Government. As a matter of fact, I heard no complaints, while going round during the election, in regard to the matter of quarters except one. But I just mention this for the information of the House: that at the Mulgrave Mill there was a strike owing to the bad food supplied to the millhands, and at the Hambleton Mill as well a deputation waited on the manager and told him they would go on strike if better food were not supplied, and on the whole I claim the Government would have been wise if they had done what we thought they were doing—that is, made the Factories and Shops Act apply to the sugar-mills. I remember the hon. member for Herbert asked the then Attorney-General if, in his opinion, the Act would apply to sugar-mills, and the reply was that in the opinion of the Attorney-General it would. Apparently the Attorney-General had made a mistake, or the Government, at the wish of their big fat friends in the sugar-mills, were keeping the people of the sugar-mills out of the scope of the Act. As a matter of fact, I heard the junior member for Fortitude Valley claim last session that in the matter of engine-drivers, the men in the sugar-mills were penalised as against the men in the sawmills. Now, if the Government is wise, if they do not wish trouble as there was this year at Goondi—if they are wise they will step into the breach and insist that the mill-owners will give such conditions, and the workers employed such hours as will, as far as possible, tend to do away with strikes, for after all the men who suffer most from the effects of a strike are the workers themselves and the small farmers. However, the only complaint I heard was this: That the exemption that this House, in its wisdom or otherwise, provided in the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act—that if a man employs less than nine men he need not afford any accommodation for those workers. The cane-cutters said to me they thought it very unfair that if a man employed ten men he had to find good accommodation, but if he only employed eight, he need not do so. They complained that the person who employed eight men should be compelled, just as the man who employed ten, to provide decent quarters and decent accommodation and food. The reason

[Mr. Mann.

we gave that exemption was not to unduly penalise the small man, but it might be as well if the Government went into the matter to see if it could not be found possible—not this session possibly as the time is short—but next session have inquiries made and see if they could not see their way clear to reduce the number from nine to a much smaller one. The reason why I supported it was that I believed that out of sheer competition the employers who employed a small number of men, in order to get men, would have to provide accommodation equally as good as the larger employer, and I thought the Act would be carried out in its entirety in that way. Apparently it is not so, and it would be well, perhaps, if the Government would bring in an amending Act to permit of the exemption being reduced. Other members when speaking to-night have been recounting some of their election experiences. When I saw the settlers in the Atherton district I heard a great number of complaints about the methods of the land officials in regard to the timber industry. A prominent settler informed me that the Government sold the timber on portions 241, 242, and 247, in the parish of East Barron, amounting to 100,000 superficial feet, at 7s. per 100 feet; that the purchaser had to incur the expense of 7s. per 100 feet in getting it to Atherton, and that the Government bought it back from him at £1 12s. 6d. per 100 feet, representing a loss of £900. And I was asked if I could explain this. I said we have a Government composed of business men; and I said it looked as if these business men were wise in their generation, and had a way of being kind to their friends by selling at 7s. and buying back at £1 12s. 6d., after the purchaser had expended another 7s. per 100 feet. I said that might be the reason, but it seems strange that a Government composed of shrewd, keen, commercial men should do such a thing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It was not done under the conditions you mention.

Mr. MANN: I believe that what I have stated is absolutely true, and the Minister for Lands has met the man who gave me the information, and knows him. I had a letter the other day from a settler at Atherton, where the Government thought the settlers were going to vote against me and put me out. This settler said the most pleasing thing about my victory was the fact that nine out of every ten of the new settlers on the roll voted for me. The Government have been harassing the settlers in that district in the interests of the timber-getters, and every man who has the interests of Queensland at heart should protest against that being done. They also complain that the price of land is increased by speculators bidding against *bonâ fide* settlers. When the blocks are put up there are Government surveyors bidding against them, and some of the surveyors were trying to run the railway through the blocks they bought so as to enhance their value. That is said by the settlers in the Atherton district; and is it any wonder that I objected the other day to private members' day being taken away when I wanted to move for a commission to make inquiry as to why timber was sold in the way I have pointed out, why such high prices are charged for land required by *bonâ fide* settlers, and how it is that speculators and Government officials are allowed to compete against those settlers for land? In connection with the Government programme, I have to make the same complaint I made last session—namely, that there is in it no mention of an amendment of the Cairns Harbour Board Act. When the Premier was in Cairns the members of that board waited on him and showed that an amendment

of the Act was required to allow the board to conduct its own election, and the Premier promised that the Bill would be in the Government programme, but it is not here.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And other Bills.

