

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 20 JULY 1911

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUESTIONS.

WAGES PAID BY TOOWOOMBA FOUNDRY COMPANY.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What are the rates of wages and overtime paid to, and hours worked by, pattern-makers, blacksmiths, turners, fitters, and machinists in the employ of the Toowoomba Foundry Company, Limited, in the execution of contracts for locomotives for the Queensland Government?"

"2. Will he see that the rates of wages, as recognised by the Ironmasters' Association of Queensland, are paid to those engaged by the Toowoomba Foundry Company, Limited, in carrying out Government contracts?"

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

"1. The contract provides that the wages paid shall not be less than the rates prescribed by the wages boards, the union rates, or the rates ruling in the district, as the case may be, and, although a general complaint has been made, the company maintain that they are paying the correct rates.

"2. The complainants have been asked to give any specific cases in which correct rates are not being paid, so that the matter may be investigated, but they have not yet done so."

STANWELL—LOAN TOWARDS BRIDGE.

Mr. FOX (*Normanby*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Was a grant or loan or both approved towards the cost of a bridge at Stanwell at any time, and when?"

"2. If so, what prevented the work being carried out?"

"3. Is any grant or loan or either still available?"

"4. If not, will the Minister consider a new application therefor in view of special circumstances now existing and previous promise (if any)?"

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

"1 and 2. In 1900 a promise was made to provide one-third of the cost of a bridge at that place. In the same year the Fitzroy Divisional Board applied for a loan of £250 in aid of this work, but the application was vetoed when the matter was submitted to a ballot of the ratepayers, and, consequently, the board did not avail themselves of the promised one-third.

"3. No.

"4. There is no fund at the disposal of the Home Secretary from which a grant could be made."

BURNETT LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SELECTION.

Mr. HODGE (*Burnett*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to a paragraph appearing in the *Wide Bay and Burnett News* of the 18th instant, stating that Mr. E. B. C. Corser, senior member for Maryborough, is in possession of plans and maps of lands, and can give all information at his office in Maryborough about lands available in the Burnett district for selection in the parishes of Binjour, Mundubbera, Reid, Mundowran, Malmoë, and Lochaber?"

"2. Can the same information be obtained at the Lands Offices at Maryborough, Gympie, and Nanango—if not, why not?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. E. H. Macartney, *Brisbane North*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. The plans supplied by the Inquiry Office to Mr. Corser only purport to supply information of land available as at date of issue. The

THURSDAY, 20 JULY, 1911.

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

PAPERS.

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

Regulation under the Navigation Act of 1876.

Regulations under the Government Savings Bank Act of 1864.

Regulations under the Rights in Water and Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1910.

same information, corrected from day to day, is available at Gayndah—the official Lands Office for the district in which the lands mentioned are situated—to which selectors must apply under the provisions of the Act. Such information is not available at offices other than the head office, and the office of the district affected, save in response to special inquiry made. Similar plans are in practice supplied to any inquirer, and are available on application to any hon. member."

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Governor, intimating that he had given the Royal assent to Appropriation Bill No. 1 on 14th July.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

PROSECUTION OF MILK VENDORS.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*) asked the Home Secretary, without notice—

"Why was such a length of time allowed to elapse in the prosecution of those milk vendors the other day, as was spoken of by the police magistrate in the Brisbane court?"

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

"This is a question that should be addressed to the Justice Department. The information was passed on from the Health Department to the Justice Department, and the Health Department thereafter had no further control in connection with that particular case."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The offence was committed in April.

AMENDMENT OF TRADE UNION LAW.

* Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): I beg to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should at the earliest possible opportunity introduce legislation for the purpose of amending the law relating to trade unions so that the unjust disabilities which now operate against those bodies may be removed."

It is hardly necessary for me to dwell at any great length upon the urgent necessity for introducing legislation which will place trade unions upon a more stable legal footing. But, for the benefit of hon. members who are not perhaps as much interested in this question as I am, I desire to state briefly what are the disabilities which now operate so harshly against those bodies; and I venture to express the opinion that, after hearing the case, many hon. members, particularly those supporting the Government, will be surprised that this matter has been deferred so long—that the matter of placing trade unions under better legal protection has been delayed until this date. I would remind hon. members opposite at the outset that the Government which they are now supporting has time and again promised such legislation as I desire to see this House express opinion in favour of. The now notorious Rockhampton programme which Mr. Kidston placed before the country in 1907 contained a Trade Disputes Bill which had for its object, I assume, the placing of trade unions upon a better legal footing. In the second session of 1908 and in the session of 1909 a Trade Disputes Bill was mentioned in the Governor's Opening

[*Mr. Theodore.*

Speech. I claim that trade unions are perfectly legitimate associations. In their essence they are associations of workers banded together primarily with the object of mutually assisting each other to secure more favourable conditions of employment. That is their fundamental object, and they endeavour to attain that aim either directly by the method of collective bargaining as between employers and employed, or indirectly through the advocacy of union-controlled newspapers or through the advocacy of their representatives in Parliament. Those objects and methods are perfectly legitimate, but decisions given under the trade union law in the old country and in this country have declared that they are not legitimate ambitions. Anyone who knows anything at all about the subject must admit that unionism, considered in the light of present-day industrial development, is a necessity and a benefit to a large number of workers; and the majority of employers have pronounced the opinion that unionists are generally more skilled workmen than non-unionists. On those grounds alone we should give protection to the associations which bring about such a result. Unfortunately, decisions have been given, judge-made law has been established, in England and in Australia, and has reached such a stage that now almost every act which is performed by a Queensland unionist is a misdemeanour against some law. It is to remedy such disabilities, such unfair and harsh measures against trade unions, that I desire this motion carried and the Government to take action in the matter. For thirty years—in England from 1871 till the latter end of 1900—trade unions had a certain recognised protection, not only in the eyes of the law, but also in the eyes of the general public. Everyone thought that they had a protection under the Trade Union Act, which not only safeguarded their funds, but which also safeguarded the unions against the liability for any wrongdoing that might have been committed by agents or individual members of those unions. But decisions which have been given during the present century have unfortunately disillusioned the public and unionists upon that point. When the Trade Union Act was passed in Queensland in 1886, it was generally thought that trade unions would be able to carry on their business without molestation through Government machinery or the ordinary legal process which are generally resorted to in cases of criminality. That Act gave a sense of security to those bodies, but subsequent events and decisions have proved that it was a false security. It is only to restore the security which they thought they had under that Act that I desire Parliament to give them protection. It appears that unions at the present time are legally incapable of holding property, and that they suffer other disabilities and hardships which I shall touch upon later. The decisions to which I have made reference are numerous. During the last ten years there have been many decisions in trade union cases, but two great decisions stand out pre-eminently above all others—the decisions in the Taff Vale case and in the Osborne case, the latter of which is now commonly referred to as the Osborne judgment. Those decisions and other decisions have the effect of practically nullifying the protection which was previously thought to have been conferred by the Trade Union Act of 1871 in England and the Trade Union Act of 1886 in Queensland. The Queensland

Trade Union Act followed almost word for word the English Act, and the English judicial interpretations consequently apply. The effect of the decisions referred to has been to enable juries in cases in which trade union principles were involved to give expression to their class hostility. By bringing unions under the pale of the law and enabling juries—which are mostly empanelled from the ranks of employers, and consequently biased upon this question, it has enabled them to give full vent to their malice in such cases.

The PREMIER: Are you speaking of the old country now?

Mr. THEODORE: I am also speaking of Australia and of Queensland.

The PREMIER: In respect of juries?

Mr. THEODORE: I claim that juries in relation to cases of this kind cannot give an impartial decision, because, for the most part, they are drawn from the employing class, and they are, consciously or unconsciously, biased in such cases. In support of that, I desire to quote from an article which was published during the year 1906 in the *National Review*. I do not know who was the writer of the article, as it is anonymous, but I entirely endorse the opinions expressed by the writer—

“There is great force in the contention of trade unionists that they cannot secure impartial treatment in the courts of justice. This statement is true, and it is the veriest cant, engendered of the conventional view that the administration of justice in this country is beyond suspicion, to insist that a trade union and an employer occupy a situation of equality before a jury constituted mainly, if not entirely, of employers. Few, indeed, would be disposed to question the general integrity and impartiality of juries, but there is a deep-seated, and perhaps not unnatural, prejudice on the part of the middle class against labour organisations, and this prejudice is the fruitful cause of miscarriages of justice. If one seek demonstration of the truth of the assertion, one may find it in the significant fact that not only are the verdicts of juries, so far as the writer's experience extends, invariably adverse to trade unions, but in a large proportion of those cases where the unions have ventured to appeal, the court of appeal has reversed those decisions on the ground that there was no evidence to support the findings, and, be it observed, that if there had been any evidence, however slight and doubtful, on which those juries could reasonably have so found, the verdicts could not have been disturbed.”

I entirely endorse those sentiments, and I think that most prominent trade unionists and trade union officials believe that, if we have to depend upon juries drawn, as they usually are, from the employing class, then manifestations of partiality must be expected in their findings. The English decisions have had the effect of bringing trade unions under the civil law. It has had the effect of bringing trade unionists into antagonism with hostile juries; and it has also had the effect of establishing what is called the law of agency, which, before the Taff Vale decision, was never applied in these cases. It was thought that a trade union was not liable for the tortious acts of individual members or agents of the union. I contend it would be a perfectly correct principle to establish that a whole union should not suffer for the wrongdoing of individual members of the union. If we can restore the position to what was believed to be the law before that case, it will be a very good thing. The various decisions have also given recog-

niton to certain ambiguous terms, such as “molestation,” “coercion,” “intimidation,” and “conspiracy,” which have no actual meaning as applied to the acts to which they have been applied by these decisions, and to which, prior to those decisions, they were not deemed to apply. To pursue the argument further, I want to give the opinions of the parliamentary committee of the British Trades Unions Congress which investigated this question, and forwarded a letter to the Labour members of the House of Commons in the year 1903. The full text of the letter was published in the report of the Royal Commission of Trade Disputes and Trade Combinations which was held in England in 1903. In the letter the relative position of trade unions and employers was stated. I am not going to quote the whole of the letter, but those portions which contrast the positions of the two classes. The position of trade unionists now under the law is thus stated—

“It is illegal for trade unionists during a dispute to peacefully persuade men not to enter the employment of a firm in conflict with the union.”

They contrast that with the employers' position in these words—

“Employers can, and do, persuade men to enter their employment during a strike or lockout, advertise for men, and send out agents to procure them.”

Then the trade unionists' position is thus set forth in the second paragraph—

“It is illegal for trade unionists to issue lists of unfair firms with a view to preventing men from working for such firms, or preventing other firms from trading with them.”

The employers' position in relation to the same matter is this—

“Employers can, and do, issue black lists, and through the medium of the character-note system they constantly prevent men getting employment with firms who would otherwise be willing to employ them.”

Then this is the unionists' point of view in regard to another matter—

“It is illegal for trade unionists to strike in order to compel men to join a union.”

The employers' position in relation to the same thing is—

“Employers constantly discharge men simply because they are members of a trade union.”

The letter then sets forth “Trade Union Grievances”—

- “1. Peaceable picketing is declared illegal.
- “2. Acts when done by one person are legal; when done in combination with others are actionable at common law as conspiracy.
- “3. As a result of the two grievances above mentioned of judicial interpretations of the law, trade union funds are placed very largely at the mercy of the employers.”

They go on to say—

“We make this appeal to you for the following reasons:—

- “1. We seek this proposed change of the law on the common ground of justice and equality before the law of employers and employed.
- “2. We want reasonable facilities for picketing during labour disputes, and these facilities defined in clear phraseology.”

Mr. Theodore.]

That is the position as it exists in Queensland to-day. That position has been considerably improved in England by the passage of the Trade Disputes Act, and I claim that we have just as strong a case in favour of the passing of a Trade Disputes Bill, or some measure giving further protection to trade unionists, as had the unionists in Great Britain when that letter was written. Under the Act which we had in Queensland there are a number of trade unions registered, and I presume that the members of those unions think that they get a certain measure of protection by being registered under the Act. I can assure them, however, that they are under an absolute delusion. I want to quote the experience of the Amalgamated Workers' Association of Queensland, which was registered under the Trade Unions Act of Queensland, and did everything to comply with the law governing trade unions, and are still willing to continue their registration under the Act, but, after the alteration of their rules, they were refused registration.

The PREMIER: What alterations were they?

Mr. THEODORE: In December last they had a conference, and, according to their recognised machinery, revised their rules, and they altered the objects of the association to a very small extent.

[4 p.m.] They then sought the registration of their altered rules, and received a letter from the Registrar of Friendly Societies, who is also Registrar of Trade Unions, refusing registration. That letter I shall read—

“25th January, 1911.

“Amalgamated Workers' Association of Queensland.

“Sir,—In reference to the draft rules of the above association submitted, I regret that I cannot register them in their present form.

“Amongst the objects of the association are included the following:—

- “(d) To assist in the movement for the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange;
- “(e) To gradually replace the competitive system of distribution by a co-operative system;
- “(f) To secure direct representation of Labour in Parliament;
- “(g) To establish and assist in the maintenance of Labour journals.”

These objects are wide in their scope, and are very ambitious objects, which they hope to attain, and which they no doubt will attain. But I claim that they are perfectly legitimate objects for a trade union and for a Labour organisation to follow.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And any trade unionist who does not believe in those objects cannot become a member.

Mr. THEODORE: I take it that no reasonable man would attempt to join the Amalgamated Workers' Association unless he could subscribe to the objects of the association.

Mr. COYNE: But are you increasing your membership notwithstanding that non-registration?

Mr. THEODORE: Yes, we are, very rapidly. The registration was refused on the grounds that the association was a political association as well as an industrial one.

The PREMIER: Ah!

Mr. THEODORE: We claim trade unionists, performing perfectly legitimate functions,

[Mr. Theodore.

and endeavouring to secure better conditions for themselves, have as much right to endeavour to secure legislative enactment to carry out those conditions as they have to secure improvement through industrial action. Why should it not be so? I have no complaint to make against the registrar for refusing registration. I suppose he was following out the decisions given in the old country. The decision not to register our amendments was given subsequent to the Osborne judgment, which decided a case which involved a political union. But I claim the unions registered under the Trade Union Act should be notified that they are unable to get any protection whatever, as the objects of some of the unions are very similar to this one. Their objects are such that they seek to get redress through political action. I say that there are such trade unions now registered. I will only mention two unions whose objects are along the lines of the unions whose rules have been refused registration. One of the largest and most important unions in Queensland is the Australian Workers' Union and it is still registered. The union has two clauses in its objects which read—

“1. To endeavour by political action to secure Social justice.”

That is a perfectly legitimate object and a good thing to strive for, but it is also the same object as the Amalgamated Workers' Association had. The other clause is—

“2. To establish and maintain Labour journals.”

That is also one of the objectionable aims of the Amalgamated Workers' Association. There is also another association which is registered under the Act which is not a trade union in the general acceptance of the term—it is the Employers' Federation. Their objects are also political, and in the report of the annual Interstate Conference of Employers' Federation, held in Brisbane on 22nd May, 1906, the president, Mr. E. E. Smith, in his president's address to the delegates, said—

“The platform of the Employers' Federation is known to us all—namely: Loyalty to the throne, Anti-socialism, Review of the tariff.”

That is purely political.

The PREMIER: How do they get their funds?

Mr. COYNE: Ask him something easy.

Mr. THEODORE: I think that the objects of the Employers' Federation are perfectly legitimate objects, and they have a perfect right to strive for those objects.

Mr. MANN: What do they mean by loyalty to the throne?

Mr. THEODORE: I do not pretend to know. But if the Amalgamated Workers' Association should be tabooed from registration in consequence of desiring to secure political reform, then there are other associations which are registered to whom I think a circular should be issued warning them that they are not entitled to any protection whatever under the Act. That would be a fair thing to do. As a matter of fact, we all know that latter-day unions are all developing along the lines of political action. There are very few important unions now that disdain to take political action, who disdain to use the political machine. In support of that contention I will quote the resolution which was carried at the annual Trade and Labour Union Congress

held in Brisbane in August last year. There were thirty-nine unions represented at the congress, and the following resolution was unanimously carried:—

"That this congress affirms the principle of industrial unions taking political action, approves of the constitution and platform framed by the recent Labour Convention, and urges upon the members of all Queensland unions to do their utmost to secure the enactment into statute law of each plank embodied in the Labour platform."

Those unions have a perfect right to carry such a resolution, and the protection of the law should not be withheld from such bodies, so far as their funds and officials are concerned. Most of the unions of which I have been speaking, the Australian Workers' Union and Amalgamated Workers' Association particularly, two of the most important unions in Queensland, not only assist newspapers largely political in their chief functions, but they take part in political elections, and allow their officials to engage in political propaganda, and there is no reason why they should not do so. There is no reason why the Employers' Federation should not do it, and the Employers' Federation do it and still are registered under the Trades Union Act.

The PREMIER: You think that that registration should be annulled?

Mr. THEODORE: I think that they should be notified that they are not entitled to any protection whatever. The Registrar of Trade Unions himself recognises the necessity of some alteration of the law in regard to trade unions. In the last report which is available to members—namely, 1910, he says—

"As in the case of friendly societies, it appears that the time has arrived when the Act under which trade unions are registered should be subject to a general revision."

Anyone knows how insecure is the position of a trade unionist in consequence of adverse judgments, and something should be done in this matter. Something should be done to place all unions on a similar footing which they thought they occupied prior to the Taft Vale decision. To give some general idea of what we would like embodied in such a measure I would like to quote from the recommendations of the report of the Royal Commission which sat in England upon this subject, and made recommendations to the House of Commons, some of which were afterwards embodied in the Act. These recommendations contain pretty well the whole of what we would like to see carried out here—

"Our recommendations may be summarised as follows:—

"That an Act should be passed for the following objects:—

"(1) To declare trade unions legal associations.

"(2) To declare strikes from whatever motive or for whatever purpose (including sympathetic or secondary strikes), apart from crime or breach of contract, legal, and to make the Act of 1875 to extend to sympathetic or secondary strikes.

"(3) To declare that to persuade to strike—i.e., to desist from working, apart from procuring breach of contract—is not illegal.

1911—M

"(4) To declare that an individual shall not be liable for doing any act not in itself an actionable tort only on the ground that it is an interference with another person's trade, business, or employment.

"(5) To provide for the facultative separation of the proper benefit funds of trade unions, such separation, if effected, to carry immunity from these funds being taken in execution."

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is a very important point.

Mr. THEODORE: It is a very important point—

"(6) To provide means whereby the central authorities of a union may protect themselves against the unauthorised and immediately disavowed acts of branch agents."

Surely the hon. member will not take exception to that! Recommendations 7 and 8, I do not intend to quote, as they have reference to the English Act—

"(9) To enact to the effect that an agreement of combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be the ground of a civil action, unless the agreement or combination is indictable as a conspiracy notwithstanding the terms of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875."

If we can get the principles, as mentioned in these recommendations, established in Queensland, it would give that protection which I think should be given to trade unions, which are perfectly legitimate associations. After going fully into the subject, and recognising the disabilities under which trade unions now labour, I think the Act should also give this protection: A union should not be prevented from raising or using its funds for political purposes, nor from supporting or owning newspapers. In conclusion, I hope that the Government are duly impressed of the importance of this subject, and will give some protection, or give some reasons for not giving such protection, to the bodies of which I am speaking, and I would remind them that in any legislation they are likely to consider, which has for its object the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes, or the regulation of trade unions, they must recognise the assumption that combined labour has as much right to injure capital as combined capital has to injure labour, and it is only by a recognition of that principle they are likely to introduce a Bill that will give us the measure of protection upon the subject which we desire.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*): With many of the opening remarks of the hon. member I am entirely in accord. (Hear, hear!) I am entirely in accord when he said trade unions are genuine associations, and that their object is to mutually assist one another. They are a necessity and beneficial; with that I am in entire accord. As regards his remarks *re* jury-made law, as far as this State is concerned, there has not been more than two, or at the most three, cases in which trade unions have been interested.

Mr. COLLINS: Very severe ones, though.

The PREMIER: And the hon. member is quite right in his reference to the Taft Vale case, when he said it came to the community as a shock to find that their funds were not

{Hon. D. F. Denham.}

protected. The Hon. the Attorney-General furnishes me with a memo. on the situation; it reads thus—

“Prior to this Act, trade unions were illegal associations, and the members could be prosecuted for conspiracy. They could not legally own property, and therefore could not protect their funds from embezzlement, nor make valid contracts respecting any land, building, or other property.

