

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 14 JULY 1910**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LOAN TO HINCHINBROOK SHIRE COUNCIL.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) asked the Treasurer—

1. Is the following cutting, taken from the *Brisbane Telegraph* of the 8th instant, correct:—"Approval has been given for a loan of £23,000 to the Hinchinbrook Shire Council for the purchase of a tramline, and for an additional extension, and for the extension of the Ingham-Stone tramline"?

2. If correct, does either of the tramlines in question depend upon the sugar industry to meet interest and redemption on the loan?

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

1. Yes.
2. The sugar industry will, with other primary industries, help to meet interest and redemption. The extensions will open up a large area of Crown lands suitable for general agricultural settlement.

## FINES INFLICTED ON ABERFOYLE SHEARERS.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. Was any part of the fines inflicted on the Aberfoyle shearers at Tangorin, by the police magistrate last year, paid to Eli Carter, the owner of Aberfoyle, or his representatives?

2. If so, what was the amount paid to him or his representatives in respect to each shearer fined, and what was the total amount so paid?

3. Was such payment made to him by virtue of any statutory enactment conferring on him a right to receive such payment?

4. Why was such payment made to Eli Carter?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

This is a matter that does not come within the scope of the Home Department, but within that of the Justice Department. I have, however, endeavoured to obtain the information from the Justice Department, but it is not yet available. The information has been asked for from Hughenden; and if the hon. gentleman will repeat his question on Wednesday next, I will endeavour to give him an answer.

## TRANSCONTINENTAL AND OTHER RAILWAYS.

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. In reference to linking up the Northern and Central systems of the Government railways, have any statistics or any preliminary survey of the country between Hughenden and Burchardine been obtained?

2. When will the Government surveyor's report *re* the desirability of constructing a railway from Cloncurry to Mount Cuthbert be available?

3. When will Mr. Amo's report *re* transcontinental and extensions westerly of the present railway systems be available?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

1. No; a surveyor will examine this route as soon as one can be spared.

2 and 3. These reports will not be ready for a few weeks. The surveyors have been considerably delayed by wet weather.

## GLADSTONE HARBOUR STATISTICS.

Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*) asked the Treasurer—

(a) The amount required annually for interest and redemption on Gladstone Harbour account?

(b) The amount collected in wharfage and harbour dues during the last twelve months?

The TREASURER replied—

(a) £751 5s. 6d.

(b) Wharfage, £277 16s. 3d.; harbour dues, £919 3s. 2d.

THURSDAY, 14 JULY, 1910.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (W. D. Armstrong, Esq., *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

## MEMBERS SWORN.

During the sitting Messrs. BLAIR and LESINA took the oath of allegiance to His Majesty King George V.

## ELECTIONS TRIBUNAL.

## PANEL OF ASSESSORS.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pursuant to the requirements of the Elections Tribunal Act of 1886, I now lay on the table my warrant nominating the panel of assessors for the trial of elections petitions during the present session. The assessors are Messrs. George Phillips Barber, George Powell Barnes, Charles Joseph Booker, Thomas Bridges, Richard John Coote II, Henry Alexander Cecil Douglas, Donald Gunn, John McEwan Hunter, Peter Alfred McLachlan, John Mullen, Thomas Nevitt, and Edward Bowdick Swayne.

## QUESTIONS.

## DEEDS OF OLD-AGE PENSIONERS.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Charters Towers*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. Has the Government decided to return the deeds of those old-age pensioners who were formerly in receipt of indigent allowance?

2. What number have made repayments of indigent allowance?

3. What is the total amount received?

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

1. Yes; on refundment of the amounts paid in respect of indigent allowance.

2. Two.

3. £24 16s. 8d.

[*Hon. W. Kidston.*

**CHARGE FOR HORSES SHIPPED AT BROADMOUNT AND PINKENBA.**

Mr. BRESLIN asked the Secretary for Railways—

- What is the charge per head on horses shipped—
- (a) Over Broadmount Wharf?
- (b) Over Pinkenba Wharf?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

- (a) Sixpence.
- (b) Sixpence.

**CHARGE FOR HORSES SHIPPED AT GLADSTONE.**

Mr. BRESLIN asked the Treasurer—  
What is the charge per head on horses shipped over Gladstone Jetty?

The TREASURER replied—

Harbour dues—Inward, 1s.; outward, 1s.  
Wharfage—100 and under, 2s. each; 101 to 150, 1s. 9d. each; 151 to 200, 1s. 6d. each; 201 and over, 1s. 3d. each.

**NON-PAYMENT OF OVERTIME BY TOOWOOMBA STOREKEEPERS.**

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

1. Did the department send a female inspector of factories and shops to Toowoomba some short time ago?
2. As a result of that inspection, was it not found that a large number of storekeepers were keeping back or refusing to pay for overtime?
3. What are the names of the storekeepers and amounts each was called on to pay his employees as a result of that inspection?
4. Will the Minister send a male inspector to see if the Act is being complied with?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. BARNES, *Bulimba*) replied—

1. Yes.
2. Yes; but apparently it was through ignorance of the law.
3. Twelve (12) employers were affected, and arrears of overtime amounting to £166 were paid.
4. A male inspector has been appointed to the Toowoomba district, and is now stationed there permanently, having taken up his duties on 1st July last.

**OLD STOCK RESERVE AT GATTON.**

Mr. NEVITT asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

1. Did the Tarampa Shire Council ask the Lands Department to sell a portion of the old Stock Reserve at Gatton?
2. If so, what papers was the sale advertised in, and number of insertions in each?
3. When was it sold?
4. What amount per acre did it realise?
5. Why was it not advertised in the local papers?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. F. DENHAM, *Oxley*) replied—

No land can be identified as the old Stock Reserve at Gatton.

**WIDOW'S HOMESTEAD AT HODGSON.**

Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*) asked the Home Secretary—

Is it not a fact that the homestead of a widow at Hodgson was ordered to revert to the Crown, and the improvements thereon sold?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

The facts in this case are as follows:—In consideration of the payment of the regulation orphanage allowance to widows in support of their children, Mrs. Mary Burton, on the 25th February, 1909, transferred to the

Crown an area of freehold land at Hodgson. This land was thrown open by the Lands Department for agricultural farm and unconditional selection, and was selected by Mrs. Harriet Burton, wife of Henry Burton, father-in-law of Mrs. Mary Burton. The improvements, which the selector has to pay for, are reported by the Roma Crown lands ranger to be of the value of £83 13s. Claims for a portion of this amount have been made on behalf of Mrs. Mary Burton and her father-in-law, Mr. Henry Burton. The claims will be dealt with by the Lands Department.

On the 2nd June, 1909, Messrs. Hunter and Co., of Roma, advised the Home Secretary that Mrs. Burton owed them £20 2s. 4d., which they had not pressed her for on the understanding that she would place their claim for that amount before the department when the transfer was being effected. This Mrs. Burton failed to do, and the Home Secretary subsequently refused to recognise it.

Should all the children live to reach the age of twelve years, the payments by the Government will amount to £336 9s. 7d.

**AMOUNTS PAID TO LAND AGENTS, JIMBOUR ESTATE.**

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*) asked the Secretary or Public Lands—

1. What amount has been paid to land agents for the disposal of selections on Jimbour Repurchased Estate?
2. What are the names of those agents, the amounts each received, and the portions on which each received commission?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

1. £1,235 5s. 9d.
2. —

Name of Agent.	Amount.	Portions—Parish of Cunkillenbar.
Hamilton, Groom, and Co.	£ 53 17 0	84, 103/3
Higgs, W. G. ...	435 15 9	66, 72/7, 79/81, 83, 85, 93/8, 107/8, 110, 116, 120/1
Pulsford, F. E. ...	126 4 6	65, 89, 88, 87, 130
Thompson, A. C.	579 19 6	30, 64, 78, 99/102, 112/3, 117, 125, 131/3
Weavers Limited	39 9 0	79/81, 83

**LIFT IN PARLIAMENT HOUSE.**

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

1. Were the members of the Building Committee of this House consulted about the installation of the lift in Parliament House?
2. On whose recommendation was the work undertaken?
3. What will be the cost of the installation of the lift?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS replied—

1. Yes.
2. The Parliamentary Buildings Committee.
3. £755.

**DIAMANTINA HOSPITAL PATIENTS.**

On the motion of Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing the number of patients at present at the Diamantina Hospital for Incurables, being persons who have arrived in this State from overseas within the past two years, together with the nature of the complaints from which such patients are suffering.

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*), in moving—

That it is the wish of this House that the Workers' Compensation Act should be amended in the following particulars:—

- (a) Repeal of contracting-out provisions, section 12 of the Act;
- (b) Protecting injured workers in case of insolvency of employer;
- (c) Extending the benefits of the Act to all workers;
- (d) Schedules of amounts to be paid in case of permanent injury;
- (e) Abolition of the 5s. duty stamp on policies;
- (f) Providing for compulsory State insurance—

said: In moving this resolution I hope that it will meet with the unanimous approval of this House. We had a fairly good Workers' Compensation Act when it was passed in this House in 1905, but since then things have moved a bit as regards the protection extended to workers during their employment. We passed a very good amendment of the Act last year.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS conversing in loud tones,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER said: Order! I must ask hon. members, if they wish to carry on a conversation, to do so in a lower tone, as it is almost impossible for the member speaking to be heard.

Mr. RYLAND: Last session we passed a very good amendment in connection with the Workers' Compensation Act, reducing the time from which the compensation should start down to the date of the incapacity, provided that the incapacity extended over three days. There are a good many more defects in connection with the Act as it stands at present on our statute-book. The first one which I will deal with is as regards section 12 of the Act, which gives permission for an alternate scheme to be adopted in place of the benefits of the Act. Now, this section has not been taken much advantage of, but at the same time there are a large number of workmen connected with the Colonial Sugar Refining Company who do not come under the Act, and as regards that company I am quite satisfied that the expense in connection with their scheme is equally as expensive as it would be under the Act, but it has this disadvantage: While it gives other benefits as regards sickness in the family of the employees, it takes away the more necessary benefits in the case of accidents, and thus consequently the workers who are only working for a limited time lose the benefits of the Act. Under the scheme of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company the employees only get four weeks' compensation after ceasing to be employees, and, being only employees during the sugar season, it is a great disadvantage to these men. I have had several complaints sent to me in connection with this matter, one in particular where a man lost the use of his arm in connection with the machinery there, and all he got out of it was £29. Now, if that man had been under the benefits of the Act itself he would have got compensation amounting to over £100. I think it would be well if this contracting-out system was done away with altogether in connection with the Act. I know that my friend, the hon. member for Herbert, has also a grievance in connection with the men in his electorate who are asked to sign this agreement, and they are at once outside the provisions of the Act. The second portion of my motion deals with the

protection of the injured workers in the case of the insolvency of the employer. Section 11 of the Act gives protection in cases of insolvency, but only in cases if the employee is insured. Consequently if a worker meets with an accident, and he is not insured, if the employer goes insolvent the worker is not protected at all by the Act. I think the compensation for injury should be made the first charge upon the estate, even although the worker was not insured.

Mr. MURPHY: Don't you think that compulsory insurance would do it?

Mr. RYLAND: Yes, compulsory insurance would cover it, but we have not got compulsory insurance, and that is a weakness in the Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Then why not barrack for compulsory insurance?

Mr. RYLAND: I say that it should be a first charge in cases of insolvency. Another amendment of the Act is necessary to extend the benefits of the Act to all workers. There are a great number of workers in this State who get no benefit whatever from the Workers' Compensation Act. When the Bill was first passed in this Chamber and went up to the other House there were a larger number of workers under the benefits of that Bill than are under the benefit of the Act at the present time. In the Act as it stands now the compensation to be paid is limited as to whether it is part of the trade or calling of the employer. Now, that was not so when the Bill left this House. It then read "any part of the trade or business or not." As regards dangerous occupations like house-building or other such occupations, if the employee was working for an employer, and it was not the trade or calling of the employer, then when the Bill left this House the worker would be under the protection of the Act. But the clause was amended, and at the present time if a man works for me or anyone else that man will not come under the benefits of the Act, because it is not my trade or calling, as is provided in the Act. A cook in a restaurant is under the benefit of the Act, because it is the employer's trade or calling, but a cook in a private house is not under the benefits of the Act because it is not the trade or calling of the employer. I consider that all workers should be brought under the benefit of the Act whether it is the trade or calling of the employer or not. This refers very particularly as regards the mining industry. When the Bill providing for workers' compensation left this House and went up to the Upper Chamber, clause 11 provided that workers working in a mine, if they were tributers or contractors they were to be deemed workers under the Act. That clause was knocked out in the Upper House. The result is that there

[4 p.m.] are in Queensland hundreds and thousands of miners working on tribute, or contract, who receive no benefit from the Act, simply because a tributer, or contractor, is not recognised as a worker under the Act. The same remark applies to workers in the Western part of the State who are employed in making dams and in other work by contract. Such men are outside the provisions of the Act, though of course men working for contractors on wages come under its provisions, and can sue the principal, or the contractor, for compensation, both parties being jointly and severally liable under the Act. But there are a great number of workmen who get no benefit from the Act. I was very pleased to see that in the case (Bag-

[*Mr. Ryland.*]

nell & Leahy) of a man employed in the timber-getting industry, the court decided that he came under the provisions of the Act, because for a portion of the time he was employed at daily wages in making roads to take the timber away. At the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there are a great number of men similarly employed who get no benefit under the Act. The New Zealand Act protects workers in mines who work on tribute or by contract, and schedules are given of the amounts to which workers are entitled in case of permanent injury to different parts of the limbs and body. The magistrates in Queensland as a rule are very fair-minded in administering the Act, but there have been glaring inconsistencies as regards the amount of compensation awarded in case of permanent incapacity. Some of these cases have not come into court. I know of one such case in which a young man in the Burnett district, employed in a sawmill, lost an eye in the course of his employment, and he received £13 as expenses and £10 as compensation for the accident. Twenty-three pounds is a ridiculous amount to pay for the loss of an eye, especially in view of the fact that the Government have paid £200 and £250 for a similar injury. This matter is dealt with in the New Zealand Act in a schedule, which reads as follows:—

## SECOND SCHEDULE.

Nature of Injury.	Ratio of Compensation to Full Compensation as for Total Incapacity.
Loss of both eyes ... ..	100 per cent.
Loss of both hands... ..	
Loss of both feet ... ..	100 per cent.
Loss of a hand and a foot ... ..	
Total and incurable loss of mental powers involving inability to work	100 per cent.
Total and incurable paralysis of the limbs or of mental powers	80 "
The total loss of the right arm, or of the greater part of the arm	75 "
The total loss of the left arm, or of the greater part of the arm	70 "
The total loss of the right hand, or of five fingers of the right hand, or of the lower part of the right arm	65 "
The total loss of the same for the left hand and arm	75 "
The total loss of a leg ... ..	60 "
The total loss of a foot, or the lower part of the leg	75 "
The total loss of the sight of one eye, together with the serious diminution of the sight of the other eye	50 "
The total loss of the sight of one eye	30 "
The total loss of the thumb of the right hand	30 "
The total loss of the thumb of the left hand	25 "
The total loss of the forefinger of the right hand	20 "
The total loss of the forefinger of the left hand	15 "
The total loss of part of the thumb of the right hand	15 "
The total loss of the little finger of the hand	12 "
The total loss of the middle or ring finger of the hand	8 "
The total loss of a toe or of a joint of a finger	5 "
Complete deafness of one ear ...	10 "

The maximum, or full, compensation payable for total incapacity is £500, and under that schedule the worker knows exactly what amount he is entitled to for a particular in-

jury. With regard to the 5s. stamp duty, I brought this matter up in the House on a previous occasion, and the Government promised that they would abolish the duty. It is not felt very much where the policy is large, but it is a serious matter in the case of a small policy of, say, £70 taken out by a selector to cover workmen employed in scrub clearing or other agricultural work, and I think the charge should be done away with. It would be much better for the Government to subsidise accident insurance than to make a profit out of it. With regard to the next point mentioned in the motion, that provision should be made for compulsory State insurance, I think that is a matter of the greatest importance. There are thousands of workers working for small selectors and other people who would get nothing in the case of accident, simply because their employers have nothing with which to pay compensation, and I think it should be compulsory insurance in such cases. Indeed I think it should be made compulsory that everybody employed should be insured. I do not see why a selector engaged in scrub clearing and other farming operations should not have his life insured. The cost of the policy would not be much, but it would mean a great lot to him if he met with an accident. All these will increase the cost to a slight extent, but, if the Government would initiate a system of State insurance, judging by the experience of New Zealand, there should be no increase in the premiums. In that country the payments are better in a great many cases, whilst the premiums are 20 to 30 per cent. less than are paid in Queensland to private companies. The last returns from New Zealand to hand are for the year 1908. The premiums received during that year amounted to £20,897 12s. 7d., and interest to £1,790 19s. 4d., making the total receipts £22,688 11s. 11d. The amount paid in claims during the year was £11,926 0s. 11d.; £1,000 was placed to reserve; in the accident fund were £3,093, and the amount to the credit of the fund at the close of last year was £9,598 8s. 10d. Those figures show that the fund is in a pretty solvent condition. If the Queensland Government follow their example—and I do not see why they should not—it will be a great convenience as well as a considerable saving to the community. Another amendment might be made in the Act in connection with cases where there are no dependants. In that respect we might follow the example of Italy and other Continental nations. The amount of compensation in Italy in cases where there are no dependants has to be paid over just the same by the insurance companies, and it goes to meet cases of insolvency and cases where there are no assets to meet claims. As regards the payment of half-wages, the Act might also be amended to meet the case, particularly of North Queensland. It is provided that the amount payable shall not exceed £1 per week, and, as I suppose half-wages in North Queensland average from £1 5s. to £1 10s. per week, that amount is insufficient. The amount payable might therefore be increased. The words "serious and wilful" in regard to cases of death might also be knocked out, as they are not necessary. Another amendment I would suggest is with reference to medical references. Some time ago a promise was made by the Government that the Government medical officers should act as medical referees free of charge. It is hard that in the case of a small amount such as £1 the fee of 10s. should be charged for the medical referee to certify that a man is absent from his work for

*Mr. Ryland.]*

two or three days by reason of an accident. It would only mean a slight increase in the present payment to Government medical officers if this was included as one of their duties. If the Government would bring in a Bill embracing these few amendments, it would be quite enough for this session. There are other amendments that I could bring forward, but I do not want to ask for too much all at once. These are the urgent ones, and the ones that we are likely to get right away. I have great pleasure in moving the resolution standing in my name.

\* Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution. I am fully in accord with all the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Gympie. I certainly feel that it is urgently necessary that we should have another amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. During last session a deputation of hon. members on this side waited on the Premier in connection with some amendments of the Act. We placed our views before the hon. gentleman, and those views are practically included in this resolution. We pointed out the urgency of the case, and suggested that the Act should be amended in the directions indicated, and the hon. gentleman said that he would consider the matter. You will recollect, Sir, the disappointment with which the amending Bill, that was introduced subsequently, was received in this Chamber. We felt keen disappointment. We had come to the conclusion that a very useful amending Bill would be introduced that would cover all the points we submitted to the Premier. While the discussion was taking place upon it, the Premier acknowledged that the amendments we were seeking had a pretty wide scope and would benefit a large number of wage-earners, but he was of opinion that if we overloaded this legislation it would probably injuriously affect some industries. Now, it is my opinion that any legislation that will be beneficial to the wage-earners, and which is urgently needed, should be carried into effect irrespective of its effect upon any industry. It should be a charge upon the industry. If an industry cannot recognise its obligations and survive, then it has no right to survive. That is my candid opinion. As a matter of fact, the amendments that have been suggested are not of such a wide-reaching character that they will seriously affect any industry. Certainly the amounts payable can be scheduled without placing any extra charge or obligation upon the employers in any industry, and it is a thing that will prove of great benefit to the men working in many industries that are classed as dangerous. I have had brought under my notice quite recently a couple of cases which will serve to illustrate this point and the necessity for having an amendment such as has been suggested by the hon. member for Gympie. There is the case of a Spaniard who was seriously injured at Chillagoe two and a-half years ago. He had the misfortune to fall down a lift well at the company's works, and did not regain consciousness for two months, but in consequence of not lodging notice of the injury according to the provisions of the Act, he got no compensation. He put his case in the hands of a solicitor with a view to instituting proceedings against the company, and the matter has been going on until now. The unfortunate man has suffered permanent injury, and yet he has received no compensation whatever, and the case has been bungled up from solicitor to solicitor. The unfortunate man is in this position not only through a little technical

[*Mr. Ryland.*

error but in consequence of the difficult legal process that has to be gone through under the present Act. If the amounts to be paid in the case of certain injuries were scheduled, then he could claim the amount without having to go through any course of litigation whatever, and the matter would end there, and if there was any dispute with regard to the amount due, I think the onus of disproving liability should be cast upon the employer. The initial cost of any litigation under the Workers' Compensation Act should be paid by the employer and not by the employee as at present. In the case of this unfortunate man, whose name was Thomas Bores, a Spaniard, he did not have the wherewithal to prosecute the employers under the Employers Liability Act, or under the Mining Act, or any other measure under which he could perhaps have gained redress or compensation. At present the amount that should be paid in case of certain injuries is not provided in the schedule, and the consequence has been that that unfortunate man has received absolutely nothing whatever in connection with the injury. Another case came under my personal notice some time ago of a man at Stannary Hills, who lost an eye through an explosion in a mine; he received nothing except the £1 a week that was paid to him while he was in the hospital—a matter of a few weeks. The hon. member for Gympie mentioned a case or two that came under his notice in reference to the small amounts paid in connection with the loss of an eye. This unfortunate man, whose name is Thomas O'Byrne, received absolutely nothing except the £1 a week while in the hospital. If the amounts were scheduled, the police magistrates would do their duty and see that those responsible paid the correct amounts in the case of certain accidents. That would be a much simpler process than the present difficult process we have to go through in order to claim the small amount due for an accident. In my opinion the Workers' Compensation Act should apply to all workers. It should apply, not only to those following dangerous occupations but to those in every occupation or industry. It should apply to tributaries in mines, who do not come under the benefits of the present Act. They are men who are just as liable to injury as any other miner or any person working in any industry. It should also apply to domestic servants. I mentioned this matter last session when we were discussing the second reading of the amending Act, and the Premier seemed to think it was ridiculous to advocate the extension of this Act to domestic servants. He said we might as well extend it to everybody. I think the Act should extend to domestic servants. Accidents are certainly not very frequent in domestic service, but nevertheless when they do occur, it means an absolute hardship to the unfortunate victim. Therefore I think some protection should be given to that class. It would not mean a very great hardship to the employers, because they could protect themselves by the simple method of insurance. In connection with the advocacy of State insurance, I think that is a step in the right direction, and it should be well considered by the Government. We have had the experience of other countries to guide us in this matter, and their experiences have been happy ones. Mr. A. P. Hillier, in a recent work in commenting on the measure in force in Germany, says, in his opinion, it is one of the most successful and one of the most simple pieces of social reform that has ever been carried into effect. He is perfectly satisfied that, after twenty-nine years' experience, the

German insurance legislation has been successful. I think the same measure could be introduced in Queensland. I think we should make some provision against those contingencies that are continually operating against wage-earners—sickness, accident, and infirmity—that at present compel them to rely absolutely upon some form or other of public charity. We should make this a charge upon the industry in which the employees work, and when they are disabled, in consequence of any such contingency, they should be entitled to a certain amount of relief. The State should make provision for that relief, and the worker could claim from the State the relief which the State has helped him to purchase and not left him to beg. We should recognise the necessity of making this provision for wage-earners. It is one of the highest obligations of every community. I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): I just paused for a moment or two to see if any reply would come from the Minister on the front Treasury bench. I would like to hear what he has to say about the matter, and, if he would rise now and let the House hear what the Government think of the proposition, I would be only too glad to give way to him. As he makes no sign of rising, I would just say I am in general accord with the motion moved by the junior member for Gympie, only I think he should have put the last proviso first—that we should provide for compulsory State insurance and then we would get all the others. If we cannot get compulsory State insurance, I am quite satisfied we cannot get the others, because it will mean too heavy a charge upon the employers insuring. I think myself we ought to get compulsory State insurance, and also we ought to get it from this Government, inasmuch as State insurance was a plank in that now famous Rockhampton programme. If it has not been thrown overboard, I now call upon the Premier to give us that plank in the Rockhampton programme in order that he may go to the country and assure the people that he is still that rampant democrat the Premier claims to be. However, I listened to what fell from the lips of the member for Woothakata, and he urged, with a good deal of force, that everyone who was in employment and met with an accident should receive compensation, and he claimed that the employers could fully protect themselves by insuring their employees. Of course that is perfectly correct. Everyone who receives an injury should receive compensation. The only question to my mind is: Are employers at all times able to meet the heavy insurance charges? For example: Up in the Atherton district where they are felling the scrub—a very dangerous occupation—the insurance companies charge a very heavy premium indeed. Many of those settlers wish to make their homes there and desire to get their scrub felled, but are without any money. The Government charged them such an extortionate price for their land.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where is that?

Mr. MANN: In Atherton. Many of them have had to wait about two years for their land. They have felled a portion of the scrub, and put it under grass, and now they have not the wherewithal to buy a hoof to eat that grass down. I ask any ordinary commonsense individual how those settlers can afford to pay the heavy insurance charges on scrub cutters? Some of the lads from the town—

perhaps some whom the Hon. the Secretary for Public Lands knows—have gone up to the Atherton Scrub and have undertaken to fall the scrub themselves, and have lost their lives. Two young Queensland lads have been killed recently while falling scrub there, and after every accident it is reasonable to suppose the insurance companies will say, "We must increase the premium for scrub falling." I heard some complaints during my recent trip in the North about the heavy rates they had to pay, and I think it is only reasonable to believe that, after a number of accidents, the insurance companies will combine among themselves to raise the rates. That being so, the only solution is complete State assurance, so that we can guarantee employers getting insurance for their employees, both male and

female, at the cheapest rate possible. [4.30 p.m.] If a man gets killed while falling scrub, and the employer can barely pay his wages, there is no use in saying he should give the widow and orphans £400. And there are cases in which the Government do not acknowledge any obligation whatever. In Atherton a workman went on a selection and worked for a considerable period. The employer threw up the land, and though the Government got the land back with the improvements made on it, the unfortunate worker got nothing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That has nothing to do with the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. MANN: No; but I think it is only right, where the Government get the benefit of the work done, they should meet the obligations of the employer to the man who did the work.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What do you mean by "benefit of the work done"?

Mr. MANN: Suppose a man employed by a railway contractor gets killed, and the employer cannot afford to pay the £400 compensation. If he forfeits his contract and the Government take it over with the work already done, they should see that compensation is paid. In my opinion insurance should be made compulsory, and the insurance companies should not be allowed to charge more than a certain rate. I do not wish to take up any more time, because I think a vote should be taken to test the feeling of the House in regard to the matter. With regard to a remark that fell from the hon. member for Woothakata as to the effect which compulsory insurance might have on industries, I think the public will be prepared to pay a little more for the products of any industry they wish to survive. If the public want the workers in the dairying industry or any other industry insured, they will have to be prepared to pay a little more for their product, if necessary. The difficulty can only be got over by increasing the cost to the consumer. I think the hon. member for Gympie is to be commended for bringing this motion forward, and I hope the Minister will promise that as early as possible a Bill will be brought down providing for compulsory State insurance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I think it is generally admitted that the Workers' Compensation Act has proved a benefit all round. It is a measure that received the general approval of all parties in the House; and in the country I think the Act has been very well respected and responded to. The hon. member who is responsible for the motion which is now before the House said that we could not stand still. That is

*Hon. D. F. Denham.]*

perfectly true; the State is moving forward rapidly; but I think it will be generally admitted that it is undesirable to be making frequent amendments in industrial legislation like this. Only last year there was a very desirable amendment brought in by the Government reducing the time at which compensation became payable from fourteen days to three; and with that alteration I think we have an Act that is practically up to modern requirements. It is quite possible that it is not perfect in every respect, but that it meets the urgent requirements of the day it has not been denied. I was rather disappointed that the hon. gentleman in moving the resolution did not endeavour to produce evidence to thoroughly satisfy one of the urgency of the case. The call "Not formal" proceeded from his own side, and it is apparent that hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of ventilating their views, therefore there was no need for the Treasury bench to anticipate them. I would like to call attention to the terms of the resolution. The first is—

(a) Repeal of contracting-out provisions, section 12 of the Act.

I think the hon. gentleman might be a little more careful in his phraseology. This section 12 is not a contracting-out provision.

Mr. RYLAND: It is known by that name.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The provision is very simple, and can be put into operation to the manifest advantage of those concerned. And what need is there for an amendment because only one such scheme has been approved? That is the scheme of one of the largest concerns in the State—the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—and anyone who knows anything about their operations recognises that they are methodical and emphatically just and honourable. The scheme they submitted received the endorsement of the Government and remains in force. The hon. gentleman is seeking to lead the House astray by talking about "contracting out." There is no such proposal in the measure; it is merely a provision for a scheme of compensation which may be substituted for the provisions of the Act. There is perfect liberty, and there is no attempt to evade the underlying principles of the Act. I venture to say that the employees of this company, the only company that has sought to come under the provisions of section 12, are better pleased with the scheme they are enjoying than they would be under the ordinary compensation provisions. The Government has shown an excellent example in its dealings under the Act. Whenever any of its employees have suffered they have been dealt with in the most generous manner, in the hope that the general community might take it as a lead to follow. But it must be remembered that all measures such as Workers' Compensation Acts, involving as they do heavy premiums, in order to protect the employer from the consequences of negligence or of misfortune on the part of employees—I say all such Acts as these necessarily involve increased cost, and therefore it is discreet to be as gentle as possible in its first application and operation. Certainly, the provisions we now have are vastly superior to the conditions obtaining prior to the introduction of the Workers' Compensation Act of 1905. Had the hon. gentleman, or any of those who subsequently followed him, shown any inequality or any injustices that were calling for adjustment, then, of course, it would be a matter for immediate investigation, but I fail to recognise that there was any such allegation. Talk about schedules—a schedule setting forth how much for an

injured eye, or how much for the entire loss of an eye, or of a leg, or of an arm! We recognise that an eye in some employments is much more valuable as a matter of intrinsic use than in others. I suppose there is hardly a man in this State who would voluntarily lose his eye for any compensation that might be awarded to him, and that is one feature that I have always appreciated in connection with the Workers' Compensation Act. It has been said that there are men who malingering and who actually run the risk of an accident so as to get compensation. I recognise that, first of all, there is the dread of suffering physical pain, and, secondly, the loss of a bodily organ. I do not think any man would voluntarily subject himself to that, but whilst men will not voluntarily subject themselves to the consequence of an injury or an accident, yet we cannot aver that the leg is equally valuable in the employment of every man as one of the other, or any other limb. For instance, to men who are navvying, the loss of a leg is much more serious than it is to a clerk. Now, are you going to schedule the rate for a clerk, the rate for a navvy, the rate for an artisan, and the rate for a stockman? Are limbs equal in their value? I say it all depends upon the occupation of the individual just how that member may be valued. I observe that the deputy leader of the Opposition is smiling as if this was something not altogether in the nature of a common-sense argument, but I would draw attention to the investigations carried on in the old country, which have been quoted this afternoon. There was a committee appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the matter, so as to bring in recommendations for an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. They have advised contrary to a scheme for scheduling the amounts payable in regard to any individual injury. I will quote from page 85. The inquiry was on the lines of a tariff for an injury, and the findings are these—

These and similar difficulties have led some witnesses to recommend a fixed tariff for certain injuries. So much for the loss of an arm or leg, so much for the loss of an eye, and so forth. We think it possible, or probable, that in the course of time something approaching to a tariff of this character may be arrived at by mutual agreement, and adopted in practice in the case of the highly organised trades in which it would be appropriate, and it is probable that if this were the case the practice would be adopted and followed by County Court judges, but, in our opinion, it would not be practicable to settle any such tariff to be embodied in an Act of Parliament. All that can be done in this respect is to leave the question to the judge, defining as far as possible the matters which, in the exercise of his discretion, he is to take into consideration.

Now I think it is far better that the Act should remain as it is. It is elastic.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is very elastic.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Very elastic, and I do not think the hon. gentleman can point to any magistrate or any judge who has operated that Act in a mean or casuistic manner.

Mr. RYLAND: It should be settled without going to a magistrate.

Mr. MURPHY: They are bound by the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are bound by the Act, but there is a great liberty in the Act. But if, on the other hand, you say they are to have a fixed sum for any member or any limb, then of course the magistrate cannot exceed that.

Mr. BOWMAN: You partially recognise that in your public service to-day.

[Hon. D. F. Denham.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:  
In what regard?

Mr. BOWMAN: In giving a certain amount for the loss of a hand in connection with the Ipswich workshops.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Speaking of my connection with the Railway Department, there was a case in which an eye was lost, and we gave the highest amount. I remember one case in the railway workshops—a portion of steel entered the eye and caused the loss of sight—and in that case we went to the maximum which the law provided.

Mr. RYAN: £250 you gave.

Mr. BOWMAN: I know some private employers who have not been as generous as your department has. That is why we are anxious.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Then if you are going to give a schedule which would make it possible to get £200 or £400 for an eye, it means the premium will be increased at once, as, the higher the maximum amount is, no doubt the insurance companies base their premiums accordingly.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is why you should have an insurance of your own.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That might be a very desirable thing.

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: As far as concerns the first portion of the hon. member's request in his motion for the repeal of the contracting-out provisions, I say there is no such thing as the contracting-out provisions; that so far we have only operated in one case—the case of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—and no complaint has been made by any member of that big organisation. Then the hon. member proceeds to ask that the benefit be extended to all workers. Now let us look at the Act, and see who are comprised within this scheme, and it is almost difficult to find anyone outside the provisions—

- (1) Any industrial, commercial manufacturing, or building work carried on by or on behalf of the employer as part of his trade or business; or
- (2) Any agricultural, horticultural, or pastoral work carried on by or on behalf of the employer as part of his trade or business; or
- (3) Any mining, quarrying, engineering, or hazardous work carried on by or on behalf of the employer as part of his trade or business or as an investment with a view to profit; or
- (4) Any work carried on by or on behalf of the Government of Queensland or any local authority as the employer, if the work would, in the case of a private employer, be an employment to which this Act applies.

About the only employee that is not comprised in that I think is a domestic servant.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: No; tributers in mines.

Mr. RYLAND: Your coachman would not be included in that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; because it is not in the ordinary course of employment.

Mr. RYLAND: But surely a motor-car would be included?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I neither possess a motor-car nor a coach; but as coachbuilding is not my business, and not having a livery establishment, therefore I should not be liable in the event of the coachman having an accident.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Your lorry-drivers are included.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, they are. Everyone engaged in any work in connection with business pursuits is covered by insurance, and we go further than that. Whereas the law provides merely as it stands for part payment, we pay the full rates whether the man is injured or merely sick.

Mr. THEODORE: Then why not extend it to tributers and domestic servants?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I cannot discuss the question of tributers being included, because I do not understand what you mean. I understand that a mine having been worked by a company, and for some reason or other the company decides to close down. Say it is the No. 3 Great Eastern Company. They cease mining altogether. A number of men agree amongst themselves to co-operate and work that mine. There is no employer amongst them, is there?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; they are holding the ground for the company, and fulfilling the mining conditions for them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The owner of the mine has spent some thousands of pounds in trying to make the mine payable, and he cannot do it. He then says to a number of men, "If you can win anything out of the mine, go ahead. If you win any gold at all, I will get a percentage out of what you win." That is it, I take it. Whom would you require to insure? Not the company who put down the shaft.

Mr. MULLAN: The company, of course.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There are a number of men working for their own personal gain, not for wages. They are not working for the owner of the mine, but for themselves.

Mr. RYLAND: They cannot insure themselves under this Act at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you say that a number of men working together for themselves cannot take out a joint policy?

Mr. RYLAND: No.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They can take out a general accident policy.

The TREASURER: Of course they can. They can always take out an accident policy with the insurance company.

Mr. RYLAND: Not under the provisions of this Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is difficult to hear what is being said with half a dozen talking at one time, but I think that a number of men working together as tributers could easily take out a joint accident policy, and the policy would cover one and all.

Mr. RYLAND: Not under this Act.

Mr. FORSYTH: Any insurance company would insure them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If tributers are unable to take out a joint accident policy for one and all in that way, then I think that some such provision should be made for them.

Mr. RYLAND: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Originally we contemplated the question of employer and employee, and the Act as it stands has made ample provision for every form of employment. It brings in every man engaged in hazardous employment.

Mr. RYAN: Does it cover the police?

*Hon. D. F. Denham.]*

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The police are covered by the Crown in another way. They are just the same as the railway men. Although the railway men are not covered by any insurance, if there is an accident they are covered by the Crown. That is provided for by the Crown.

Mr. RYAN: The railway men are covered by this Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, I know. But the Government do not insure this building, and they do not insure their employees. But if an accident happens to anyone employed in the Government service, they receive compensation from the Government on a liberal scale. If any of the police are injured in the discharge of their duties, then not only do they get the full amount of compensation provided for under the Act, but provision has also been made for their children until they reach a certain age.

Mr. BOWMAN: Some of them get it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I think it has been done in every case that has come under my notice.

Mr. BOWMAN: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I know that in every case which was brought up before the Cabinet they have had the fullest consideration and compensation. Not only the police, but it has also been extended to the medical profession. You remember the doctor at Toowoomba who was so brutally treated by a lunatic that he died.

The TREASURER: Dr. Wishaw.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes. He was receiving a salary of £600 or £700, and his widow received from the Government the sum of £400, although the doctor was not covered by insurance. Not only that, but provision was made for the children, in the case of the lad until he reached sixteen years and in the case of the girl until she reached eighteen years.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is so.

Mr. RYAN: That is not done in every case.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If there is any case that has not been dealt with in a fair and liberal manner, it is because that case has not come before the notice of the Cabinet.

Mr. RYLAND: You admit a weakness in the Act there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Every occupation is dealt with under the Act evidently, except tributers.

The TREASURER: And they are dealt with.

Mr. RYLAND: And contractors are not dealt with.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If there are six, eight, ten, or twelve men working together on tribute, it would be better for them to take out a joint policy.

Mr. RYLAND: How can they take out a joint policy under this Act, when there is no provision for them doing so?

The TREASURER: They can take out an accident policy.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They can take out insurance policies to cover them. Take the case of an ordinary employer in any ordinary walk of life. He does not insure his employees in their names of John Smith or William Brown, and so forth; but he just says that he has so many employees and their wages are so much. The policy is then issued to cover all the wages, so that if a man

drops out to-day and another man comes in to-morrow to take his place, and an accident occurs, that man is protected at once. I say that every form of occupation is cared for here, including the tributer. It has been suggested that domestic servants should be brought under the provisions of this Act. Surely their employment cannot be called hazardous employment. I really think that it is making a travesty of a very important measure like this.

Mr. RYLAND: Why?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We will see what they say about this in the old country in the report of the departmental committee appointed to inquire into the matter of paying compensation for injuries to workmen. They say in this report—

It seems to us that it would be impracticable to propose a general extension of the Act to all contracts of employment. We hardly think it necessary to argue at length against universal and indiscriminate extension. There must, in our opinion, be some definition of the kind of contract of employment which carries with it consequences so serious; some definite and not merely momentary relation of employer and employed must exist before so onerous a liability as that created by the Act is imposed.

You know that you can overdo a thing, and you can break a thing down by its own weight.

Mr. RYLAND: That is why we did not ask for too much at the beginning.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is so, and it was quite right.

Mr. RYLAND: We want to go step by step, and this is our step for this session. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Originally the idea was to protect those engaged in hazardous employment, and that idea was extended to cover others, even the clerk who works in the office. Now we are asked to extend it to domestic servants. I think the hon. gentleman has got his eye perhaps on the voting power of the domestic servants.

Mr. BOWMAN: You should not impute motives to the hon. gentleman.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the hon. member for Gympie thinks I am imputing motives I will recall my words, as I do not in the least degree wish to reflect on the hon. gentleman's integrity in the matter. But the hon. gentleman always has his eye on the main chance.