Mr. MANN: The Government want to get through their programme before Christmas, but this Bill should be passed in time for the February election. I look upon this programme merely as window dressing. A lot of it is simply padding. There is the Trades Disputes Bill, for instance. Is it likely that the Government will try to put on the statute-book a Trades Disputes Bill that will be of any use? One has only to read the speech delivered by the hon. member for Moreton when he was member for Carpentaria, and the speech made by the member for North Brisbane when he was member for Toowong—in which the Bill was described as a measure that would lead to assault and battery—one has only to read those speeches to come to the conclusion that there is not the faintest chance of a Trades Disputes Bill being passed. The merest novice can easily understand that the Government put forward this window-dressing programme for the purpose of gulling the people outside; and after the House closes at Christmas for a long recess the Premier will go round the electorates and say that but for the speeches made by members of the Opposition the Government would have passed all those Bills. The fact is that the Government do not want to do things, because doing these things hurts the Government. For example, at the last general election the Wages Boards Bill hurt the party on this side, because people did not understand that that Bill was passed by the Premier. I admit

[10 p.m.] that it was passed to please the Labour party, but it was also to please some of the Liberals with him, who could not swallow an Arbitration Act, and this was passed as a sop. The poor shop girls in Brisbane were told that this was the work of the enemy, and they did not put the blame on the rightful shoulders—that is, on the Premier. He accepted the amendment to bring farmers under the Bill, although the late Government "Whip" assured him it was a foolish thing to do, and he put it in to save trouble.

Mr. HARDACRE: Excuse me, it was from sheer obstinacy.

Mr. MANN: He thought that if he refused the Labour party would make trouble, and he accepted that amendment and put in the farmers, and he was backed up in that respect by the late member for Warwick, Mr. O'Sullivan, and it is a curious fact that retribution came in the form of that amendment losing the hon. gentleman his seat. Then the Premier met another deputation in Atherton, and some of the settlers there, men who had been on the Northern Rivers of New South Wales, laid their wishes before him, and pointed out the great difficulty they had in cutting roads for themselves through the scrub. The Tinaroo Shire Council was not able to do the work. The hon. the senior member for Maryborough will understand what it means cutting a road through a heavy scrub like the Atherton Scrub. These settlers pay from £3 to £7 an acre for the land. It would cost another £5 an acre to fall and burn the timber, and put the land into a comfortable state, and on the top of that they had to make their own roads. The Premier was apparently so impressed that he made a promise that when any land was thrown open to the settlers, roads would be made for them out of the public estate improvement fund. A good deal of land has been thrown open since that, and I may tell the hon. the senior member for Mary-

Mr. Mann.]

borough, who is keenly interested in the settler, that the promise has not been kept, the land has been thrown open under the same conditions, and the poor unfortunate settlers have still to cut their own roads through the scrub, owing to the fact that the shire council is unable to cope with the work. I have been urging the Government to make a grant to build these roads out of the public estate improvement fund. The reason I have asked for this is because the value of the land has gone up there from £1 to £4 an acre, the Government getting £3 10s. an acre more now than they would have got three or four years ago. The value has been given to the land by the inrush of settlers, and not by the Government, because I am told that Government officials tried to prevent men going up there, by telling them that there was any amount of land about Dalby. It may be urged by the Government that a line is built up there, but the settlers have to guarantee that line, and if it does not pay through the mismanagement of the Railway Department, they have to pay a further tax.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is a common practice.

Mr. MANN: That is a common practice, and it is one which I voted for. I believe that lines should only be built where there is a chance of their paying, and, as the hon. member for Barcoo said, if a community want a line, and think it won't pay, then the community should guarantee the line or borrow money from the Government themselves. But the fact remains that this line is being built by the Government, and the settlers have to guarantee that it will pay; but the settlers have been charged £3 an acre more for land than it would fetch three years ago. The Government are also deriving a heavy revenue from timber. The hauling out of that timber with heavy wagons cuts up the road; and if the Government give back to the settlers only a moiety of what they get from timber revenues, they can see that decent roads are made in the Atherton Scrub. But nothing is done, and the Government are more concerned about taking money from those settlers than seeing them make happy homes for themselves. After all, whatever money the settler makes from his timber or from his crops, it all swells the railway revenue, and goes back into the soil, and instead of the Government having a lot of discontented settlers as there are now, they would have prosperous settlers and a railway line that would pay. While I believe that there should be a betterment area for these lines, I also urge that in the mapping out of that area the people of the district should be consulted. In the Atherton to Evelyn extension, owing to the oversight of the clerk of the shire council, the betterment area was not known by the farmers there, and a large number were included in the area who will receive no benefit from it, and that line will not pay for axle grease for the next twenty years. I claim that I was justified in asking the question the other day which the Treasurer refused to answer. I asked if all the people at Warwick were told what the betterment area will be in connection with the Warwick and Maryvale line. Before I vote for that railway I want to see laid on the table of the House a letter from each shire council interested, saying that they have put the matter before all the settlers concerned, and that the settlers clearly understand where the benefited area is, and are agreeable to come within the area. I have told my constituents in Atherton that if they are wise they will not pay one single penny towards the betterment on the Atherton-Evelyn Railway, because they are not benefited by the railway even in the slightest degree. I may say

that while I have been returned here to oppose the Government, that fact will not in any way prevent me from assisting them to pass any of the legislation I believe in. The first thing I see on the list is the Queensland University Bill. I may say plump and plain that I am not going to vote for that measure until such time as our hospitals get back the full amount of the subsidy taken from them last year by the Government to produce their paltry surplus. I intend to oppose a Queensland University Bill every stage I can until such time as I have an assurance from the Treasurer that our hospitals will receive the full £1 10s. endowment, and only then will I consent to vote for that measure. I further wish to say that in my district there are repairs necessary to the schools.

Mr. MURPHY: They will not even put a paltry tank up North.