“This position was intolerable, and led to the passing of the English Act of 1871, on which the Queensland Act is based. The English Act was considered a great advance by unionists of that day, and regarded as the charter of trade unions. It legalised trade unions, and enabled them to hold property and to bring and defend certain actions in the names of trustees. It also specially provided that certain trade union contracts should not be enforceable. It stopped short of actual incorporation of trade unions, and therefore did not, apparently, enable a trade union to sue or be sued at all in its own name, or even in the name of its trustees, except as set out in section 17, and only in reference to property. It was under a disability as compared with a company of not being able to sue its own members for calls, or enforce contracts between members, etc.

“This immunity from being sued had the effect of protecting trade union funds, and for many years there was not the slightest doubt thrown on the immunity which trade unions were supposed to enjoy. In 1901, however, a civil action for conspiracy by certain trade union officials was brought against the trade union in its own name, and it was held by the House of Lords that a trade union might be sued in its registered name, and was responsible for damages for the acts of its officers. This was the famous Taff Vale case, which is cited as *Taff Vale Railway v. Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants* (1901 Appeal Cases, p. 426).

“This was apparently an extension of the law, but the reasons for the decision were summarised by the Earl of Halsbury, Lord Chancellor, at page 436, as follows:—

“If the Legislature has created a thing which can own property, which can employ servants, and which can inflict injury, it must be taken, I think, to have impliedly given the power to make it suable in a court of law for injuries purposely done by its authority and procurement.”

So that the hon. member is quite right when he states that the impression prevailed that their funds were not attachable. The Taff Vale case revealed this weakness, which has been met by amending the English law. But when he speaks about the jury in Queensland, and I suppose also in Great Britain, as being not the class of men who should try industrial cases, I would like him to remember that the jury found the facts, and malicious intent must be proved. I do not propose this afternoon to in any wise follow him in the intricacies of the law; if that is to be done, I leave such to my colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands, who himself is a lawyer, and has taken particular interest in trade union law. But I want to inquire what are the objects of trade unions, and really what called trade unions into existence. I think it will be generally admitted that the competitive system is in part accountable for the institution of trade unions. The number of men who were seeking employment was in excess of the work offering, and the competition caused either an unsatisfactory rate of wages, or a diminution in the prices paid for their labour, and, therefore, the members of various trades and industries and various

(Hon. D. F. Denham.

occupations sought to strengthen their position by co-operating together and forming themselves into trade unions for mutual protection—a perfectly legitimate and laudable object indeed. What, then, was the original thing that drew men together? Their sense of the need of protection, that they might stand shoulder to shoulder in an emergency, and during, perhaps, a time of industrial peace to build up their funds from which to draw in case of their going out on strike. I want to point this out: that the very thing that necessitated or called into being trade unions has been, in recent years, very fully met by enactments in the States of the Commonwealth. The purpose for which men joined together originally was to secure for themselves fair conditions of toil, reasonable hours of labour, and fair remuneration for their work. Those were the original objects for which trade unions were called into being, and from time to time, in order to accomplish their ends, they were called out on strike, as they could not enforce their demands unless they ceased work. During the time they were on strike, with their accumulated fund they were able to pay a small sum to their members.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: As soon as they were exhausted the boss won.

The PREMIER: I do not think that was always the case; the history of strikes has not revealed that. When the men had a good case, they invariably came out successful. It all depends on the case. If they have a good case, and get behind them public opinion, they are bound to win. But in recent years, in the States of Australia, there have been placed on the statute-books special provisions to obviate the necessity for strikes. There is no need for the disbandment of the unions; but the original design of the unions has been secured by statutory enactments in a more satisfactory manner. I refer to the Wages Boards Acts which have been passed in every State, with the exception, possibly, of Tasmania—I do not know whether an Act was passed there last year. Apart from Tasmania, there are wages boards in all the States, the object being to accomplish the very thing which trade unions were established to accomplish—fair conditions, fair remuneration, and proper hours of labour. There are men from either side—employer and employee—who come together and settle the points of difference far better than it could be done by the old method. Public opinion was stirred by trade unions to the necessity of providing better machinery to obviate strife and settle conditions of labour, and not only have we wages boards, but also a Commonwealth Act known as the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I suppose the most powerful organisation in Australia to-day is the Shearers' Union—the strongest politically, and, I suppose, the strongest financially. This very organisation is availing itself of the powers of the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Court. They have been many weeks before the court; and Mr. Justice Higgins spoke of it going on till “the crack of doom.” This is a very costly mode of procedure, whereas the wages boards are simple, ready, and effective. The objects of trade unions were fairly stated by the hon. gentleman to a certain point; but my contention is that apart from the aspect of benefits of mutual support their original purpose is more than realised by putting on the statute-books the measures to which I have referred.

But the hon. gentleman wants to go a great deal further; he wants to secure power so that the organisations shall become not industrial machines, but big political machines. Political unionists—a term to which I suppose the hon. gentleman will take no exception—political unionists to-day recognise that the legislation of recent years has cut the ground from under their feet. It has secured for the worker that for which he has strenuously striven by industrial laws. It does not follow that because we have wages boards and a Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Court that therefore trade unions, *per se*, should be disbanded; but I doubt very much if the trade unionists generally are desirous of being converted into a political machine—the creature of an executive in whose aims, objects, and ambitions they have no interest.

Mr. THEODORE: What about the resolution passed at the congress held in Brisbane last year, which I quoted?

The PREMIER: I will come to that later on. At present the hon. gentleman is not worrying about the disabilities under which unionists are suffering; it is rather to bring into existence a lawful instrument of coercion—(Opposition laughter)—so that the men must contribute a certain sum for a newspaper, must contribute a certain sum for the Central Political Executive to carry out a political platform, in which a large number of unionists have no share or interest.

Mr. BARBER: Does not the boodle crowd do that?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not, if they want to?

The PREMIER: If they want to, there is no reason why they should not voluntarily do so; but the vast proportion of unionists are not socialists, and it is not fair to compel them to subscribe to support propaganda in which they have no interest, and the hon. gentleman said the reason why the registrar turned down his request was that one of the things they required was the socialisation, not the nationalisation, of all the sources of production, distribution, and exchange.

Mr. RYAN: It would be voluntary.

The PREMIER: What position would a man be in if he did not subscribe? I will show the hon. gentleman by quotation that instead of this being a protection to the worker it is the very opposite.

Mr. NEVITT: Let the workers judge.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman referred to the last report of the Registrar of Trade Unions; and I shall refer to the same paragraph of the report, in which we find that the income of the unions for 1909 was £16,867. Then the registrar says—

“The expenditure for 1909 amounted to £16,256, of which £2,532 was paid for benefits, £8,398 for management, and £5,326 for other payments, mainly assistance to other unions, legal and political expenses, contributions to the Labour newspaper, etc.”

This is on page 18 of the report for 1910. The registrar goes on to say—

“In view of recent legal decisions the position of the unions generally respecting these latter payments is doubtful, and I have advised the officials to that effect as necessity has arisen and when considering amendments to rules submitted.”

Now just let us analyse the figures which I

have quoted. Talk about it being a political machine! The object of the trade union originally was that in the event of [4.30 p.m.] their going out on strike there should be something for them to fall back upon, and yet out of £16,000 there was strike money paid, £1,001; sick pay, £544; old age or superannuation, £448; unemployed, £213; and funeral, £284, a total expenditure in what was the original legitimate object of trade unions of £5,532 out of a total expenditure of £16,256. Did the workers when they were contributing expect that about half-a-crown in the £1—it is a little more net, but that is the approximate amount—should be used for what might be designated legitimate trade union purposes, and a little under 17s. 6d. used for the paying of officials, and for the propaganda of their particular species of socialism of all the sources of production, distribution, and exchange? The registrar calls attention to the fact that some of the expenditure is not in accordance with the rule.

Mr. HARDACRE: We want the rule altered.

The PREMIER: I do not think it would be well to put such a mighty weapon in the hands of the Central Political Executive. (Loud Opposition laughter.) How many workers are there in this State who have no sympathy with socialistic principles, and yet such would be the thumb-screw they would all have to subscribe to an organisation with which they had no sympathy. Trade unions are right as an industrial organisation. But you are trying to prostitute them into a political organisation. It is quite apparent that the Registrar of Friendly Societies and Trade Unions has already found that large sums have been misappropriated, or perhaps I should say, applied to a wrong purpose. For all practical purposes the law upon our statute-book is quite effective to secure the objects of industrial unionism—that is, to secure better terms of employment and fair hours of labour. I would go this far, at any rate—reverting to the Taff Vale and the Osborne case—to protect a provident fund of a union against claims founded on acts of unauthorised officials. If the hon. member wishes to have the security that he is seeking, is he prepared to accept all the liabilities of incorporation?

Mr. RYAN: Will you impose the same condition on employers?

The PREMIER: Will the hon. gentleman accept all the conditions of incorporation the same as a limited liability company? That is a different matter. He wants all on one side and none on the other.

Mr. RYAN: Are you prepared to give incorporation?

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to give immunity to the provident fund of a union as against claims founded on acts of unauthorised officials.

Mr. RYAN: Are you prepared to incorporate, I ask?

The PREMIER: I think so, with all the liability of it. I am perfectly willing to consider industrial laws. I am willing, if industrial laws to-day are not effective, to have them amended so that they shall be effective, or I am perfectly willing to

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

amend the trade union law to provide that the contributions which the various persons shall give per week or per month shall be allocated to a benefit fund, strike fund, or superannuation fund; but I do not think it is a fair thing to put power into the hands of a few men to extort under a trade union a sum of money to support a propaganda for them with which they have no affinity or no liking.

Mr. COYNE: Who told you so?

The PREMIER: I gather that clearly from the mover of the resolution, also from the perusal of one of the latest copies of the Parliamentary Debates in the House of Commons, from which I will quote directly to support my position. I think it is recognised in Great Britain generally that they have made great advances in legislation controlling trade unions, and preparatory to quoting Mr. F. E. Smith, a prominent member of the British House of Commons—

Mr. BARBER: The most conservative member in the House.

The PREMIER: I will quote the Hon. A. Lyttleton, who points out the big strides that have been made in trade unionism in Great Britain. He says—

“I might remind the House how great and expansive are the privileges which have been granted to trade unions (by the Act of 1906). When a trade dispute is being carried on the law of conspiracy, the Master of Rolls said, is repealed. Boycotting is made legal. Immunity is given to the trade union in a trade dispute. Immunity is given even to members who induce a breach of contract which has been deliberately made. Or, higher even than that, immunity is given to a trade union from all liability in consequence of civil wrong.”

Mr. RYAN: That is not so here. You are misleading if you quote that.

The PREMIER: I am quoting an hon. member of the House of Commons, speaking quite recently.

Mr. RYAN: On a different law.

The PREMIER: On the question at present before the House of Commons now, to enable trade unions to legally apply money for political purposes.

Mr. RYAN: Will you make the law the same as it is in England?

The PREMIER: No, I will not.

Mr. FOLEY: That is giving the whole show away.

The PREMIER: When the hon. gentleman quoted the Osborne case just now, he knew quite well it was not an analogous case at all. The Osborne case was to provide a fund to secure parliamentary representation. Here the State provides that. Now they are proposing to legalise the use of union funds for political purposes, and it is in connection with that that I am quoting the Hon. A. Lyttleton, and will also later on quote Mr. Smith—

“These are enormous privileges. For myself, I have never said that they are fully justified, and I never will say it. I believe that two of them, and some of the very best friends of trade unions say so—that by which you are going to give immunity for all actions of tort and of civil wrong, and that which gives immunity for deliberately seeking to set aside and inducing breach of contract—are indefensible on any ground. I pass from that. I quite admit that they are now on the statute-book, having been passed in 1906.”

The Hon. A. Lyttleton referred to that

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

point and strenuously objected to giving power to the union to coerce members to financially support a political organisation. Now, the Attorney-General introduced this Bill, and he was followed immediately by one of the legal lights in England and a very prominent member of the House of Commons. I am quoting vol. 26, No. 80, of Parliamentary Debates in the House of Commons, bearing particularly upon the phrase that the hon. member seeks to incorporate into our Act. He wants certain disabilities removed so as to secure that the funds of the unions shall be appropriated for political purposes. I do not think I am misinterpreting him in that. Further, he wants money appropriated for the purpose of supporting a newspaper.

Mr. THEODORE: I just want to say that the members should really spend their own money in their own way—to cut it short.

The PREMIER: Not in their own way, but in the way dictated by socialistic propagandists. Mr. Smith says—

“The real importance of this Bill does not lie in the least in those provisions which could have been embodied in a non-controversial Bill. The important parts of this Bill come under two heads. First of all, there is the enabling of trade unions by ballot to decide to make contributions towards political objects.”

That is what the hon. member does—

“In the second place there is the provision which, to my mind, is wholly illusory, for giving protection to minorities where such a ballot has been decided upon. Let me, in the first place, state the objections which I entertained to the proposed safeguards in this provision as far as the ballot is concerned. The Act allows a trade union to devote itself to political objects and to collect a political fund, provided that a resolution is passed recommending this course by a majority of the members voting.

“The Attorney-General, in the early part of his speech, made some observations upon the singular lack of correspondence between the total membership of a trade union and the number of members who take part in a ballot. If this provision is maintained in its present form, what does it mean? It means that an extraordinary small minority of the total members of a union may legalise the practice of exacting political contributions for all the members. I can give an illustration of that. Take the case in which the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, with a total membership of 107,000, voted on the question of a shilling levy to replenish the parliamentary fund. On that occasion there voted in favour 5,110 members, and against 2,056, out of a total membership of 107,000.”

Mr. FOLEY: All had an opportunity to vote.

The PREMIER: Yes; but that all goes to show what a tremendous power the minority may exert, when 5,110 members control a membership of 107,000. Mr. Smith further says—

“Take the Shipwrights' Society as another illustration. The total number of members in this case was 21,805, and there voted in favour of the levy 3,133, and 1,000 against it. In other words, only 4,000 members voted out of a total membership of 21,000. Then there is the Boilermakers' Society, with a total membership of 50,900. In this case there voted in favour of the levy 3,371, and 1,000 or 2,000 against it. Out of a membership of 50,000 only about 4,000 voted, and yet under this Bill it would be possible for those 4,000 to decide that a fund should be collected for political purposes.”

Now we come to something which to my mind

is entirely applicable to the state of affairs in Queensland, and which expresses very clearly the reason why I certainly would not favour making it possible for unions to make levies upon their members for political propagandist work, or for the support of any particular newspaper—

“With regard to the second part, providing for this alleged protection of minorities, I will state my objection as inoffensively as I can to hon. members below the gangway. The objection I have to this provision is that, after considering all the evidence which is accessible to me, I am convinced that intimidation is simply rampant in trade unions in these matters.”

Mr. FOLEY: Whom are you quoting from?

The PREMIER: I am quoting from Mr. F. E. Smith. He says further—

“It is a farce to talk about dissident members being able to carry out their individual wishes and take advantage of the so-called protection which is contained in this Bill. What is the alleged protection contained in paragraph (c) of clause 3? It is as follows:—

“That a member who is exempt from the obligation to contribute to the political fund of the union shall not be excluded from any benefits of the union, or placed in any respect, either directly or indirectly, under any disability or disadvantage as compared with other members of the union (except in relation to the control or management of the political fund) by reason of his being so exempt.”

Mr. Smith goes on to say—

“It does not, however, give the slightest protection, for the simple reason that the circumstances do not admit of the slightest protection being given to individual members of the union. There is not the slightest protection given them. Let me just take a few important cases, which will show what is the real nature of the protection which must be given if this clause is put into operation.”

Mr. FOLEY: What is the use of quoting that?

The PREMIER: It is absolutely pertinent to the case in point, and it puts the case so succinctly and forcibly that it cannot very well be improved upon. He goes on to show how that operates—

“I gave an illustration to the Attorney-General in debate three weeks ago. I remember he said it disclosed a most lamentable state of affairs. I can only say those particulars were widely published, and I have received no contradiction of the facts as stated the other night. Let me very shortly summarise those facts. There was formed in Lancashire a Conservative trade union. Hon. members below the gangway may disagree as much as they like with the political view of the members of that union, but no one has dared to say they did not conform to every condition of wages and labour insisted on by hon. gentlemen below the gangway in their trade unions. They were working at a mine in Lancashire, and it happened that it was a mine which could not be closed, even for a short time, without disaster. The trade unionists who were working in that mine went to the manager and said: “We will not work side by side with the members of the Conservative trade union, and if you do not turn them out and deprive them of their livelihood we will leave your mine, and you will be ruined.” This pressure was resisted for some days, I think for about a fortnight or three weeks, but ultimately the manager was most reluctantly compelled to give way in order to save his mine; and the result was, these Conservative trade unionists lost their employment, not because they were not adhering to trade union conditions, but for the one and

only reason that they were Conservatives in their political views. These facts were stated in debate, and they have never been contradicted in the Press or by anyone else, and not one single member of the Labour party has expressed the slightest disapproval of the tyranny exercised.”

Mr. RYAN: What is all this for?

The PREMIER: If the hon. member will make a pertinent inquiry I will answer him. I clearly understand my subject, and I say distinctly that I am not prepared to confer any power upon unionists which will enable them to use their funds for the promotion or promulgation of socialistic unionism.

Several members of the Opposition interjecting,

The SPEAKER said: Order! Hon. members on my left will have an opportunity later on of refuting the statements of the Premier, and should refrain from interjecting.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: These things are actually pertinent and exactly analogous to what the hon. member is seeking to secure in Queensland. The hon. member has admitted that I have not misrepresented him. It is asked that members of unions should be compelled to contribute a certain sum towards the Central Political Executive—(loud Opposition laughter)—a certain sum towards the maintenance of a certain newspaper. That clearly means that members may be compelled to support certain political propagandist work which they do not believe in in order to keep hon. members opposite in their positions. It is not in the interest of the worker or in the interest of industry that the proposed amendments of the law are advocated, but in order to secure for themselves a permanent tenure of office as members of Parliament, and particularly at no cost at election time. Mr. Smith further says—

“What is the use of pointing to a clause like this, and saying that it gives the slightest protection to any member of a trade union who wishes to exercise his right not to subscribe to the political levy? What is the kind of thing that would happen? Members of trade unions working side by side with men who would not contribute would make their life in that trade union impossible. An hon. gentleman says that would not happen.”

They do not deny it; you notice that. (Opposition laughter.) It was not met with a laugh in the House of Commons. Mr. Smith goes on—

“He cannot have paid great attention to what has happened quite recently in trade unions. Take a case reported in *The Times*, 2nd September. It was never contradicted by any representative of the Labour party. It is stated in a report sent by *The Times* representative that at Abertyswg, on 2nd September, in connection with the Tonypandy disturbances—”

I think we have heard that name before. That is where the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher told the people “There is plenty of room in Australia for miners,” and he invited the men on strike to come to Australia. I may tell the hon. senior member for Ipswich, who stated the other day that there is no room in Queensland for more coalminers, that I have sent a cablegram to the Agent-General saying it is not desirable to encourage miners to come here; but the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher told them last week that there was plenty of room for them.

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

Mr. THEODORE: You don't want the Tonypandy men here.

The PREMIER: Mr. Smith went on—

"In connection with the Tonypandy disturbances, a non-unionist was surrounded by many thousands of people. He was wheeled down the street in a wheelbarrow, and, as he adhered to his refusal to join the federation, he was drenched with water, and then, such is the persuasiveness of such methods, he acknowledged himself a convert, and expressed his readiness to join the federation."

We do not want a reproduction here of anything of that kind.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That was cold water conversion.

The PREMIER: Then he gives other illustrations—

"At Gilfach two alleged defaulters were captured. They were called defaulters because they were men who had belonged to the trade union and who did not wish to continue their membership. They were recognised in the street, dressed up in women's clothes, brought back to the meeting, and compelled to abandon their default and pay up. Surely no one will be under the slightest misapprehension! The only reason this violence was used—no one will defend it—was simply because the trade unionists resented, and were prepared to resent by violence, if necessary, the fact that other men working side by side with them would not accept the view of those who used the violence."

Mr. THEODORE: You must surely be quoting from a debate in the House of Commons.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: From a speech by one of the rising Tories.