Mr. LENNON: He is humanitarian.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: As far as my own relationship with domestic servants is concerned we seldom

[5 p.m.] make changes, but we often hear of domestic servants moving round and how often they change. Sometimes a domestic servant is cross with a mistress, and it is not always the mistress's fault. She might be an evil-minded girl, and she might say to herself, "I want a holiday. It is getting warm." She may say, "It is getting warm; I would like to go to Sandgate for a month, or two or three months," and may voluntarily incur some insignificant injury; she would not expose herself to serious injury.

Mr. NEVITT: You said a few minutes ago that nobody would willingly get injured.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We were then discussing hazardous employments. I say it would be a mistake to overload the Act by bringing in the domestic servant who may secure for herself a holiday on account of some simple injury to which she

[Hon. D. F. Denham.]

has herself contributed. Even in the old country, where they have dealt with this matter as liberally as possible, I do not think they have yet gone so far as to include domestic servants as workers within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. RYLAND: Yes; they cover insurance of domestic servants for a fee of 5s. per annum.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not think it can be said that the domestic servant is helping a man to earn his income; she may be helping to spend it, but not to earn it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Some girls conserve it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Some girls may help to conserve it.

Mr. RYLAND: Five or six shillings a year would cover the insurance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Possibly, but I do not think it is necessary to extend the provisions of the Act to domestic servants. By the passing of the Workers' Compensation Act we got rid of all that litigation business which arose under the provision of the Employers' Liability Act that exempted the employer from payment of compensation where there was contributory negligence on the part of the employee. We extended the protection to the employee where an accident occurred "in the course of his employment," and then included all workers who helped to earn revenue for their employer. I fail to recognise the necessity of extending the operation of the Act. The only classes of workers, according to the hon. member, who do not come under the provisions of the Act are tributaries in mines and domestic servants.

Mr. MURPHY: Don't you think that every employer should be compelled to insure his employees against accident?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Every reputable employer does insure his employees against accident. Employers will not take the risk of having to pay compensation for accident. Therefore, all reputable employers insure their employees. But how are you going to compel employers to insure?

Mr. RYLAND: By Act of Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How would you carry it out?

Mr. RYLAND: Fine a man £1 per week if he does not insure.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not think such a scheme is desirable.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You compelled dairymen to pay an inspection fee.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What was the object of the fee paid by dairymen? It was to pay for the inspection from which they benefited. But it would be unreasonable to compel every employer by law to insure, because he would not be contributing towards any benefit conferred upon him. So far as the general trend of this motion goes, I do not regard it as anything to be alarmed at. The proposals are in no wise serious; they might be an improvement to the Act, but they do not appear to me to be so important as to demand an amendment of the Act this session. As I have pointed out, what the hon. member calls the "contracting-out" clause is not a contracting-out provision at all. It is simply a provision under which employers of labour may devise a scheme of their own, and that is an eminently desirable thing to do where employers are big enough and strong enough to do it. I would not allow everybody

to do that, because every employer is not strong enough to meet his obligations in relation to accidents. It must be borne in mind that employers adopting a scheme of their own have to get the approval of the Government to any such scheme. With regard to the proposal to protect injured workers in the case of the insolvency of their employers, I think I have dealt with that, and I hope effectively. As to providing in a schedule the amount which shall be paid to employees for different injuries, that has been proved beyond doubt to be an unwise thing, not only by arguments adduced here but also by quotations from reports on the subject in the old country. As to State insurance, that is a matter well worthy of the closest investigation. The only information I have on that subject at present is information gathered casually. When we tackle a big question like that it should not be done in a casual way. We should deal with it practically and thoroughly.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have been associated with a Cabinet who have announced that such a measure is a part of their policy.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, but we are going to be here for some years—(Opposition laughter)—and you cannot expect us to carry out all improvements in one session.

Mr. BOWMAN: There is the handwriting on the wall.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We are not so ambitious as to try to do everything in one year. We proceed by degrees, and it is possible that we shall yet put upon the statute-book a State Insurance Act. But what is such an Act to be? Is it to be a Fire Insurance Act or a Life Insurance Act or an Accident Insurance Act or an Act including all those matters?

Mr. BOWMAN: All those.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There are members on this side of the Chamber who have advocated some such measure, apart altogether from the Government policy. In some places insurances are effected by local organisations. I believe they have local insurance schemes in Bundaberg and Toowoomba. It is only in large cities like Brisbane that they have not the cohesion to carry out such a scheme. If they had had cohesion in Brisbane, I suppose we should have had a mutual insurance concern here. The finest investment a man can have for his money is insurance.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you interested in the business?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; unfortunately I have no interest in insurance business. At the same time, I think there is no scheme of investment comparable with insurance in regard to the wonderful strides it has made and the profits it produces. From what I have seen insurance companies apparently pay very well. They are building up their reserves, meeting their obligations, and paying dividends. It is quite possible that some scheme of State insurance may be desirable. I had hoped that the hon. member would have dealt with the New Zealand scheme and have shown how triumphantly successful that has been.

Mr. RYLAND: I did.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: As one who insures largely it would please me to see some such scheme, because the very first effect would be to bring premiums down,

*Hon. D. F. Denham.]*

though I observe that that great State of New Zealand had to enter into negotiations with the companies to raise the premiums.

Mr. RYLAND: I am dealing with accident insurance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Very well; when we tackle this big question of State insurance it will not be in a small way; it will be in a comprehensive way, but it must be done on an actuarial basis. We cannot have any kite-flying in this business. I think the Treasurer has quite a hard enough row to hoe without taking upon himself any undue risks. If a scheme be proved actuarial and sound, then there is no reason why the State should not tackle insurance just as it has taken hold of the great carrying work on the railways. (Hear, hear!) But until we know just the ground we are treading we must be wary. As soon as we know how far we can travel with safety, then I have no doubt that the item appearing in the Rockhampton programme to which reference has been made this afternoon will find a place on the statute-book, but I am not in a position to say that the wish of the hon. member for Gympie will be translated into statute law this session. Neither do I state that I am opposed to many of the schemes that the hon. member has advanced this afternoon. I merely say that there is no such urgency as to necessitate putting other business aside in order to carry out these schemes.

Mr. CORSER (*Maryborough*): Hon. members on the other side seem to forget that we have a Workers' Compensation Act as free and as good as any existing in the British Empire.

Mr. BOWMAN: We want to make it better still.

Mr. CORSER: I think a good many members opposite put a very wrong construction upon what can be done under insurance. It has been stated that tributers cannot be insured under the Act.

Mr. RYLAND: You can insure them, but not under the Act.

Mr. CORSER: You can insure them as individuals.

Mr. RYLAND: If there was a big accident and the insurance companies objected to pay, you could not enforce payment.

Mr. CORSER: You can take out a policy to cover tributers, just as a contractor can take out a policy to cover his employees. You can insure each individual, or you can take out a general cover. The owner of a mine can insure any tributers under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. RYLAND: He can pay the premiums, but can he get compensation in the event of an accident?

Mr. CORSER: I do not think it is fair to suggest that insurance companies in this State that are registered by the Government will so carry on their business that they receive premiums and fail to carry out the obligations of their policies.

Mr. MURPHY: They do it in connection with mining tributes, anyhow.

Mr. CORSER: Certainly no case has come under my notice where any company tried to evade its obligations in this respect. A personal accident policy can be taken out for a miner for £100, payable in this way:—£1 10s. per week will be paid during incapacity for twenty-six weeks, and £100 will be paid in the event of death. If the man wants to

multiply that by four, he has only to pay four times the amount of premium and four times these payments will be made.

Mr. MULLAN: He would have to pay £6 per annum.

Mr. CORSER: Well, it is no more than his employer has to pay. If a tributer places himself in the position of his employer, and becomes a worker in the mine, and takes all the profits—

Mr. MURPHY: No, he does not.

Mr. CORSER: He takes very nearly all the profits. Many tributers I know only pay 5 per cent. to the owners of the mine, and all the rest belongs to themselves.

Mr. MULLAN: I know some who have to pay 20 per cent.

Mr. MURPHY: They are not even allowed to take the gold that they get.

Mr. CORSER: These men may not be labourers under the Act in a sense, because they are working for themselves and are their own employers, but it is wrong to say that they cannot cover themselves by insurance in exactly the same way as any ordinary employer could cover them.

Mr. MULLAN: Not under the Act.

Mr. CORSER: Yes, under the Act.

Mr. RYLAND: No; it has nothing at all to do with the Act.

Mr. CORSER: Supposing you go to the owner of the mine and say, "There are twenty of us in this tribute, and we want you to take out a policy under the Workers' Compensation Act for any accident that may happen to any of us whilst we are working on tribute," the mineowner can do it.

Mr. RYLAND: He can pay the premiums all right.

Mr. CORSER: And compensation will be paid. I understood hon. members on the other side to say that you cannot insure a groom or a gardener or a chauffeur. I do not possess such a thing as a chauffeur, but you can certainly cover a groom or a gardener. We have also heard that there has been a very large increase in the premiums charged in respect of scrub-cutters. Now, let me assure hon. members that there has been no increase in the premiums since the Act came into force. At that time the rate for scrub-cutters was £3 per cent. If a farmer puts his men on at any ordinary work the premium is only 15s. per cent.; but if they are engaged all the time at scrub-cutting, the premium is £3 per cent., and it has never been less.

Mr. RYLAND: If a farmer cuts scrub himself, why should he not be entitled to compensation as well as the man working for him? It is the wages they cover, and not the man.

Mr. CORSER: If I have a contract to let, I take the precaution to ascertain, first, that the contractor has an insurance policy, otherwise he does not get the job; and any labourer can go to an employer and say, "Have you got an insurance policy, otherwise I will not work for you?" Then the employer would have to take out a policy—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: A poor fellow standing for a job!

Mr. CORSER: So that I really do not see that there is anything in this motion that calls for us to support it at this juncture. There is one thing: I do not know whether the hon. member threw it out as a bait, but he wants the stamp duty of 5s. taken off the

[*Hon. D. F. Denham.*]

policy. Now, the stamp duty is never charged to the men. It is certainly paid by the insurance companies, and, as it goes to the Government, the people get it back in some other way.

Mr. RYLAND: The poor labourer has to pay it.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the hon. member for Gympie. I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches that have been made on the other side of the House—both to that of the Minister and of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I heard the Minister say that he does not think it advisable that there should be frequent amendments to industrial legislation. Whether that is desirable or not, I think every hon. member in this House will agree that it is desirable that promises which have been made to the electors of Queensland should be carried out. The Government have promised that they will bring down a measure providing for State insurance, and I quite agree with the hon. member for Cairns that that is one of the most important amendments that could be made in the Workers' Compensation Act. But when we listen to speeches such as that which has just been delivered by the hon. member for Maryborough, we have not far to go to find the reason why the Government are not carrying out their promise with regard to State insurance. It is quite evident that the influence of private insurance companies behind the Government is so great that they are not game to bring forward the legislation which they have promised.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: I have been rather curious to know the application of the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough. He has stated that it is possible to insure your gardener or to insure your groom or to insure your domestic servants, but I quite fail to see what application that has to the motion that has been moved by the hon. member for Gympie. No one in this Chamber disputed that you could insure your groom or your gardener or your domestic servants, but what the hon. member for Gympie desires is that if your groom or your gardener or your domestic servant is injured by an accident, that he shall be entitled to compensation for that accident. At present he is not entitled to compensation, and if I insure my groom or my gardener that does not entitle him to receive compensation in the event of his meeting with an accident. In other words, the arguments that have been used by the hon. member for Maryborough are simply arguments in support of insurance companies.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: He stood up there as an advocate for insurance companies and has quite forgotten the motion before the House.

The TREASURER: Do you say an accident policy is no good?

Mr. RYAN: I do not say an accident policy is no good, but I say it was quite possible to take out an accident policy long before the Workers' Compensation Act was ever thought of, and it is quite irrelevant and quite misleading to bring such arguments forward and use them as an argument against an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act, and I am surprised a Minister, having the legal training of the Minister who has just interjected, should have made the interjection he did.

The TREASURER: You said they were no good.

Mr. RYAN: As regards section 12—the first part of the motion—the Minister has stated that that is not a contracting-out section. With all due deference to the Minister, I submit that it is clearly and distinctly a contracting-out section, and if the Minister will refer to the regulations which have been made by the Governor in Council under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, and which bear date the 2nd March, 1906, he will find that the regulation 80 is headed—and these are provisions made by the Governor in Council—"Contracting out under Scheme." I do not think it is necessary for me to go any further than to refer to them to show that it clearly is a contracting-out section.

Mr. MANN: The Minister drafted the regulations.

Mr. RYAN: As the hon. member for Cairns reminds me, the Minister who spoke those words was one of the Cabinet who drafted those regulations. But if any further proof were necessary, you need only look at the section, and you will find that under the provisions of that section an employer can "contract"—that is the word used—with any of his workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act. Is that contracting out of the provisions of the Act? Of course it is, and I do not see why the Colonial Sugar Refining Company or any other large company should be able to receive a certificate from the Governor in Council which enables them to do that which no other employer can do. As regards the second part of his motion—protecting injured workers in case of insolvency of employer—the Minister said that he expected to hear some reasons advanced by members of the Opposition showing the urgency of these amendments. In my own experience I have come across many cases where the employer has been unable to pay the compensation to which the workman has been entitled, and there has been no protection under the Act which would give priority such as the motion proposes. I do not think any further reasons need be advanced than reasons that I have seen from actual experience. I have seen numerous cases. The Minister has not said that these cases do not exist, and in my experience I have found that they do. The Minister, in referring to the matter of extending the benefits of the Act to all workers, said the only people who are not included are domestic servants. I beg to differ from the Minister. There is a far larger number of workers excluded from the operations of the Act than merely domestic servants. I asked him, by interjection, whether the police were protected. He said they were servants of the Crown, and if accidents happened to the police, they compensate them to the full extent. I know that this is not a fact. I know of a constable who, about two years ago, was accidentally killed when he was travelling from Rockhampton to Clermont after doing special duty at the Rockhampton Carnival. He happened to fall off the platform under the train. His name was Hoge, and he left a widow and little children who were dependent upon him. That case happened to come under my notice for an opinion, and I gave the opinion that I did not think they could succeed in getting compensation because the police were not within the ambit of the Workers' Compensation Act. That is an opinion that I regretted very much having to give under the circumstances of the case, but I added also that

*Mr. Ryan.*]

notwithstanding my opinion, that they might apply to the Government and see whether they held the same opinion. What was the result? They applied for compensation and were told that the claim would be resisted. That is a particular case I know of, and I know the Government refused to give compensation, and after the statement made by the Minister to-night, I think it is the duty of the Government to see that they pay £400 to the widow and children of the constable who was killed on that occasion. If the Government establish any principle like that, they should see that it is carried out, and I shall take the opportunity, at a later stage in this session, to ask whether that compensation has been paid.

Mr. MURPHY: We will move a vote of censure if they do not pay.

Mr. WHITE: There may be special circumstances.

Mr. RYAN: I am thankful for that interjection. There were no special circumstances in the case except that the man who was killed through an accident left a widow and young children with nothing to support them. Those are the only special circumstances. The unfortunate dependants were left absolutely without anything, and they were offered, I think, something like £100 as compensation. With regard to the schedule of amounts to be paid in the case of permanent injury, no doubt the Minister has spent some time in looking up different reports with regard to the advisableness or otherwise of having a schedule. The advantage of a schedule, to my mind, is this: If there is a schedule to the Act it will prevent a lot of litigation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER Most unselfish.

Mr. RYAN: I can assure the Premier that workers' compensation litigation does not pay the profession. The machinery of the Act is so involved in many cases, and the scale of costs is so small, that I would rather have nothing to do with it myself.

The PREMIER: Then it is not so unselfish as it looks.

Mr. MURPHY: No costs in it. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: As the Act stands, before the amount of compensation can be ascertained for the loss of an eye or an arm or a leg, a worker has to go before a court and his claim has to be resisted. The employer has to resist, so that necessarily there is a fight as the Act stands at present. It may be that a man loses an arm. The worker is not entitled to have a sum fixed for the injury received—a lump sum—he is only entitled to a weekly payment, but the employer can fix a lump sum. Why should not the employee have the same power as the employer with regard to having a lump sum fixed?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: Most workmen who receive an injury are desirous of receiving a lump sum; but the employer always prefers [5.30 p.m.] a weekly payment until he can tire out the worker and get him to accept a smaller lump sum. The Minister also stated that it would be impossible to arrive at the value of the eye or limb of a worker, and that it would be better to leave it to the police magistrate. Every hon. member must admit that if you leave it to the magistrate, every magistrate will give a different decision. You might get one to fix the value of an arm at £100, another might fix it at £125, another at £150.

[Mr. Ryan.

The PREMIER: Does not that apply to all law?

Mr. RYAN: Certainly it applies to all law in regard to damages; but if there was a schedule fixed it would prevent the necessity for going to law at all, except to decide the question of liability. In most cases, owing to the nature of the provisions of the Act, the question of liability is not disputed, but the question of the quantum or the amount of liability is disputed; therefore, it would be a distinct advantage not only to the workman but also to the legal profession to have the amount fixed by schedule. Even the insurance companies desire it, or say they desire it, at all events. Then there is the abolition of 5s. duty stamp on policies. I was interested in the argument of the hon. member for Maryborough, who says it is paid by the insurance companies. If it is paid by them, it comes eventually out of the person assured.

Mr. CORSER: And goes back to him.

Mr. RYAN: It goes to the Government. The last part of the motion, providing for compulsory State insurance, I heartily support, though I do not think there is any possible chance of getting it from the present Government, because the influence of the insurance companies is too great. There is nothing that would more conduce to the prompt settlement of claims made by workmen for compensation than providing compulsory State insurance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why "compulsory"?

Mr. RYAN: Because there are employers who will go insolvent and will not pay their workmen if they are injured.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Wages are always a first charge.

Mr. RYAN: Evidently the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer. (Laughter.) I am aware that wages are a first charge; but this is not a question of wages; it is a question of compensation; and the hon. member for Gympie desires to put the payment of compensation on the same footing as the payment of wages. Even if the Government will go so far as to establish State insurance, that will be getting a long way towards facilitating the settlement of claims made by workmen. Anyone with experience of claims under the Act will know that those who cause the trouble—those who resist the claims—are the insurance companies. They are the people behind the Government and behind the employer, and they raise every difficulty they can in the way of preventing the worker from getting compensation. I believe that if this insurance was in the hands of the Government there would not be the same incentive to raise technical objections to the workers' claims; and for that reason I strongly urge the Government to carry out the promise to establish State insurance. It may be that the elements behind the Government are different now; but evidently there is some reason why the Government are not carrying out their promise to provide what the people of Queensland are clamouring for.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WHITE (*Musgrave*): This provision for making a schedule I thought some time ago as chairman of an insurance company—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. WHITE: I thought the schedule would be a very good thing; but there is a good deal in what the Minister for Public Lands said about a hand or an eye not being of the

same value to all professions and all workmen. I will give an instance where a man got one finger and part of another taken off. He was off twelve weeks, during which time he was paid the usual compensation. At the end of that time the company offered him £50 for the loss of the finger; but through the influence of a solicitor, not through his own efforts, he took the case to court, and asked for compensation to the extent of £200. I think the case lasted two days, and it was shown that the man was earning more money without the finger than he was earning before it was taken off. Before the loss of the finger he was working a machine, but afterwards he was put on drafting work and other things. At the machine he was earning only £2 15s., but afterwards he was earning £3 5s. The result was that he got no compensation. The hon. member for Barcoo stated that this is not a paying game for the solicitors. In the town I come from there was a solicitor who simply haunted the hospital continuously for cases to bring before the court.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Name, name!

Mr. WHITE: I refuse to give the name, but I will give an instance. A man got an ankle hurt and went to his home in Bundaberg. The solicitor induced this man to go for £300 compensation for his injured ankle. This man came out of the hospital and went limping about the town for months, trying, I suppose, to get better, and still being worked upon by the solicitor, who induced him to take proceedings. Ultimately, the company settled with the solicitor for £250. The man came to me to see what help he could get in the matter. He said that he first saw the solicitor in the hospital, and the conditions were that if the solicitor got the compensation he was to keep one-half the amount. The solicitor kept his one-half when he got the money, and also kept all expenses that he had incurred in the matter, and the man got the other part. I was very sorry for this individual, and I went to the Minister about it, but he said if that was the arrangement there was nothing else to be done. I happened to go up in the train with this man. He got into the train with crutches, with the same old bad leg, and when he got on the steamer he put the crutches away again, and seemed in fair health. (Laughter.) I saw a case reported in one of the London papers recently, which I quote to show that all employers or insurance companies are not absolute rogues, any more than that all workmen are perfectly honest. I think there are faults on both sides. I think there should be some prevention of malingering. In this case a man went into court with a bad eye. He went to the doctor, and the doctor threw something on the floor and asked him to pick it up, to see if his eye was all right. The man could not find it at all. The doctor went out for a minute. There was a pin that had dropped out of the man's tie, and when he came in the man was lifting the pin off the floor. (Laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are imagining that.