Mr. MANN: I may just mention that at the Alocmba Pocket they have an 800-gallon tank. They are too mean even to give us a 1,000-gallon tank to provide sufficient water for the school children. This school is built on a dry knob, and there is only an 800-gallon tank for some forty children who attend the school. At Mareeba there are a number of families settled across the river, and for four months in the year their children are cut off from the school. Before I vote for a University, I should like to see a foot-bridge built across that river in order to enable the children of those settlers to attend school in the wet season. I maintain that we should see that every young Queenslander has a chance of getting a primary education before we establish a University, and until such matters as those I have mentioned are attended to I am not going to vote for a University Bill. In that attitude I am sure that I will be backed up by a majority of the people of North Queensland. Another measure mentioned in the Government programme is a Land Acts Amendment Bill. I do not know what is the nature of that measure, and shall not attempt to criticise it. Nor do I know what are the provisions of the Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill, but I know that we will not be allowed to make any amendments in it. The Cairns delegate to the Local Authorities' Conference went home and told the shire council that he voted for everything that was carried by the conference, and against everything that was lost, so that we can imagine what Tory propositions were adopted by the conference. Then we have a Licensing Bill. I dare say we shall have a great deal of debate on that measure, and I shall do all that I can to see that it is made something more than a mere title. The Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Bill shall have my hearty support. That is a measure which is very badly wanted in Brisbane. The sanitary arrangements in the city are shocking. The provision for disposing of nightsoil in hotels and boarding-houses is of a very primitive description, and it is marvellous to me that there is not a plague epidemic in Brisbane. With regard to the Redistribution of Seats Bill, I favour that measure. It is time that something was done in that direction, but I am decidedly of opinion that we should, in making a redistribution of seats, take very good care to see that the country does not unduly suffer, and that a preponderance of voting power is not given to Brisbane. When the Trades Disputes Bill comes along I shall have something to say about that measure, and I shall try to make it something on the lines of the English Trades Disputes Bill. There is an Aliens Leases Restriction Bill, but it is some way down on the programme. The hon. member for Bowen dealt very fully with that subject this afternoon, and I simply wish to back up what he said, and

[Mr. Mann.]

to express the hope that in the very near future we shall have a Government in power in Queensland who will really deal with this matter. The present Government, judging from the remarks made by the man who opposed me at the election, are not likely to deal with it in any satisfactory manner, for he said that a man should be allowed to do what he likes with his land—to lease it to Chinese if he chose. However, the hour is getting late, and I shall refer to one or two other matters only. The Address in Reply which it is proposed to present to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor reads as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

We, His Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

The various matters to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, shall receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.

To those words I desire to add the following:—

But we regret Your Excellency's advisers have not assured us that a better system of immigration would be instituted; that those workers already here would be further protected by a liberalising of the Workers' Compensation Act, and that in the interests of the State the Lands Department would be remodelled so as to provide that intending settlers should get on the land without undue delay. And we further urge a reduction in the price of Crown lands to *bona fide* settlers in North Queensland, and the introduction of a Bill this session to amend the Agricultural Bank Act.

That is my amendment to what has been moved by the other side, and one reason I have for moving it is the action of the Government with regard to immigration. I am sorry that I forgot to bring with me a letter which I received from an immigrant in my electorate. During the election I had a letter handed to me by an immigrant who had received it from one of the immigration agents of the Government, in which the recipient was assured that the lowest wages paid to a domestic servant in Queensland was 15s. a week, and that the wages ran as high as £1 10s. a week. And that girl got an engagement at Allora at 8s. a week. I intend to read that letter during the discussion on the Estimates, in order to show that we are bringing out these people on false pretences. Every person who is brought to Queensland under that system will write home to his friends and tell them that he has been induced to come out by lying statements by Government agents. You will see the same kind of thing stated in an article in the September number of the "Strand Magazine." The article is not signed. Perhaps it is by Sir Horace Tozer. That article states that the best lands along the railways in Queensland are reserved for new arrivals. There is no doubt that we are bringing out those people under false pretences. They expect that immediately on their arrival they will get land, but they soon find their mistake when they come here. I have used my endeavours with the Lands Department to get them to put people on the land at an early date, but have been told that they cannot get the land for two years, unless they take up land in the Tara district. Every person who is brought out here by lying promises must of necessity write home and tell his friends and relatives how different he found things as compared with what they were represented to be. I know a case of a man who left America and came here on the assurance of his brother that we had the best of land and a good climate. That man was disgusted at not being able to get land as he had