Mr. THEODORE: They are most extravagant sentiments.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: Mr. Smith goes on—

"If it be true, as I contend it is true, that no real protection at all is given to dissident trade unionists under this Bill, how does the matter stand? It has been very simply explained by the hon. member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Keir Hardie) at Swansea quite recently. Not this time by a Conservative, but by Mr. Keir Hardie."

It is well that the people of Queensland should know what is lying behind the proposition to secure similar conditions in this State—

"Labour representation means more than sending a member to the House of Commons. It is a means to an end, and that end is not trade unionism, but socialism."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Every time I am prepared to do anything to assist industrial trade unionism, but I am not going to help in any wise to secure socialistic trade unionism. Mr. Smith says further on—

"You are going to compel Liberals and Conservatives to contribute to the political support of men whose one idea is to extend the doctrines of socialism."

That is just the position in this State. If the hon. member's wishes are complied with and the law is amended in the way that is asked, and unions can exact from their members a sum of money to be used legally for political propaganda, we shall find the same kind of thing happening in Queensland that Mr. Smith so graphically points out is being rampant in the old country.

Mr. BARBER: Does Mr. Smith say anything about the Central Political Executive?

[Hon. D. F. Denham.]

The PREMIER: There is no gainsaying the fact that to secure their rights the men and women of Queensland have suffered privations. All honour to the men and women of the earlier days of trade unionism who suffered great privations in order to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. MULLAN: And they will do it again.

Mr. FOLEY: They are doing it now.

The PREMIER: But it is equally true that the Legislature has recognised the inhumanity that has inflicted strikes, and has legislated to make them illegal. There is no necessity for strike methods with the provisions that are on the statute-book to-day, and hon. members opposite know that quite well, and realise quite clearly that their mission as promoters or advocates of trade unionism will slip from them under the legislation that we now have on the statute-book, and therefore they are seeking wholly to control unionism, and in this specious way secure a tribute, willy-nilly, from willing and unwilling unionists towards the support of a propaganda with which they are not all in sympathy. It is well known that many men, if not intimidated, have been unduly influenced, and, whilst I am sincerely desirous of assisting in every way to make the lot, to make the prospects, to make the influence of the workers, all that it should be in this fair land, I shall certainly use every effort to resist anything that savours of coercion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: There is no question about it that there will be strong coercion—as evidenced by the resolution and by the speech of the hon. member who proposed it—if ever what is now proposed becomes statute law, men who do not subscribe to the political beliefs of the unions will quietly pay their money rather than be turned out of the union. The bulk of the workers of Queensland and of Australia desire to pursue their way under the protection of the law, and they do not want to be leg-roped or to be forced to subscribe to the propagation of a policy and a platform with which they are not in accord; and that being so I cannot help the hon. member to carry the resolution. I cannot consent to remove disabilities that will at the same time impose a yoke—a political tyranny—upon the democracy of this State. Consequently I shall vote against the motion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON (Rockhampton): I did not expect to have to speak on this subject this afternoon, because I was under the impression that the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Bowen was to come on for discussion. But, after having heard the Premier, and knowing something about the history of trade unionism, knowing something about its evolution, and knowing something about its present intentions, I think that I would be doing wrong to sit silent while a lot of things are being said which, to my mind at any rate, misrepresent trade unionism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Trade unions have always been political. I was born in the midst of trade unionism—reared in the midst of it, and I have seen it develop for the last forty years, at any rate; and there has never been a time during that period in which trade unions have not been political. There are men in the British House of Com-

mons to-day who are regarded by some—and by Conservatives as well as by Liberals—as the best men in the House of Commons, so far as trade unionists are concerned—though I do not regard them in that way now, because I think those men are belated—such men as Thomas Burt and John Wilson—men who belonged to the old trade unions; and anyone who has read Howell's "History of Old Trade Unions" knows exactly what the old trade unions stood for. While they were benefit societies from many standpoints, they also stood for protecting the interests of the labourer so far as wages and hours and other things were concerned. But the men who went into Parliament—the men who have made a name for themselves in Parliament—were men who were trained in the old trade unions. Of course others of us have read about the newer unionism. From Mr. Sydney Webb's book, and some other books [5 p.m.] dealing with unionism, we know to-day that unions aim to become political. We know to-day that the majority of unionists, those unionists who are prepared to make sacrifices for themselves, and who do not think of the pounds, shillings, and pence always, are prepared to fight for the unions becoming political. And there is nobody more responsible for this than the men represented by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House. Everyone knows that in 1891 we were told to give up striking and go in for political action, and the trade unionists took that advice.

Mr. RYLAND: And now they are not satisfied. (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: The trade unionists sent men to Parliament to legislate in a certain way, and they have gone on legislating in a certain way. We hail with pleasure the coming of wages boards and the coming of arbitration and conciliation courts and that kind of thing. But away back in 1880 in the North of England we had our arbitration courts and our sliding scales and that kind of thing, so that there is nothing new so far as these things are concerned. They become recognised as part of the laws of the country. Trade unionists in Queensland realise that the wages boards as constituted are such that the men who preside over them do not always do what we think is the right thing to do, and therefore we contend still that it is as well for the trade unionists to have the power to strike—to use the weapon of strike when it is necessary. Personally, I am one of those who believe that strikes are a relic of barbarism, as industrial war, but I also believe that the competitive system is a relic of barbarism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: It belongs to this age, and the barbaric conditions which brought it to the front, and, when the competitive system passes, the necessity for strikes will also pass. Later, when co-operation becomes the law that governs in industrial matters, and men are prepared to assist each other, there will be no need for striking, because men will seek to co-operate and give to each other the very best conditions possible. There is one statement which the Hon. the Chief Secretary made which I want to rebut. He made us feel that the funds of the trade unions are used in a foolish way against the wish of the majority of the unions. He said that the funds were used foolishly.

The PREMIER: I never used the expression "foolishly" this afternoon.

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not know what the hon. gentleman wanted to infer when he said that a certain sum was used for striking, which was not legitimate trade unionism, and a certain sum was used for expenses. I want the hon. member to listen to the list of expenses of the Australian Workers' Union, one of the largest organisations in Australia. This is what Mr. W. G. Spence, M.P., the president of the Australian Workers' Union, says in his book, "Australia's Awakening"—

"The Australian Workers' Union is not only the largest, but the most vigorous and aggressive of Labour organisations. I have recently finished a summary of the total receipts and expenditure of the organisation since its inception in 1886, including the Queensland section. All cross entries have been eliminated so far as I could trace them. The various items have been concentrated under as few heads as possible, so as to present the statement in a simple form. The following is the result of my investigation of the various balance-sheets:—

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
To Entrance Fees and Contributions	273,327	5	8
Levies	19,700	12	6
Fines	1,828	19	10
Donations	16,735	14	6
Various other items, such as rent, sales of material, etc.	5,721	9	5
Total	£317,312	1	11

EXPENDITURE.

By Salaries	61,320	1	2
Organisers' Wages and Expenses	39,913	11	1
Strike Expenses	54,533	1	9
Law Expenses and Legal Charges	12,823	18	11
Printing and Advertising	20,922	8	6
Postage, Telegrams, etc.	13,946	17	9
Committee Expenses	4,703	12	5
Donations to other Unions and various objects	26,537	12	0
Co-operation, Worker, etc.	44,491	0	2
Political and Parliamentary Refunds, Fines, Forfeited Wages, etc.	5,543	13	7
Various other items, totalling	15,128	10	10
Total Expenditure	£306,329	13	9
Leaving a Balance in hand of	10,982	8	2

Of the above the following may be classed as direct benefits returned to unionists:—

	£	s.	d.
Strike Expenses	54,533	1	9
Legal Charges	12,823	18	11
Donations	21,537	12	0
Worker, etc.	44,491	0	2
Refunds	5,543	13	7
Political	6,465	5	7
Total	£150,394	12	0

"Practically one-half the moneys paid are returned in benefits, the other half paying for cost of running the union. No allowance is made for the very large saving effected by having the two Workers as a means of communication between the office and the members. Thousands of pounds per annum are saved in advertisements alone. As a matter of fact, the union could not carry on its work at present cost without having its own organs. This is looking at it from a purely business point of view. From the educational standpoint, the good done is simply incalculable. In our Universities teaching is carried on by means of lectures. Professors condense into a series

Mr. Adamson.]

of lectures the essence of thought and knowledge of the world, thus enabling the youthful listeners to start at the point of evolution now attained. The *Worker* and the travelling organisers are the educators of our members. They give extension lectures. They tell of progress made. They set forth the ideals of the great Labour movement. In that sense they do University work, and the cost is more than repaid in the enlightenment of our members, who are notoriously the best informed of Australian unionists."

I want to read another portion of what Mr. Spence says. The Chief Secretary read a great deal from the debates going on in the English Parliament. I want to say that there are some things in those speeches that he read which appeared in this book of Mr. Spence's years ago. We aim to make the trade unions political, and everything we can do in the future will be to make them more and more political.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

This is what Mr. Spence said—

"When a strike takes place every union man is expected to cease working in the particular industry concerned."

The majority rule that the hon. gentleman talked so much about. Those on that side of the House are always in favour of the minority when they are doing something to prevent the workers getting better conditions.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: They are in favour of the majority when the majority is crushing the workers. Here is what Mr. Spence says—

"The large mass of unionists in Australia have declared a strike against electing any but Labour men to Parliament, realising that the battle-ground is now on the floor of the law-making chamber; yet some unions stand aloof and decline to join in support, thus hoping to defeat the main body. Neither rules nor benefits should stand in the way. Old laws made by the dead have hampered progress, and it is our duty to change them. It would be better to wind up all such unions as feel tied up by rules, and reorganise on up-to-date modern lines."

We have organised up to date on modern lines, and will continue to organise.

"Unions are good, and are profitable only whilst they live up to the ideals underlying the movement which gave them birth. Such a union is worth belonging to, and the return is great. Its members gain social status, in self-respect, and in development of social instinct and interest in the realisation of social and political power. Industrial unionism is the first step towards securing a co-operative Commonwealth."

I want to say that we plead guilty to the charge made by the Premier. We say that the aim of unionism is to bring in socialism. That is the reason of this party's existence. We never hesitated to say it, and we believe that socialism is in harmony with the highest and best things in the religion that we profess to-day.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Mr. Spence continues—

"The second step is the application of union principles and machinery to the exercise of political power. With all workers organised and acting together, complete control of the country's Parliament is assured, and the banishment of enforced poverty certain. Injustice will disappear, a new and healthier environment be created, and mankind raised to a higher plane of existence. The workers who stand aloof from unionism retard progress, and help to add to the sum of human

[Mr. Adamson.

misery. Those who join become part of the grand army working for better and saner conditions of life."

I want the Premier and members on the other side to realise that we have never hidden for one moment what our objects are, and I would not be in this party if I did not think it was a socialistic party, and what we hope to do is to seek, as far as we can in a legitimate way, to lead unionists to become socialists.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: I want to say there is no secrecy about the Amalgamated Workers' Association; but I say, if a majority of men in any union say their funds should be used for political purposes, then, as in every case, the minority should bow to the majority and be loyal to those who wish to advance the best interests of their class. If I had known this debate was coming on this afternoon, I should have fortified myself with some of the speeches of other members of the British House of Commons, members of the other side, and it is a pity we have not the present Attorney-General on the floor of this House. Those who read his speech on the Trade Disputes Bill which he introduced know he has a great deal of sympathy in a certain direction, at any rate; but if there are lawyers in England who are afraid of the unionists getting political power, there are also lawyers in England who are in favour of them having it, and who are working for it. I have here in my hand the last number of an English paper which I received to-day, and there is a paragraph here dealing with the Trade Union Bill. This is a series of notes written by one of the brainiest of British Labour members, a man who has the credit of having had a great deal to do with Lloyd-George's Budget, a man who is said to have had a great deal to do with the insurance scheme that Lloyd-George brought in, and he is said to have some influence with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the old country. This is what he said about the present situation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is his name?

Mr. ADAMSON: Mr. Philip Snowden. This is what he said—

"The Government's Trade Union Bill for dealing with the situation created by the decision in the Osborne case has been introduced. It bears in every line evidence of the unwillingness of the Government to make the full concession which the trade unions in their conferences have unanimously demanded."

I want the Premier to remember that. He said it was only a minority of trade unions of England that were asking for it. This article states that the trade unions have unanimously demanded this change, and that is a very important thing. The Premier thought to lead us to believe only a few trade unions were asking for it. We know it is the great majority of them who are asking for it—

"It is quite clear from the terms of the Bill that the Government are being reluctantly forced to do something, and they are limiting the concession to the barest point which might be accepted. But I do not think the trade unions can take this measure as a settlement of their case. It does not put them in the position they occupied before the House of Lords' decision. It does not make political work one of the statutory functions of a trade union. It gives direct encouragement to the minority man to contract out of paying for the benefits he gets from Labour representation. It does not appear to provide for trade unions

joining together for political purpose in such a federation as the Labour party, nor does it give power to trades councils to engage in political work. It does not concede as much as we were led to expect from the answers which the Prime Minister gave on this question in November."

That is the position to-day. What does it mean? That the English Government are not going to do what they promised practically. It shows that the Liberal party are not more to be depended upon than the Conservative party towards this great question affecting the trade unions, and whatever the Premier may say about the men of Tonypandy they are the true descendants of unionists who fought against the conspiracy law, who gave up their positions, who starved, and their wives and children starved, and I glory in the men and women of Tonypandy far more than the men who accept the benefits of trade unions and would not make any sacrifice to obtain those benefits.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: What does it mean? It means the agitation is going on. It means that the trade unions are going to continue that agitation, and it means before very long the Liberal Government will have to give way and trade unions will become political organisations working in harmony with the desires of the great mass of workers in this country and other countries for the welfare of humanity. I read during the last fortnight two reports of the Labour Commission that went to Germany last year, and what is stated in those two reports? That in the places where there are no trade unions the workers are in a bad condition. It is not the paternal Legislature, the German Reichstag, that has placed the workers in a better condition. It is the things which have been wrested from the German Government by the trade unions; and to-night, if I get a chance to speak on the Address in Reply, I will quote figures to prove that unionism has made more progress in Germany during the last three years than in any other part of Europe. The trade unionists are amongst the most intelligent and most advanced and most socialistic in the world, and depend upon it, those men are going to win. We find some men condemning anarchists, socialists, and others. Why, there have been some splendid men among them, and, personally, I glory in the idea that we stand for a co-operative commonwealth. I want to say, as Andrew Carnegie said, "Surely a time will soon come when service for others will be the prime incentive to all progress, when men shall cease to exploit each other, and when men will live to serve each other!" (Hear, hear!) We have got some men who want more than ever they can use while they are willing to leave others starve, and what we want to eliminate is the extreme of wealth on the one hand and the extreme of poverty on the other, and it is because I believe trade unions may become a political party to do this, that I will do all I can anywhere and everywhere to advance trade unionism, notwithstanding what the Premier said this afternoon.

Mr. D. HUNTER (*Woolloongabba*): I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down posing as a trade unionist. I did not know before that he was one; neither did I know that the leader of the Opposition was a trade unionist. I have a fancy that they are only trying to capture the unions for political pur-

poses. The hon. member who introduced the subject told us that trade unions could not hold property. I was under the impression that there was a union in Turbot street owning the Trades Hall; and I happen to be a trustee of a union which has property in Queensland; but we are not entitled to hold property and do an injustice to an individual without that property being liable to attachment.

Mr. HARDACRE: What do you mean by an injustice?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I will tell you before I sit down. I was pleased to hear the Premier's statement that he is quite prepared to legislate so as to give some security for union funds which are used for certain purposes. If they are used for insurance against sickness, unemployment, old age, accident, or the loss of tools, then we have just as much right to protect them as to protect an insurance policy. I was struck the other day, when at the old-age pensions office, to find that even under the Old-age Pensions Act the insurance is taken into account and the surrender value reckoned as property a man possesses. It was an eye-opener to me—and the Labour party are not seeking to amend that. I am connected with a society that has been in existence fifty-one years, and which has raised the condition of the trade to a very large extent.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It is very weak in Queensland.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Very much stronger than the society the hon. gentleman supports. At the next election his society, which is dominated by the Trades Hall, will be found to be weak enough. I repeat that I am glad the Premier is willing to give protection to union funds to the extent I have stated. In 1908—I am sorry I have not the figures for a later period—the society with which I am connected spent at the rate of £1 16s. 8d. per member for unemployed benefit. That was a thing worth securing to the worker, and it would be a pity if anything was done to make that sum liable to attachment. We spent at the rate of 1s. 1½d. on tool benefit—which is a considerable amount, as there are over 61,000 members. That also should be secured from attachment for the misdeeds of officials. We spent for sick benefit 14s. 9½d. per member; and that also should be secured. We also spent at the rate of 2s. 4d. for funeral benefit.

Mr. FOLEY: All subject to attachment under the law now.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I am glad the Minister is prepared to amend that. We also spent at the rate of 1s. 7d. on accident benefit, for which we paid sums from £50 to £100; also at the rate of 15s. 3½d. for aged members over fifty-five years, who received 8s. a week. Was not that also a worthy thing? Long before there were old-age pensions in Australia this society adopted the attitude of paying their old members a pension when unable to earn the ordinary rate of wages. In assistance to strikers we paid at the rate of 14s., which was exceptional. The year before the rate was only 11½d., and the year before that only 8d. The whole of the funds, to a large extent, go in benefits to the members, and I consider it is only fair that those funds should be protected, even in a Trade Disputes Bill. For that reason I support the programme of

Mr. D. Hunter.]

a Trade Disputes Bill; but when you ask for power to force men into unions and force them to contribute 4s. 4d. a year towards the *Worker*, the official organ of the Labour party, that is another matter.

Mr. THEODORE: Where is the compulsion?

Mr. D. HUNTER: If you join the Labour Federation you have to contribute to that paper.

Mr. HARDACRE: You do not join unless you want to.

Mr. D. HUNTER: If your society goes in, you have to be a contributor to the newspaper. They force every man not only to be a unionist, but to be a Labour agitator or a worker in the interests of labour.

Mr. HARDACRE: Does not the same thing apply to all unions?

Mr. D. HUNTER: No. It is different when you ask men to become unionists for the purpose of lifting themselves up. That is a fair proposition; but it is a different matter when you say, "You must also think with us and act with us, or out you go."—like the member for Fitzroy.

Mr. HARDACRE: The majority rule.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The majority has no right to rule on political matters in connection with any union.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. D. HUNTER: I know that in my union there are all shades of opinion, and always will be; and I would not [5.30 p.m.] fear to take a vote on the question to-morrow against my friends on the other side. Why have they been trying to kill that union for years? They are doing it now.

Mr. MAUGHAN: What union is that?

Mr. D. HUNTER: The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners. They have been trying to kill it for a long time, and they have never succeeded.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is the most conservative association in Queensland.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is conservative because it pays benefits to its workers. I suppose it would not be a conservative organisation if it paid for a working delegate who was aspiring for parliamentary honours. The report of the Registrar of Trade Unions, as quoted by the Premier, shows exactly what was going on in connection with these unions. I have made mention of this before, but it shows to a large extent what would happen if they had absolute control. They are paying the most money for management expenses. I will give some of them. In connection with the Brisbane female clothing trade the contribution per head last year was 4s. 4d., and the expenditure per head was 8s. 4d., and the most of that was spent in management expenses.

Mr. MAUGHAN: What has it to do with the motion?

Mr. D. HUNTER: It has this to do with it: It is a very bad advertisement for Queensland, a very bad case for those female workers if they cannot live within their means, and yet we are encouraging that sort of thing—the spending of far more than they can contribute, and in what? That 4s. 4d. went for the *Worker*, and where did the rest go? It went in management expenses. Now to come again to the Brisbane coalworkers.

[Mr. D. Hunter.

Their contribution was £1 6s. 2d., and their expenditure was £1 7s. 3d. for management expenses alone. What are the management expenses? The whole object is a walking delegate, who goes about inspecting the State inspectors. They stand up in this House and ask for State inspectors, but they do not trust them. They have to have a walking delegate paid by the people. Without the engineers and amalgamated carpenters, there is a levy upon every unionist in Queensland to the extent of 10s. 3½d. per head per year for management expenses alone. If this party or any other party endeavoured to put a poll tax of 10s. 3½d. a year, what would happen? Yet the people have to be compelled to become unionists whether they want or not, and pay 10s. 3½d. for the support of that union, and they want the protection of the Government.