Mr. WHITE: I do not say that all men are like that, but I say there are cases where there is malingering.

The PREMIER: There are exceptional cases.

Mr. WHITE: I hold no brief for insurance companies, for when the tariff came out I considered it was altogether too high. (Hear, hear!) On that account we started an insurance association in Bundaberg, and up to the present time we have been able to remit no

less than 20 per cent. of the premiums to the policy-holders. We are accumulating a fairly large reserve, and we have only disputed one single claim of all those that ever came before the association. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. BOWMAN: After that experience there should be no delay.

Mr. WHITE: I want to mention this particular claim, because it shows that there are some of them which are not just. This case was not instigated by a solicitor, but it was instigated by the hon. member for Gympie. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: No wonder he is getting so bald-headed.

Mr. WHITE: This was a case where there was a young man insured in our association, and he said he had got a knock from a swingle-bar. We investigated the case, and found that there was no swingle-bar where he stood. The case went to the court, and, I think against the evidence and the weight of evidence, the police magistrate gave a verdict against us, which cost £150 or £160, besides the solicitor's fees. I mention this to show that our company is trying to do the very best it can. As I said, we had never before resisted a claim, and we have paid over £1,000 in claims. Every claim which has come before us has been justly met. I believe the insurance companies do that too. I think the hon. junior member for Gympie acted from a humanitarian point of view, but I am quite sure he did not know the facts of the case, and he acted more in the interests of the boy's mother than the boy himself.

Mr. RYLAND: Did he not get it?

Mr. WHITE: He did, and he is still being paid by the insurance company.

Mr. RYLAND: That shows I gave them good advice.

Mr. WHITE: If the hon. member had known the facts of the case, I am sure he would not have given that advice.

Mr. RYLAND: Do you say it was wrong?

Mr. WHITE: I say it was against the weight of evidence. However, I was glad to see the matter closed up. We are still paying that boy, although we are certainly not entitled to do so.

Mr. RYLAND: Did they not deal with the case in Brisbane?

Mr. WHITE: No; that was a question of change of venue which was decided in Brisbane. I do not think it is possible to make a schedule for every accident which may happen.

The hon. member having addressed himself to several hon. members who interjected,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to address the Chair. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. WHITE: I apologise, but you must admit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is the Opposition members who are drawing my attention from the actual rules of debate. I submit to your ruling. (Laughter.) There has been a great deal said about domestic servants being brought under this Act, but domestic service is not a hazardous occupation, and I do not think it is necessary to include domestic servants. They are not earning money for their employers.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are spending money for their employers.

Mr. WHITE: In fact, they are doing their best to spend as much of their employer's money as they can possibly manage.

*Mr. White.]*

Mr. MURPHY: They break a good deal of crockery. (Laughter.)

Mr. WHITE: There is no reason why domestic servants should be included under the provisions of the Act at all. I do not think that the hon. member for Gympie, or anyone sitting on that side of the House, could give a single instance where domestic servants have suffered to any extent through not being included in the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Oh, yes!

Mr. WHITE: The hon. member for Gympie did not give any instance when he proposed his motion. He could not give one instance where it entailed hardship on domestic servants, or anyone else, through not being included in the Act. I think that when a member brings forward before a deliberative Assembly such a comprehensive matter as is contained in the motion brought forward this afternoon, he should be prepared with evidence not only from this State but from other States and from all parts of the world, to show that the alterations he is bringing forward are justified.

Mr. MURPHY: He did bring some.

Mr. WHITE: The Minister for Lands told us what has taken place in England and elsewhere, and he showed that it would not be possible to bring forward a schedule that would be satisfactory to all parties—to either the employers or the employees. A great deal of time is wasted over these matters on Thursday afternoons, and I do not know what is the object, because they know perfectly well that when they bring forward these measures there is no hope whatever of getting them through.

Mr. LENNON: It is sufficient justification for bringing them forward to hear you defending the insurance companies.

Mr. WHITE: I am not defending the insurance companies. In fact, I am against them. And I am so much against them that I started an insurance company of my own. We started an insurance company in Bundaberg, and it is a very prosperous concern. It has saved the employers in that district a large amount of money, and we have no squabbling at all, with the exception of the one case I have referred to. We deal straightforwardly with everyone, and whenever we get a reasonable claim we always deal with it fairly. I think that there should be equal justice for all in these matters, but I know that in nearly every case that goes before the police magistrate he is on the side of the employee. Probably that is only right and fair—that he should side with the employee.

Mr. RYAN: No, it is not fair.

The PREMIER: The police magistrate should not be on any side.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He leans towards the employee.

Mr. MURPHY: What about the man in Croydon who had both of his legs amputated below the knee as a result of an accident, and he only gets £1 a week compensation, although he has to keep a wife and four children?

Mr. WHITE: But he will get the £1 a week until it reaches £400.

Mr. MURPHY: But why not give it to him in a lump sum?

Mr. WHITE: Has he not got the power of appeal?

Mr. MURPHY: No. The employer can appeal, but not the employee.

[*Mr. White.*

Mr. WHITE: I think that in the case of a man losing two legs the insurance company that would not pay the lump sum is not acting rightly.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not the insurance company. The man was not insured. There should be compulsory insurance to bring all these men under it.

Mr. WHITE: The insurance company that refuses to pay the lump sum in the case of a man losing both legs are not doing right, and are not carrying out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Well, that £1 a week is all that he has got.

Mr. WHITE: I sincerely hope that there are few cases of that kind, as if there were it would go hard with the insurance companies. I have known several cases where the insurance companies try to avoid paying the compensation at all.

Mr. RYAN: They always do.

Mr. WHITE: I do not think always. I know cases where I appealed to the insurance companies, and this was before the Workers' Compensation Act came into existence at all, and I never appealed in vain, as the insurance companies always came down and paid handsomely. I had an insurance association connected with the foundry I am connected with, and we paid the incapacitated workers from the very day they were sick, and it was not half rates but full wages from the date that any slight accident took place. We paid them right from the commencement. Of course the employees themselves contributed a certain amount to the fund, and it was a fair and equitable arrangement. If the employees in the State had taken the same action the Workers' Compensation Act would never have been insisted on; it would not have been necessary. Under that system the workers were more satisfied and better paid than they are under the Workers' Compensation Act. There are many reputable firms that do the same thing, and they always paid the worker from the date of the accident.

Mr. BARBER: Some places do it.

Mr. WHITE: My friend knows that the Bundaberg foundry did it, and there are other instances where they were paid from the date of the accident in the Bundaberg district. I only want to prove that there are plenty of reputable employers in the country, and when these statements are brought forward on the other side they are generally brought forward in such a way as to lead people to think that the employers have no consideration for those whom they employ. I certainly think that the majority of the employers in this State are reputable employers who have just as much consideration for the workmen they employ, or rather a great deal more consideration for the workmen than the workmen have for them. I only rose after hearing the statements made by the hon. member for Barcoo, and in that case I think I refuted them. (Opposition laughter.) There are good and bad people in all professions. I have heard of cases of solicitors hanging round the hospitals urging the patients to bring cases against the insurance companies. There are many solicitors in England who get their living by it.

Mr. MURPHY: Did you see that Lloyd George said that the lawyers were always opposed to reforms that were likely to reduce fees?

Mr. WHITE: I remember Mr. Charles Powers reduced the fees in this House, and he was driven out of Parliament for it.

Hon. R. PHILP: Not for reducing them, but for increasing the fees. (Laughter.)

Mr. WHITE: With regard to what the hon. member for Gympie said—

At 7 o'clock the House, in accordance with Sessional Order, proceeded with Government Business.

### WAGES BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Wages Boards Act of 1908.

Mr. MURPHY asked if the Minister could give the Committee any idea as to the direction in which it was proposed to amend this Act?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he did not think it wise at this stage to enter into any discussion with regard to the contents of the Bill, but he might state that, generally speaking, the amendments proposed were in the direction of making the Act more effective, and were the outcome of experience obtained in the working of the Act, which showed that certain defects existed.

Mr. MURPHY thanked the Minister for his courtesy. It was a pleasant thing to find some Minister on the Treasury bench courteous enough to reply to a question.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, which was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

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

### MINES REGULATION BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to make better provision for the regulation and inspection of mines.

For the information of hon. members he might mention that the first part of the Bill was preliminary. Part II. contained provisions relating to all mines, and dealt with inspection, the examination and certifying of mine managers, the procedure in case of accident, plans, and general and special rules. Part III. related to collieries only, and contained general and special rules, and miscellaneous provisions. Part IV. dealt with the liability of employers and employees, returns from mines for statistical purposes, abandonment of mines, penalty, and procedure. Part V. dealt with rules, the schedule setting forth the subject-matters for rules, and the general rules to be observed in all mines with regard to ventilation, fences, and protection. There were also provisions dealing with machinery, winding-gear, explosives, health, sanitation, and general rules applicable to collieries only in regard to ventilation, accident, safety-lamps, and the protection of underground workings.

Mr. MURPHY thanked the Minister for his courtesy in giving the Committee so much information in regard to the Bill, and said members on the Treasury bench were becoming quite courteous since yesterday.

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*) asked if the Minister would be good enough to respect the promise he made last year that he would send so much of the Bill as dealt with collieries to the people interested in the industry. He referred specially to the Mine Managers' Association and the Queensland Collieries Employees' Union. If those bodies were consulted as to the requirements of that particular branch of the mining industry, it would probably facilitate the passing of the measure.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES replied that he had a spare copy of the Bill which would be at the disposal of the hon. member immediately the motion was passed and the Bill introduced.

Mr. MURPHY: Why should there be a spare copy of the Bill handed to the senior member for Ipswich? If there were any spare copies, other members interested in the mining industry had as much right to one as the hon. member for Ipswich.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member will have his copy in the morning.

Mr. MURPHY: What about the junior member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair? Was he not interested in the Bill.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Can't he speak for himself?

Mr. MURPHY: He was speaking for the hon. member just now.

Question put and passed.

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

#### FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I move that the Bill be now read a first time.

Mr. MURPHY: Before the Bill is read a first time I would like to ask when we are likely to be supplied with copies of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I trust the hon. member will have his copy the first thing in the morning.

Question put and passed.

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

### POLICE JURISDICTION AND SUMMARY OFFENCES BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

On the Order of the Day being called for the consideration in Committee of the desirability of introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the powers and duties of officers of the Police Force, and with respect to certain offences punishable summarily, and for other purposes—

The TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair.

Mr. MANN: Before you leave the chair, Sir, I would like to ask what is the necessity for going into Committee to introduce a measure of this sort? Is there any crying need for introducing a Bill to give the police more power than they have now? If they have not got power, in many cases they arrogate it to themselves, and I am quite sure hon. members on this side are with me when

*Mr. Mann.*]

I say that there is much more needed legislation than this Bill. For example, what about an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I am sure that hon. members on this side and some hon. members on the other side favour such a Bill as that. Why is that not brought down, instead of the time of the House being taken up with a measure of this sort—a measure that has never been asked for except by a few extreme “wowsers,” as they are called, who have the ear of the Government, and who seek to make people moral by Act of Parliament? Why is not a Bill brought in, for example, for the preservation of our State forests? We were promised by the Secretary for Public Lands last session that a Bill would be brought in for the more effective preservation of our forests, which are fast being denuded. Why is not a Bill like that brought down instead of a trumpery Bill like this that nobody has asked for?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The question of the necessity of legislation is not before the House at the present time. The question is the specific one—“That I do now leave the chair,” and I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that question.

Mr. MANN: The question before the House is that you do now leave the chair for the purpose of going into Committee to discuss a Bill which I am pointing out is not urgently called for in the interests of Queensland; and I am asking the Government, before you leave the chair, to bring forward some other measures which I deem of more importance to the welfare of Queensland. I think I am perfectly in order in arguing along those lines and asking that some member of the Cabinet, before you leave the chair, shall rise and announce that this is going to be deleted from the business-paper and that some other measure more beneficial for Queensland is to be substituted for it. For example, there is on the Government programme a Bill to prevent the leasing of land to aliens.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the hon. member to depart from the question before the House. The question which he has now raised will arise when the Bill he speaks of is before the House.

Mr. MANN: I cannot follow your ruling, Sir, inasmuch as I have cotton wool in my ears; but I understand that, when it is moved that you do now leave the chair, members are allowed to discuss the business which is to come before the Committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must again call the hon. member for Cairns to order. The question is the specific question that has been submitted from the chair. Upon that question I rule that hon. members cannot discuss the desirableness or otherwise of introducing certain other legislation.

Mr. MANN: The question before the House is that you, Sir, do now leave the chair, and I am asking that you should not leave the chair, but that you should remain in the chair, and that we should discuss matters of more importance. I should be sorry to see you leave the chair to consider a Bill to increase the power now given to the police while I have the faintest hope of the Government altering their programme and introducing other legislation which I am sure the majority of hon. members think should be introduced. For example, the hon. member for Fassifern wishes to introduce

[Mr. Mann.]

drastic legislation to deal with the prickly pear. The hon. member has been a loyal supporter of the Government, and if the Government were acting in the best interests of the agricultural districts of the State they would have had upon the business-paper a measure giving the local authorities more power to deal with the pest. It is suggested that there may be something in the Bill it is now proposed to introduce giving the police power to deal with the pear, but I do not think so. I think it is rather a Bill giving the police power to run in small boys who are smoking cigarettes, or dealing with frivolous offences like that. If the Government had the real interest of the country at heart they would deal with national questions like the destruction of the prickly pear instead of bringing in such a tinpot lot of Bills as they have put before us in the Governor's Speech. We should see them bringing in legislation, perhaps, to give effect to the suggestion of the hon. member for Fassifern to destroy the prickly pear by convict labour, though I do not believe in that being done myself. I believe in a more scientific and up-to-date method of coping with the pest. I am sure that the members sitting behind the Government are also keenly anxious that measures of a nature calculated to benefit the farming community should be placed on the statute-book rather than the one now proposed. For example, I think I heard the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply make some reference to the wonderful prosperity of Canada, and possibly the Government, if they were wise in their generation, would pass a Land Bill to allow settlers to get land at the price they are now charging in Canada.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: For example, we know—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order! I called the hon. member to order in the hope that he would see he was transgressing.

Mr. MANN: I must apologise, but I cannot hear, as I have cotton wool in my ears. (Laughter.) It is a statement of fact. I am always willing to obey a call to “Order,” and I am willing to debate it in an orderly manner if I think I am right. I do not know in what respect I was out of order—I was simply urging the Government to introduce legislation—that is a liberal Land Bill such as they have in Canada in order to encourage settlement. I hope there is nothing wrong in asking the Government to do that, instead of passing this motion. I was saying, only a few months ago, a settler left the Cairns district and went to Canada—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: Well, I won't pursue that topic any further. I hope some member on the Government side of the House—the member for Fassifern for preference—will rise and assist in my efforts to get the Government to bring in a Bill to deal in a drastic and comprehensive manner with the prickly-pear pest, instead of bringing in this tinpot measure. I think he is not in earnest in his utterances in this House if he does not insist on the Government postponing this measure, and introducing a Bill to cope with the prickly pear.

Mr. FERRICKS: He is sincere enough, but they are all gagged.

Mr. MURPHY: After the very eloquent address delivered by the hon. member for Cairns, I feel satisfied that members generally

will recognise that it would be advisable for the Government to withdraw this motion, and proceed with some other business that is likely to do good to the country. For instance, take Northern Queensland. Take that vast mineral belt which stretches from Cairns right away to the Gulf. Why cannot the Government come down this session and do something to help the resources of that part of Queensland? What about the Mines Development Bill that was prepared in 1904 by the late W. H. Browne? Where has that got to? It has been pigeon-holed, and neither the Premier nor the Secretary for Mines is likely to bring it forward. I think, instead of going on with this Bill, which his own party absolutely refused last session, it would be better to introduce a Mines Development Bill to assist the mining industry in Queensland.

Mr. RYLAND: Will this interfere with any industry in your district?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, it might interfere with the cattle industry. (Laughter.) Of course we shall be told, if this Bill reaches its second reading, that at the caucus meeting on the "Lucinda" the party decided to make it a non-party question. Everything on the Government programme to-day is of a non-party nature. We have noticed and you, Sir, no doubt have also noticed, in the local papers that the Government are a strong coherent party, and they have agreed to everything in the Government programme, but first of all it was agreed that they should all be non-party questions. I am very pleased to see that, because I think that the time is fast arriving when, instead of being ruled by Cabinet, we will have an elective Ministry—that members who are sent here by the people will have the pleasure of selecting those who are to form the Cabinet and who are to run the country. I feel quite satisfied of this: That some of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the front Treasury bench to-day would not be there if they had to get there by the vote of this House. Of course I quite agree the Premier would be there. He is always pretty confident of getting a vote from me if it comes to a question of making him Premier. (Laughter.) I honestly think that the Government might withdraw this motion, and bring in something else. Let us have this Licensing Bill—let us deal with this liquor question—another question of a non-party nature. This Police Offences Bill, if I remember rightly, consisted of 500 or 600 clauses, from what I saw of it last session. I know the Premier wants to close the session quickly, and how can we deal with all the Bills that have been brought forward? Bring in good measures that are likely to be of benefit to the country, and not measures of this sort. I plead with the Premier, and I am sure after he has listened to the hon. member for Cairns and myself upon this question he will issue instructions to the Treasurer not to take the Bill any further.

Question put and passed.

#### COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to consolidate and amend the law relating to the powers and duties of officers of the Police Force, and with respect to certain offences punishable summarily, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURPHY asked the Treasurer to give the Committee some particulars in connection with the Bill. In what direction did he propose to amend the present law?

Mr. MANN said before he could give an intelligent vote he would like to know what the Bill contained. They had been told there was some slight alteration to the Bill brought in last session. He went through that Bill very carefully and noticed one or two very objectionable clauses. For example, no boy under fourteen years of age was allowed to handle a gun. Just picture a boy sent out by his father to keep the wallabies and cockatoos away from a crop of maize not being able to use a gun! A boy fourteen years of age might handle a gun better than a man sixty years of age. Were hon. members going to allow a Bill like that to be introduced which would harass the poor settler? Hon. members opposite had often brought the tears to his (Mr. Mann's) eyes by their picture of the woes of the small settler, and yet they were going to prevent his family being allowed to use a gun to protect their crops. He had always advocated the settler getting cheaper land and better conditions.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The land question is not before the Committee at the present time.

Mr. MANN: He wished to explain the question of the settlers protecting their crops on the land.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the House is the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the law relating to the powers of officers of the Police Force.

Mr. MANN: He could not vote for the introduction of the Bill without knowing something of its provisions. Hon. members opposite claimed to be the friends of the small farmer, and they should not allow a Bill to be introduced which would prevent a boy of fourteen years of age being allowed to handle a gun to protect his father's maize from cockatoos and parrots.

Mr. MURPHY: It is purely a squatters' Government.

Mr. MANN: They did not hear much about the small farmers. He had seen no desire on the part of the Government to deal effectively with the prickly pear or to give better facilities for people settling on the land.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Committee is [7.30 p.m.] not either prickly pear or land settlement; it is a question of the law relating to the Police Force.

Mr. MANN: Sometimes he was drawn off the track by interjections. It was only fair that members should know something about the Bill. Would the Treasurer cause copies to be handed round, so that they could see whether it contained any obnoxious clauses or not? He did not think it would hurt the dignity of the Government to do that. Then if members considered the provisions of the measure too drastic it could be recast and brought down in another form. If it was like the Bill circulated last session, he would be inclined to call for a division on every clause; and as it contained more than 400 clauses that would be a great waste of time.