expected, and went back to America. While that kind of thing is taking place, what hope have we of inducing people to settle in Queensland? Why, they have taken the very worst methods they could for advertising this fair land, because we need only tell the people the truth—tell them that it is a land of glorious promise, and a land with glowing potentialities. We should tell them straight out that we have not got land available for them—that we have not even got land available for our own people. We are told by the Government that they are desirous of pushing along the construction of more railways to open up the country for more settlers, when for miles and miles along the lines already built you find the country unoccupied. If you travel through the "Garden of Queensland," as the Darling Downs are called, how much real settlement do you see? How much of the land is under the plough? Very little indeed. My amendment with regard to the liberalising of the Workers' Compensation Act is most necessary. I listened to the speeches of hon. members on this side, especially some of the mining members, pointing out in the most vivid language the horrors of miners' phthisis. During the election campaign I found men in the Atherton Scrub with their legs and arms broken, and the most they could get done for them was that at the end of a fortnight they would get £1 a week. If the Government, as one speaker said, were really desirous of celebrating the jubilee of Queensland, instead of erecting a University they would try to pass the most up-to-date Workers' Compensation Act that their ingenuity could devise. I want to see a real humanising measure placed on the statute-book. Then I wish to see the Lands Department remodelled to provide for intending settlers getting on the land without undue delay. During the campaign my opponent said that there was a Land Bill to provide for immediate settlement, and I had to tell him that without any Bill like that, if the Government were to do their duty and had the necessary surveyors at work, men could get on the land without all this undue delay. Further than that, the department ought to be remodelled, for the reason that men who are sent out to value the timber on selections do not know a cedar from a kauri pine, nor a blackbutt from a walnut, and the settlers have to accept the valuations of these men, and pay for the timber, whether it is on the land or not. During the election I was told that, before the land for the Park Group was actually surveyed, the land ranger valued the timber upon it before he even knew where the boundaries of the selections were. Perhaps we shall find that the timber for which these men will have to pay is not on their selections at all, but on the roads, and will be the property of the shire council; and, if a selector attempts to remove from a road the timber for which he has paid, the council will have a good case against him. I dare say hon. members remember the Tinaroo Shire Council proceeding against Burns, Philp, and Co. for removing cedar from the roads. I also desire to see a reduction in the price of land in the case of *bona fide* settlers. That is most necessary, when we find unfortunate settlers paying from £4 to £7 an acre for scrub land, which it costs £5 per acre to clear. That unduly penalises the settler, and no Government will have my support that does not attempt to cope with the growing evil of land speculation. In fact, if this Government did their duty, they would try to do away with the Land Court in order that our Western settlers might be given a fair deal when they take up grazing farms, and not have to pay so much for grazing farms as they have to pay at the present time. Then we want the introduction of a Bill

Mr. Mann.]

to amend the Agricultural Bank Act. In the past, as nearly every hon. member has admitted, the bank has been a sham and a failure. During the election campaign a friend of mine applied to the bank for an advance of £250. He was assured by the valuer that there was full value on his selection for that amount. He got a reply from the bank saying that his application had been refused, and £1 10s. was returned, but no reason was given for refusing his application. I advised him to write again to the bank and ask for a reason, and say he was willing to accept a less sum. He did so, and the bank sent a memorandum offering to advance £200. Now, why did not the bank write to him in the first place and say that his application was refused because he wanted too much, and offer to advance £200 or £150? If I had not advised him to make a further application, being rebuffed the first time, he would not have applied again, and a very deserving settler would not have been able to carry on for lack of sufficient funds, or he would have had to borrow from a private bank and pay 7 or 8 per cent. For all those reasons I beg to move the addition of the amendment that I have read.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): I desire to say a few words with reference to the Speech. I take this opportunity of so doing because [10.30 p.m.] from the experience of the last two sessions of Parliament there is every likelihood that later on the Government will come down with that formidable weapon that parliamentarians know of, and I will have no opportunity of dealing with the matters to which I wished to refer at the last session of Parliament.

The PREMIER: That is what you have been playing for, but you will have to sit here without it.

Mr. MURPHY: I wish the Premier would not make disorderly interjections. I desire to congratulate the new members on this side of the House on the able speeches which they have delivered, and I sympathise with the Premier in the position in which he finds himself to-day. During the last election the Premier lost his Minister for Mines, and we find that this great, strong Premier, this leader of a strong, coherent, progressive, and democratic party, is not game to put another Minister in his Cabinet. Why? Because there are too many aspirants for the position. He knows perfectly well that if he tried to take a man out of his following and put him in the Cabinet there would be mutiny in the ranks. There would then be another opportunity for me to walk round amongst his followers and offer them a few portfolios. (Laughter.) During this debate very little reference has been made to the election. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly satisfied with the election. I got back. The Premier sent a little foreign capital into Croydon to try to put me out. We spent his money and I won my election expenses off the men who were supporting the Premier's candidate. I had a good win, and I would have had a better win if the 10,000 voters who were able to vote on the 5th October had not been disfranchised by the action of the Government. In the election of 1908 the Premier went round the country—he spoke in the Exhibition hall, he spoke at Maryborough, Gympie, Charters Towers, and sundry other places, and he condemned the Philp Government for disfranchising a few thousand electors. He pointed out what would happen to the electors of Queensland if they again put the Philp party in power, and yet at the very next election, when the Premier was in power, he went to the country and disfranchised 10,000 people, or rather kept 10,000 people

from recording their votes. Of course in those days the Premier used to go about the country referring to the Philp-Leahy reactionaries. He used to tell the electors that if that party came back to power it was good-bye to democratic legislation in Queensland. He used to tell the electors that their only hope was in the third party which he had created.

Mr. MANN: Socialistic on the one side and conservative on the other.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; he pointed to the extreme socialists on the one side and to the extreme conservatives on the other, and he said that William Kidston's democratic party was the one for Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MURPHY: I am only pointing out what the Premier used to say it was. He did not refer to it as the Premier's party, but the party led by William Kidston. At the recent election the Premier was fortunate enough to induce the electors of Queensland to practically wipe out that third party. There are some of us left, and there are some of us who are game to fight the Premier yet.