Mr. HARDACRE: No compulsion.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is not a compulsory thing, but this preference to a union means compulsion. Tell us what it means. Where are the interjections of hon. members now? If preference is granted to a union, then non-unionists have no chance till everything is used up. That is why I object to unions being organisations.

Mr. HARDACRE: They do not need to support it if they do not want to.

Mr. D. HUNTER: We know what that means. We were told on a deputation that forty-six were represented at a certain meeting in a gas dispute, and the secretary and the president came to a certain resolution that the only way to settle the dispute was by a general strike. We know that sometimes presidents and secretaries do not reflect the opinion of the people whom they represent, and that is why I say that our funds should not be attached for men who are not representing the members.

Mr. HARDACRE: You are misrepresenting that case—the men said they did not carry the resolution.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The men said in a letter to the Premier that in their opinion, come to unanimously, the only way to settle that dispute was by a general strike.

Mr. HARDACRE: And the men did not carry the resolution.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Every one of them had to "eat the leek" before the union; not one union supported the action of those men. I challenge contradiction.

Mr. ADAMSON: That shows there is no compulsion—it shows that the majority rule.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It shows that there was a good deal of bluff practised by the presidents and secretaries, and when they made that statement they knew they would not support it. I say it is not fair, because of the irresponsible action of presidents and secretaries, to attach the insurance funds of a society. The object of our industrial legislation lately has been, and I hope will continue to be, to prevent trade disputes altogether. A Trade Disputes Bill to me is a misnomer. We do not want trade disputes—a trade dispute is a trade strike. There can be no object in amending the Act unless there is an intention to do some damage. Consequently in that regard I must say that I am against all strikes. Here is a copy of the official report of the fifth Intercolonial Trade Union Congress held in Brisbane in

1888, and in it you will find that I took up the same attitude then—that the power to strike was a splendid power to possess, but desperate power to put into practice.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You were pretty extreme in those days.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Perhaps a little more extreme than I am now. I have gained a little more sense. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MAUGHAN: Would you mind reading us a little of that speech?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I said then—

“Too often employers took advantage of such immigrants, and got them to work for wages below the current average rate, or the men, struggling under the difficulties of language, offered their labour at half its value.”

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do not stop—go on a little further.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I say that cannot happen now. Under our wages board system it is impossible, for our wages board system says what our arbitration did not say and cannot say, because the arbitration court cannot declare a common rule, and every man who works in any industry, no matter whether he is a unionist or not, is entitled to the rate of wages fixed by that award.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Will the hon. member read a little further on in his speech?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I will read further if the hon. member will tell me the part that he wants. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MAUGHAN: I have read it all.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I am quite prepared to let hon. members read my speech when they get up. I have no doubt they will quote anything they can find, and if they have to go back to 1888 to find something against me, I think that will just show that some men never learn anything at all. On that side you never learn anything; you are not allowed to think, and that is the position they want the unionists to get into here.

Mr. ADAMSON: You are an insulting man. (Laughter.)

Mr. D. HUNTER: They want to be able by a majority rule to dictate to men who happen to be forced into a union, not only how he shall act as far as his trade is concerned, but how he shall vote when he goes into the ballot-box. Is that a fair position to take up? Is it fair that a man should be dominated and made a political machine, simply because a majority of his trade should happen to be made a union in a certain direction? I have the utmost sympathy with my fellow-workmen, and I want to help them by wages boards, and to assist them in every way possible to settle their disputes without having recourse to strikes. My idea is that the best thing we can do for working men is to help them to avoid industrial disputes altogether. The Labour Government in New South Wales is legislating at the present moment in that direction, and I would do everything possible to avoid industrial disputes and at the same time secure justice to the workers.

Mr. HARDACRE: The only thing is, you don't want them to be represented in Parliament.

Hon. R. PHILP: Misrepresented.

Mr. D. HUNTER: There is no danger of their being unrepresented in Parliament, but I should like to see them properly repre-

sented. But allow me to continue the discussion of the motion. There is no occasion for this proposal, unless there is an intention to encourage strikes, because we have legislation on our statute-book which has for its object the prevention of strikes and the securing of a fair thing to the workers. The trend of all our industrial legislation is in that direction. In England such legislation as the hon. member desires is necessary, because they have no other way of settling trade disputes. But we in Australia have invented a system by which strikes can be avoided, and we should discourage strikes as much as possible. I do not want to say anything nasty about members on the other side, but I am constrained to say that I have noticed that whenever an industrial dispute occurs—I do not care what the cause is, or whether the dispute is afterwards proved to be unjustifiable, or whether it is afterwards proved that the workmen were in the wrong—members opposite are bound to cling like leeches to that cause, and to advocate the case of the men. There was a strike in Sydney not long ago in connection with the gasworks, and when it came before the referee, Mr. Watson, the old leader of the Federal Labour party, he was compelled to acknowledge that the men were in the wrong. Again, only the other day there was an attempt at a strike at Moree, in New South Wales, and a Labour Minister sent men to the place to take their jobs, what members on the other side call “scabs.” The hon. member for Warrego stated the other day that he could not find any name too bad for a man who took the place of another who was out on strike. I would ask the hon. member if “murderer” is too bad a name? But let members opposite call them “scabs,” or anything they like. If it amuses them, it will do us no harm. What I wish to point out is that if a man in a union has an opinion of his own and gives expression to it, he is called all sorts of opprobrious names, and we see men in power who have helped to create strikes. If such a Bill as is suggested is introduced, I shall be prepared to do all in my power to give relief to the workers in every case where it absolutely right, especially as far as the insurance of workmen is concerned. Mr. Lloyd-George's scheme of insurance is pretty well based on the rules of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and the rules of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and a scheme of that kind is worthy of the most serious consideration. In England they have no arbitration court and no wages boards, so that it is necessary there that the power to strike should remain with the workmen. But let us by all means in our power seek to pass legislation which will do away with industrial disputes, and stave off the misery which is brought about by those disputes. Let us encourage the amicable settlement of industrial disputes, so that both sides can go on in peace. My idea is that we should not try to create friction between employers and employed, and then make political capital out of it, but that we should encourage and assist men to settle their trade differences in an amicable manner, as that will be most satisfactory to all parties concerned. If I were to be wiped out because of my opinions, I should rather be wiped out for advocating peace and amity than be wiped out for trying to make discord. (Hear, hear!) I have never encouraged strikes, because I

Mr. D. Hunter.]

know the misery which strikes entail upon the men, and the suffering they entail on wives and children.

Mr. THEODORE: You believe in what is called "Paddy's unionism."

Mr. D. HUNTER: I do not follow the hon. member. I suppose my friends on the other side would like me to become one of those men who are called "free unionists." I can only say that I believe in the principles of unionism, but I am not prepared to encourage trade disputes at any time. Trade disputes are what our friends on the other side to a large extent—they will excuse me for saying so—live by. Many of them have come into this House because of trade disputes. That was the first thing that helped them to get into Parliament. No doubt there is policy in the work they are doing. The coal strike in New South Wales was largely instrumental, as hon. members will recollect, in the defeat of Mr. Wade at the last election in that State. I heard it said by a Labour man, "Now we have been defeated, we shall have an immense number of industrial disputes."

Mr. COYNE: Who said that?

Mr. D. HUNTER: A Labour man.

Mr. COYNE: Name!

Mr. D. HUNTER: I am not going to give the name. It appears that it is coming true, for a great many Labour people are doing their best to encourage industrial disputes in order to be prepared for a certain event which is expected two years hence; but I am certain that when they go before the people again they will find that the people are prepared to express their own opinions in defiance of any body of men who call themselves "Labour." If the Hon. the Premier brings in a measure which will give the relief that I desire for trade unionists, I shall support it, but I shall not at any time be a party to forcing anyone to adopt political views that they are not inclined to accept; in other words, I am not prepared to give unions the power to force men to vote against my party.

* Mr. RYAN (*Baroo*): I think the hon. member for Woothakata is to be congratulated upon the subject-matter of his motion, and also upon the manner in which he has placed it before the House. I listened very carefully to his speech, and was very much impressed by the manner in which he marshalled his facts, and the knowledge that he showed of the subject, which was in marked contrast to the knowledge shown by the Premier in replying to his arguments, and in even greater contrast to the rambling and sometimes offensive nothings which have just fallen from the hon. member for Wooloon-gabba. The subject which the hon. member for Woothakata has introduced is one which occupied the attention of politicians in England some few years ago. In 1906 a Bill was brought forward in the Imperial Parliament which passed its second reading in the House of Commons by 300 votes to 30. The Hon. the Premier has said this afternoon that he is not prepared to bring in a similar law here. He is not prepared to bring in that law, notwithstanding that the Rockhampton programme—which this Government is supposed to be intending to carry out—contained in it a promise to bring in a Trade Disputes

Bill calculated to place the law in Queensland upon the same footing as the law in England.

Mr. MAUGHAN: He was a member of the Cabinet in 1906, when a Trade Disputes Bill was introduced.

Mr. RYAN: As I am reminded by the hon. member for Ipswich, the hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet in 1906, when the present Attorney-General introduced a Trade Disputes Bill in this House. That Bill was introduced on 23rd October, 1906, and I see that the name of the then Secretary for Agriculture and Secretary for Railways was "Hon. Digby Frank Denham." I presume that is the same gentleman who is now Chief Secretary. The hon. gentleman was a member of that Cabinet, and yet he says this afternoon on the floor of this Chamber—no doubt on account of the change that has taken place since then in the personnel of the Cabinet—that he is not prepared to bring in such a Bill to-day. Now, what did the Bill that was introduced in 1906 propose to do? It proposed to protect union funds against the illegal acts of individuals—acts which were done without the authority of a union, without its sanction, and which were repudiated by the union. (Hear, hear!) Is that unreasonable? Let me quote from the opening remarks of the present Attorney-General, in moving the second reading of the Bill in 1906—

"We must bear in mind, in starting to consider this subject, that trade unions are legal associations. The right to strike is a legal right, and the trade union rule, which is the principal cause, I think, of the majority of strikes, is the rule that a unionist will not work with a non-unionist. That is a perfectly legal rule. Any man, whether a unionist or a non-unionist, has a perfect right to exercise an option as to whom he will work with, just as well as whom he will work for. Now, experience has shown that whenever the unions attempt to exercise their undoubted legal right to strike, their officials run the risk of having an action brought against them for conspiracy. The action is not merely brought against the alleged conspirators themselves, but also involves the union funds—that is, at any rate, since 1901."

Hon. members will recollect that 1901 was the year of the famous Taff Vale decision—

"Up to that time actions involving union funds were never thought of, at any rate, were never brought successfully. It does not matter, as far as the question of union liability is concerned, whether the officials of a union had any authority from that union or not; they may have had no authority whatever; the union may not have known of the acts complained of; they may have been the acts of branch officials in a distant part of the country—which acts may have been repudiated by the central authority as soon as ever they came under its knowledge. But, notwithstanding all that, the union funds were held to be liable to be attached for the acts—unauthorised and repudiated acts, I may say—of officials of the union, and provision that had thus been made for sickness and misfortune has been futile."

Could I use any more convincing words than were used on that occasion by the Attorney-General? He was backed up by the present Premier, and to-day we find that hon. gentleman refusing to do what he was then prepared to do. To me the position seems absurd, and I trust that some time during this session a division will be taken upon this motion, so that the people may know on which side hon. members sitting on the other side of the Chamber are voting.

Mr. FORSYTH: They will vote all right.

[Mr. D. Hunter

Mr. RYAN: I know how the hon. member for Moreton will vote. I know how he intended to vote in 1906.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am dead against you.

Mr. RYAN: And he was dead against us then. And the present Secretary for Lands was also dead against us.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And the present Secretary for Agriculture too.

Mr. RYAN: Will the Premier and the Secretary for Public Instruction tell this House plainly that it is not the policy of the Government then in power that is going to be carried out but the policy of the Government that the hon. member for Moreton and the Secretary for Lands were previously associated with? If the motion proposed by the hon. member for Woothakata does nothing more than show the people of Queensland that, it will have done much good. But I trust that it will do more good than that, and that the Government, even late in the day, will see the wisdom of harking back to the policy laid down at Rockhampton by Mr. Kidston.

Mr. MANN: Who was he?

Mr. RYAN: He is now Dr. Kidston. He is not in Parliament, and I do not desire to say anything with regard to him.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: The Premier read out to us certain quotations from the British *Hansard*, and—perhaps from want of knowledge of the subject—though I can hardly think he has such a want of knowledge as that—by those quotations he misled this House, because the remarks which he quoted were not applicable to the law as it exists to-day in Queensland. In England the law has been altered, and I am quite satisfied that hon. members on this side would be pleased to have the English law in force here as a first instalment, and an instalment that would last for a long time. The Premier asked whether we desired complete incorporation, and, when I asked him if he was prepared to support incorporation, he said he thought he was. Well, I can only say that on reconsideration I think he will come to the conclusion that he is not in favour of incorporation. I would like to know whether the Secretary for Lands, who is now representing the Government on the front Treasury bench, and the Secretary for Agriculture, are prepared to intimate that they are in favour of incorporation. I appeal more directly to the Secretary for Public Lands because of his legal knowledge. Would he be prepared to have trade unions incorporated? I have no answer from the hon. gentleman. (Opposition laughter.) If the hon. gentleman had been speaking, instead of the Premier, I do not think he would have given the answer the Premier gave to my question.

Hon. R. PHILP: Do you want them incorporated?

Mr. RYAN: I would be very pleased to see them incorporated, with certain limitations, but I have no hope of getting incorporation from the other side. The Hon. the Premier laid down a proposition, which, to me, is an extraordinary one. He said that the legitimate object of trade unions—the object for which they were formed—was for the purpose of striking; and he said that their funds were supposed to keep the strikers during the time a dispute was on. But the hon. gentleman does not think it is a legitimate object for unions

to take a constitutional means of avoiding strikes by returning members to Parliament in order to bring about what they desire. That is an extraordinary contention, coming from a member on the other side of the House—that a strike is a legitimate thing, but that it is not legitimate to see union funds used to put men into Parliament who will obviate the bringing about of strikes, and who will provide machinery by which strikes can be avoided. Then, in a somewhat contradictory way, the hon. gentleman said that at present we have the machinery for doing away with strikes. Well, how were these things brought about? Were they not brought about by the influence of trade unions—by getting men returned to Parliament who would advocate the formation of such tribunals? Now the hon. gentleman thinks that trade unions should not let their members come into Parliament—that these tribunals have reached the height of perfection, and that they cannot be improved. What would happen if that argument were carried out? We would find that the tribunals themselves would be wiped out in time.

Mr. McLACHLAN: He almost argued that.

Mr. RYAN: He practically argued it.

Hon. R. PHILP: You will not use them, in any case.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!" said: Mr. Speaker,—I, with other members, exceedingly regret the death of the late Speaker, Mr. J. T. Bell. At the same time I wish to congratulate you on having been elected to the very high and honourable position of Speaker of this House, a position which I believe you will occupy with great ability. I notice in the Government programme laid before the House that there are several very controversial measures, but they are measures which, if passed this session, will be an acquisition to the statute-book. Amongst these measures is an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act. (Hear, hear!) There is also an amendment of the Factories and Shops Act promised and a universal holiday for the State. I think that the time has arrived when there should be a universal holiday throughout the State of Queensland. When the Factories and Shops Act was first passed in this House the country members were rather timid about adopting a Saturday half-holiday, but I notice now that the consensus of opinion in country districts is in the direction of a universal half-holiday. (Hear, hear!)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do you believe in the Saturday half-holiday?

Mr. GRAYSON: Yes; I have no objection to a Saturday half-holiday being proclaimed throughout the State. Although the members representing country electorates did not believe in a Saturday half-holiday some years ago, when the Act was passed, I have reason to know now that

Mr. Grayson.]

the majority of the residents in the country electorates will be satisfied with the Saturday half-holiday.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The shop assistants in Warwick would like it.

Mr. GRAYSON: Yes. They are going to demand a poll on the question in Warwick shortly, and I have not the slightest doubt that the Saturday half-holiday will be carried in Warwick. (Hear, hear!) There is also an amendment of the Machinery and Scaffolding Act promised. That is a very useful measure, as it protects the lives and limbs of those engaged in dangerous occupations, especially in connection with the erection of buildings. I shall certainly give that measure my support. I notice that there is also an amendment of the Elections Act Amendment Bill. I believe that it is the intention of the Government to assimilate the State Act with the Federal Elections Act, so that one system of voting shall prevail in the State.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Why not use the same rolls for both?

Mr. GRAYSON: I do not know anything about that, but it is time that the one system of voting was brought into vogue in Queensland and the Federal and Queensland Acts assimilated. There is another Bill mentioned in the programme, the Liquor Bill. I anticipate that that will be a contentions measure, and I intend before expressing any opinion on that Bill—

Mr. MULLAN: To discuss it in caucus. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRAYSON: To carefully peruse the different clauses of the Bill. There is also to be an amendment of the Workers' Dwellings Act. This is a measure to which I gave my hearty support when it was passing through this House. I contend that that measure has been a great success ever since it has been passed. I believe there have been 450 applications for the erection of houses, and most of those applicants are men of small means. This Bill enables workmen to erect homes of their own and pay for them by small payments, and at the end of the term of the payments they will be living in their own homes without having any rent to pay.

Mr. FOLEY: What about the fellow with no means?

Mr. GRAYSON: He can avail himself of the provisions of that Act. If a man owns even a small allotment of land that costs not more than £50—

Mr. MAY: Some men would think themselves mighty rich if they had £50.

Mr. GRAYSON: They would be able to borrow sufficient money on it to have a building erected.

Mr. MAUGHAN: There is an element of socialism in that, you know?

Mr. GRAYSON: It is the very socialism that I believe in. I believe in a good deal of State socialism. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. LENNON: We are getting on. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRAYSON: At the time that that Act was passed I was under the impression that it was only to be the citizens or the residents of the principal towns that would avail themselves of its provisions, but I find that in the country districts many people are applying for assistance to build under

[Mr. Grayson.]

the provisions of that Act. I believe that as time goes on it will be found that this Act to enable workmen to procure homes of their own will be considered one of the best Acts that we have passed. I notice another Bill here, the Police Offences Bill. Like the Liquor Bill, I want to make myself thoroughly acquainted with its clauses before I speak on it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You will know all about it to-morrow.

Mr. GRAYSON: Getting on to other matters, I wish to say a word or two about the immigration policy of the Government. As a member representing a country constituency, I must at once state that I am entirely in accord with the immigration policy of the Government. I say that the vigorous immigration policy which the State is carrying out is in the true interests of the State of Queensland at the present time. I have been talking to numbers of men and women who arrived here recently as immigrants, and I say that a fine type of men and women are now being brought to Queensland.

Mr. LENNON: You differ from Dr. Taylor.

Mr. GRAYSON: At Warwick about a fortnight ago I noticed about fifty young men who arrived from the old country. They were destined to proceed to the Maryvale Railway and the Bullamon Railway. They are a fine type of men, and in time to come they will make excellent colonists.

Mr. MAUGHAN: All good Labour men.

Mr. GRAYSON: If we want to assist the primary producers of this State to carry on their operations with profit, not only to themselves, but to the country, it is the duty of the Government to secure labourers for those engaged in the farming and pastoral industries. The immigrants I have come in contact with, in my opinion, are a superior class of men, and I believe in a few years they will make excellent colonists. They seem to me to be a similar class of men to those who came here thirty or forty years ago—men who were content to work for a few years on wages and ultimately take up land and become farmers. I have had conversations with several of them, and that is the object they have in view. I trust the Government will continue the vigorous immigration policy and bring out the right type of immigrants. There is plenty of room for them in Queensland. Every industry in Queensland, both primary and secondary, is crying out for labour. I know for a fact that nearly every employer I come in contact with is unable to obtain sufficient labour to carry on his business, especially amongst the small tradesmen such as plumbers and building contractors. They all complain that they want more labourers. I understood the Premier the other night to say that the amount to be expended on immigration this year would be about £80,000. I do not mind if it amounts to £150,000. I say the best manner in which the Government can expend money is in introducing a reliable and selected class of immigrants. I remember when the immigration vote was under discussion last year the Chief Secretary asked for £50,000 to assist immigration for the year 1910-1911. The Opposition proposed that the vote be reduced to £25,000. I would like to ask: How many immigrants could be introduced into Queensland for £25,000? I say a vote of £25,000 is totally inadequate, and if the Premier asks for £150,000 this year for

the purpose, I shall certainly support it. I noticed that during the recess an immigration lecturer was appointed to proceed to Ireland with the view of encouraging farmers and farm labourers to emigrate to Queensland. I quite approve of the appointment of Mr. O'Keeffe, ex-member for Lockyer. I think no better appointment could possibly have been made, as forty years ago Mr. O'Keeffe arrived in this State an immigrant himself, with very little capital, and by dint of perseverance and hard work he has acquired for himself one of the best farms in the State; and, in my opinion, a successful farmer like Mr. O'Keeffe is the proper man to send home to encourage emigrants to come to Queensland.