Mr. MURPHY: If the Treasurer did not know anything about the Bill, of course he was not in a position to give particulars; but after the courtesy shown to the Committee by the Minister for Education and the Minister for Mines, both of whom were well versed in the Bills they proposed to present, the Treasurer was showing great discourtesy, and it was time to protest. In addition to the clauses in

last year's Bill referred to by the hon. member for Cairns, there was one under which the police would have power, without a warrant, to rummage everywhere in a man's house. If the Treasurer knew anything about the Bill, he should courteously give the Committee the required information, as other Ministers had done when introducing their Bills. The Cabinet he intended to form at one time—(laughter)—if they had been going to introduce a Bill, would have known all about every clause, and would have given the information to hon. members; but if the Treasurer knew anything about this Bill he religiously kept it to himself. For all they knew, their liberty might be at stake, and they had a right to know what was in the Bill. The Treasurer had to do exactly as the Premier told him; but fortunately there were some members of the Cabinet who had a little backbone.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question of Cabinet Ministers is not before the Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: But it was a question of the liberty of Cabinet Ministers. Under the Police Offences Bill, if the Cabinet were not prepared to raise the salaries and allowances of the police, who knew that they might not go and arrest the Premier? There was one clause in last year's Bill with which he agreed, and that was the clause which gave anyone power to shoot a vicious dog. (Laughter.) It would be better if it gave power to shoot the owner, too. Was there nothing in connection with the cattle industry about which the Treasurer could give them some particulars? Had he any particulars at all? If he did not know anything, would the Premier tell them something? He must know something, as he had seen the Bill in the Cabinet. Would the Treasurer tell them whether they had the Bill on the "Lucinda," and whether, after reading it, the farmers' representatives said, "It must be a non-party question; we cannot support the second reading of this Bill"? (Laughter.) Was there anything about prickly pear in the Bill? Could the Treasurer tell that? Could he tell them, or would he tell them, anything—that was the most important question just now?

Mr. MANN said he really thought the Treasurer would have risen in his place, and given the House some assurance of what the Bill contained. What was the use of supporting a Bill when they knew nothing about the provisions? It was simply asking the House to go it blind. They wanted the second reading passed to save the Government's face, and then they would throw it in the waste-paper basket. They knew the Treasurer was naturally a kind and courteous individual. If he would rise in his place and tell them that certain clauses had been deleted, and that there was no provision to give the police the power of a Czar or a Kaiser; if he assured them that it did not limit the rights of His Majesty's liege subjects, there should be no objection to bringing in this Bill. Apparently, the Government had made up their minds to bring it in, but before they did so they should inform the House what it contained. If the Treasurer would give the House a summary of the Bill, and show that there was nothing that the most punctilious person could object to, they could introduce the Bill and time would be saved. He had no desire to rise on every occasion to put his views before the House; he would be contented to sit quietly in his place if the Treasurer would do what the Minister for Mines did to-night in introducing the Mines Bill, when he stated what

it contained, and there was a general chorus of "Hear, hears!" from this side of the House. The matters contained in that Bill appealed to the sense of the House as being urgently required for the protection of those engaged in the mining industry. But the Treasurer sat there like a Chinese idol, if he might use the expression. He could not even answer the question as to whether any demand had been made by the people of Queensland for this Bill. It was not a part of the Rockhampton programme, and he did not see why it should be brought forward before other legitimate measures. What about a Trades Disputes Bill? Would not that be a better measure to occupy the time of the House with than giving power to the police to run small boys in for smoking cigarettes, giving them power to search dwellings for firearms, and to see that no youth under fourteen was allowed to go about with a pea rifle, and that no little boys went about the streets selling papers on Sundays? But even if the measure was of no importance, the Treasurer should at least assure them that it was worth the paper it was written on, and that even if it passed into law it was not intended to put it into operation. As far as he could tell, he might be assisting to pass a measure which would be very harmful to His Majesty's dutiful liege subjects. It would, perhaps, prevent many people earning their livelihood. There was a great storm of indignation in the Chamber in connection with the previous Bill, and there would be a great deal of trouble before this Bill was passed if the Treasurer did not assure them that the more obnoxious clauses had been deleted. If the Treasurer had not read the Bill, they could easily adjourn for a few minutes to allow him time to peruse it. For the convenience of members, he thought there ought to be a summary of the Bills printed before they were introduced, so that members could see what they contained, and vote for their introduction or otherwise.

Mr. MURPHY: As the Treasurer kept silent, he could quite understand that the Government had decided to give them no particulars regarding the Bill. They could well understand why they did that. Did not the Premier say last session that it was a dress-circle Government, and this Bill, so far as he could understand it, was being introduced in the interests of property. What about the poor unfortunate working man? He was surprised at the hon. member for Clermont not being here to-night to defend old "Blinky Bob." (Laughter.) Here was a Bill introduced by a dress-circle Government, and the working classes were going to be overpowered by the police. If they walked in the street the police would be throwing them into the cells. The Premier probably learnt a lot of these things when travelling about England and Scotland, and he (Mr. Murphy) supposed he wanted to get even with the working classes who had withdrawn their support from him. Was it fair that they should spend the greater part of this session in dealing with a Bill which his own party refused to accept last session, when it was withdrawn? He was going to oppose every clause and line in this Bill, bar that line referring to the dog. (Laughter.) He was going to agree to that. There were a lot of objectionable clauses in the Bill. Why should they not have a paper on Sunday? What was he going to do on Sunday if he had got no paper to read?

Mr. BRENNAN: Go to church.

Mr. MURPHY: Why should he go to church if he did not want? He did not object

[Mr. Murphy.]

to the hon. gentleman going to church. He knew that he went, and sung in the choir—(laughter)—but that was no reason why he (Mr. Murphy) should go to church. He wanted his Sunday paper on the Sabbath. He wanted to read all the news in *Truth*, and the political news in the Sunday *Sun*. When he read *Truth* he knew what the Government were doing, and when he read the *Sun* he knew what the people were doing. The Government wanted to stop the sale of newspapers, but were not game to go down and tell the *Courier* people that they must let their hands off on Sundays. Did they not start to get their Monday paper out on Sunday night? They knew the Rockhampton *Bulletin* did that. Did the reporters on the Brisbane papers not have to work on Sundays, and did the "comps" not have to work on Sunday night? Yet this Bill was going to be pushed through the House, and they were going to deprive the people of Queensland of a great deal of the liberty they possessed, and what for? He supposed the honorary member of the Cabinet, Archdeacon Garland, was mixed up in this Bill. Had it come to this in Queensland, that they had to have Archdeacon Garland in the position which Mr. Thynne was in in the Legislative Council some time ago.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. MURPHY: He bowed to the Chairman's ruling. While the Government might think it was necessary to introduce the Bill, there was no reason why Parliament should be bossed by the Cabinet. Members should have some particulars of the Bill before they agreed to it being introduced. Had the members on the Government side seen a copy of the Bill? If they had, then why should the members on the Opposition side not see it also? He wanted to know if there were any alterations in the old Bill. The hon. member for Cairns and himself had had a caucus meeting on the old Bill, and they went through it line by line, and they decided to oppose it with the exception of the clause about the dog, as there were some dogs in Croydon which he wanted to shoot. If the Treasurer knew nothing about the Bill, why did he not say so? Why did he not say to the House, "I know nothing about the Bill? This paper was put in my hand and I was told to move for leave to introduce it and the Committee would pass it." The Treasurer would have to speak on the second reading, or perhaps he would get his Under Secretary to get his speech ready for him. They were going to get some information about the Bill, or it would have to be "gagged" through.

Mr. MANN again appealed to the Treasurer to give the House some information about the Bill. If members on the Government side had seen the Bill then the same consideration should be shown to Opposition members. If a copy of a Bill could be given to the senior member for Ipswich, then a copy of this Bill could also be given to an hon. member who asked for it. He told his electors that he was opposed to the old Bill, and he would not be doing his duty to the electors of Cairns and the people of Queensland if he allowed the Bill to be introduced without making an emphatic protest. If another Bill had been brought down he should have sat silent and would have let it go through without any discussion. The only way the Opposition had of getting rid of the obnoxious clauses was to make the Government make the provisions of the Bill known, and if it were a bad Bill to fight it. For in-

stance, the Premier, in his wiser days, took over six weeks in fighting against the introduction of the Callide Railway Bill. The hon. gentleman would not have done that if he had known something about the provisions of the Bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. member must obey the Chairman's call to order. The question before the House is not the Callide Railway Bill.

Mr. MANN: He was only giving the reason why the Premier took six weeks in opposing the introduction of the Callide Railway Bill—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman is not going, by a subterfuge, to disobey the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MANN: He had no wish to go against the Chairman's ruling by means of a subterfuge. Had the Chairman made use of that expression when sitting in the House he would have been guilty of using unparliamentary language, but as he sat in the chair he had the majority behind him, and he could suppress him (Mr. Mann) if he took exception to the words used by the Chairman himself. They should keep all obnoxious measures outside the House as long as they possibly could, and he was quoting the Premier's example in taking six weeks to try to keep out a measure. If he had more friends like the hon. member for Croydon they would keep the House for six weeks before this measure was introduced. They knew that after the first Old-age Pensions Bill was introduced the Government went round to their members and said that if the Minister had seen the Bill before it was presented it would not have been introduced in that form, and they would be prepared to accept reasonable amendments from members if they allowed the Bill to pass the second-reading stage. If they allowed the Treasurer to introduce a bad Bill, it would be passed through all its stages, although it was obnoxious and would have to be "gagged" through the House. The Treasurer was a busy man, and if he had not had time to peruse the Bill himself, would he hand the Bill around to members and allow them to peruse it? Why did not the Treasurer make a frank confession and say he did not know what the Bill contained? If the Premier would get up and say that he would allow his supporters to vote as they liked, and that it was a non-party measure, he would allow it to be brought in. Unless he knew some of the details he would raise his voice against a Bill which was uncalled for, and which would be largely inoperative, because the good sense of the people of Queensland and the good sense of the Police Force would be against it.

Mr. MURPHY: There was another matter in connection with the Bill on which he should like to get some information. He noticed that

among the provisions of the [8 p.m.] measure were some clauses dealing with gold-stealing. As the representative of a mining constituency which had returned him from 1904 up to the present time, he should not be doing his duty if he allowed a measure to be introduced which empowered the police to worry and harass miners, to enter their homes and search their effects, merely because some mine manager said, "I believe they have been stealing gold." He desired to know what was the nature of the provisions dealing with gold-stealing before he withdrew his opposition to the introduction of this Bill, and he hoped that in that

Mr. Murphy:]

attitude he would receive the support of every member representing a mining constituency. They ought to compel the Government to tell the Committee whether those iniquitous provisions with regard to gold-stealing were included in this Bill. In Western Australia and New Zealand miners had been harassed through the passing of provisions dealing with gold-stealing, and in New South Wales miners had been tried without a jury. Was that kind of thing going to happen in Queensland under this Police Offences Bill? He wanted the police to have a fair deal, but he did not want them to rule Queensland. It was bad enough for Queensland to be ruled by the Premier without being ruled by the Police Force. The Premier sat there holding in his hand a book dealing probably with the aristocracy of the old country, and telling what kind of motor-car they preferred, how they dressed, and what kind of shirt fronts they wore.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Committee is the Police Offences Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: That was what he was coming to. He wished to show that it would be better for the Premier to give members some information about the Police Offences Bill, to tell them whether farmers' sons were to be run in because they tried to keep the wallabies out of their crops, or whether miners were to be run in because some mining manager said, "I believe they have been stealing gold." The Committee must have some information given them respecting the Bill. It was early yet, and they had plenty of time to get the information they required. He was asking, pleading, for information from the Treasurer, and what was the result? Silence. Could the newly-appointed "Whip," the hon. member for Nundah, or the head "Whip," the hon. member for Toombul, give them the assurance that there was no attack on the liberties of the people in the Bill? Even that would be something. Who drafted the Bill? Was it drafted by Commissioner Cahill or Inspector Urquhart or by somebody in Cairns or by the Women's Christian Temperance Union or by the People's Political Association, which had a place in Ann street over which there was a crown? Again he would ask the Treasurer two questions: (1) Was this Bill similar in all respects to the Bill which was foreshadowed last session? (2) How many clauses were there in the Bill? He believed there was a dog clause in the Bill, and he knew why the Government had a down on dogs. Did not the Premier at Rockhampton say that the working classes were "ungrateful dogs"? They were introducing this dog clause in the Bill in order to be even with the "ungrateful dogs" who voted against Government supporters at the last election. As the representative of some of those "ungrateful dogs," he objected to the introduction of the Bill. He objected to British liberties being taken from them. Even if the Premier had been presented with the freedom of Falkirk, he objected to the hon. gentleman attempting to enslave free-born Australians. The Police Offences Bill must go. They must oppose it at every stage. He would sooner vote for the Religious Instruction in State Schools Bill. This Bill was introduced purely in the interests of property. Ministers proposed to prosecute the unfortunate farmer who had to stop out all night with his gun to keep wallabies out of his crops. What about the boy of fourteen in the Gulf country who had to ride on his "bike" to try and get a job in the Chillagoe smelters? Was he not to be allowed

to take his gun and shoot a duck on the creek? Of course not! The Government did not believe in the children of the poorer classes having game. The Premier at one time attempted to impose a gun tax. He hardly wondered at the hon. gentleman objecting to the children of the poorer classes carrying guns, because he might be in the bush some day, and some young fellow might say, "This is Premier Kidston, the once great democrat—the man that fought for the shearers, and wrote 'The ballot is the thing'—"

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. MURPHY: The Home Secretary was one of the most courteous men in the Chamber, and he was sure the hon. gentleman knew something about the Bill. He supposed it had been considered by the Cabinet, although he remembered the Premier saying once in connection with the Old-age Pensions Bill that he had not seen the Bill. He (Mr. Murphy) only wanted one question answered: "Was this Bill the same as that which had been introduced last session?" No answer! Ministers knew absolutely nothing about it, and that was the Cabinet that they were asked to allow to run the country! It was a good job the country could run itself. Leaving the Cabinet, he would ask if there was one member on the Government side who knew anything at all about the Bill? They were all at the caucus, and they must have heard some of the clauses read. They were all "on the blind." The country was being run absolutely "on the blind." Not a member of the Government party knew anything about the Police Offences Bill! Well, members on the Opposition side wanted to know something about it. If the Government could poke those things down the throats of their supporters, they could not poke them down the throats of members on the Opposition side. They wanted to know whether it was likely to attack the liberties of the people of Queensland before they agreed to it. The Secretary for Public Lands and the Secretary for Mines had got their Bills introduced in a few seconds, because they had the courtesy to explain the provisions of the measures in their charge, but the Treasurer had not a single word to say. He was dumb. Had he not recovered from the shock he got over the Federal elections? He believed the Bill was the result of the Federal elections. He believed the Government wanted to "run them all in." The Secretary for Public Lands had charge of the Police Offences Bill when he was Home Secretary, and he should know something about the Bill. If the hon. gentleman did not know anything about it, he should at least have the courage to get up and say so. The Premier could not browbeat him or make him sit twiddling his thumbs, the same as he was making the Treasurer do. Why did not the Treasurer assert himself and get up and say, "The Bill is the same as the Bill that we laid on the table last session. It contains 547 clauses. The clause relating to the shooting of dogs is still in it, but we have deleted the clauses relating to the sale of Sunday newspapers?" He was not interested in *Truth*—he wished he was. He was not a shareholder in the *Sunday Sun*, but he held that Parliament had no right to try to stop the sale of newspapers on Sunday. Everybody did not want to read "The Boys' Own" or "The Family Herald" or "The Church Gazette." There was nothing interesting in that class of literature. They wanted a real live Sunday paper.

[Mr. Murphy.]

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that he has already dealt very fully with the question of Sunday papers, and, if he again speaks of them, I shall rule him out of order for tedious repetition.

Mr. MURPHY: If he recollected rightly, another provision in the Bill of last session made it possible for children riding to school to be sued for trespass if they had to pass through a squatter's paddocks. Now, were they going to permit a Bill like that to pass without protest? Of course, if Ministers told them that such a provision was not to be found in this Bill, they would let it pass; but they would have to fight for the liberties of the people, and he thought the Treasurer had better find his tongue and let them know whether the Bill was the same as that introduced last session. Did the Treasurer know that? If he did not know, why was he not courteous enough to say it? They could not expect to get information from the Treasurer if he did not possess it. All Sunday football matches were prohibited. What about the miners in the North? Were the men who were working all the week not to have a game of football on Sunday? There was a provision in the Police Offences Bill to deprive those people of all their liberties, and Government members sat silent and allowed it to go. He was not going to allow it to go without a protest. It was far better for the young fellows in the North to play football on Sundays than to be drinking and playing two-up. There was a class of people who wanted to rule—they were getting back to the old Cromwellian and Puritan days. They were not to have any liberty at all. They had given the police a rise in salary, to which they were entitled, but he was not going to give the police any more powers than they at present had. They had plenty of power at the present time. They dared not say a word to a policeman unless they had plenty of witnesses, as the police magistrate believed the policeman every time. The law was all right as at present, and he would like the Treasurer to tell the Committee whether the present Bill was similar to the Police Offences Bill introduced last session. If it was, he objected to it, but if a lot of the obnoxious clauses were deleted, then he would agree to its introduction.

Mr. BOOKER (*Maryborough*) said he was taking a course that he thought was right. The time had arrived when the sensible men of the Chamber should resent the conduct of the hon. members who had just spoken. He was taking the responsibility of drawing attention to the fact that the rights of Parliament were being abused, and that they were insulting every sensible man in the Chamber and every sensible man and woman in the country. If Parliament was to be abused as it had been abused to-night, then the sooner hon. members got out of Parliament the better.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: He said unreservedly, if men were prepared to come into that Chamber and talk the abject rubbish, pure abject nonsense—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The question before the House is the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the law relating to the powers and duties of the Police Force.

Mr. BOOKER: He wished to say that the time had arrived when the good sense of the

Committee should resent the conduct that had been exemplified that night, and he, for one, did resent it in all sincerity, and he knew that every hon. member in his heart felt as he (Mr. Booker) did. The time had arrived when somebody should say just what they meant.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. BOOKER: He desired to emphasise the grave necessity of the sensible members of the Chamber resenting the conduct experienced to-night. That was all he desired to say.

Mr. MURPHY did not object to the criticism and lecture of the hon. member. If he did not wish for information in regard to the Bill, that was no reason why other members should not endeavour to get information. If hon. members sitting behind the Government were bound by the caucus, was that any reason why the hon. member for Cairns and himself, who belonged to no party—who were absolutely free-lances, bound by no caucus—Labour or Government—who had the right of free speech, and could talk when they liked—should be gagged when the Premier liked? Had they no rights in the Chamber? They wanted to know what were the provisions in the Police Offences Bill. Was it fair to allow the Government to introduce a Bill which attacked the liberties of the people of Queensland? The Treasurer gave them no answer. He was entitled to an answer to that question. He placed before the Committee several provisions in the Bill introduced last session, and he wished to know whether those provisions were contained in the present Bill. If they were included then the Bill should not be introduced, and if they were not included, why did not the Treasurer or some member of the Cabinet say so?