Mr. MANN: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier came down to this House and told us what to do. He called the House together when he liked, he allowed us to speak when he liked, and he stopped us from speaking when he liked, but he will have to resort to the provisions of the Standing Orders to stop us from speaking on this occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I would remind him that there is a definite amendment before the House—that certain words be added. The hon. member should confine himself to giving reasons why these words should be added, or why they should not be added.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; I shall reserve my further remarks on the Address until the amendment is disposed of. I have a case in connection with land myself. It was placed under my notice to-day by a resident of North Queensland. He applied to the Lands Department for 50-square miles as an occupation license on Strathmore Station. The Government have never received any rent, so far as I can ascertain, from that particular country. The station is owned by the Bank of New South Wales, and no sooner did the small man put in his application than the Lands Department came to the rescue of the bank. This man asked for 50 square miles, and asked for priority. Previously another block had been granted of 70 square miles. The Lands Department officials told this man that they intended to put up 122 square miles to competition. How can any small grazier possibly compete with the Bank of New South Wales? We are told that the Government is desirous of helping the small man by settling poor men on the land, and enabling them to enter into grazing and agricultural pursuits, but we do not find the Lands Department, under the present Minister, trying to help these people at all. I certainly think there should be an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. During the last session you will remember that a deputation waited on the Premier at the closing hours of Parliament and asked him whether it was not the intention of the Government to introduce an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. The Premier said it was, but that Bill is not before the House. It is not referred to in the Speech, and, so far as I can see, there is no possibility of its being dealt with this session. With regard to immigration, the Premier assured this House during the last

[Mr. Mann.]

session that he intended to try to reorganise that department. But nothing has been done in the matter. The hon. member for Cairns, and other members who have spoken, have shown that the system which has existed for years still continues, and the Government are making no effort to alter things. Possibly the appointment of the new Agent-General may have something to do with this matter. He may have received instructions to report on the matter, but, seeing that none of the Ministers have spoken, we are at a loss to understand whether any new arrangement has been made in this matter. The Hon. the Premier remains silent, and his Ministers remain silent, and he told us to-day that all his followers intend to remain silent also. It is necessary that the Lands Department should be remodelled. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that when you were removed from the Lands Department to the Home Secretary's Department, the Premier gave as a reason that the Lands Department required to be shaken up. Has it been shook up? Have things improved in the Lands Department? Not at all. Your successor, Mr. Speaker, has not done better in that department than you did. You shook it up pretty considerably, but it has not been shaken up since the Hon. D. F. Denham took charge of it. With regard to that portion of the amendment which reads—

we further urge a reduction in the price of Crown lands to *bona fide* settlers in North Queensland and the introduction of a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank Act.

Members on this side of the House have, session after session, called attention to the necessity for an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act. You yourself, Sir, when Secretary for Lands, pointed out the necessity for alterations to that Act. The Premier referred to it. The hon. member for Warwick and the present Secretary for Public Instruction, when they were on the Opposition side of the House, repeatedly referred to the amount of red tape and the long delays that occurred before applicants got an answer to their applications. The hon. member for Cairns pointed out to-night the case of an application for £250. The trustees were quite prepared to give that applicant £200, but letter after letter passed between them before a decision was arrived at. I would like to have seen added to this amendment, "that the Government would be more generous in assistance to the mining industry," but I think the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cairns takes in everything. I think that the House ought to agree to that amendment—that we ought to add it to the Address in Reply that we are sending to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, and I sincerely trust, if a decision is taken, that this amendment will be carried. What other remarks I have to make I will keep until the amendment is disposed of.

Question stated.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*): The reason why I delayed in rising to address the House on this amendment is that I thought possibly the Premier may wish to say something. However, as he does not appear to have anything to say, I think it my duty to say something, and I would like to say this: When I gave the House the assurance the other day that this party would assist the Government to pass legislation, I really intended to assist the Government to facilitate business. I wish to make it clear that that was no mere empty phrase. I really have that intention, subject, of course, to a full and proper criticism of all matters brought forward. Now, this motion, sprung upon the House to-night, has been done without my knowledge or approval—entirely without my knowledge—

and seeing that this is a new House just returned from the country, and that the country has given the Government a working majority, and having regard also to the fact that during last session we had a want of confidence motion, and in the preceding session a similar motion, and that now the country has sent the Government back with a majority, I regard it nothing short of a burlesque—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS (loudly): Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: To associate myself under the existing circumstances to an amendment of this character. We are here to do business. This party, when we think we will be able to oppose the Government successfully, will be just as ready as the hon. members sitting on the back cross benches probably, to table a motion of the kind. We want it distinctly understood that we are not chock full of confidence in the Government—it is not running out of all the pores of our skin, so to say—and the action we take is simply to show that we are not in sympathy with an amendment of this nature under the existing circumstances. I wish to say we want to devote the time at our disposal to a thorough, and I trust intelligent, discussion of the whole of the measures laid before the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: When this vote is being taken, I may say it is the intention of this party to walk outside the bar to emphasise our objection to action of this character being taken.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I would just like to say, in reply to the hon. member, that if any member of his party, whom he had put up for that purpose, had moved such an amendment, the Government, of course, would have considered the matter seriously and discussed it. I am quite unable to accept this motion as serious. It is a mere waste of time, and therefore I do not pay any attention to it.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added—put and negatived.