Mr. ALLEN: The people won't leave Ireland just now.

Mr. GRAYSON: It seems to me, judging by what I saw in the Brisbane papers a few weeks ago, and in a letter sent to the Premier, that Mr. O'Keeffe will be the means of inducing many men to emigrate to Queensland. I notice the Government intends to introduce a railway policy during this session. I say that this is an opportune time for the Government to construct light lines into farming districts. The present Government has constructed more farmers' lines than any previous Government.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And is constructing them.

Mr. GRAYSON: And is continuing to construct light lines into farming districts. I say this is an opportune time to carry out a vigorous railway policy in farming districts. I would like to mention one line that was constructed under the guarantee principle. I refer to the Guarantee Act that was passed in 1895. The first guarantee line, I believe, that was constructed in the State under that Act was the Hendon to Allora line—a line 3½ miles in length. At the end of fourteen years the Government took that line over. I notice the Allora Town Council guaranteed that line, and they paid by way of guarantee a sum of £1,500, and a few days ago they received a letter from the Railway Department stating that there was a sum of £1,120 to their credit on account of that line, so that Allora had only £380 to pay for the guarantee during the fourteen years.

Mr. ALLEN: There were special rates on that line.

Mr. GRAYSON: Quite so. There was an arrangement between the Commissioner and the Allora Town Council. That line, which was only 3½ miles in length, necessitated an engine-driver, a fireman, and a guard continually to work it. Now, had the line been twenty miles long it could have been worked by the same staff and the same engine and at the same expense. I am very pleased to say that last year that line was extended 8½ miles to Goomburra, and the one engine and the one staff of men will be able to work the Allora line and the Goomburra guaranteed line. I say I am in full accord with the policy of the Government in constructing light lines of railway into farming districts. I have at the present time three applications for light lines on the Downs. A deputation will wait on the Minister in a few days asking for a line from Nobby to Felton, a district in which three parts of the land is under intense cultivation. There are other applications for lines to be constructed on the Downs. The Government need have no hesitation in the construction of those lines. The land is valuable on each side

of the line in the benefited area, and there is no doubt that the guarantee will be made without any trouble. I have heard it stated by members who do not understand the conditions the farmers have to contend with in carrying their produce 10, 12, and 15 miles—

Mr. MURPHY: Some have to carry it 100 miles.

Mr. GRAYSON: That is a different matter altogether. (Laughter.) The districts I refer to are all closely settled by small settlers on both sides of the line; it is different when you travel 20 or 30 miles before you come to a station or a selection.

Mr. MURPHY: I am talking about farmers.

Mr. GRAYSON: I notice that the Premier on Tuesday night referred to certain railways; and the hon. member for Ipswich said that two of them were particularly old friends—I refer especially to the *via recta*, for which money was borrowed twenty-seven years ago, and a survey made. I have a report here from the then Chief Engineer, Mr. Stanley, which states—

"The through distance between Brisbane and Warwick by the principal routes above described is as follows:—

"1st, *via* Rosewood, Bremer, and Spicer's Peak Road Gap, 110½ miles; 2nd, *via* Mount Fraser and long tunnel at Mount Mitchell, 108½ miles; 3rd, *via* Fassifern, Mount Edwards, and Spicer's Peak Road Gap (1 in 33 gradient), 108 miles."

I would like to mention that the third route mentioned—the one *via* Fassifern, Mount Edwards, and Spicer's Peak Road gap—is the section which the Premier stated he would table this session—Munbilla to Sandy Creek. The report goes on to say—

"As the distance from Brisbane by the existing line, *via* Toowoomba, to the point of junction of the trial survey near Warwick is 167½ miles, the saving effected by the proposed direct line will be between 57 and 59½ miles."

You can imagine the disadvantages and the disabilities the Southern Downs farmers have suffered during the last forty years in having to pay railage on 45 miles extra—we get 15 miles allowance. They are paying 30 per cent. more for their goods from Brisbane to Warwick than if the *via recta* was made; and the same thing applies to produce. The farmers are handicapped in having to pay extra railage on their produce, but not so much as on goods arriving from Brisbane. Mr. Stanley then gave the comparative total cost of the lines, as follows:—

"1st line, *via* Spicer's Peak Road Gap, Rosevale, and Rosewood, £955,875; 2nd line, *via* Mount Edwards and Fassifern, including reconstruction of first section of Fassifern Branch, £529,625; showing a saving in favour of a line by the latter route of £426,250."

I would like to point out that already there are 19 miles of the route of the *via recta* nearly constructed between Warwick and Maryvale.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is only a light line.

Mr. GRAYSON: It is a permanent line. Then the Munbilla section, which is to be tabled this session, is 17 miles; and when that is made there will be 36 miles of the *via recta* constructed, leaving only 28 miles of a gap to be bridged between Sandy Creek and Maryvale. I am prepared to take the Premier's word on the matter. I have known the hon. gentleman for many years, and I

Mr. Grayson.]

never had the slightest doubt about his word. Not only will I take his word, but I am certain that every man, woman, and child on the Southern Downs will take his word on this important subject.

Mr. ALLEN: Especially the children. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRAYSON: These are Mr. Stanley's conclusions—

"After carefully weighing the merits of the various schemes proposed for the direct line, both in respect of the engineering features, the probable cost and future working expenses, as well as anticipated traffic, I have no hesitation in advising that the route *via* Campbell's Plains, Spicer's Peak Road Gap, Mount Edwards, and Fassifern should be adopted.

"The reasons which have led me to this conclusion may be briefly summarised as follows:—

"1st: The large saving in first cost of construction, amounting to £426,250, or, if allowance is made for the construction of a branch line to Rosevale, a saving in the ultimate expenditure of £345,175.

"2nd: That against this saving the extra cost of special locomotive engines to be employed on the Main Range section, together with the capitalised value of their working expenses, will not exceed £32,500.

"3rd: The shorter length of unproductive line in respect to local traffic compared with the route to Rosewood.

"4th: The shorter length of railway to construct, the lesser magnitude of the works involved, and consequently the greater rapidity with which the line could be completed."

If there were reasons twenty-seven years ago for the then Government borrowing money to place £500,000 on the Loan Estimates for the construction of that line, I say there is much greater necessity to-day. The population at that end of the Downs has increased threefold, and there is three times as much land under cultivation. At that time there was not a mile of line constructed west of Warwick; to-day there is constructed and under construction a line of 257 miles between Warwick and Dirranbandi. I remember when that line was tabled in 1905—the line from Goondiwindi to Thane—I heard several members state that if it was constructed it would not pay grease for the wheels.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. GRAYSON: I do not think so. I would like to make myself clear on this matter. The residents of the Southern Downs have to thank the senior member for Townsville for the construction of the line from Warwick to Thane. It was [7.30 p.m.] during the time that he was Premier that that line was

passed and constructed. The hon. member for Townsville was the means of having passed in this House the first section of the Western line from Warwick, which is now paying 4½ per cent. interest; in fact, it is one of the best paying lines we have in the State, and I believe the further the line is constructed the better the line will pay—it has tapped one of the best pastoral districts we have in Queensland. I live very near the line myself, and day after day you will see three or four special trains

[Mr. Grayson.

with stock travelling on that line, coming in from the West, from Talwood and the Goondiwindi district.

Mr. MURPHY: There is more stock to be shifted in the Gulf district than in that district, and they won't build a railway out there.

Mr. GRAYSON: As I have already stated, if there were reasons twenty-seven years ago to construct the *via recta*, there are 257 more reasons for the construction of that line. I refer particularly to the construction of the line from Warwick to Dirranbandi. I will not detain the House any further on this matter except to reiterate what I have already said, that I am prepared to accept the statements made by the Premier on this particular line. I would like to say a word or two relative to the Agricultural Bank. I am not of the opinion of the hon. member for Murilla, who stated that the Agricultural Bank, in his opinion, was defunct, but I contend that the Act can be much more liberalised, so as to make it easier for small farmers and selectors to avail themselves of the advantages of the bank. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. ALLEN: It is not much availed of in your district.

Mr. GRAYSON: The hon. member for Bulloo says it is not much availed of in my district. That is so.

Mr. ALLEN: They are all rich.

Mr. GRAYSON: They are. I am very pleased to say that the farmers and settlers in my electorate are a well-to-do class of people.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They pay good wages too, I suppose, £2 a week?

Mr. GRAYSON: They pay good wages. These are interjections that members representing farming constituencies are pretty well used to. I would like to mention that on the day the Federal referendum was taken, I visited Clifton, and was invited by one of the leading farmers to visit his farm. In driving through his paddocks I noticed that he had five or six men in his employ. I asked him how long these men had been employed, and he said from eighteen months to two years. I asked what wages he paid, and he said that the lowest wages that any of these men got was £1 5s. a week and found, and one got £1 10s. a week. I ask hon. members opposite if that is low wages?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: How can a man keep a wife and family on that?

Mr. GRAYSON: This farmer employs these men all the year round, and they are men, judging by their appearance, who intend to work for three or four years for this farmer, and then take up land of their own and become farmers and employers. Speaking about the Agricultural Bank, I am very pleased the Secretary for Agriculture has decided to bring in a Bill to amend the Act in certain particulars. What strikes me is that there are so few who avail themselves of the opportunity of borrowing money from the Bank. There is no question that the terms are quite as liberal as those of any other bank in Australia.

Mr. ALLEN: No.

Mr. GRAYSON: I wish to give the following comparative statement of the operation of similar institutions in other States and the total amounts received:—

State	1908.	1909.	1910.
	£	£	£
N. S. Wales	789,333	1,062,625	1,362,853
Victoria	2,254,488	2,492,698	2,657,713
Queensland	153,228	187,014	235,793
S. Australia	1,233,264	1,386,153	1,544,946
W. Australia	743,598	1,004,675	1,257,082
Total	5,173,911	6,133,165	7,058,387

Here is Western Australia, one of the youngest States of the group, and where there is not nearly the land selected that there is in Queensland, and yet they have lent five times as much money through their Agricultural Bank as what Queensland has. There must be something wrong in this.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYSON: I have every confidence that the present Minister for Agriculture will try to rectify it. I would have had equal confidence in the ex-Minister for Agriculture had he had time to attend to it—he has always been most sympathetic to the man on the land.

Mr. ALLEN: Sympathy is not much good if there is no action.

Mr. GRAYSON: There was action. There is one other matter I would like to refer to. I notice that the senior member for Ipswich, when speaking the other night, said—

“I would like to know if that is an authoritative statement. Can we go from this House and inform the teachers of Queensland that there will be a training college associated with the University, and that it will certainly be an established fact? I should also like to see more itinerant teachers appointed.”

“The PREMIER: There are twelve now.”

“Mr. MAUGHAN: And there should be more. I have a letter from a person on the Darling Downs, and they say, amongst other things, that there are fourteen youngsters attending the school, and that there are girls and boys from twelve to fourteen years of age who cannot read or write.”

“The PREMIER: Where do they come from?”

“Mr. MAUGHAN: The Cunningham district.”

“The PREMIER: Where were they born?”

“Mr. MAUGHAN: I cannot say.”

I think I can fairly claim to know my own electorate as well as any member in the House. There are forty schools in the Cunningham electorate, and I am fairly well acquainted with all the teachers of those schools, and I may say, in reply to the hon. member, that I have never heard a teacher make a statement to the effect that there are attending school boys and girls of from twelve to fourteen years of age who cannot read or write. When the Education Estimates come on for discussion, I should like the hon. member to give the name of the writer of that letter and the school at which those children are supposed to be taught. I believe the hon. member received the letter. I do not doubt his word in the least as far as that is concerned, but my opinion is that some one has been trying to “pull his leg.” My opinion is that the statement that children of that age who cannot read or write are attending a school in my electorate is absolutely untrue, and I

believe that when the hon. member makes further inquiries into the matter he will find that it is untrue.

Mr. MURPHY: They may be new arrivals, and may not have had an opportunity to learn to read and write.

Mr. GRAYSON: In that case it would not be the fault of Queensland schools. I should like to emphasise the statement that I do not doubt for a moment that the hon. member received the letter, but at the same time I think that an experienced gentleman like the hon. member for Ipswich should be careful to make proper inquiries before publishing such a statement in the House. I have resided on the Darling Downs for a period of nearly half a century, and I can safely say that the children attending the schools in the Cunningham electorate are as well educated as any children in the whole State of Queensland. Referring again to an interjection by an hon. member opposite with regard to the rates of wages paid by farmers, I would advise those members to look after their own electorates—to look after the wages that are paid to miners.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not think the average miner earns £2 a week.

Mr. GRAYSON: I am quite in accord with the hon. member. My advice to those hon. members is to look after the miner and see that he gets a fair wage, and to be very careful in the advice they give to the men working in the sugar fields. The farmers of Queensland pay good wages, the men employed have good conditions, they are well fed and well housed, and they are all well satisfied with their conditions. I am not here as a representative of the farmers only. I represent the farm labourer equally as well as the farmer. I know the farm labourers and come into contact with them very often, and I can safely say this afternoon that I have not had a single complaint from a farm labourer that he has been underpaid or underfed or ill-used by farmers on the Darling Downs. Again, I should like to impress upon the Government the necessity of continuing their vigorous immigration policy. Notwithstanding all we have heard from the other side, notwithstanding what members who represent Labour constituencies state, I say there are any amount of openings for eligible young men in Queensland in every walk of life, and there are any amount of openings for females too. If the Government could arrange to bring out a supply of domestic servants, they would all be absorbed immediately they arrived in Brisbane. I know for a fact that there would be no trouble at the present time in placing at least 200 or 300 eligible young women in good positions on the Darling Downs. Some servant girls are getting from 15s. to £1 a week in many good situations in the country districts.

Mr. ALLEN: Is that the ruling wage?

Mr. GRAYSON: Yes. I am prepared to give you positive proof that at the present time it would be very easy to place at least 200 or 300 domestic servants at the wages I have mentioned. My opinion is that if those who are engaged in the primary industries—I refer particularly to those engaged in farming—are allowed to conduct their business in their own way without being hampered by labour conditions, they will make a success of it.

Mr. Grayson.]

Mr. ALLEN: Are the farmers afraid of the Rural Workers' Union?

Mr. GRAYSON: The hon. member for Bulloo asks if the farmers are afraid of the Rural Workers' Union. The hon. member was reared on a Downs farm himself, and he knows perfectly well that it would be utterly impossible to organise the farm labourers on the Darling Downs. If every Labour man sitting in this House spent six months on the Darling Downs they would not be able to organise the farm labourers, because they are well treated and well satisfied, and there is no necessity for the introduction of the Rural Workers' Union in Queensland. Let the men who are engaged in this industry carry on their business in their own way, and, as I have already said, they will make a success of it. I do not wish to detain the House any further. I thank members for the patient hearing they have given me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): I must congratulate the Home Secretary on his speech last night, and on the way in which he declared himself in favour of State socialism. I also congratulate the hon. member for Cunningham upon his advocacy of State socialism in his proposal that the Government should bring in a socialistic measure like the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill. At the same time I must say that the Agricultural Bank Act has not been administered as it should have been. With every application for a loan a deposit of £3 is required, and if the application is refused, only one-half of the deposit is returned. In New Zealand the amount of the deposit ranges from a minimum of 10s. to a maximum of £2. As the hon. member for Cunningham has given the figures in connection with the operations of the agricultural banks in West Australia and South Australia, there is no necessity for me to refer to them, and I shall only express the hope that the Government will make the Agricultural Bank a real live institution, and not allow it to remain the dead thing it is to-day. West Australia is practically the youngest State in the Commonwealth, but yet in agriculture it has already passed Queensland, and I have no doubt that the liberal way in which the Agricultural Bank there is being administered has had something to do with the progress that has been made. I wish now to say a few words with regard to the report of the Mining Commission. Hon. members have only received the report of the commission during the last two or three days, and personally I have not had time to go through the whole of the report yet. I have really only had time to go through the recommendations made or the conclusions arrived at by the commission. I think the commission have put a lot of work into their report and their recommendations. Perhaps they may not have gathered all the information we would have liked, and they may not have visited all the places it might have been necessary for them to visit, but that may have been owing to the time at their disposal. However, they have given us the result of their investigations, and there may be much valuable information contained therein. Their conclusions have been put in a very small compass. Hon. members will remember that the primary object for which the commission was appointed was to inquire into the prevalence of miners' phthisis, or

dust disease, and what steps should be taken to deal with that disease. Under the heading "Conclusions regarding exclusion and compensation of miners," the commissioners say—

"We therefore consider that the exclusion from underground work in mines of miners suffering from pulmonary or laryngeal tuberculosis is expedient, provided that—

- "(a) Effective means are taken to deal with the predisposing causes of tuberculosis amongst miners, and with the sources of infection by this disease amongst the general population;
- "(b) The practical difficulties attaching to medical examination and to the collection and distribution of funds, previously referred to, can be overcome in an equitable and reasonably economic manner."

If miners suffering from this disease are to be excluded from underground work, it is only equitable that they should receive compensation. The report quotes a resolution passed by the Executive Council of the Amalgamated Miners' Association of Bendigo on this subject, which I shall read—

"That we as an organisation are in favour of an Act of Parliament prohibiting miners suffering from miners' phthisis from working underground, in order to prevent the spread of the disease, under conditions specified hereunder—

"That the whole question be dealt with by the Government, the conditions being—(1) By erecting a sanatorium for treating miners suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis; (2) That provision be made by the Government to provide adequately for miners and their families; (3) That as an organisation we are prepared to give our quota, to the extent of 1s. a quarter per member, the mineowners to contribute a similar sum, and the Government to subsidise this sum to the extent of £1 10s. to every £1."

That is one way in which the difficulty can be met. Then we find that in South Africa they were confronted with the same difficulty. The Union Parliament introduced a Bill which threw the cost of providing a fund on the mines. That was not considered satisfactory, and an amending Bill was brought in providing that the cost should be borne by the mines and the miners. That did not prove satisfactory either, and so the State itself is at present paying for the cost. My own opinion is that it is a national question, and should be looked at in the same light as old-age pensions. If men suffering from this disease contracted it in the mines, and though the disease may be more dangerous in connection with that occupation than in connection with any other, still it is in the interests of the whole community that the disease should be coped with, and therefore the cost of dealing with it should be borne by the whole community and not by the mining industry alone. That is the opinion expressed by Mr. Knibbs in his pamphlet on Social Insurance, in which he says—

"It is recognised that, in order to advance the prosperity of a nation as a whole, and to conserve its vital forces, it is better that a misfortune falling on an individual should be distributed and borne lightly by the whole community, rather than that the individual should be crushed by the weight of his own misfortune."