Mr. MANN: In the heat of debate there was one point in regard to the measure that had been overlooked. Most members had read the report of the Commissioner of Police during the last two or three years, and the Commissioner complained that the men were not all he would like them to be, but he did not get sufficient money to pay a salary to get the best men available. That being so, he (Mr. Mann) thought it was a fair and reasonable argument that they should be very chary about giving the police any more power. Did any member on the Government side advocate giving to a body of men, whom their own chief complained were not all they should be, more power to tamper with the liberties of His Majesty's subjects? The Bill that was put in their boxes last session contained a clause whereby the chairman at a public meeting could call upon a policeman to arrest any person at that meeting who interjected. Let hon. members picture to themselves a good solid conservative candidate who had a policeman in the meeting who had got his appointment through the hands of that conservative candidate. Why the policeman, out of the fullness of his heart, would rush up and arrest any person who was apparently getting the better of his pet candidate. In districts where there was no Press circulated, a candidate could come forward and make a statement, and no one in the meeting could contradict him, because it would be in the power of the chairman to tell a bumptious policeman to arrest the man for interrupting the meeting. He (Mr. Mann) when walking along the streets had seen policemen order old women to move on who were having a chat in the street, while all along the footpath there were larrikins blocking up the footpath and using

*Mr. Mann.*]

objectionable language, and they were never ordered to move on because the police knew if they went near those larrikins they would be given cheek, and perhaps a stone later on. Respectable citizens would not object to move on if the police were impartial, and at the same time ordered the larrikins who were spitting on the footpath and making obscene remarks to passers-by to move on. Was it wise to give more power to a class of men who did that sort of thing? The Committee should not pass the Bill until such time as the Commissioner of Police could assure them that the men were all that could be desired, and that they possessed discretion and wisdom and were not inclined to over-step their duty. It was well known that once the police get a set on an individual it was not long before they had him in the lockup. The

[8.30 p.m.] force was not what it might be, owing to the number of raw, immature men employed, and he thought the Government would be well advised if they were to pause before passing such a Bill. The member for Brisbane North, Mr. Macartney, got a Bill passed to prevent the smoking of cigarettes by young persons; but it was not put into force because the police could not tell the ages of the lads they saw smoking cigarettes. There was also a Bill passed to prevent little girls selling flowers; but it was not put into force, and little girls could still be seen importuning people to buy flowers. With regard to the gold-stealing part of the Bill, that provision had proved a hardship to prospectors in Victoria; and it was scandalous to think that members should be asked to agree to the introduction of a measure of whose purport they knew nothing. Why should the police have power to arrest a prospector who happened to be in possession of gold? The discovery of gold made Queensland, and this Bill would make prospecting a crime. A policeman would have power to go up to a prospector and say, "Tell me where you found that gold, or I will arrest you for gold-stealing." Then the prospector could no longer keep his find to himself. They knew about the Eureka Stockade in Victoria; and he could imagine this provision leading to the same thing happening in Queensland. He did not believe in gold-stealing, but he did not believe in harassing people who were trying to earn an honest livelihood.

Mr. ALLEN said a lot of time would have been saved if the Minister had deigned to give the Committee a little information. He considered that the desire on the part of the hon. member for Cairns and the hon. member for Croydon was very reasonable; and he had every sympathy with those members in the stand they had taken. He also wanted to know some particulars about the Bill, because he considered that the police had too much power already in some cases. Last session he gave an instance where a police officer was guilty of persecution; and he did not know what would happen if they accepted a Bill giving the police powers similar to those contained in the Bill of last session. They knew at the present time that the police were so miserably paid that very few good men stayed. As soon as they got in they found it was not what it was cracked up to be, that they had too many duties and that their pay was a mere pittance, so they left the force, and the result was that the Police Department was begging for recruits. They were consequently getting in boys of eighteen and nineteen years of age, with no experience, and they were going to give them power to run in whom they chose.

[Mr. Mann.

For instance, the idea of giving the chairman of a public meeting power to order a policeman to lock up an interjector!

Mr. MURPHY: A good few of us would have to be locked up.

Mr. ALLEN: Were they going to pass a Bill like this?

Mr. MURPHY: They will start to put chains on them next.

Mr. ALLEN: The Government might say that they only intended the provisions of this Bill to deal with certain cases, but there was no knowing how far some inexperienced, tactless boys in the Police Force would go. Men might get run in because they had not paid sufficient respect to the dignity of these individuals. The idea of a Bill being brought into the House to prevent a boy under fourteen using a gun! If members on the opposite side had any experience of hunting cockatoos on a farm, or keeping wallabies and bandicoots away from the crops, they would not bring in that provision. In the case of selectors in the bush with cockatoos, bandicoots, and wallabies all round them, it was generally the duty of the children to keep these pests away, and the noise of a gun, if there was only powder in it, was of great assistance; but the Government said they were going to prevent the small boy having a gun. If the Premier or any other member of the Cabinet had had any practice at this game when they were boys of twelve or fourteen, they would not have brought in such a proposal. So far as the Education Act was concerned, the education of our boys came to an end if the parents needed them at the age of twelve. Then from twelve to fourteen they would be assisting them by keeping cockatoos and wallabies away.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I would remind the hon. member that he is using tedious repetition in regard to cockatoos. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: He wanted to know how many clauses the Bill contained, and if the Government intended to pass it this session; or was it simply brought forward for window dressing? Was it going to deal with cattle-stealing, and place citizens at the mercy of those who seemed to get an idea into their head that somebody had been making use of their cattle? He remembered a case in the West in which two persons were arrested on a charge of cattle-stealing because they had some salt beef in their possession. A squatter had lost a red heifer some time previously, and it was alleged that this piece of boiled salt junk, which was found in the camp of these men, was the flesh of the red heifer which had been lost. It was a justice of the peace who went into the box and swore that this piece of boiled corned beef was the flesh of a red heifer. (Laughter.) Only for the fact that these men had a capable advocate, they would have perhaps been doing seven years, but they happened to get out of it. When on the way home this gentleman who had lost the red heifer found her in a lane near his house. There was no redress for those two unfortunate men, who had been locked up on a charge of cattle-stealing, who had to undergo the odium of spending a night in the cells, and had to stand idly by behind the bar of a court and hear their characters and their reputations torn to pieces by such witnesses as he had just described. It was only reasonable that members should know what were the provisions of the Bill, and he hoped the Premier would treat the House differently to what he had been doing in the past. This information

had apparently been given to the daily papers, if they were to place any credence on the inspired paragraph which appeared in a certain paper. He would not labour the question any further, but hoped that the Government would take a hint that when information was asked for that it would be given.

Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*): Without entering into the merits or demerits of the debate, it would have looked better if the Treasurer had seen fit to follow the example set by his colleague, the Minister for Public Works, and given the desired information in connection with this Bill. During the discussion the Treasurer had spent his time reading an illustrated paper, but perhaps if he had read the Bill which he was introducing he would not have refused to give the information that was asked. It was quite permissible for country members to ask for information. For instance, the Bill before the House last session contained a number of clauses, but it was withdrawn because the caucus which was held on board the "Lucinda" would not stand it. They were promised a number of things, or rather threatened a number of things which would weigh heavily on people living in the country. They had a fine body of police, and they had enough to do now without tacking further duties on to them. It would have been better if the Treasurer had given them the information, and not have to threaten them with the "gag" on the second night of the session.

Mr. MURPHY: In the discharge of his parliamentary duties he always liked to be well up in matters which he brought before the House, and at considerable personal inconvenience he got a copy of the Police Offences Bill which was introduced last session. He believed that the only reasonable stand for him to take would be to read certain clauses of that Bill and ask the Treasurer whether the Bill he proposed to introduce this session was a similar one to that which he now held in his hand. It would not be much trouble for the Treasurer to say whether the Bill was the same as that introduced last session.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You have developed an inquiring turn of mind.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, he had always been so, and he remembered when the hon. gentleman was "Whip" of a certain party in opposition that he also was of an inquiring turn of mind. He remembered when he (Mr. Murphy) sat behind the democratic Government led by the junior member for Rockhampton, that the present Secretary for Railways used to inquire for information at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. The Police Offences Bill might stop all that kind of thing. He just noticed one clause that was in the Bill introduced last session, and it was that the police could raid anybody's house. He supposed it would permit all those who played "bridge" for 1s. or 10d. a hundred to go on playing, but the poor unfortunate miner in Croydon and Clermont, or the sugar-cane cutter camped in the district of the deputy leader of the Labour party, who were having a game of "crib" at night-time, would be pounced on by the police and run in. What did it mean? It meant that in all these wretched reforms it was the unfortunate working classes who were attacked. They did not attempt to attack the big off, the judges, the Premiers, the heads of the Police Force, and Under Secretaries, who were playing at their bridge parties. There would be no Police Force called on to shift them. It was the poor unfortunate miner and working man, who wanted to have a game of cards, and put

a shilling on it, who would be run in. And that was the kind of legislation that they were told was good for the working classes! They wanted to make him good. These Acts of Parliament all went to prevent the working man from getting any kind of enjoyment. They never heard of Acts of Parliament to prevent the moneyed classes from getting enjoyment. So far as he was concerned, he had done his duty to his electors in trying to get some information respecting the Bill, and he had come to the conclusion that the Treasurer knew absolutely nothing about it. If the Government were going to submit the Bill, he hoped they would hand it over to someone who knew something about it. Why did they not put a member like the junior member for North Brisbane into the Cabinet? He was sure that if that hon. member were in the Cabinet, and he was to introduce a Bill like this one, he would be able to tell them all about its features. Look how nicely the junior member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, used to introduce a Bill, and how courteous he was when he sat on the Government side of the House. He would have something more to say about the Police Offences Bill when it reached the next stage. He intended to oppose the Bill. Unless the Government took out certain clauses, he would not agree with it. He was of an inquiring turn of mind, and it was a pity that the Treasurer was not also of an inquiring turn of mind, as he would then know something about the Bill which he had to introduce. If they had got the information, the matter would have been finished at a quarter past 7 o'clock, but they had wasted two hours over it. In order to get some information he had gone into the library and worried the librarian, Mr. Murray, to search up the last year's Bill for him. He did not know if the Bill they had to deal with was the same as that he held in his hand, or if it was going to be a new one. He wanted to know if this Bill was only acceptable to the Government party on non-party lines? He noticed that most members talked about British liberty and the rights of British subjects and freedom. And the Premier said that "they had rights, and dare maintain them." And it would be their duty to maintain the rights and liberties of the people of Queensland. He supposed that the Premier would get up later on and tell them that the Bill proposed to make the bounds of freedom wider yet. That was an old expression of the Premier's. He used to give it on all the platforms. The Police Offences Bill was not going to make "the bounds of freedom wider yet." The police were a very good body of men, and the majority of them

[9 p.m.] tried to do their duty impartially, but the Commissioner said that the pay had been so bad that all the good men were going over to New South Wales, just as men engaged on railway construction works were going to New South Wales in order to obtain better wages. He supposed he would have to leave the matter for the present, but he sincerely trusted that when the Treasurer had another Bill to introduce he would endeavour to study it, and learn something about it.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, which was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

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

*Mr. Murphy.]*

The TREASURER: I may tell hon. members that copies of the Bill will be in their boxes this evening or at the latest to-morrow morning.

### LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The HOME SECRETARY moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the law relating to local authorities.

For the information of hon. members, he might mention that this Bill contained many clauses and amendments which had been already submitted to and passed by the Committee. It further contained amendments which were considered desirable as a result of consultation with a delegation from the executive of the Local Authorities' Association. It also contained provisions which it was considered desirable to introduce as the result of the experience gained by the officers of the Home Department in administering the Local Authorities Act. It further contained new clauses which it was considered would increase the efficiency of the working of local authorities. For instance, power was given them to subsidise motor or omnibus services, which they had not at the present time. They would also be enabled, by incorporation similar to the incorporation allowed in Victoria, to establish an indemnity accident fund and a fidelity guarantee fund. Power was also given whereby alien labour might not be permitted to be employed in connection with works carried out by local authorities, or in carrying out any of the services which it was provided local authorities might establish under the Act. (Hear, hear!) It also made provision—and he was sure that hon. members who had spoken about prickly pear eradication would be glad to hear this—it also made provision whereby local authorities might be compelled in certain cases to destroy prickly pear on the roads within their areas, and on reserves which were under their control.

Mr. COYNE: "May" be compelled or "shall" be compelled?

The HOME SECRETARY: "May" be compelled, but in certain cases "shall" be compelled to eradicate the pear. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Do you make the Crown do anything of that sort?

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon members would find that provision was made in the Bill under which in certain cases the Crown would be prepared to take its part in the eradication of prickly pear. Without entering into such details as one would give in connection with the second reading of the measure, the amendments he had indicated practically comprised the changes proposed to be made by the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY thanked the Home Secretary for his courtesy in giving information regarding the Bill. He hoped the hon. gentleman would give a lesson to the Treasurer in courtesy.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, which was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

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

[*Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.*]

### ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The HOME SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair.

Question put and passed.

#### COMMITTEE.

The HOME SECRETARY moved—

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to make provision for the better representation of the people of Queensland in Parliament.

The Bill provided for the number of members proposed. It also provided the method by which the electoral districts should be ascertained. It also made provision for the quota of electors, with a percentage of electors above and below, which should be contained in the new electorates. To all intents and purposes it followed the same lines as the Commonwealth Act. It further contained the machinery for the compilation of the new rolls and for the steps to be taken in cases where the number of electors in an electorate fell below the necessary quota.

Mr. MURPHY asked whether there was to be a reduction of members?

The HOME SECRETARY: The proposed measure did not contemplate a reduction in the number of members.

Mr. MURPHY: He certainly thought that, after the result of the Federal elections throughout Australia, there should be a reduction in the number of members of the Assembly. The lesson taught by the Federal elections was that the people of Australia believed in the national Parliament, and thought that the time had arrived for clipping the wings of the puny little State Governments who had been fighting the federation from the day it was formed. In New South Wales they had seen Mr. Carruthers gathering his police—possibly under the provisions of the Police Offences Act in that State—and taking possession of wire netting, and absolutely declining to pay the Customs duty, and threatening a revolution. In their own Chamber last night, the Premier, when some reference was made to the transcontinental railway—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! That does not come within the scope of the question before the Committee. The question before the Committee is the representation of the people of Queensland, and it has nothing to do with the Commonwealth.

Mr. MURPHY was proposing to show that it was necessary for the better representation of the people of Queensland that there should be a reduction in the number of members. Surely that came within the scope of the question before the Committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No; it does not come within the scope of the question before the Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: He had no objection to a Redistribution of Seats Bill, but he held that there should be a reduction in the number of members, and they should carry out the suggestion made by Premier Kidston some years ago, when he went round Central and Northern Queensland waving the red flag of revolution, and advocated the division of Queensland into three districts, each of those districts to be represented in that Chamber. For the better representation of the people of Queensland, he thought the time had arrived for the abolition of the Legislative Council. They had to spend £750—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! That question does not come within the scope of the question before the Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: He did not oppose the introduction of the Bill, but he would like to ascertain at that stage—and he hoped the leader of the Opposition would ask the question, because there was a possibility of his being answered—whether they would have an opportunity of dealing with the question of a reduction of members. Last session he (Mr. Murphy) had advocated unification, or, rather, reconstruction, and, in view of that fact, he could not object to a redistribution, although he supposed that a redistribution of seats would interfere materially with the Croydon electorate. Before the Committee agreed to the motion he would like to know, if they agreed to the resolution at the present time, whether they would be permitted at a later stage to move for a reduction of members.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will be in a position to know that when he has seen the Bill. At the present stage hon. members are simply asked to allow the Bill to come before the House.

Mr. MURPHY: When the Committee saw the Bill they would be able to deal with it. He hoped the Redistribution of Seats Bill would result in better representation, and also in a reduction of members.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The question is, that it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to make provision for the better representation of the people in Parliament.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*) asked whether the commissioners to be appointed were within the public service, or were they to be outside the service?

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): At this stage the scope of a measure very often came up, and it appeared to him that the Minister ought to be prepared to answer a question like that asked by the hon. member for Croydon in regard to a reduction of members. He did not desire to endorse the sentiments uttered by the hon. member for Croydon, but if the Committee passed the resolution they bound the scope of the Bill down to certain narrow lines, and later on, when hon. members came to move amendments, they would find they were outside the scope of the measure, and they would then be told by the Minister that the present was the proper time to enter a protest. At the present time they had not the slightest idea what the Bill proposed to do. Surely in a case like that they should get more information from the Minister in charge of the measure. If the Bill provided for the more effective representation of the people of Queensland on certain definite and democratic lines, he was sure hon. members would support it. Might he ask the Minister to give an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Croydon before the resolution was put?

Question stated.

Mr. MURPHY said he anticipated that the Minister would have risen and answered the questions asked by the hon. member for Rosewood and himself. He was sure the hon. member for Clermont had put the matter very clearly before the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY said he thought he had made himself clear to hon. members, and he hardly anticipated that hon. members would require him to give what was practically a second-reading speech at that stage. So far as defining the electorates was concerned, it was

practically on the lines of the Commonwealth Act, which defined the Commonwealth electorates. As hon. members knew, that definition was made by a commission which was appointed under the authority of that Act, and a similar method was proposed in the present Bill. How hon. members could expect him to say who the commissioners were to be, he could not see, because he did not know himself.

Mr. MURPHY asked whether the scope of the measure would exclude any amendment providing for a reduction of members.

Question stated.

Mr. MURPHY: Did he understand the Minister to say that he did not know whether it would or not?

Mr. MACARTNEY: You ought to know as well as I do.

Mr. MURPHY: He remembered the time when the hon. member for North Brisbane, clever lawyer as he was, was put in a fix in regard to the scope of a Bill. The hon. member did not know at this particular stage of that Bill that he was going to be put in the soup. It was only when it came on later—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order! Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The ACTING 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 was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

#### JOINT COMMITTEES.

Upon the Order of the Day for the consideration of the Legislative Council's message of the 13th instant being read,

The PREMIER said: I beg to move—

That Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cottell, and Mr. May be appointed members of the Joint Library Committee; Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Ryland members of the Joint Committee for the Management of the Refreshment-rooms; and Mr. Speaker, Mr. D. Hunter, and Mr. Payne members of the Joint Committee for the Management and Superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings; and that the appointments be communicated to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

Mr. MURPHY: I wish to say a word with respect to the Parliamentary Buildings Committee. The last time the committee was appointed, the hon. member for Woolloomgaba, Mr. Hunter, and the hon. member for Mitchell, Mr. Payne, were included. I think the expenditure of £750 on a lift [9.30 p.m.] to go up one flight of stairs is a ridiculous waste of public money; and I understand that the work was carried out without consulting the members appointed by this House. I would like to know if that be so. If not, I think the hon. member for Mitchell and the hon. member for Woolloomgaba are deserving of censure for the expenditure of £750 in providing a lift simply to go up one flight of stairs. I could jump from the bottom to the top.

The PREMIER: It's a pity you did not jump down.

Mr. MURPHY: I jumped down a long way when I supported the hon. gentleman.

Question put and passed.