Original question stated.

Mr. MURPHY: The amendment having been disposed of, and the deputy leader of the Labour party having lectured the hon. member for Cairns for having the temerity to move an amendment—which, of course, he has a perfect right to do—I will make a few remarks on the Address in Reply. I remember a few years ago the Premier used to quote that old phrase "That they that had rights should maintain them," and if the hon. member for Cairns considered it desirable that he should move an amendment to the Address in Reply, he was perfectly within his rights, as a member of this House, in doing so. There is no necessity to consult the Labour party. We are not members of the Labour party; we are not bound by any of the actions of the Labour party. We have a perfect right to take any action we like, and accept the responsibility of that act. Most of the Speech refers to the question of Federal finance. We are told that—

A Bill is now before the Federal Parliament to make provision for referring to the people the scheme of re-arrangement unanimously agreed upon by the seven Governments, and it is to be hoped that the people will ratify the agreement with the requisite majorities, and thus settle in an equitable manner what has been one of the most difficult problems in connection with Australian federation.

You will remember in this morning's *Courier* that that great strong Federal Government—that coalition Government which was formed—were unable, in the Federal House, to carry through their Bill. It was beaten by the casting vote of

Mr. Murphy.]

the Chairman. We were told, when that Government was formed, that the Labour party had no possible chance of ever interfering any more with Commonwealth business, but we find, on this question of Federal finance, that quite a number of the members who joined that coalition have gone back upon Mr. Deakin, and have voted against the Bill which he introduced. They are in this position now: They are waiting for the return of Colonel Foxton in order to recommit the Bill, and try and get it through, as the *Courier* said, by a majority of one. The Premier, in dealing with this question last night, said that the Premiers had met eight times to discuss the question, and eventually came to a certain conclusion. So far as the conclusion come to is concerned, I am not taking any exception to that. The exception I take is to the action of the Premier, who, before he found out whether the Federal Labour party were prepared to agree to the scheme which the Premiers had concocted, came back to Queensland and said he was going to fight the Labour party. As a matter of fact, in Queensland and New South Wales and the other Australian States the Parliamentary Labour parties are State-rights parties. In this morning's *Courier* it is stated that at a caucus meeting of the Labour party in New South Wales they decided to support Mr. Wade in his contention for £1 5s.; the Victorian Labour party came to the same conclusion; and at the Labour Convention in Brisbane some time ago the Labour party came to the decision that the rights of the State should be protected. As far as I am concerned, I believe in the supremacy of the Commonwealth Parliament. I realise that they want more money for defence. We are always talking about how badly the Post and Telegraph Departments are managed, and the Federal Government want more money for them. I have no hesitation in saying I sincerely hope the Bill will be defeated in the Federal Parliament. We know that Mr. Wade in New South Wales ran that State into an expense of thousands of pounds in fighting the Federal Government. There was the wire-netting episode, for instance.

Hon. R. PHILP: That was not Wade; it was Carruthers.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Wade was Attorney-General at the time, and was the legal adviser of the Government. I feel positive that as the Government intend to close the session in six weeks' time there is no intention of passing a lot of the Bills on this programme, and I think they might as well let us know the Bills they do intend to pass so that we may deal with them as intelligently and quickly as we can. The Trades Disputes Bill is one that will not be passed. Of course the University Bill will be introduced, and I may say at once that I intend to vote against it. In the electorate of Burke I came to a place on the Gilbert where the school teacher had to erect a residence at her own expense, and the Government were too mean to provide tanks for water. At Crooked Creek, also in the Burke electorate, they have been trying for years to get a teacher, and nothing can be done. I think a lot of things in Queensland want doing before we can spare the money for a University. What about the Grammar school scholarships? Can anyone say that the scholarship or the bursary is sufficient to allow any child of poor parents in North Queensland to go to Townsville to be educated? If the Government want to celebrate the jubilee year, they can do it in a better way than by establishing a University. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Cairns and others, the Government ought to liberalise the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, and it

[Mr. Murphy.

should be done at once. Take a mining centre like Croydon, for instance, where the mines are worked principally by syndicates, and the miners are generally shareholders. Though we might pay the insurance if an accident happens, the companies say they will fight the claim, because the men, being shareholders, are not entitled to compensation. They take our premiums every year, and then tell us they will fight us if there is an accident. And is it not the same with contractors and tributors? Do not the insurance companies try to fight every case? When the Bill was going through we were assured that injured parties would receive half-wages, and a clause was inserted making it "not exceeding £1 per week." In Croydon the weekly wage is £3 10s. a week in dry ground, and £4 in wet ground; but if a man is injured he only gets £1 a week, and nothing the first fortnight. I think the Government might have introduced that Bill this session, and that we might come back after Christmas, if necessary, to get it through. Of course, the Premier does not intend to be here after Christmas—he is going to be busy trying to beat the Labour senators. He stated after the result of the recent State election was known that he thought he had a chance of winning seats from the Federal Labour members, but I sincerely hope that when the numbers are up he will find himself on the wrong side. There is no doubt that he had a victory at the last election, and he came back here with a big following. The country decided in favour of the coalition, and, as far as I am concerned, that ends the matter. At the same time, I did not go to the country as a supporter of the coalition, but as an opponent of it. I am an opponent of the coalition to-day, and if ever I get an opportunity to put the Government out the Government is going out. I don't suppose I shall have the opportunity; still, you never can tell. Some years ago the senior member for Townsville had a big majority, but he woke up one morning and found that His Excellency the present Lieutenant-Governor and the present Premier had settled him, and so it may happen here. If the Premier tried to pick a man to go into his Cabinet at the