I think the gist of the whole thing is contained in that quotation, and my opinion is that the best and most satisfactory way of dealing with the disease is to make it a national matter, making the compensation of the victims of the disease a matter for either

[Mr. Grayson.

the State or the Commonwealth Parliament to take in hand. There are many men now working in the mines who are suffering from the disease who, if they had the opportunity of finding some other occupation—occupation on the land, for instance, and especially in a drier climate—would be restored to health. That has been proved in the case of some men whom I know personally. These men left mining and went up to the Kingaroy district, not far from here, and they went on the land and are doing all right there. I say that these miners should have an opportunity of taking up land, and it would be better for them, and it would also save the State money in a very short time. They could easily be given priority in any land that was thrown open for selection. I notice that we are going to have an amendment of the Elections Act. My idea is, like that of the hon. member for Cunningham, in that we should assimilate the State and Federal Elections Acts, and have one system of voting, but I would go further than having merely uniformity of voting. I would have only one set of rolls for both elections. At the present time we have the double expense, as we have the police going round collecting the names for the State, and then the registration and revision courts, and then we have the police going round and collecting the names for the Commonwealth and the registration and revision courts. It would be far better to have uniform rolls. The present system only confuses the elector, as when the police come round the elector thinks that they will put the names on both rolls. The electors think they are on both rolls, and it is only when an election comes round that they frequently find they are not on the roll at all. As regards the Workers' Dwellings Act, I see it is to be amended. That Act may be doing good work, but it does not go far enough, in my opinion. I know it is a good thing for a working man to be able to have a house of his own and not have to pay any rent, but at the same time the provisions of the Act do not go far enough. My idea is that the local authorities should take it up, if the Government will not do it, and build houses and let them to working men at small rentals. They should build residential townships at convenient places. There is no necessity for people working in the factories in the towns to live in slums in bad air. If the Government, or the local authorities, would only build these workmen's houses they would be sure to do good. I do not believe in the Government building houses to make money out of them. They should be given to people for just what they cost, or, better still, would be to rent them, and I am sure the Government could let them have the houses at a rental for 50 per cent. what they have to pay for

[8 p.m.] house rent now to the private landowners. The percentage of workers who are able to get houses under the provisions of the Act is very small indeed, and the only solution that I can see is to do as they do in the older countries and build residential cities outside the towns, and in that way the workers would get good houses to live in at a cheap rental. I notice that we have had a commission inquiring into sugar-mills. I am pleased that they are going to build some more central mills. I notice in the Speech that they are going to safeguard the Treasury; that they are going to look after the interests of the canegrower.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Quite true.

Mr. RYLAND: And they are going to look after the interests of the sugar-worker.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Unquestionably.

Mr. RYLAND: Then this is the first time in the history of our sugar-mills that the interests of the workers are going to be looked after, and I really hope that it will be done.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It will be done.

Mr. RYLAND: When central sugar-mills were first advocated twenty years ago I was one of those who advocated them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: 1893.

Mr. RYLAND: That was when they were passed, but they were advocated and agitated for years before that.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The first one was built in 1889.

Mr. RYLAND: I advocated them thirty-one years ago in Gympie.

Hon. R. PHILP: Did not you vote against that Act?

Mr. RYLAND: What Act?

Hon. R. PHILP: The Central Mills Act?

Mr. RYLAND: I advocated sugar-mills, but the Act was not the sort of Act that I wanted to see, because it left too much open for land speculation. I wanted to see the Government establish central mills and keep them in their own hands altogether and not part with them. Instead of that, the Government erected mills which sent up the price of the adjoining land. The owners sold out and left those they sold to help the mills.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is easy to be wise after the event.

Mr. RYLAND: The Government should have held on to the central mills and worked them to their own advantage, and the land about those mills should have been taken up in small areas and worked by the farmers themselves. We want settlement to support our central mills, but when the central mills were first started, instead of cutting up the land into small farms the land was given in large areas, and in a short time it was just as bad as the estates of private people.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are mistaken. You do not know the facts.

Mr. RYLAND: I am quite right.

Hon. R. PHILP: You are not right.

Mr. RYLAND: You have only to look at Nambour and see what settlement is there.

Mr. THORN: Did you ever work on a farm?

Mr. RYLAND: Yes, I worked on a farm. In the case of some of the central mills the Treasurer had to take them over and work them himself and set them right, and then he gave them back again. There was no necessity to do that at all. The canegrower and the labourer are both supposed to be protected, but neither is protected as he should be. If the hon. member wants to do anything in connection with the sugar industry at the present time he has plenty of opportunity, as there is nothing being done for it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There is a strike on now.

Mr. RYLAND: The strike will be over in a few days. If there was no grievance, there would be no strike. We find according to the figures that were put before Mr. Tudor, when he was in Bundaberg the other day, by the deputation of growers,

Mr. Ryland.]

that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company for every £2 worth of work they do in connection with refining sugar charge £6. In fact, they get a net profit of £4 2s. 6d. on refined sugar.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The growers know a great deal more about the Colonial Sugar Company's business than they know of their own.

Mr. RYLAND: That was their business. That deputation waited upon Mr. Tudor and gave the expenses as regards the refining. The mills also net £3 10s. profit, consequently there is a net profit of £7 12s. 6d. on each ton of sugar—one-third of the price of sugar. The farmer has to prepare his ground, plant the cane, and cut it, and there is no profit for him, but the refiner and the miller get all the profit. For last year alone the Colonial Sugar Refining Company practically got £2 10s. net profit upon every ton of sugar in Australia.

Hon. R. PHILP: How do you make that out?

Mr. RYLAND: It is on their own figures. We have only to take the amount of sugar that went through their refineries and the amount consumed.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the Fiji and New Zealand refineries?

Mr. RYLAND: Look at the amount they do in Fiji, and the amount they do here. Those are the figures put by the growers' representatives before Mr. Tudor in Bundaberg the other day and nobody contradicted them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Figures can be made to prove anything.

Mr. RYLAND: They were not taken exception to, and I take them to be correct. I do not think there is any industry in Australia to-day in which there has been more misrepresentation than in connection with the sugar industry. At the last yearly meeting of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, the President, in his inaugural address—and he is a man who should know something about it—said that during the last ten years the Federal Government made a profit of £2,400,000 on account of excise and bonus in connection with the sugar industry—that practically the Federal Government made a loss of a million and a quarter on that excise and bonus, and in 1903 alone they made a loss of £399,000. You have only to look at the matter to see there must be a loss. In the first instance they collect the excise of £4 a ton. Out of that £4 they had to pay back £3 to the States under the Braddon clause. That only left them £1, and for every £4 collected on white-grown sugar they had to pay £3 back to the grower, and had only £1 with which to pay it, consequently for every £4 collected as excise they had to pay the State and the grower £6.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They should never have altered it from a rebate to a bounty.

Mr. RYLAND: They made it a rebate the first two or three years and they were told it was illegal. They were in the same position then as they were in connection with the harvester case. The State got the benefit in that instance, although now the Federal Government have only to pay £1 5s. a head to the States, and, of course,

[Mr. Ryland.

they get something out of the excise. At any rate, a proposal was made the other day that they would return the full amount after paying expenses—they would pay the full amount back if the mill-owners would only pass it on to the growers and workers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Why should not the £4 be returned?

Mr. RYLAND: Then there would be an absolute loss, because they have to send their inspectors here, and there are some expenses in collecting the excise. The Federal Government are prepared to do the fair thing if the millers are prepared to do a fair thing. I hope that the Minister, when bringing in the Bill with regard to central sugar-mills, will make provision, as he has told us he is going to, to protect the labourer and see that he gets a fair thing, and also that the grower will get a fair thing, because those are the men who are victimised at the present time. I was working on a sugar plantation thirty-one years ago, and we worked nine hours a day, and I think if it was only necessary to work nine hours a day at that time, when they were getting 45 per cent. less sugar out of the cane, they could do with an eight-hours day at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The people paid more for the sugar then.

Mr. RYLAND: Certainly they did. They get fully 45 per cent. more sugar out of the cane now on account of better machinery and by using treble rollers and steam jets and all that. I have been talking on behalf of the canegrower and labourer. I know that the refiner and miller have plenty of friends. I am talking in the interests of the labourer and the canegrower.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why don't you allow him to get his cane cut?

Mr. RYLAND: I want also to say something to the Secretary for Railways about the new railway proposals. The Premier told us the other night they were going to make some deviation on the North Coast Railway. I suppose it will go from Antigua down to Tinana.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He did not say this year.

Mr. RYLAND: I suppose that is the proposal. It just shows that in constructing railways in the past—and I am afraid there is a lot of it at the present time—they have not always been constructed in the right place. When that railway was built to Maryborough, the first survey was down by Tinana, but the influence of the Yengarie Refinery and the Queensland National Bank at that time—the Queensland National Bank had Queensland in its grip then—was sufficient to get the route of the railway changed, and it was constructed 7 miles round, via Yengarie. A mistake was made in the past; and now it is intended at great expense to make a line that will shorten the route by 6 or 7 miles. In the past political influence has been used to get railways built in places where they should not have been built, and I hope we shall have no more of that in the future.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you think a mistake was made about the Mary Valley Railway?

Mr. RYLAND: I do not think so. The only mistake was in not building it sooner. I

reckon that it is one of the best railways in the State. If the hon. gentleman is going to amend the Railways Act—which I think ought to be amended—he should make provision by which the new wealth produced by the construction of these railways should be credited to them. In the case of one line, there is a State forest containing 400,000,000 feet of pine within the benefited area. That was worth 1s. per 100 feet before the line was built; now it is worth 2s. per 100 feet, and the extra amount of £200,000 ought to be credited to the railway.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you want to rackrent the timber-getters?

Mr. RYLAND: I say that if that new wealth is produced by the railway it should be credited to the railway. That is only one of the forests. And not only will the value of the timber be enhanced, but the scrub land will be enormously enhanced by the railway, and the railway should get credit for that. The estimated cost of the line, which is 24 miles long, is £190,000, or £8,000 a mile—very expensive for an agricultural railway; and you are not going to pay interest and redemption out of what is made by carrying a few bags of potatoes and a few loads of maize.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You say it is one of the best lines in the State.

Mr. RYLAND: I say that the produce will be only a small item in the wealth produced by the railway. The wealth will come from the enhanced value of the land and the timber. It is not right to credit the line only with one item. It cannot be expected to pay under such a condition. The dairying industry, for instance, will pay if you take all the items of profit—calves, pigs, and cream—but not if you do not credit it with the cream. The Minister for Railways, in counting up the items that will make the railway pay, does not take into account the cream, the enhanced value of timber, and the Crown land. Another thing in connection with these lines: I consider that the rate should be struck on the enhanced value, without including the original value.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. RYLAND: Why should a man whose property bears a high valuation, though its value is not enhanced by the construction of the line, pay more than a man whose property, which is greatly enhanced, bears a low valuation? I say that the tax should be on the enhanced value, and not on the value that was there before the line was built.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You do not understand the method by which the valuations are made.

Mr. RYLAND: I do; and I am trying to make the Minister understand. The people will understand it very soon if they have to make up a deficiency. I have now a word to say about the late loan, of which the underwriters took up 90 per cent. The Federal Government offered to lend money to the State Governments, and some of them took advantage of the offer.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: For four years!

Mr. RYLAND: The Premier said the term was four years, but he afterwards admitted that it was ten years. The Mary Valley Railway could meet the cost of con-

struction within ten years. There is no doubt that if we credited our railways [8.30 p.m.] with the wealth they produce they would meet the interest and redemption. Even the Western line would do so if the increased revenue we receive from our pastoral rents went towards payment of interest and redemption.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Tax the present population for the benefit of posterity?

Mr. RYLAND: No; but seeing we have borrowed such a great amount of money, and made no provision for anything in the way of redemption, we should do something out of revenue. If we borrowed money upon a short term of ten years, it would be better if the lines were credited with the new wealth got from the timber along the lines. There is another question I would like to bring before the Secretary for Agriculture. I see from the Governor's Speech a reference to a Leases to Aliens Bill. The leasing of lands to aliens is a very big question at the present time in Queensland. I was up in the North recently, and was surprised to find that a great portion of the banana industry is practically carried out by Chinamen on land leased from whites. I do not think that that should be allowed. I was up at Buderim Mountain lately, and I see they are growing very good bananas there, but they want a higher tariff so that they can compete with the Fiji bananas. I have received a letter from a friend in my electorate, and he and other growers wants to meet the Secretary for Agriculture during show week to see if something cannot be done to put the banana industry on a sound footing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Is not that as easy as falling off a log? The Prime Minister of Australia is their representative in the Federal Parliament, and is at the head of the canegrower and labourer. All that the Prime Minister has to do is to express a wish that the tariff shall be raised to meet the wishes of his constituents. Why don't you ask him to do it?

Mr. RYLAND: Under present conditions I should think twice before I asked him to do it—until the Minister goes in a right direction. (Laughter.) Are we going to have a high tariff here simply for Chinamen who are growing bananas? It is a Chinamen's industry at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not in the Wide Bay electorate.

Mr. RYLAND: But the most of the bananas in the Cairns district are grown by Chinamen.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. RYLAND: And that is the very thing that will prevent the people in Victoria and South Australia voting for a higher tariff, as they will say that they are not going to tax themselves so that the man holding land in the Cairns district can get a higher rent from the Chinamen who grow the bananas.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There are plenty in the Wide Bay district, too.

Mr. RYLAND: I know there are. I was on a plantation myself last week in the Gympie district. The whole difficulty is that land is leased to Chinamen.

Hon. R. PHILP: Give a bonus to the white grower of bananas.

Mr. RYLAND: That brings us back to what we have been discussing—the excise

Mr. Ryland.]

and bonus. Is the Federal Government asking something that they should not ask for the sugar industry? What we want is to get the Chinamen out. Amend the Land Act so that the white landowner cannot lease his land to the Chinamen and other aliens. Then you will get protection, and it will be a white man's industry. Not only that, but to make it a white man's industry something must be done as regards the shipping ring. The shipping ring bring the bananas from Fiji at low freights. If the Minister amends the Act so as to prevent the leasing of land to aliens, I think that will meet the difficulty, and there would then be a protection which would offer a fair show to the white workers in the banana industry. As regards immigration, the system of bringing immigrants indiscriminately to Queensland is not in the best interests of the country or of the immigrants themselves. The men they have brought out for the railway works are not satisfied, as the conditions are not what they were told in the old country they were going to get. I notice that the works at Wallall are shut down for three or four months.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You saw that report in the Press.

Mr. RYLAND: Yes. I see that right along the line the Government are reducing their hands on the railway construction, and the consequence will be that these men will be forced to go and work on the plantations. We may read that the Mary Valley Railway is to be shut down, and the men forced to blackleg on their mates in the sugar districts. That seems to be the policy of the Government. The question has been asked during the course of this debate why German immigrants are not coming here. I remember reading in the Press some time ago that some Germans who came out sang the "Marseillaise" on board the ship on the voyage out, and showed by their conduct that they were all socialists. Since then we do not appear to have received any German immigrants. The Premier told us this afternoon that he had wired to Tonypandy to tell the miners there that there was no room for them in Queensland. The Government do not want men like them to come out here; they only want men who will be subservient. There are no Irishmen coming out as immigrants. Why? I have read in the Press a statement to the effect that at a meeting in Ireland a resolution was carried against immigration, the people saying that they would stop at home and fight the landlords there instead of going to Australia or elsewhere to have to engage in the battle with landlordism. They are quite right, and I believe they will adhere to their decision. We read various reports in the newspapers about our great resources and our great production of wealth; but our wealth is not distributed as it should be. During the ten years ending December, 1909, the net increase in wealth per head of the population in Queensland was £10 5s. 2d. Is the general worker, the man with a family, £40 a year better off than he was eight years ago? I do not think so. Wages may have risen, but the cost of living has increased in a greater ratio. With regard to bringing out immigrants, I would ask who are they going to benefit?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They are certainly going to benefit themselves.

Mr. RYLAND: Who in Queensland is going to benefit by this increase in our

[Mr. Ryland.

population? Supposing our population was as large as the population of Victoria, would the general worker in Queensland be better off than he is to-day?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. RYLAND: The wealth produced in Queensland amounts to £45 10s. per head of the population, while the wealth produced in Victoria, which has a much bigger population, is only £32 13s. per head of the population, so that per head of the population we are £12 17s. better off than Victoria.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You have a good many other men's shares.

Mr. RYLAND: I do not think so. We are now £12 17s. per head better off than they are in Victoria, and when we get a larger population we shall be no better off than we are now. In fact, the workers will be worse off, because the employer will be able to get more labourers, so that the men who have to work for a living will be in no better position than they are to-day. The great problem is not how to produce wealth, but how to secure the more equal distribution of wealth. But in spite of the increase in production by the invention of machinery and the division of labour in our various industries, which enables one man, in many cases, to do the work previously done by ten men, the condition of the men who produce our wealth is not improved. We find that big monopolists are benefited by the increase in production, but the general worker is not benefited. One large monopoly gets £5 for every £2 of work done in a sugar industry, but the workman does not share in that profit. Then we have shipping combines, coal combines, and so forth. In Newcastle there are millionaires on one side and practical destitution on the other. It is high time that we turned our attention to monopolies and combines, and did something to secure to the worker a fair share of the wealth which he produces. I have a newspaper report of a deputation which waited upon the Acting Premier of New South Wales to impress upon him the importance of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the causes of the increased cost of living. It was pointed out by that deputation that although production was great, and the farmer did not get high prices for his produce, the consumer had to pay big prices, and the middlemen got the benefit. The report of that deputation says—

"Potatoes on the Northern Rivers were, it was alleged, bought at £3 10s. per ton, and sold to the Sydney retailers at £12 per ton. Bread made from Australian flour was sold in England 1½d. per loaf cheaper than in Sydney. In Shanghai Australian butter was sold cheaper than in its country of origin. Wages in the boot trade had gone up equal to 2d. per pair, but the price of boots had advanced by 1s. 3d. to 2s. per pair, and so on."

All that shows that the Government should do something to protect the people from monopolies. Down in New South Wales the making of bricks and supplying of timber for the building trade had fallen into the hands of trusts, and the Government established brickworks of their own, and supplied bricks at reduced rates. The timber industry of Queensland has also fallen into the hands of a trust. Seeing the Government have State forests and State railways, they should supply timber at a fair price, and thereby put an end to the trust. There is

no provision made in the Government programme for a Trade Disputes Bill or for an eight-hour day. Another thing that we were promised in the Rockhampton programme was an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. That Act certainly requires amendment. One weakness in it is that it permits contracting out. That provision has been taken advantage of particularly by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Now, I want to know from Ministers why it was that the request made by the employees of that company to the Department of Justice to have the company's misnamed benefit scheme revoked was not complied with?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Because it was thought advisable not to do so.

Mr. RYLAND: Well, the Act provides that if any private scheme proves less favourable than the scheme provided under the Act, the employees can apply to have the scheme revoked. There can be no question that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company's insurance scheme is much less favourable than the scheme under the Act. In the first place, the company's employees have to contribute 3d. per week, and, in the event of death from a fatal accident, the maximum amount of compensation payable is only £100, whereas the maximum under the Act is £400, and cannot be less than £200—three years' wages.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the sick benefits?

Mr. RYLAND: Is that not less favourable than the scheme for the general workers? Would not £400 be much more acceptable to a widow and orphans than £100? Then there is a big shortage in connection with the company's scheme as regards serious or permanent injury. The amount payable is £1 for the first twenty-six weeks—that is equal to £26; 12s. 6d. a week for the next twenty-six weeks—that is equal to £16 5s.; or a total of £42 5s. It is at the discretion of the company to give 7s. 6d. a week for a further term, but all that a man is legally entitled to under the scheme is £42 5s. Now, under the scheme of the Act the maximum amount payable is £400, which is equivalent practically to £1 a week for eight years. We amended the Workers' Compensation Act in 1909. Prior to that nothing was paid for the first fourteen days after an accident. We amended that so that now a man is paid practically from the date of the accident. The amendment provided that compensation shall only be paid if the incapacity lasts longer than three days, but as almost any accident incapacitates a man for three days, it means that payment commences from the date of the accident. I am quite satisfied that the result of that amendment has been to increase the benefit by 20 per cent. But there has been no corresponding improvement in connection with the scheme of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. That scheme was in operation in New South Wales and in this State before there was a Workers' Compensation Act in either State, and the only changes in the scheme have been to reduce the contributions of the employees from 6d. to 3d. a week, and to increase the payments from £15 to £100 in the case of death. Now, when the employees asked that the scheme should be revoked, I want to know why no attention was paid to their representations.

Here is another clause in the agreement which reduces the payments made by the company very considerably—

"Any member employed for the season only at one of the mills who is in receipt of sick pay when his fellow-workers are paid off shall only be entitled to relief for four weeks thereafter."

See the effect of that. Any man drawing sick pay when the season closes—and the season only lasts six months at the very outside—will only be allowed sick pay for four weeks, even though he may have lost both his legs.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is sick pay—not accident pay.

Mr. RYLAND: Accident pay too.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: That must be wrong.