*Mr. Murphy.]*

ADDRESS IN REPLY.  
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*), who, on rising, was received with Opposition "Hear, hears!" said: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Before entering upon the few remarks I propose to submit for the consideration of hon. members I would like to take the opportunity of expressing my regret at the absence through illness of Mr. Speaker. At the same time, I congratulate you upon your occupancy of the high office, and trust that, whether the term be long or short, it will prove creditable to yourself and satisfactory to the House. I think the Speech we had read to us the other day was commendable in many ways—on account of its brevity, and for some of the things which the Government promise to lay before the House. I derived considerable pleasure from listening to the speeches delivered by the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply; but whilst I may admire the method of the speakers and their mode of expression—which I consider highly creditable to them—of course, I cannot identify myself with the opinions expressed. However, I think it is only right that I should take the opportunity of congratulating them on their excellent speeches. We had some trouble to-night in getting information in regard to some of the measures referred to in the Speech, and one of them has been already tabled—the one for curing anomalies in connection with our electoral law by the redistribution of seats. I am very much in favour of single electorates; and I suppose that is to be provided for, though it is not so stated. I think experience has shown that single electorates are better, generally speaking, not only for the electors of the district but for the members who represent them. Very often you find a double electorate return members on opposite sides of the House, which is unsatisfactory both for the members and for the electorate. Another very popular idea—a democratic idea in which I thoroughly concur—is one vote one value; but the difficulty is to appraise the value of the particular votes. A vote in an electorate like Cook, Croydon, Gregory, or Burke—I mention these because they are generally used as illustrations in comparison with Toowong and Toombul—I say that electorates so far removed from the metropolis and the operations of this House, where the influence of the people is felt—the difference is so great that ten votes in those electorates are not equal to one vote in the city of Brisbane. In my humble opinion, if North Brisbane, for instance, had no member at all to represent it—at present it has two members—it could exercise more influence in this House and in the administration of the departments of the Government than could the four distant electorates I have mentioned—particularly as the Premier has taken the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce to his bosom. Formerly the Premier was very much given to criticising the influence exercised over Governments, particularly by the *Courier* newspaper. He had strong opinions regarding the so-called "*Courier* Ministry" not many years ago; and I am perfectly certain he had no sympathy whatever with organisations—self-constituted bodies such as Chambers of Commerce—who very often exert considerable influence on the legislation in some States of Australia. I think from what we have seen already that the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce is likely to exercise—or attempt, at all events, to exercise—considerable influence upon legislation in Queensland, and it will be the duty of the

[*Mr. Lennon.*

Opposition to endeavour to check as far as possible any influence of that sort. Now, this matter has been before the country in an indirect way for many years. We have had redistribution talked about by various Governments. Generally speaking, hitherto it was coupled with the reduction of members. The Labour party's attitude in that respect always has been that the reduction should begin in another place, that there the reduction is very necessary, but that here in our own Parliament it is not quite so necessary. However, I dare say at the present time that a large number of members on the Opposition side would not have resisted a reduction of members; but I understand from what I can gather, reading between the lines of what we see in the newspapers, and what many of our public men say, that it has been recognised by the State Premiers that they must not lessen their importance in any way, and therefore they do not care about reducing the number of members in the popular House. I think but for that reason—but for the fact that the various Premiers of the States of the Commonwealth desire to keep up their fancied importance—we should probably have had a reduction of members proposed at the present time. Now, hon. members will perhaps be good enough to remember that I discussed this particular idea of a redistribution of seats in this Chamber about two or three years ago. I discussed it chiefly from the standpoint of a Northern resident, of one who had lived for many years in the North of Queensland, and who at present represents a Northern constituency. I propose to so discuss it to-night, and I have, in fact, taken the trouble to prepare a table of what I would consider fair representation. I consider, as I have already said, that the influence of votes under this democratic principle of one vote one value is very hard to accurately appraise in so scattered a country as Queensland. If we had a thickly-settled population all over our State, or a settlement of population anything approaching to what exists in Victoria, the question of arriving at one vote one value would be comparatively easy; but when you take into account districts like Cook, Gregory, Burke, and Bulloo, where you can travel hundreds of miles without coming across very many residents, the matter becomes supremely difficult. Supposing the carving-knife was introduced to so carve up the State of Queensland into electorates so that some of those sparsely populated places were unfairly reduced, you would render the proper and efficient representation of those remote districts very, very poor indeed. If a couple of the less populous electorates of Northern Queensland by the machinery introduced in this proposed Electoral Districts Bill were to be amalgamated and thrown into one, it would be utterly impossible for any representative of such a constituency to do what I regard as his most urgent and principal duty—that is, to make himself familiar with his electorate. I say that the first indispensably necessary duty of any member of Parliament is to make himself familiar with his own electorate, and I hope that the conditions I have pictured will not arise under this Bill—though it is possible it may—and that no such difficulty will be met with. I think, therefore, that very large allowance should be made for remoteness from the scene of operations. I am not asking that sheep or horses or trees or broad acres or anything of that sort should be represented. I, of course, desire that men should be represented, but if I could induce hon. members to realise the position of

men so remotely situated as those are who will be electors of the districts I have named, and others like them that I have not named, they would see that in common justice they are entitled to very much greater consideration than are the people who are near the centre of government. I will illustrate what I mean. For example, we know deputations have waited upon various Ministers to-night, we know they waited on Ministers yesterday, we know that half a dozen deputations might arise upon a discussion bearing upon the local authorities and half a dozen other things—deputations might easily be organised to wait upon as many as half a dozen Ministers on Monday morning in regard to these matters; whereas people at a distance from the scene of operations, before they would have time to think of the matter, the opportunity for having a deputation likely to be of any benefit might have passed away. I am sure that that must appeal to the minds of members on all sides of the House.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You do not expect that to appeal to the Government.

Mr. LENNON: I do. I expect the Government to consider and note that we are in opposition to them, and we take full opportunity of exercising our liberty of criticism of any of their proposals. I think they will admit that we are not altogether unreasonable, and that whenever the measures contain matters that we are in accord with we are ready to acknowledge it. I have not seen the proposed Bill nor the recent tabulation of the number of voters in Queensland, but going on the assumption that there are now 260,000 voters included in the seventy-two electorates, I find it gives a quota of 3,611, or in round numbers a quota of 3,600. Now, as already stated, whilst I admit all the good features of the one vote one value principle, I would recommend that the remote districts should have some special consideration, gradually increasing as their remoteness increases. But I propose to follow marginal allowances practically on what may be called the zone system. Districts over 100 and under 200 miles from Brisbane, to have a margin of 10 per cent.—that is to say, if the quota be 3,600, those electorates will have a minimum of 3,240; districts over 200 and under 400 miles from Brisbane to have 15 per cent., that makes their minimum 3,060. (Laughter.)

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You are worse than the Government.

Mr. LENNON: Districts over 400 miles and under 600 miles, 20 per cent.; districts 600 miles and under 800 miles, 25 per cent.; districts over 800 miles from Brisbane, 33½ per cent. Now, that would give the minimum number of electors in an electorate as 2,400.

The PREMIER: That is a very good argument for yourself.

Mr. LENNON: It is quite consistent with what I have already urged in support of this plan, that the minimum number of electors entitled to have a representative in this House will be 2,400, but, of course, in congested or metropolitan electorates, the margin would work inversely. Therefore, under the same plan, the maximum number they would have would be 4,800, or exactly double the minimum number. Now, when you take into account what I have pointed out, the greater influence of members near at hand as compared with those at a distance by reason of the readiness with which deputations can be

organised and sent here to the various departments, I do think that it would be fair and just to say that, at all events, one member in a metropolitan constituency is quite equal in influence to two members representing, say, Croydon and the Cook. Now, I do not think that that is too much to say, although the Premier seems to think differently. I have not asked for more than we are entitled to. I consider it my duty, as a resident of North Queensland for many years, to make a hard fight to get something fair and equitable, as I think we shall do under this Bill, and I think that the scheme which I have prepared and put before the House fills that description. I do not know whether the metropolitan constituencies would consider that they are unfairly dealt with if they have only one member for every 4,800 votes. I do not think that they would have anything to complain of at all. For example, Toombul—which is always referred to as the most glaring case of disparity, as compared with Bulloo, for example, or Burke, or Croydon—has at present something like 7,000 electors. Toowong, I think, has something like 6,000 electors, so you see that if you put these two electorates together they would have three members instead of, as at present, having only two members. I think that the Northern people are entitled to the liberal margin of allowance which is suggested in that scheme. If any hon. member from any side can point out where my scheme has broken down, I will be glad to hear them do it. I think that that proposition of mine is a successful solution of a difficult matter. Speaking about a redistribution of seats, I warned the people of the North many years ago through the public Press that this cry of "One vote one value" was bound to arise, and I pointed out that the sparse population of the North and West, compared to the more dense settlement around the metropolis and other places, would be at a considerable disadvantage. I think it will be the duty of members of this House to, as far as possible, cure this disability under which the Northern and Western districts labour.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: I will now pass on from that measure. After the very exhaustive speech of my leader the other night I do not propose to criticise all the measures mentioned in the Governor's Speech, but I pass on to one which I think is perhaps one of the most contentious that we will have to discuss during the present session. I refer to the Bible in State schools measure, or, to call it by its proper name, "The State Education Acts Amendment Bill." In speaking very briefly the other night on the order of leave to introduce that Bill, I gave expression to an opinion held by this party. This party has been twitted by the Premier with having gone back on its programme and on its platform, in having the temerity, at this particular stage, to repudiate the expressed will of the people, as he put it. I venture to differ with him, and in a few brief words I gave expression to my views. As showing that I was consistent in the views expressed the other night, I would like to quote from a speech which I made in this House in the year 1907. It will be found on page 1188 of *Hansard* for that year. At that time we were discussing a motion which was very similar to the one now before us. It was on a motion called "Referendum re Number of Members," moved by the senior member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, and

Mr. Lennon.]

I gave expression to these words as showing my views on the question of a referendum—

Mr. LENNON: This is a subject which has interested me for a considerable time, and I am not at all surprised at the leader of the Opposition bringing it forward again, as he has on several occasions given expression to similar ideas. Nevertheless, I am not in favour of any referendum whatever. I venture to say that a majority of members sitting on the Opposition benches, if a general Referendum Bill were under discussion, would probably speak and vote against it.

I may say, in order that this will be all the better understood, that Mr. Philp was then in Opposition. You will then understand the purport of my remarks. I said that members of the Opposition would oppose a general referendum Bill, and then went on— and I think I am justified in saying that members in this corner would support it.

At that time the Labour party were sitting in the back Opposition corner. I then went on—

The position I take up is: that I must oppose either this or any other special referendum, until the general principle of referendum is affirmed in this House.

These are my words, which I expressed in 1907, three years ago, and they are exactly in keeping with the views which I expressed very hurriedly the other night—that the Labour party was in no way breaking its platform in taking the action it is taking with regard to this Bill. We believe in the initiative and referendum, but not for a catch vote or a snatch vote, as was done in this case. I am perfectly consistent in all I have said. It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to indulge in that chuckle of satisfaction which seems to give him so much pleasure.

The PREMIER: A strong man struggling with a bad argument.

Mr. LENNON: Let him enjoy his laugh. No doubt he enjoys it. He looks in excellent condition, and no doubt it is a very good thing for the health to be able to laugh. The Premier, when discussing this measure, made certain promises. I think that when a public man makes a promise on the floor of the House, if he fails to carry it out the least thing he should do, as soon as the opportunity offers, is to explain the reason why he did not carry out his promise. I have here a quotation from the *Trinity Times* dealing with this particular promise. It was written on the 9th April, just before the Federal election, and it says—

The Queensland Premier is so strangely silent on the Bible referendum matter that the impression may be pardoned that he has forgotten his promise made on the floor of the House on 31st March, 1908, at the time of the Referendum Bill being carried, when he said— "The question before the House is not a question as to whether the State shall teach religion in the State schools. If that were the question, I myself should vote against the Bill. I have never made any disguise of my sentiments in this respect. The Bible in State Schools League, who have asked for this referendum, know quite well that I myself, if the referendum is taken, will vote 'No.' . . . I think it is not the duty of the State to teach religion at all. . . . Even with those most strongly opposed to religious teaching in our State schools, I do not give place to any man in the House in the strength of my convictions that our national system of education should be kept secular. . . . Our appeal is to the people of Queensland, and, unless a great mistake is made, I believe that an overwhelming 'No' will be given on this question, and the people who are endangering that thing are the people who are preventing the question from being remitted to the electors. . . . I do not think that the majority of the people of Queensland are in favour of any change in our system of education. I am democrat enough to let the people of Queensland settle the matter themselves. If this goes to a referendum, I will do my best, when the vote is taken, to persuade the people of Queensland against making what seems to be so unwise a change in our educational system."

[Mr. Lennon.

Instead of making an effort to carry out that promise to endeavour to persuade the people of Queensland to vote against the religious instruction in State schools referendum, he spent all

[10 p.m.] his time in trying to get the people to vote in favour of the financial agreement and to vote against Andy Fisher. All the heavy artillery of the present State Government in Queensland was directed against the Wide Bay electorate in the hope that they would down the present Prime Minister of Australia. I am delighted to think that all those efforts failed, but I think it is due to members of this House—even though we may allow that the Premier was within his rights in devoting his time and attention to that absorbing Federal subject—that he should have explained to us why he altered his mind. Can it be possible that there has been some influence at work which has made the hon. gentleman change his opinion with regard to the character of the instruction which should be given in our State schools? Not only did he speak in the strong way shown in the speech from which I have quoted, but he stated that he was entirely opposed to religious teaching in State schools—that he was opposed to the parson going into the schools. Whether he has changed his opinion on that matter or not, we know that the Bill to which I refer contains a provision providing for the introduction of clerics into our schools. If the school committee be favourable to the plan, and there is a clergyman living in the locality who has so much time on his hands that he can devote one hour per day to the religious instruction of the children, then he can go into a State school and teach for one hour every day of the week.

Mr. KEOGH: They have that right now.

Mr. LENNON: I know they have that right, but not during school hours. They have permission under the regulations, with the sanction of the Minister, to teach scholars before or after school hours, but they cannot go into the school and give religious instruction to the children during school hours. This Bill proposes to give them the right to go into schools during ordinary school hours—during the time when the education, to which we have grown so accustomed, should be imparted. The present system of education, which is briefly described as free, secular, and compulsory, has been in operation in Queensland for thirty-five years, as nearly as possible, and I may say that the introduction of that system was a matter which occasioned very protracted and very able debate in this House. It was debated by some of the foremost speakers who have ever addressed the Speaker in this House. I refer to Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, the late Hon. John Macrossan, the late Sir Thomas McIlwraith, and others. Those men debated this question for hours and hours, and it was finally decided that we should have free, secular, and compulsory education in Queensland. I think any reasonable man will admit that if we have compulsory education, it should be secular. The fact of having compulsory education should convince any reasonable man that it must be secular. Of course, it ought to be free also, but I do not think any rational, reasonable person will gainsay the proposition that if education is compulsory it ought to be secular. We have had our present system, as I have said, in operation for thirty-five years, and I am delighted to testify to the splendid harmony which has existed throughout the length and breadth of Queensland under that

system. Our country has never been sullied by sectarian bitterness; we have had none of those scenes at elections that have taken place in New South Wales, but I venture to predict that if the character of our educational system is altered, as desired by the Bible in State Schools League, by the introduction of religious instruction in our schools, that happy condition of affairs will depart for ever. It is a most regrettable thing that when we have an educational system that has given every satisfaction, and that statistics have proved is a rational and successful system, should be changed at the request of a portion of the community. If the people desiring this change had given statistics showing that our people were not equal in morals and behaviour to the other States in Australia, they would have made out a fair case in favour of the proposed change. But statistics prove the contrary. Queensland compares most favourably with all the other States, particularly in the matter—a delicate one which one scarcely likes to mention—of illegitimate births. It has been shown that in regard to first births that in New South Wales nearly 50 per cent. are not legitimate. I know that we are not free from stain in Queensland in this matter, but we compare most favourably with New South Wales and the other States. Why, then, not follow the good old maxim of letting well alone? I may be told that it is now too late to argue in this way, but I should like to show that a strange departure was made from our usual practice when taking a poll by the Bible in State Schools League in connection with this referendum. Why did not the Government follow the good old practice of inviting the contending parties to appoint scrutineers? Why was that practice not followed on this occasion? No scrutineers were appointed by the parties. I took the trouble on polling-day to travel round a few of the suburban electorates—Toombul, Albion, and others—and I found that only one section of the community had scrutineers and canvassers at work in connection with the referendum. The canvassers of the Bible in State Schools League were hard at work and strongly enthusiastic, and they deserve credit for their energy. Anyone who enters into a fight should do so warmly and enthusiastically. But I did not find anyone taking up the other side and working in the same way.

The PREMIER: Why didn't you appoint scrutineers?

Mr. MULLAN: Because they would not allow them.

Mr. LENNON: I have made careful inquiries in various parts of the State, and I am assured that the returning officers—with what authority I know not—expressed the opinion that scrutineers were not to be allowed on this occasion. That is what I have ascertained, and I believe it is true. Anyone going round the suburbs of Brisbane on that day could not but be struck with the fact that the Federal election—the election of senators and of members of the House of Representatives—seemed to be entirely subordinated to this sectarian question—a most deplorable circumstance. The polling-booth in the North Brisbane electorate was in Finney's old building at the corner of Edward and Adelaide streets. Crowds of people were congregated about the booth, and canvassers for the Bible in State Schools League were most energetic in their efforts to secure votes. They are quite within their rights, and I express my appreciation of their ardour. But I noticed that there were placards posted in the polling-booth—a thing that is never allowed at an ordinary

State election. I went to the returning officer, Mr. Nielson, and called his attention to the fact that this was a breach, if not of the Elections Act, at any rate of the custom which had grown up in connection with polling-booths. He very promptly came out, and pulled the thing down with his own hands, but he had not time to pull down the thousands of discs which were posted all over the building telling people how to vote.

Mr. COYNE: They did that in Toowoomba.

Mr. LENNON: To put up in polling-booths instructions how to vote is contrary to the spirit and contrary to the practice of our election law. In all my experience of State elections I have never seen returning or presiding officers permit placards to be posted up in the polling-places, whereas in this instance placards—and some of them of a highly objectionable character—were placed in some of the polling-booths. It would appear that there was something strange—something unusual—about the method in which this particular vote was taken. I have received complaints about it from various places, and to prove that I am not romancing I would like to quote a letter which deals with a concrete case. This case occurred in my own electorate, and I am perfectly within my rights in reading the letter to the House. It is written by a lady. I shall allow her to speak for herself, and she does it very well. The letter is addressed to the secretary of the Workers' Political Organisation at Geraldton—

Sir.—I desire to bring under your notice what I consider was a gross injustice to many electors who went to the State polling-booth to vote on the Bible in State schools referendum. I myself experienced a little difficulty in obtaining a vote. After giving my name to the returning officer, I was told by the poll clerk that my name was not on the roll, and that I couldn't vote. I thereupon argued that my name was on the roll, but I was turned away with the retort, "My good woman, it is not there." I told the poll clerk that I was going home for my roll, which I accordingly did. Armed with the roll, I returned to the polling-booth, and was met with profuse apologies, and was subsequently given my vote. Whether this is a case of incompetency or bias on the part of the officials, I don't know; but had scrutineers been allowed to attend at the State polling-booth, as they were at the Federal booth, I consider that the foregoing would not have occurred. You are at liberty to use this communication in any way you think fit.

That is the authority given to the Workers' Political Organisation, and they handed it to me with the like authority. The letter is signed, "Janet McDonald." She writes a very sensible letter, and proves what I say up to the hilt—that there was something strange and unusual about the method in which the referendum was conducted.

The PREMIER: It proves that somebody made a mistake in compiling the roll.

Mr. BARBER: It was the same all round.

Mr. LENNON: That is only one of half a dozen cases regarding which complaints have reached me, but I have not taken the trouble to get evidence in other cases. The complaints have been made to me by people of good repute. Not quite 30 per cent. of the people on the State rolls gave an affirmative vote, and I think that is not a sufficient vote to justify us in making such a great change in our educational system.

The PREMIER: If it had been a 70 per cent. vote, would your attitude be different?

Mr. LENNON: That is hardly a proper question to put to me at this late hour. If a big prize were offered to hon. members to answer conundrums, no doubt we might compete, but in this case it is hardly a question that the hon. gentleman should put to me.

Mr. Lennon.]

Not quite 30 per cent. of the people on the State rolls voted in the affirmative, and not quite 20 per cent. voted in the negative; but there was a 50 per cent. abstention from voting.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; 54 per cent. of the electors voted.

MR. LENNON: I am speaking approximately. I am not saying that the figures are absolutely accurate. I say 30 per cent. voted in the affirmative, but actually under 30 per cent. gave an affirmative vote. Likewise I say that there was a negative vote of 20 per cent. However, it leaves a balance of 47 per cent. who abstained from voting. Now, I ask any reasonable man is it a wise thing to make such a change in our educational system, that has been in existence for thirty-five years, on a vote of that sort? I think it is not.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

THE PREMIER: Is it a wise thing to elect a member of Parliament on such a vote?

MR. COTTELL: How many people voted for you, and how many did not vote at the last election?

MR. LENNON: Quite enough voted for me to put me in, and I can tell the hon. member that he will require a few more to make him comfortable at the next election.

MR. ALLEN: They are going to cut out Paddington, so it will be all right.

MR. LENNON: I would like to support my view as to the unwisdom of making this change by reminding hon. members that there are approximately 100,000 children attending the schools in Queensland. Of that number about 90,000 are attending the State schools, and about 10,000 are attending the denominational schools. The cost of educating the children in the State schools is something a little in excess of £4 per head per annum. This system that we have put before us, if adopted, will probably lead to the withdrawal of a considerable number of children from the State schools, which will probably increase the cost per head of educating the children in those schools from £4 to £5 per head. I do not know whether the Secretary for Public Instruction—who, I know, takes a very deep and, I believe, sincere interest in this question—looks with equanimity upon such a thing as the withdrawal of a large number of children from the State schools. Does it commend itself to him as a desirable result to make a change in our educational system that will practically drive a large number of children out of our State schools? We know well that the Roman Catholic people in Queensland have made a splendid sacrifice in building schools of their own. They have not made any song about it. They do not whine about it.

THE PREMIER: Why didn't you make that appeal to the people of Queensland before the matter was settled?

MR. LENNON: I did.

THE PREMIER: And they consuted you.