present time, there would be mutiny [11 p.m.] in the camp. It was wired through Queensland, after the election, that the senior member for Toowoomba would be taken into the Cabinet. We know he left the late Government because they would not give him a portfolio, and we expected he would get a portfolio this time, but there were other aspirants for the position—the junior member for North Brisbane, and the hon. member for Moreton, the great financial expert. And my old friend, the hon. member for Rosewood—has he not claims upon a portfolio?

Mr. KEOGH: And he will get it, too.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; but he is not going to get it for some time to come. When disunion takes place, when there is mutiny in the camp, when things are beginning to burst up, the hon. member for Rosewood may get a portfolio then. Why, they would not endorse him for Rosewood at the last election because they thought he was going over with us at one time, and so he was.

Mr. KEOGH: I rise to a point of order. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. member has made use of statements which are incorrect. I have been endorsed by the present Administration.

Mr. MURPHY: I accept the hon. member's denial. I was certainly under the impression from what I had read that the hon. member had not been endorsed by the Government. Still I

hope, knowing that he has been endorsed, that he will be a loyal supporter of the Government—for a time. (Opposition laughter.)

MR. KEONH: For all time.

MR. MURPHY: So far as this Redistribution of Seats Bill is concerned, I know it will wipe the Croydon electorate out, unless we get some discovery in the deep ground. The hon. member for Townsville would sooner see the hon. member for Cairns wiped out than he would see me, and so would the hon. member for Moreton. They have tried to get him out several times, and he has wiped the floor with them every time.

HON. R. PHILP: We will put him out next time, and you too.

MR. MURPHY: I will be going out because the Redistribution of Seats Bill will put me out, but let me tell the hon. gentleman that he will be out also. (Opposition laughter.) He has had to hustle and bustle at the last two or three elections to keep his place.

HON. R. PHILP: Most of them have had, have they not?

MR. MURPHY: Of course. Whenever there is an election battle there are also some deaths. We had a lot of political deaths on this side during the election. The hon. member for Toowoomba was wiped out also. Did not the Premier go to Toowoomba and stand upon the platform there and tell the electors of Toowoomba that the hon. gentleman was not worth supporting? Did he not say he had gone back on "me," and any man who goes back on "me" is not worth supporting? (Opposition laughter.) This time he went to Toowoomba and advised them to support the hon. member, and the hon. member is in Parliament. I will say this for the hon. member: that he made the Premier sit up before they came to terms about that election—he made him apologise for his past alleged misstatement. I don't know whether he went to the penitent form or not—he ought to have gone. (Opposition laughter.) The Licensing Bill stands fourth on the list, but I noticed that it was not amongst the Bills which were brought forward by the various members of the Government to-day. I do not think it will be considered this session, or next session either. This is a bit of padding, a bit of window dressing. I believe the Mining or Private Land Bill has been prepared, and I sincerely trust that it will be a good one. I suppose the late Minister for Mines had a good deal to do in the preparation of that Bill, and, of course, his successor will have to introduce it. The late Minister had been a member of the House since 1893, and understood mining matters fairly well. The present hon. member for Kennedy referred to miners' phthisis, and the hon. member for Fassifern said that this miners' phthisis was brought about because the miners smoked too many cigarettes. (Opposition laughter.) Miners' phthisis is brought about by working in hot levels, by dust, by hard work. I think the present Home Secretary will recollect that I wrote to him a few weeks ago about a miner in Croydon who is trying to get into the Dalby Hospital. I asked for a free pass to bring him down to enable him to get into the hospital. There is one thing about Dalby—it has got a good hospital and a good climate. Some of its railways do not pay. I believe there is a good deal of prickly pear on the surrounding country. (Opposition laughter.)

THE SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MURPHY: I was merely pointing out what is the cause of miners' phthisis, and congratulating Dalby on having a good hospital. As I have said, I wrote to the Home Secretary