Mr. RYLAND: It is not wrong. Here is a case in point: A man named William Warnock met with an accident in September, 1909, when working in the company's mill at Childers. He spent thirteen weeks in the hospital, during which time he received £13, and received another sum of £4 when the mill closed, making a total of £17. I saw the man on 10th January, 1910, and he was then unable to work, and the doctor told him that the bone of the elbow joint was smashed and that he was permanently injured. Now, Warnock had paid is. a month to the fund, and all that he got for an accident permanently incapacitating him was £17. The men have been practically signing away all the benefits of the Act. In

[9 p.m.] December last, the employees sent a petition down asking for the determination to be revoked, and I hope that it will be attended to. I will give somebody else a chance now, but before I sit down I would like to say a word or two about the Imperial Conference in the old country. I specially refer to the good work done at the conference by the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Fisher, and the honours he brought to Australia through his work on the conference. The Imperial Conference is one of the greatest gatherings in the Empire, and it deals with national matters affecting the whole Empire. It is at such meetings as these that an understanding can be brought about between the United States, the British people, Canada, South Africa, and Australia, and if that is brought about then I think we can secure the peace of the world. A lot of empty titles were offered to the Prime Minister, but he refused them all. In fact, the only title he took was that of member of the Privy Council. I am pleased that Mr. Fisher is now in a position to be able to sit with the King in caucus, and talk business, and talk all things over with His Majesty in caucus. (Laughter.) The Privy Council is practically the highest caucus of the Empire, and we are pleased that our Prime Minister is taking an active part in it. I hope he will succeed in bringing about a better understanding between the civilised nations. What is Europe now but an armed camp? I look forward to the time when there is peace between all nations and there is no need to keep up these armaments. We have people in Germany and people in France trying to rush those nations into fighting each other, just simply because the one wants to sell more goods than the other. What does it matter who sells the most goods? It does not make the slightest difference to the average German working man or the average French working man, as they will

Mr. Ryland.]

not get any more pay from it. They are just the same as the English working man in that respect, in that they are victimised by the employers. We find, so far as the wealth production is concerned, that the German workmen get just as little as the English workmen, although England is a freetrade country and Germany is highly protectionist. Still the two countries want to fight one another. I think the time will come when no matter if a man is an Irishman, Scotchman, German, or French, they will not want to fight each other, but will want to do away with standing armies.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Are you preaching the brotherhood of man?

Mr. RYLAND: Yes. The arguments at the Imperial Conference tended in that direction. I hope that the time will come when we shall have the brotherhood of man brought about, when this warlike spirit will cease and when wars will cease. This will be brought about by the Labour party, because the Labour federation of one country does not fight against the Labour federation of another country. They all work together, and right along the line the Labour parties have advocated peace amongst the working people right throughout the civilised world. It is the Labour party who are going to bring about universal peace, and the good time that is coming will be due to the efforts of the Labour party. The Home Secretary referred to the warlike spirit in Germany, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the socialists in Germany will succeed in breaking down the warlike movement of the Kaiser. There will be no warlike movement in Australia so long as we have the Labour party to keep it down. The spirit of the Labour movement all over the world is the same with regard to its advocacy of peace among the nations of the earth, and we will all be glad of the time when—

“Man to man the world o'er
Shall brothers be.”

I hope for that time, and I am very sorry there was not some reference in the Speech,—because I believe that the question was big enough—about our Australian Ministers at home in connection with the Imperial Conference.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Charters Towers*): I have carefully read over the Speech recently delivered by His Excellency the Governor in another place. I think the Address we listened to, which is supposed to be composed by the Governor and is supposed to be his Speech, is really what he has been asked to read by members who sit on the opposite side of the House, and therefore I take it that the sentiments expressed in the Governor's Speech are really the sentiments of the Government. In the first place, I notice reference is made to the loss of the “Yongala,” and I am sure that no event has taken place on the Queensland coast for some time that has caused such a feeling of regret and sorrow in the minds of everybody, both in Queensland and outside. The loss is not merely a loss to the company, it is not merely a loss to those who had friends and relatives in that ship, but it is a loss to the whole community, and the expressions used in this paragraph seem to me to show that those who did express themselves thus—which I take to be the Premier—were of a different opinion to what they were when the ship went down. There is no doubt at that time arguments

were being looked for and expressions were being used to induce the people to vote against the referendum proposals. There is no doubt that the loss of the “Yongala” was used by the Premier to try and show that the Federal Government had not done its duty. He pointed out that the Federal Parliament had been in existence ten years and had the power to take over the lighting and lighthouses of the coast, and they had failed to do so. It is just as well to know that the responsibility for that work rested on the shoulders of the State Government until the Federal Government saw fit to take it over. While it was thought at that time the loss of the ship could have been evaded had the coast been better lighted, or some wireless telegraphy used, I think it has been admitted that in all probability none of these things would have averted the disaster; but it seems anything but satisfactory that the matter should remain where it is at the present time. There would be a good deal of satisfaction to all concerned if the wreck could be located, and more satisfactory still if some evidence could be found as to what really caused the disaster, so that it might be possible that something could be done to prevent similar disasters taking place in the future. I think from what we have seen and heard since that time it must be admitted that the coast is not well lighted, and that provision has not been made that ought to have been made, not only in reference to this disaster, but in reference to the danger to shipping on the coast all the time, and therefore if any blame is attachable to anyone at all, it is the State Government that is really responsible, and not the Federal Government. In the next paragraph we find regret is expressed at the death of the late Speaker. I do not want to say very much about this, but the thought that strikes me in connection with this is that it seems an evidence of the insincerity that exists in this House as well as outside. It seems to me we leave, to a very large extent, all the good things that might be said about people; in fact, we oftentimes fail to give them credit for the virtues which they possess, until they are dead, and, when they are laid under the sod, people appear to find out what splendid fellows they were. I think while they are living is the time to blame or praise them, and it does seem to me it savours of insincerity. In fact, it is mere cant to wait until they are dead before acknowledging their worth. There is the usual statement in the Governor's Speech which has been used for the last two or three years, and I am sure we are all glad that it can be used—that is, in reference to the unexampled prosperity of the State. I am sure we are all glad when the State is prosperous, when we get good seasons, and when those engaged in the primary and secondary industries are getting good prices for their products. But it has been pointed out very clearly, and very emphatically, I think, that the fact that the State as a whole is prosperous is no evidence that the majority of the people of the State is prosperous. As a matter of fact, it is very often just the reverse, and we all know because a State or a country on the whole is prosperous, it does not mean that every individual in the State is prosperous. In fact, there is no country on the face of the earth that is as rich or has such a splendid income as America, and we know perfectly well at the same time there are millions of people there who are in abject poverty. And the unexampled prosperity of

[*Mr. Ryland.*

Queensland at the present time is not being enjoyed, even though it is a new country and sparsely populated, to anything like the extent it ought to be enjoyed by the people of the State. As a matter of fact, although things are prosperous at the present time, there are scores, and probably thousands, in this State who find it somewhat difficult to make both ends meet. In spite of the fact that there is said to be a shortage of labour, there are men in Queensland at the present time, and who have been here for years, who find it difficult to get away from their present surroundings—where work is not plentiful and where wages are not good—to some place or other where work is plentiful. Although the Government are advertising for and inducing men to come here from other countries for work—that they may obtain railway work in particular from 8s. 6d. to 11s. a day—they are not prepared, in a great many instances, to pay the men who are here, and who are both able and willing to do the work, and men who are seasoned to the climatic conditions, and who for years past have been engaged in that particular kind of work—they are not prepared to pay them any more. As a matter of fact, in the first half of this year men engaged in construction work in Charters Towers were only being paid 8s. 6d. a day. The Government was interviewed on that account, and it was pointed out that for similar work done on a previous occasion for a private company they were compelled to pay the current rate of wages, and those other individuals had to pay the current rate of wages, which was 10s. a day. I have in my pocket a letter from the department which says the current rate would be paid; but, unfortunately, events took place after the promise was made which prevented that from being done. I believe that but for the death of Mr. Thallon the current rate would have been paid. The matter was put before the Premier when he was at Charters Towers. He said the facts were convincing, and he would see if the men could not be paid the current rate; but it has not been done from that time till now. The work was stopped and is now at a standstill. The question has been shuffled from time to time—from the Premier to the Commissioner, and then to the Minister—and it is nothing less than a repudiation of the promise made.

Mr. WALKER: Men are leaving mines in Gympie to go on the railways.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They are leaving mines in other places; but they do not want to work on the railways for 1s. 6d. a day less than they can get in the mines.

Mr. WALKER: They are getting a little more on the railways.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Perhaps the Government pay the men more in the hon. member's district than elsewhere. In spite of all the talk by the Government about the unexampled prosperity and the increase of wages, considering the increased prices, the workers are very little better off, and in some cases worse off.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: And the increase in rents.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Of course there is the increase in rents, which is out of proportion to the other increases—though that does not apply to Charters Towers. There are some industries not under wages board—and, as far as the worker is concerned, the unexampled prosperity is more apparent

than real. I do not think the Government have much reason to talk as much as they do about what they are prepared to do for the people who come here when they do not treat the people already here as well as they should be treated. Later on in the Governor's Speech it is mentioned that the report of the Royal Commission on Phthisis amongst Miners has been handed in. Personally, I am sorry there was not a better response to the inquiries made by the commission. Out of 14,000 cards of inquiry sent out not 2,000 were returned. Though it was intimated that they would be treated as confidential, it was difficult for the men to believe they would not run some risk of losing their jobs, in answering the questions and returning the cards. In mining districts when a man gets beyond middle age and begins to get grey it is difficult to get a job at all, though his experience and knowledge may qualify him better than a younger man. A man who has met with an accident and broken a limb, though he gets perfectly well and strong, is asked to sign a paper practically acknowledging that he will not claim more than £100 compensation. The conditions are such that men are not very ready to do anything in the way of giving information. I was glad to hear the Secretary for Mines say it would be possible to make regulations to meet some of the needs in this connection. And there are some other directions in which amendments are required. While provision is made for the prevention of accidents in straight shafts there is no such provision in the case of underlie shafts; and I think it should be made compulsory by regulation for provision to be made for the prevention of accidents in that connection. In the Speech we are told what is going to be done during the present session. We are to have about twenty measures—more than half of them amending Bills. There is practically nothing original in the Government programme. There are the Police Jurisdiction Bill and the Liquor Bill—the former to take the place of a punching ball—and probably the Liquor Bill. The prospect of going through does not look too rosy.

Mr. CORSER: Perhaps the wish is father to the thought.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The Premier says it is to be a Government Bill, but we shall see what it is, and what its provisions are when it is tabled, if it ever gets that far.

It has been promised so often, [9.30 p.m.] and the promise has not been fulfilled, that one is not too sanguine that we shall see it at all. Something has been said in reference to the asylum at Goodna. It seems to me a strange thing that in a new country like Queensland we should have such numbers of insane people as we have. It is rather a blot on our advanced civilisation that there are so many who find the stress and strain of life too much for them, and whose minds become unhinged, and, unfortunately, a great many of them do not recover. At the present time, according to official figures, insanity appears to be increasing, not only in Queensland but elsewhere. A paragraph in the *Courier* yesterday showed that other States are affected as we are. It said—

“According to official figures, insanity appears to be increasing to a remarkable extent in Victoria. The Inspector-General for the Insane (Dr. James) has for some time past been

Mr. Winstanley.]

engaged on an investigation of the causes which may be held responsible. Between 1905 and 1910 the total admission rose from 780 to 1,130."

We find that the same thing is taking place in our own State. Year by year the number is increasing, and the number that are cured are nothing like in the same ratio to those that go there. In a country where life ought to be comfortable, and the conditions easy, it is strange that so many should find it so difficult, and the strain such that it is unendurable. While the altruistic spirit which is abroad is shown by the way these people are looked after and every care bestowed upon them, at the same time I think it would be a good thing if we not only dealt with the effect, but tried to find out something about the cause, and, if it is possible, to remove some of the causes, so as to have less of these people who have to seek refuge in these places. Something has also been said with reference to an amendment of the Health Act, and there is no doubt, judging from the Health Commissioner's report, that something is needed in that respect. A good deal was said last night by the hon. member for Carpentaria about the milk supply. I do not want to traverse the same ground, but to point out that Denmark in years gone by has set a splendid example as to what can be done by co-operation in regard to the placing on the market of milk and butter. We know the benefits that have accrued to Queensland by following Denmark's example. Denmark has something to say in this connection. In a book called "Rural Denmark," dealing with the supply of milk to people for their children, the case of what is really a private undertaking is given. Interest up to 5 per cent. goes to the shareholders, and any balance is used in supplying milk free to those who cannot afford to pay for it. In connection with the supply to children, it says—

"What I can best describe as wire cruet stands are sent out by the company, each holding from six to ten bottles. Through the help of another society these stands of bottles are sold to the poor for about 2d. each. Each of them hold sufficient milk to feed a child for twenty-four hours. The younger the child the more bottles there are in the cruet-stand, as it must be fed more frequently. All that need be done by the nurse or mother is to set a bottle from the cruet into tepid water, and when it is sufficiently warm, to fix an indiarubber teat and give it to the infant. Special boxes are provided in which these cruets can be sent sealed and packed in ice all over Denmark, and if thus treated will keep for more than forty-eight hours without sterilisation or preservatives. Of bottles alone I may add, in order to give some idea of the activities of this society, about 16,000 have to be dealt with between 10 p.m. and 1.30 a.m. every night in the year."

That shows that they are well to the front. The price of these sets of bottles runs from 4½d. up to 6d.—that is for 1½ pints—nearly a quart. The writer points out what geniuses they are for going into the minutest details in this connection, which all goes to show that they deserve the position they have attained through their industry. We must remember that with respect to soil and climate Denmark is not so favourably situated as our country, yet by their strenuousness in co-operation they are very successful. The Government certainly render the people assistance in looking after their cattle, in testing, and in feeding them; and have helped the farmers to their present

[Mr. Winstanley.

position in which they can do without protection or spoon feeding, and they are able to put their produce on the market in a way that no one else has been able to approach. Their example is one which we should imitate, and there is room for something similar being done in Brisbane, where there is a large and compact population. I just want to say a word or two in reference to another paragraph in the Governor's Speech in reference to the referenda. I listened to the arguments of the Premier on this subject, and it seems to me that the very places where the Premier spent the most of his time, and used what he thought were the most convincing arguments, were the places where the vote was "Yes," and against him. The paragraph states—

"It is a matter for rejoicing that at the recent referendum the Commonwealth Government's proposals, which, if adopted, would have made a serious inroad into the self-governing powers of the States, were rejected by an overwhelming majority. In consequence of this rejection, it has been suggested by the Government of New South Wales that a conference of State Premiers be held in order to discuss whether it might not be desirable to surrender to the Commonwealth certain legislative rights, which, it is contended, the States cannot exercise as effectively as the Commonwealth. My advisers have no objection to the holding of such a conference, and will welcome the fullest discussion of the subject referred to."

It seems strange to me that the statements should have been made that were made by the Premier and others in this connection, and immediately after rejoicing at the great majority that were against the proposals, they admit that it is necessary that the Commonwealth should have additional powers. During the referendum campaign the Premier stated that the Commonwealth Parliament had more powers at the present time than they were prepared to use. He practically said that no more powers should be handed over to the Commonwealth than had already been handed over to them, and yet in this paragraph of the Speech it is really admitted that there are some matters which could be better dealt with by the Federal Government than by the State Governments, and that it might be desirable to surrender to the Commonwealth certain legislative rights to enable them to deal with those matters. The Premier used some very strange arguments to back up his case, but they were not very convincing to his hearers. For instance, at Hughenden—I am quoting from the *Northern Miner* of 27th March—he said—

"They might declare woolgrowing a monopoly and take over the stations. Notwithstanding the incapacity they had shown, they desired to manage everything. We might see the driver of the sanitary cart holding the office of Treasurer. If they voted "Yes" all these things were possible."

That kind of thing might have seemed very convincing to the Premier, but it was a paltry argument to use, and it was certainly not very complimentary to his Treasurer. I do not see why those men should have been dragged into the argument at all. Even some of those men may some day occupy the position of Treasurer, and may discharge the duties of that office as efficiently as they have been discharged by some Treasurers in days gone by. There have been in the past Treasurers who have been nothing more than figure-heads. They

have really not been responsible for income or expenditure; they have simply done what they were told, and have done it as well as they possibly could. Reference is made in the Speech to the successful flotation of the loan. If the Government regard the last flotation of a loan as a success, then I do not know what they would regard as a failure. The loan was underwritten beforehand. There should be no necessity to underwrite the loan; only two or three loans have been underwritten.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The underwriters unload on to the public.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is true, but if the loan had been subscribed two or three times over the Government would have sung a very different song from that which they did sing. We were told when the Government asked authority to float this loan that they were not going to place it on the market until conditions were favourable, as they were not in need of money. When a previous loan was floated and was not a great success, it was stated that the reason for its non-success was that there was a war scare at the time it was placed on the market. A similar excuse has been made in this case—that when the loan was placed on the market the Morocco trouble loomed on the horizon. The result was a practical failure, whatever was the cause. We were told last session that the raising of the £10,000,000 loan would help to convert the loans falling due in the near future. But when we remember that this was the first loan necessary to carry out the railway policy of the Government, our prospects of getting more money are not very rosy. The Government know in their own minds that the loan was not a success, and there was nothing whatever to excuse the failure.

Mr. WIENHOLT: English consols were lower than they have been for forty years.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There is a reason why consols were lower than they have been for forty years, and that reason is not the Morocco trouble, but the fact that there were other and more profitable investments for capital. Money has been withdrawn from that source and invested in other directions. When we remember that the Government will have to go to the money market another four times to get the money they want, we cannot regard the flotation of the last loan as a success. With regard to the programme submitted by the Government, it is practically a programme of shreds and patches. More than half the Bills mentioned are amending Bills, and I have no doubt that we shall find that a number of them are to amend Bills passed last session. Among these Bills are amendments of the Factories and Shops Act, the State Education Act, the Wages Boards Act, the Workers' Dwellings Act, and we shall probably find that the amendments to be proposed in those Acts are amendments which were submitted by this side of the House when they were going through, but which the Government refused to accept. The hon. member for Dalby pointed out that amendments are required even in the pet measure of the Premier which was passed last session—the Land Act. It is necessary to amend it practically before it has come into operation. I think that in cases where it is necessary to amend measures of that character so soon after they have been passed we should have a consolidating Bill from the commencement,

so that those who want to become familiar with certain legislation shall not have to look at three or four Acts to find what they want, but shall be able to get it all within one set of covers. With regard to a number of the Bills mentioned in the programme, it is as well to say little or nothing about them until we see them and know what are their contents, as the names with which Bills are labelled in the Governor's Speech are no criterion of what their provisions will be. Judging from past experience, I am doubtful whether some of these Bills will come up to anything like what they are expected to be, or anything like what they ought to be. Certainly we need not expect anything very valuable or very drastic from the present Government. They do not seem in any hurry to bring their Bills before the House, as we are to have the debate on the Address in Reply finished, and then go through the tedious work of passing Standing Orders again before the work of the session is really begun. I do not think the Government are very anxious to place much legislation on the statute-book this session, and it is doubtful whether a great many of the measures mentioned, if passed, will be of much benefit to the people in the country who are most in need of assistance. At any rate, when the Bills come before us and we see what they contain, I have no doubt they will be dealt with on their merits, and if there is anything good in them it will be accepted, and if it is possible to improve them, hon. members on this side will try to do something in that direction.

Mr. COYNE (Warrego): I do not intend to speak at any great length, but as I feel I have a cold coming on and may not be able to speak at all next week, I wish to say a few words to-night. I do not take much notice of the contents of the Governor's Speech. A lot of it is padding. There are a great number of omissions, and, as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, said, it does not matter a great deal to us whether some of the measures mentioned are placed on the statute-book or not—that is if we are to go by the titles of those measures, and we know from past experience that that is not much to go by. There is one extraordinary omission from the Speech, so far as my district is concerned. No reference is made to the Government making an effort to settle people on the lands in the Western districts of Queensland. For a long time past I have been endeavouring to get land thrown open in the Charleville district, where there is a large number of applicants waiting. I have met a number of men who have come from the other States and from New Zealand, and they have asked my advice, and I have told them that, owing to the promises I have received from the Lands Department, I expect land to be thrown open in the Charleville district and in the Western districts generally in a very short time. As the result of that information, some of those people have settled around Charleville waiting, Micawber-like, for something to turn up and for the land to be thrown open. It is very hard indeed, after we have made such an outcry about our vast areas of land and the vacant spaces we want filled up, that when we have the opportunity of filling up a great many of those vacant spaces, we are not taking advantage of that opportunity.

THE PREMIER: We are filling them up.

Mr. Coyne.]