MR. LENNON: I addressed myself to this question very warmly—as warmly as I felt. I think that describes it accurately. In Cairns, Townsville, Mareeba, Wolfram Camp, and all over Woothakata, I spoke on the subject, and at Brandon and Ayr in the Bowen electorate. When I came down here, I found that it was not considered a desirable thing to speak about it, and it did not strike me as a strange objection either, as it certainly was not a desirable thing to bring this question into prominence at the Federal election. I consider

[Mr. Lennon.

it was a mean thing to have such a question settled at the Federal election. It was mean for this House to do it. I would have greatly preferred to have had it settled at a State election. I would have preferred, of course, not to have it at all, if I had been able to prevent it. I have done all I could to prevent it in the past. I have opposed it at every stage, and I shall oppose it at every stage still. I hope that those who feel just as strongly on the other side as I do, will do me credit in thinking that I am acting from conscientious motives—just as conscientious as they are in their desire to establish religious instruction in our State schools.

MR. COYNE: Sectarian teaching.

MR. LENNON: Sectarian teaching in the very nature of the case. It was bad enough, but in so far as Bible teaching in State schools without comment—it is to be taught by men many of whom are agnostics, and men who belong to any of the many and various sects and denominations. How can they possibly teach Bible reading and discourse on Biblical topics without imparting to it some particular colour of their own feelings in the matter? In one case there would be a tendency towards the Church of England, in another case towards the Roman Catholic faith, and in another agnostic. You know very well that, in the Bible teaching, a man by a mere shrug of the shoulders, by an elevation of the eyebrows, could belittle the lesson to the children and make them atheists. To the people who desire to foist this thing on the children, that is a very serious view to take. Are they to be the direct means of turning a large number of the rising generation in Queensland to atheism? I say it is a very serious view for them. I do not know what the Premier thinks about it, but I think his duty is to oppose this thing. He admits—at all events he did the other night—that his supporters have a free hand on this matter, and they have a free hand on the licensing question.

MR. COYNE: And on anything else he is afraid of.

MR. LENNON: A free hand on all contentious matters. I think it is the proper thing in this matter that they should have a free hand.

THE PREMIER: It is more than your supporters have on the matter.

MR. LENNON: From the hon. gentleman's past speeches on this subject in this House and elsewhere, I call upon his vote. I say he is in duty bound to vote against this Bible teaching in State schools. If I were on the other side—I thank Heaven I am not—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You wish to be some day, though.

MR. LENNON: Of course, and in the near future. I would like to say this: If I were sitting on that side of the House, and if what the Premier has said about members opposite having a free hand on this question—and whether he said it or not, after the way the Venerable Archdeacon Garland has threatened this House—I would assert my independence, and out of sheer opposition I would absolutely take the opposite side to the Venerable Archdeacon. In his little parliament, the Church of England Synod, he, of course, let himself go. I make every admission that they are entitled to be overjoyed—entitled to express jubilation at the grand victory they have achieved, but I think the venerable gentleman has allowed his zeal to outrun his discretion

on this question; and, instead of jubilating in decorum, he is beginning to utter threats. Amongst other things he stated at that Synod—first of all he referred to the action taken by the Labour Convention in Townsville. I will read what the venerable gentleman said—

The second aspect of the situation was that a body in Townsville had called upon its parliamentary representatives to oppose the verdict of the referendum, because of the conditions surrounding its taking. That objection came from those who used one to have a plank embodying the principle of referendum to the people on any and all subjects under the sun.

I characterise that as a deliberate misrepresentation. We not only had it once—we have a plank now, and we always will have a plank of that character I hope and believe, but it never was intended to apply to all subjects under the sun.

Mr. COTTELL: What is that?

Mr. LENNON: The referendum. We hope to have that put on the statute-book of Queensland, and until we do that—

The PREMIER: Twenty years hence.

Mr. LENNON: Until we have it on the statute-book we shall not be able to legally define to what it shall apply, but once we get it affirmed in this House, and by that time I hope there will be no other House—when we have it affirmed in this House and it is on the statute-book of Queensland, it will be clearly defined to what subjects the referendum shall apply, and I venture to predict that religious questions shall be specifically excluded from the Bill. I think it is a very great pity that we allowed a referendum in this matter at all. However, I will go on quoting what the Venerable Archdeacon said further on—

But when the supporters of the Bible referendum sought to use that plank it was the members of the Labour party who broke it into fragments.

That is another misrepresentation. We have not broken it into fragments. We confirmed the principle at the last convention, which was held two or three months ago in Townsville, so it is not true to say we have broken it into fragments. I am not saying that the Venerable Archdeacon would deliberately tell a falsehood, but in the exuberance of his joy he has made statements that certainly will not bear close investigation. The venerable gentleman goes on—

It could not be claimed that the opponents of the Bible in State schools were all asleep, because *Hansard* contained 248 columns on the subject, of which 201 columns were opposed to the referendum, and it was to be supposed that the voice of the members of Parliament reached the people outside. So far from the opponents of the referendum not knowing what was going on, there had been an active propaganda against the movement on the part of candidates at the recent Federal election, assisted by State members of Parliament.

I say this is only in a measure true. There was no active propaganda, or only in a few very remote instances. There was no proper plan of campaign conducted against that Bill in Queensland at all, so I say this is misrepresentation on the part of the venerable gentleman.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I thought you did it up North yourself.

Mr. LENNON: I say I did, and I am grieved I did not have more frequent opportunities of speaking on the matter. I spoke whenever I had the chance. The report further states—

Mr. Garland said that if the members of the State Parliament refused to pass the resolution of the sovereign tribunal of the people, they would appeal to the people of Queensland to give them power over the court of Parliament.

Then further on it states—

He (Mr. Garland) could promise that the supporters of the referendum would land Parliament in endless difficulties if they did not give due heed, and very speedy heed, to the decisive verdict of the people of Queensland. (Loud applause.) The verdict was the more striking when they bore in mind that it was the verdict of people who for thirty years had not had the advantage of scripture instruction, such as the referendum claimed.

Then he goes on to say—

The alternative would be the forcing of this question on to the platform at the next State general election. The jockeying of the scripture referendum in Victoria had led to the elections in both Houses being fought and won exclusively on the question of the Bible in State schools. Such a state of affairs he would regret most deeply; but not half so much as would the members of Parliament when they were standing as candidates. (Laughter and applause.)

This happened at the last parliament of the Church of England Synod. The venerable gentleman threatens members of Parliament if they do not vote as he tells them—as he dictates they should vote—then he will take good care that every vote cast at the next election practically will be cast on the sectarian principle. I have said enough to show that, at all events, going back for two years, my position is thoroughly consistent in this matter, and if it went on for another twenty-two years my attitude towards it will not be altered in the slightest degree. I want to say no more on this subject. I would like to refer to a matter of momentous importance in my mind, and that is, in the Speech there is no reference whatever, good, bad, or indifferent, except that it might possibly be argued as included under the term "agricultural"—no reference whatever is made to the important sugar industry in Queensland. And the present attitude of the Government in

[10.30 p.m.] regard to this question staggers me. I would like to quote from an article of the 8th of this month in the *Courier* with reference to the closing up of a large factory in Melbourne owing to the increased price of sugar. The Minister for Customs said this was a matter for much regret, and pointed out that "in 1906 the production was 295,576 tons, in 1907 it rose to 214,244 tons; then it dropped to 165,715 tons in 1908, and last year the estimate was only 161,253 tons. In 1907 the imports were only 6,167 tons; in 1908 they increased to 19,552 tons, and last year they reached 99,690 tons." Practically 100,000 tons of sugar was imported into Australia during the last year; and that is made by cheap labour in foreign parts. Of course the Federal Government receive a magnificent revenue from the importation of 100,000 tons of sugar. When we ask the Premier to take into account what has been done for the industry by the establishment of central mills, and urge on him the necessity for extending the system, he calmly tells us we are to go to the Federal Government. It was mentioned only yesterday that there was a possibility of the Federal Government constructing a railway in Queensland, and that was termed aggression on the part of the Federal Government. Here we have an industry that would be cherished in any other country but this, and we have a Government in power that is practically allowing it to be strangled for want of encouragement. If the butter industry, the honey industry, or the cape gooseberry industry wanted assistance, it would be given readily; but the important sugar industry has to go by the board. Production has decreased enormously for three or four years.

The TREASURER: Was not that largely owing to frost?

Mr. Lennon.]

Mr. LENNON: There was a large decrease apart from that. The Premier gave as a reason for not granting us mills in the North that the production was sufficient to meet home consumption; and I then predicted that the consumption would be enormously increased. That has come true, yet Ministers sit down quietly and allow that industry to be practically threatened with annihilation. (Government laughter.) It is all very well to laugh.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the 180,000-ton crop coming on this year?

Mr. LENNON: You will be particularly lucky if you are able to crush the 180,000-ton crop. Apart from that, it is the feeling of the Premier and others that Queensland must prove its right to retain Queensland, and Australia must prove its right to retain Australia by effective occupation. There is no evidence that any other industry except the sugar industry will settle a dense population on the coast of Queensland. The Premier knows that I am not exaggerating when I say that sugar is the one industry that will settle a dense population from Mackay to the Mossman, about 500 miles. And when he knows that it is the one thing that will do it, I ask him in all earnestness: Why does he sit idly by? Can it be that he has been taken to the bosom of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company? I think the hon. gentleman has a capacity for making new alliances. He must be actuated by some motive that is not understandable when he will refuse applications for the establishment of central mills. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Munro, of Cairns, a few weeks ago in Brisbane; and he told me with satisfaction that he practically had a promise from the Premier to establish a mill at Babinda Creek. I have had some experience of promises made by the Premier, and I knew it was not wise to trust too much to any promise emanating from that quarter. At the same time, I was disappointed when I heard, as alleged by the Cairns people—I am not saying that such is the case—that the Premier or the Treasurer, or both of them, had broken the promise.

The TREASURER: No promise.

Mr. COYNE: Is it not customary for them to go back on such a promise?

Mr. LENNON: Not in places outside of Queensland. I am urging as strongly as I possibly can on the Ministry that they should take a broader view of our Queensland industries. They are anxious to have a railway running to the never-never country for the benefit of the woolgrower; and I say that those Western lands should be opened up in due time; but I maintain that we want to settle a population on the coast for our safety; and unless we do so we are faced with the menace that we may not be able to keep it. The Premier has frequently spoken in glowing words of the necessity of filling up the empty spaces, and I have admired his rounded periods and glowing phrases; but it is all sham, and made merely to catch the prevailing breeze of popularity that he spreads his sails so adroitly. The mining industry is on the decline, but little interest is shown by the Government in that industry; and I regret to say that still less interest is shown by them in the sugar industry. What would not New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, or Western Australia give to have such an im-

[Mr. Lennon.

portant industry as our sugar industry—particularly since we got rid of the kanaka curse, and made it a white man's industry?

The PREMIER: You told us it was an expiring industry.

Mr. LENNON: I want to show that you are not doing your duty. Under white labour we had prosperity, but the hon. gentleman is evidently trying to thwart in some way the desires of the Commonwealth Government, because the Commonwealth controls the excise and the import duty. But this State Government controls the land, and when you have the control of the land you have practically the control of all. That has been the experience of every country in the world. The control of the land gives it the supreme control, and it will be a very bad record for this or any other Government that refuses to do its duty by the sugar industry of Queensland. I mentioned in some of my remarks in the North, and I will quote them again here, points where there is absolute certainty of success as far as production of sugar is concerned, could further central mills be established. I will begin at Darradgee; then there is Tully River, Babinda, Liverpool Creek, Long Pocket, and Ayr. Those are six points at which central mills could, with the very greatest security and safety, be established next year, and even if they were only 10,000-ton mills, the six mills would produce 60,000 tons of sugar. No matter how successfully they were managed from the very jump, they could not possibly have reached their full complement of production within four years. It would take four years for these mills to produce 60,000 tons of sugar, and in four years the population would have so increased, and our consumption so increased, that we would have room for six more mills. And yet those men sitting there—(Government laughter)—managing the affairs of this great State, as they are always proud to call it, are doing nothing! Indolence is one of the very worst things under the sun, and they allow that industry in Queensland to be in danger of extinction by carelessness and disregard.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Why don't you force them to do it?

Mr. LENNON: I have had considerable experience in sugar matters in Queensland, and I am glad to see that in Mackay the millers are putting their heads together with the idea of starting a refinery there, which indicates that they will expect assistance from this State Government. It will be a case of "Don't you wish you may get it from this Government." They are also applying to the Federal Government. I wish them success wherever they apply.

Hon. R. PHILP interjected.

Mr. LENNON: Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows better than I do. I would like to say that when I worked for his firm in Townsville—and I worked for the hon. gentleman's firm sixteen years ago, at the time when the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was making overtures to all the refineries in Queensland—I caused circulars to be sent out to every refinery in North Queensland, beseeching them not to throw themselves absolutely into the hands of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, but to get some of the refineries to adopt a pool system for the benefit of the sugar industry. And now I find they are coming to realise the fact, as proved by the action at Mackay, that the recommendations I gave them then were worthy of adoption, and it

has taken them sixteen years to find out. I do hope that this Ministry will not take so long, or even so many weeks, to find it out. I hope I am not beating the air; I hope I am not addressing ears that are steeled against anything like reason in this regard. I say the actions of the Premier are really beyond description in regard to the sugar industry. He coolly told us to apply to the Federal Ministry, but directly the Federal Ministry is ready to come to the State of Queensland about a railway, he says, "Oh, oh!" (Laughter.) He swells himself out, and would tear the Federal members to atoms—to rags. (Laughter.) That is not a proper attitude to take up. We are a State, and we are not to consider that we are bigger than the Commonwealth. We are a very important State. I am prepared to go to the length of admitting some of the high-faluting we hear talked about "this grand State" and its potentialities, and to acknowledge all these things, but let us remember that we are part of the Commonwealth, and that the Commonwealth has rights just as we have, and we should adopt a more becoming attitude than has been shown in the past in regard to our dealings with the Commonwealth. We have heard a lot of criticism about the financial agreement, and a lot of criticism also of what is called "misappropriation" or wrong-doing on the part of the Prime Minister of Australia. I am very sorry to see that the Premier has descended to scurrility in his treatment of the Hon. Andrew Fisher.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. LENNON: Yes. He has likened him to a clerk in the Treasury who has misappropriated Government funds, collaring some of the moneys in the Treasury to make good a shortage in his cash. That is a very glowing description given by the Premier of what Mr. Fisher has done.

The PREMIER: It may be glowing, but it is perfectly accurate.

Mr. LENNON: You say it is accurate. Then you confirm my statement that you have so criticised it. I would also remind the gentleman that it is only a couple of years ago that the hon. member for Townsville was supposed to have misappropriated £600,000. We had the hon. gentleman on that occasion showing the gravity of the offence of that gentleman, but that was simply words.

Hon. R. PHILP: I paid the money legally.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. member says so, but the hon. member for Rockhampton does not say so.

Hon. R. PHILP: What does Fisher want an Indemnity Bill for? You passed the £600,000 in the next Appropriation Bill, at any rate.

Mr. LENNON: Practically, that was an indemnity the same as Mr. Fisher is asking for. I think he was perfectly justified in doing what he has done, if the law, in words, does not quite admit as much. (Government laughter.) It is just on all-fours with the Special Appropriation Bill for £680,000 that we passed in this House. I do not want to divert the House with the picture given by the Premier of the hon. member for Townsville going off in chains to Boggo road—a picture emanating from the imagination of the leader of this House.

The TREASURER: Tell us what is going to happen to the excise and bounty in 1912.

Mr. LENNON: I am astonished to think that the Treasurer is so very inexperienced as to ask a question of that sort. The Act passed

through the House does away with all limitations of time regarding excise and bounty; it puts it exactly on the same footing as the import duty on machinery, on locomotive engines, on which there is a heavy duty, and of which I shall always be a strong supporter. The removal of the time limitation in regard to the excise and bounty puts that question exactly on all-fours with any other dutiable article, on any other article that pays excise in Australia.

The TREASURER: You say the excise and bounty are to be removed.

Mr. LENNON: Nothing of the sort. They are to be continued until otherwise ordered. (Government laughter.) It is easy to amuse some people. Can they name a single article upon which duty is levied now, or a single article on which excise is paid now, in which the case is different? Is there any guarantee given that the duty will never be altered? Nothing of the sort. Nothing so ridiculous would ever be attempted. It has been said also that the sugar industry is a most valuable industry. I am sorry to say that the gentlemen sitting on the front Treasury bench do not seem to think so, as such arrangements have been made in the Federal House that will give new life to it if they only get encouragement from the State. Those whose duty it is to run the business of Queensland are letting people outside know that they have no faith in the sugar industry, and then it does that terrible thing we hear so much about—it frightens capital away from here. I know dozens of people who visited my district and the other districts surrounding it with the object of taking up land.

Mr. FERRICKS: They came to my district too.

Mr. LENNON: Yes, they went to the Mossman and right along the Northern coastal fringe with the idea of going into the sugar industry, but they came back dissatisfied. They received no encouragement whatever; they saw no prospect whatever of getting anyone to take their cane when they grew it. I hope that the present Government will quickly throw off their lethargy, and apply themselves with energy to that great sugar industry of which this State of Queensland ought to be very proud indeed. I have only a few minutes more to speak, so as to enable members to catch their trains, so I will be brief. With regard to this Police Offences Bill, personally it will have my most determined opposition. From my knowledge of this Bill, on reading it last session, it is nothing but what I might call grandmotherly legislation, such as the curfew bell legislation. It is a Bill which is calculated to lead to a multiplication of petty offences, and in saying that I describe it exactly. It is such a Bill that if a man even coughs in the street he may render himself liable to be run in. I do not think that legislation of that sort should sully the statute-book of Queensland. I commend the Government most highly for its action in interesting itself in the medical inspection of children, and I think that all credit is due to the hon. member for Gregory and the hon. member for Mitchell and others representing Western districts of Queensland for hammering away at this thing until they got it.

The TREASURER: The old gag.

Mr. LENNON: The "old gag," but it is quite true.

The PREMIER: It was introduced before anyone of them ever mentioned it.

Mr. RYLAND: It was mentioned by the hon. member for Gregory.

*Mr. Lennan.]*

The PREMIER: No man mentioned anything about it in this House until it was done.

Mr. BOWMAN: You must give the hon. member for Gregory credit for speaking about the state of the children's eyes in the West.

Mr. LENNON: I commend the Government for taking good advice, and I hope that they will show like good sense in accepting my advice in regard to the sugar industry of Queensland. They spoke about the note issue of the Federal Government. I would like to say at once that when Sir Hugh Nelson introduced his note issue in 1893, owing to my surroundings in those days, I was a little apprehensive of its success. I am pleased to say now that I have in later years gained a wider knowledge, and I have a greater appreciation of Sir Hugh Nelson's knowledge of such matters than I had then. Sir Hugh Nelson's note issue has proved an unqualified success. To say that the notes of the associated banks are of better value than the Commonwealth is too ridiculous for words, and it is most unpatriotic too. I am delighted to see that Mr. Fisher has carried out his promise and has established an Australian note issue, and before we are five years older the people who now condemn it will say that it is an excellent measure. The very gentlemen who are condemning Mr. Fisher for bringing in a note issue were only a few years ago praising Sir Hugh Nelson for coming to the rescue of the closed-up banks. The banks were all closed up at the time, you remember, and the note issue of the Government saved them to a large extent. If it was a good thing in a time of public panic like that, how much better is it for us in times like the present? What is the use of talking about Queensland losing £25,000 and another State losing £30,000? The Commonwealth makes the profit, and as we are all one people, that is all right. We have our railways and our lands to make a profit out of, and we ought to be content with them. I have said many good things about the Government, but I will say one thing of an opposite character. We know in connection with the financial agreement the Ministers tried to get it passed. In doing that they also tried to down Fisher, and they used this as a threat. I am quoting from the *Trinity Times*, which is not a very strong supporter of the Government, and this is what it says about the Home Secretary in its issue of the 9th April—

State Ministers going round like J. G. Appel promising all sorts of things if the people will vote for the £1 5s. per capita amounts to nothing short of unblushing bribery. The Queensland Government simply holds a threat over the heads of the electors in every constituency, and says that unless Mr. Kidston's will is done, and the financial agreement is carried, no public money will be spent.

I wonder if that is one of the reasons why they neglect the sugar industry. I have been at a loss to arrive at a reason for the neglect of that industry, and I must confess my utter helplessness in arriving at the motive which actuated the Government in trying to kill that industry, as they have done in the last few years. As it is getting late, and I do not want members to miss their trains, with the consent of the House I will resume my seat.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at two minutes to 11 o'clock.

[*Mr. Lennon.*