asking him for a free pass to Brisbane for a miner suffering from phthisis, and I am perfectly satisfied that he will grant that pass. I may here say that I have had a good deal of business to do with the different departments and have met most Ministers, and, though I sit in opposition, they have always treated me courteously and fairly. There is one Bill in the Government programme that I am particularly interested in, and that is the Margarine Bill. I am sure that the Government consider the Margarine Bill of much more importance than the Workers' Compensation Bill. It is a better Government, and I am sure that when the House meets again next week the first Bill the Secretary for Agriculture will introduce will be this Margarine Bill. The Wages Boards Act Amendment Bill will be of interest to some members, because of the remarkable fact that the Wages Boards Act which was passed by the last Parliament had the effect of wiping out those who battled hardest for it. People were told that owing to the action of Parliament in passing that Act shops would be closed, and that girls would be put out of employment, and of course when election day came they naturally walked to the polling-booth and voted against those who were accused of trying to deprive them of employment. Still, though the recent general election has gone against the democratic party, the next election may not go against them. The hon. member for Townsville told us how wicked it was to ask people for a vote. When I am electioneering I ask everybody for a vote, and if a person goes to the polling-booth and is unable to walk up the steps, I have not the slightest objection to carrying him up. If I can see how he votes, all the better for me, as it enables me to discover how I stand. That was the advantage of the postal vote—you could see how people who used it voted. Although I was in the House when we passed the Adult Suffrage Act, I did not understand the postal vote, but my opponent at the election which followed understood it. I understood it better at the next election, and if there had been a third election under the postal voting system, I should have been conversant with every phase of it. With regard to the Aliens Leases Restriction Bill, the hon. member for Cairns says he asked the Premier to give a definite pronouncement on that Bill when the coalition was being considered. The Premier never admits that the question before the party was a coalition with the Philp party. With him it was always a question of swallowing up the Philp party. The Philp party represented 80,000 votes, and he practically said, "If we can get those 80,000 votes we are in for ever." Unfortunately, they got those 80,000 votes at the last election, but, all the same, they may not be in for ever. We may very soon see the Premier packing up his portmanteau and the plate presented to him by the old Kidstonite party on the occasion of his leaving for England. We then put up our silver and had a great celebration. We bought him a bit of plate and presented it to him saying, "Here we have the democrat of Queensland, the man of the hour."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you subscribe?

MR. MURPHY: Yes; I gave a note towards the presentation, and I did not begrudge it, because at that time I regarded the Premier as the cleverest politician in Queensland. I do not deny it. Members of the Labour party know that the reason the Central Political Executive refused to endorse me at the election of 1907 was because I was an apologist for the Government—because I had the temerity to stand upon a public platform and give the Government credit for the good work they had done. It was considered that I was not fit

Mr. Murphy.]

to be a member of the Labour party because I had done that. At that general election I was defeated, but I was returned again in the year 1908. The Premier never sent me any money to help to pay my election expenses, but he found some for my opponent at the last election. I was very glad to see the money coming into the district. On mineral fields we are always looking for foreign capital, and it is a matter of indifference to us whether that foreign capital comes from the Government or a private individual. I hope that money came out of the Premier's own pocket, but I do not think it did. I do not think the members of the Government put up much money to fight the election, but somehow they have the knack of getting money. I know that when the dissolution of the last Parliament took place, members on that side of the House made no secret of the fact that they were to get their election expenses. I hope they made the Government pay their election expenses, because there was no necessity whatever for an election. Whatever the South has done, the North is decidedly anti-Government. The Government is now a purely Queen-street Government. Last session it was a purely Queer-street Government, but they are not in Queer street now. They have had a good win. All the same I think a Northern man should be in the Cabinet, and I would like to see the senior member for Townsville Secretary for Mines, because he thoroughly understands mining.

Hon. R. PHILP : You will not see it.

Mr. MURPHY : Why? Because the hon. gentleman said in this House and throughout the country that he would never sit in a Cabinet with the Premier.

Hon. R. PHILP : That is not the reason.

Mr. MURPHY : That is the reason the hon. gentleman gave in this House. In saying that I would like to see the hon. gentleman Secretary for Mines, I have no desire to reflect upon the present Minister. I have done mining business with him, and he has always treated me very courteously; but all the same an important industry like mining should be presided over by a man who understands something about mining. The Secretary for Mines told us that he did not know much about mining, but that he intended to do his best to help the industry. I sincerely hope he will. I hope that when the Estimates are tabled we shall find there is a good deal of money to assist mining, and that the Premier will not starve the department—that he will not do as he did the session before last, when he promised his Minister £50,000 and then cut it down to £30,000. Of course I thoroughly understand that, with money required for a University and public works in Brisbane, there will be very little opportunity of getting much for mining. The Treasurer has pointed out the necessity there is for studying economy, and the Government are going to study economy by starving the outside districts. If the session was not going to be such a short one, I would urge upon the Government the necessity of at once introducing the Public Service Superannuation Bill and the Pearlshell and Bêche-de-mer Fisheries Bill. Some time ago a Royal Commission was appointed to report upon the pearlshell and bêche-de-mer industries, and they made a long report. The matter was discussed in this House, and the Government promised to take certain action as the result of the report, but so far nothing has been done; but I suppose we shall get a copy of the Bill later on, and also a copy of the Police Offences Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY : You will find it in your box now if you look.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. MURPHY : I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that. Owing to the late hour, I do not think I shall be able to peruse them to-night, but to-morrow I shall devote strict attention to the Bills which have been placed before us by the Government, and, as His Excellency asks us, I shall give my undivided attention to these and all other matters that may be submitted for our consideration, and I trust that, under the Divine guidance, our labours may conduce to the welfare of the people of Queensland.

Question put and passed.

OPENING OF SUPPLY.

The PREMIER : I beg to move that the Speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at half-past 11 o'clock.