Mr. COYNE: We are not filling them up in the proportion that we should be—one thousandth part. I will guarantee that if the Premier will throw open, and in sufficient areas, and not pick out the worst lands, I can have 100 selectors placed on the land inside of six weeks in the Charleville district. Is not that something for the State? As the hon. member for Burke said, people get sick and tired of waiting for land, and they go back to where they came from.

Mr. HARDACRE: I know one man in my district who has been waiting for over two years.

The PREMIER: You know there are exceptional circumstances in connection with that case.

Mr. COYNE: I make every allowance for the difficulty of throwing land open, but there is a limit to my patience in this matter. I have been waiting for eighteen months. I have been going to the Lands Department, and I have been writing to them to throw open land. The Central Warrego Selectors' Association—which is a very big body—has also been trying to get land thrown open for settlement, but all without avail. I trust, at any rate, that before this session closes there will be an opportunity given to those who wish to settle on the lands of the West to do so. After waiting until my patience has been exhausted, what strikes me is that we have the old squatting Ministry in power again. We thought we had got rid of them years ago, but it appears to me that they have come back to life again. The only solution for overcoming the apathy of the Lands Department—

The PREMIER: The number of selectors is greater and the areas smaller than in the past.

Mr. COYNE: We have had about eight of the best seasons we have ever had in Queensland, and yet the Premier is surprised that there are more selectors now than there were during the drought. What is there to be surprised about? The Government will have to exert themselves to remove the impression which has become firmly fixed in my mind, that they want a bad time to come along in the shape of a drought—whether a big one or a little one does not matter. That will exhaust the little capital possessed by these people who are wishing to get land at the present time, and then the monetary institutions, the land companies, and the banks, and the various land monopolists of the State, will be able to gobble up all the land in the far Western part of Queensland. A great deal of land can be made available now that is not being made available. We are told that there are so many thousands of square miles of land in Western and Central Queensland available for selection, but most of it is away in the South Australian corner, and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that is practically the worst desert country in the whole of Australia. You have been over a great portion of that country, and know from your own experience that what I say is true. It is not likely that people will rush that land. I do trust that before the session closes I shall be able to play a different tune to what I am doing now, and that I shall be able to give the Government credit for giving a number of people the opportunity of settling on the land. I now want to say a word or two with reference to the railways. I do not think that we in Western Queensland get fair treatment at all from the Rail-

[Mr. Coyne.

way Department. The congestion on our two western mail trains is very great indeed. It has reached breaking point; and the knowledge possessed by the Railway Department of that congestion should have led them to afford us a little more relief than they are attempting to give us. I think we are entitled to at least three through trains a week. If that were granted, it would relieve the present congestion. Another thing that I have noticed recently in connection with these Western trains is this: The Western trains that leave here twice a week have to travel some 600 miles before they reach the end of their journey, and yet they have to wait the convenience of the Sydney mail, however late it may be. I have travelled by the Western mail, and I know that to be a fact I came down by it from Toowoomba the Tuesday before Parliament opened, and when we got to Gatton it was discovered that the first division of the Sydney mail was delayed, for some reason or another, along the road—and that is not an exceptional thing—it is the rule—and we had to wait at Gatton instead of coming on, in order to let

[10 p.m.] the second division of the Sydney mail train go past. Now, in that train were people who had travelled 500 or 600 miles, and they got to Brisbane an hour late. I do not think that that is fair treatment. There are hundreds who travel by that line who can bear out what I say about being delayed by the Sydney train. We hear a lot about the generosity of the Government in giving increased wages to the railway men.

The PREMIER: Not generosity, but equity.

Mr. COYNE: I am very pleased to know that hon. members opposite are gaining some little idea of what the term equity means. (Hear, hear!) But they have been a long time in discovering it. As a matter of fact, the Premier has been discovering a lot of things lately. He has been discovering prickly pear in the Dalby district. He was greatly surprised to find prickly pear in the Warra district.

The PREMIER: Surely not.

Mr. COYNE: Judging by his expressions on the public platform, he was. I can quite understand it, as the hon. gentleman was very harassed at the time. He discovered a number of things at that time.

The PREMIER: I discovered you there.

Mr. COYNE: I do not think you did me any harm. At any rate, there was not a place where I addressed a meeting that I did not get a majority at the election.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You did not go to all the places.

Mr. COYNE: I went where I was sent, or where I was asked to go. I did not pick my own places of meeting.

The PREMIER: I did not go off the line, and I was not at all the places where you were.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. gentleman told the people that he was surprised at the state of affairs he found there. He promised them railways, he promised them bridges, and he promised them canals. (Laughter.) Goodness knows what else he did not promise them.

The PREMIER: I made no promises.

Mr. COYNE: Now that I have been reminded of this promise he made, I demand,

on behalf of the people of Warra, that the hon. gentleman should redeem his promise, and build the railway to Jondowaie.

The PREMIER: There was no such promise made, inferentially or directly.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, absolutely. The Treasurer made the promise first, then the Premier, and, I believe, the Minister for Education also.

The PREMIER: All the same, it is a line that it is necessary to build.

Mr. COYNE: But you told them you were going to build it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not to Warra.

Mr. COYNE: I do not care where it goes to, but the Jondowaie people must have a railway. Now, talking about equity in connection with increasing the salaries of the railway servants, I do not think that such equity exists.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do you not think that they deserve a rise?

Mr. COYNE: Yes, I do; and the hon. member knows very well that so long as I have been in this House I have done my best, at any rate so far as the lower-paid servants of the railway service were concerned, to get them a higher rate of wages.

The PREMIER: That has been the mission of the Government all along.

Mr. COYNE: It has been the mission of the Labour party to keep the Government up to their duty in that respect. I will give you just one idea of the sense of equity of the Government in dealing with this matter. I know a flying gang that has to look after 64 or 65 miles of very difficult road on one portion of our railways. At one time there used to be one man for every 4 miles on that same road, and the road is not improving. Now, there are 65 miles, and the whole lot attended to by a flying gang of twelve men, and one or two of the number have to constantly go over the road to see that it is safe. It is an easy matter for the Government to pretend to be generous, but they reduce the number of men on that line and give the others an extra "bob."

The PREMIER: That is not the function of the Government, but the function of the Commissioner.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. gentleman has always got someone to put the blame on to. If this is a fact—and I say it is a fact—then it is the duty of the Minister for Railways to have it rectified.

Mr. MORGAN: Are they overworked?

Mr. COYNE: Yes; and, what is more, the position is an unnatural one, as these men can only go to their homes and see their families every fortnight, and there is not sufficient time for them to do so.

The PREMIER: Members of Parliament are also kept away from their homes, so their position is unnatural, too.

Mr. COYNE: I want to draw the attention of the House to what is taking place in my district in connection with the great Wallal Railway strike. The information I have got is first hand from the spot. It is taken from the *Charleville Guardian*. This will show you what is actually taking place, and is no garbled statement sent down by any biased person.

Mr. MORGAN: Is that a Labour paper you are going to quote from?

Mr. COYNE: Yes, possibly it is. And, for that same reason, it is all the more certain to be truthful.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Is that the editor who had a prize-fight with the other editor?

Mr. COYNE: I do not know. This paper belongs to a company. There is an article in this paper about the Wallal navvies' strike, and I will read it. If it is wrong, then it is for some member of the Government to get up and deny it. I think from the way this article is written that it is fair to assume that it is correct. The article reads as follows:—

WALLAL NAVVIES ON STRIKE.

IMMIGRANTS BEGULED TO QUEENSLAND.

ON ARRIVALS EXPLOITED BY GOVERNMENT.

"We are (as all who read as they run should be) emphatically against industrial strikes when logical mental mediation is available, because those whose only capital is the labour of brain or brawn are invariably losers when pitted against the brutish strength of mere £ s. d. Still, there are occasions when men are so grossly used by employers as to be fully justified in downing tools to facilitate speedy redress. The strike of railway workers at Wallal on Monday last largely comes within such a category.

"In sequential order, perpend subjoined short account of what led up to this strike of sixty-eight navvies. These immigrants (physically and otherwise a splendid type) are unanimous, firstly, that prior to leaving for Australia they were shamefully misled by Queensland agents as to conditions here—notably, faked cinematograph films were shown them of the country, its products, and the pleasant life of workers in this land; while unskilled labourers (in great demand), particularly navvies, were alleged, per means of advertisements, to receive from 8s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. a day in North Queensland, and from 7s. 6d. to 9s. in South Queensland, the cost of living being from 12s. to 14s. per week. These statements, according to Wallal workers, were repeated on the steamer by Mr. J. J. Lewis, Queensland superintendent of labour on railway construction, who also told them that Government stores are established for their use, and that all goods would be supplied them at cost price, while each man would be fed at a weekly cost of from 12s. to 14s. each. For board alone the men found they had to pay £1 per week, and, as we know, such is somewhat the usual figure at bush eating-houses.

"So much for some of the fiction ladled out to these deluded workers. The facts they soon dearly discovered. For instance, they had to strike almost on arrival for 9s. a day, and, as this was found inadequate owing to high cost of living, the second strike is now in progress for 10s. a day—6d. less than is alleged for similar work under better conditions in the North.

"Here are a few details of how these men have been shamefully exploited by the Government which beguiled them to our shores."

The PREMIER: They tumbled over one another to get here.

Mr. COYNE: Of course, they could not help it with the story told them in the old country.

The PREMIER: Absolutely the truth.

Mr. COYNE: Such a beautiful picture was painted to them by the scalpers.

The PREMIER: They were not selected by scalpers, but by the Agent-General.

Mr. COYNE: The article goes on—

"For inferior made (some damaged) 6 x 8 tents they were charged by the engineer £2

Mr. Coyne.]

apiece. One local storekeeper guarantees to supply such tents at £1 5s. each, or £1 2s. 6d. if taken in quantities as the Wallal men were supplied; and if this shopkeeper can do so, of course others can also. A poor sort of mattress was sold them from 12s. to 15s. each; blankets, marked 6s. 6d. on tags attached, charged 12s.; while for tent poles, procurable a few minutes from camp, 1s. each was imposed. Above are some of items excessively overcharged for by the Government officials.

"As if that was not imposition enough, however, the men had to pay 5 per cent. for the collection of money due by them for store supplies delivered by Mr. G. Espie. Latter, of course, was thereupon forced to charge the 5 per cent. to the navvies. This latter, added to the alleged overbearing manner of one Government official, constituted the last straw overweighing these unfortunate strangers brought here and so treated by a fatuous Government. Hence the strike."

Now, that is a plain statement of fact, and I do not think the Secretary for Railways or the Premier can deny it. I do not know whether this Government have laid themselves out to cause strikes or to assist those who are engaged against strikers, but it appears to me that everything they have done during the last few weeks tends to promote strikes, and, when the strike takes place, to continue the trouble. They have, as I understand from the papers to-day, shut down the work at Wallal. Just imagine shutting down a work of 168 miles of railway because of a few men going on strike!

Mr. MULLAN: A vigorous railway policy.

Mr. COYNE: The next thing we will hear of is that the Premier will be engaging that human fiend named Packer, who comes from Victoria—the boss scab—the hon. gentleman's protege Packer.

The PREMIER: He is not my protege.

Mr. COYNE: There is no greater human fiend in Australia to-day than this man Packer. Those are the facts with regard to this railway strike at Wallal. I think it is the least we can expect, at any rate from hon. members of this House, that when a thing has been denied—when a statement has been proved to be incorrect times out of number—we should expect members of this House, on whichever side they sit, would refrain from repeating that falsehood over and over again. It is a thing I abstain from so far as my knowledge goes. If I have unconsciously done it, I shall be very pleased to retract if it is pointed out to me that I am wrong. Yet there are hon. members on the other side of the Chamber who get up and repeat time after time that the party to which I have the honour to belong are opposed to immigration. That is not true. It is an absolute falsehood for anybody to say so; but we do say, and our argument has been assisted very considerably by the speech of the Premier the other night, when he said there was a large number of people who came here of their own volition—without any State aid at all.

The PREMIER: No, no! They are assisted immigrants who come here for £5.

Mr. COYNE: People who come here of their own volition come here without any State assistance at all.

The PREMIER: No; they are nominated immigrants.

Mr. COYNE: When people come here of their own volition there is no inducement, and

[Mr. Coyne.

when there is an inducement you cannot say they came of their own volition. That is how I understand the language, at any rate. The Labour party do believe in immigration. They believe that this is the finest country, perhaps, on earth. If good laws are made, and those laws are afterwards administered as they should be, we can make this country so attractive that people would come here actually of their own volition—they would come here in immense numbers to fill the so-called vacant places.

The PREMIER: You don't believe in assisting the poor man.

Mr. COYNE: I do believe in assisting the poor man.

The PREMIER: You only want capitalists.

Mr. COYNE: My opinion of State-aided immigration by a Conservative Government is that they only bring people here to reduce wages.

The PREMIER: On your own argument you ought to refrain from repeating that statement, seeing that we have repeatedly refuted it.

Mr. COYNE: That is a different thing to saying they are doing it. (Government laughter.) I tell you it is my opinion that that is their object.

The PREMIER: And I tell you, through Mr. Speaker, it is not the object.

Mr. COYNE: I was asked if we were in favour of State-aided immigration, and I was trying to reply to that question. I say "Yes," under certain circumstances. If there was a shortage of labour in any industry, and the progress of that industry was being hampered in any way, there would be nobody more ready than the party on this side to assist desirable immigrants from any part of the world to come here. Does not everything that has happened prove the rottenness of the system that the Government are engaged in?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. COYNE: Are they trying to improve that system? Look at the speech of the Hon. Dr. Taylor in another place! Are they making any attempt to alter that state of affairs? None whatever. While they are pursuing that system I say I am justified in saying the object of the Government in bringing out large numbers of immigrants is that there will be a greater number applying for work than there is work for, and the price of labour will be reduced.

Mr. MORGAN: It has not been reduced so far. It is going up every day.

Mr. COYNE: The party on this side have also said that if there was a scarcity of labour in Queensland to-morrow, our first duty should be to look after the people in the Commonwealth of Australia—that we should see if there are any out of employment in the other States of the Commonwealth, and if there are, to offer this work to them, instead of paying the taxpayers' money into the shipping companies. Has that been done? No. In March last, when the Premier and his agents were shovelling money into the shipping companies and sending certain scalpers home to the old country, there were thousands of men out of employment in another State.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Where?

Mr. COYNE: In Newcastle.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: They would not work.

Mr. COYNE: Any person who looks at the *Courier* of the 4th March will see that there were 1,000 men out of employment. The Government of New South Wales had so little work that they could only offer to employ 100.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A friend of mine went down there, but could not induce any of them to come to Queensland.

Mr. COYNE: The Minister for Works in New South Wales communicated with the president of the Labour Federation at Broken Hill to see if he could not place some of them, and the reply was that he could not possibly do so, as they had 500 men out of work at the Barrier. I have a very keen recollection of something that happened about that time in Queensland. For many years past—until it was exploded—the cry of those who wanted to bring out immigrants was that they were wanted for the agricultural districts. I cannot see the hon. member for Cunningham or the hon. member for Cambooya here. If they were present they would no doubt say "Hear, hear!" to that.

Mr. MORGAN: We do want them; the demand is increasing every day.

Mr. COYNE: We remember the account in the *Courier* of the deputation of the unemployed, consisting of three men seeking work in the agricultural districts, who went to the Minister for Agriculture to place them. What did he do?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I placed two of them.

Mr. COYNE: Did he send them to the agricultural districts where there is said to be such a demand for labour? No; he rang up the Railway Department to see if there was work for three navvies. It shows the sham of the cry.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They got work—two of them.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, but not in the agricultural districts. We have heard a great deal about what Andrew Fisher said about immigration; and surely that ought to silence for all time statements that have been repeated by members on the other side in regard to what this party think about immigration. On the 8th of March last an article appeared in the *Toowoomba Chronicle*. It appears that in the early part of March a great number of things were happening. There was a great outcry at the time in Victoria, also in New South Wales, by some of the employers. The Commonwealth Government invited applications from persons who wished for employment at certain works that were about to start, and the standard wage they offered was £3 a week. The next morning they had 1,000 applications for employment, and a good number were artisans—mechanics. One of the employers in Melbourne said it was utterly unfair of the Government to offer £3 a week when employers were getting men for £2 14s. a week. My contention is that it does not matter what firm or Government offers a decent wage in any calling, there will be any amount of applicants.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: £1 a day was offered in Rockhampton, and they could not get men.

Mr. COYNE: It might have been £1 a day for only one day. On the 26th of last January, at the Chamber of Commerce banquet in London, Sir George Reid, High Commissioner of the Commonwealth, said some things that are very pertinent to this question. After referring to certain other matters he said—

"There are enormous areas held by a few and used as sheepwalks. I do not disparage the services of many of these gentlemen in the earlier days of the State, when the pastoral industry was the forerunner of all others, but the time has come when Australia must be peopled, and I would like to direct your attention to the following:—"

Then he went on to quote from a speech made by the Hon. Andrew Fisher, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—

"They (emigrants) have always been welcomed. There has been an almost inconceivable denunciation of Australia and of the Labour party in that connection. But no party has been more ready and willing to receive persons of European descent in Australia than has the Labour party. Taken as a whole, nobody is more ready than are the trade unions of this country to give such people a hearty welcome. But, undoubtedly, they desire to see maintained the conditions which have been prescribed by Mr. Justice Higgins. They wish immigrants, upon their arrival in this country, to be able to maintain themselves and their families in a reasonable degree of comfort as members of a civilised community. Subject to that condition, there is no party more willing than is the Labour party to see Australia populated."

Those are the words of Andrew Fisher.

The PREMIER: Those are the lines on which we are proceeding, and that is more than words.

Mr. COYNE: To confirm that, Sir George Reid quoted the Premier of New South Wales, Mr. McGowen, as follows:—

"I want you to know that we, as a Government—we as a party—realise that before we can consider this country belongs to us it must be peopled. We must have men where now we have sheep and gum-trees. (Loud applause.) While other parties have talked about the slender thread by which we hold this country, they did not take the one primary step of providing the land for the people they proposed to bring here. We desire to deal with the rural population. We believe also that the people who come here must have an opportunity of getting land if we are to develop the resources of the State. We have never been, as a party, against immigration. (Loud applause.) But we have all along wanted the facilities for putting people on the land when they do come here. In this brief statement on the land policy I hope we remove the idea that we are against immigration. We are in favour of immigration of the right kind, but we must have in the interior cheap land here, and for every immigrant who comes. (Applause.)"

The PREMIER: We are doing that in Queensland at a greater rate than it is being done in New South Wales.

Mr. COYNE: If we cannot provide for our own people, I do not see how we can provide for immigrants who are brought here. Now, I want to quote [10.30 p.m.] what Sir George Reid said himself—and I do not think anyone on the other side will suspect him of being a Labour man—

"If I might express an individual opinion, I would not at present advise any person to leave

Mr. Coyne.]

this country to emigrate to Australia to increase the population of Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne, or Adelaide. We have got in those great cities too many people in reference to the population inland. Sydney or Melbourne is twice as populous as London relatively to the population of the respective countries. For every twelve Victorians five live in Melbourne, for every fifteen people in New South Wales five live in Sydney, and for every fifty in that great State of South Australia forty-six live in Adelaide."

The PREMIER: That is the worst in the lot—the Labour State.

Mr. COYNE—

"I don't want to see that balance made worse; we want to redress the balance; we want to see the foundations laid first in the country, and next in the towns. Our great desire is to see our lands open to the farmers and agricultural labourers of the United Kingdom next to our own people, and plenty of room can be made for both."

I think that that is a patriotic statement for an Australian to make—that the people of the old country, next to our own, should be provided with land when they come here, and they are not going to get it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! Queensland comes out best in that comparison.

Mr. COYNE—

"So many of your people go to the United States that you might supply our wants out of the stream of emigration that goes in that direction without at all increasing the drain upon your own resources. (Cheers.) You have any number of leagues. The best part of their work does seem to me to be an annual dinner. (Laughter.) Let us have a league that has not an annual dinner, but which devotes its entire energies to persuading emigrants to go not to the United States, but to the British dominions."

(Hear, hear!) I do not think that even the Chief Secretary will find fault with the sentiments I have read.

The PREMIER: I have not a word to say against the quotations you have made.

Mr. HARDACRE: There were 164 applicants for one block, and they could not get it.

The PREMIER: In New South Wales?

Mr. HARDACRE: No, Queensland.

Mr. COYNE: It was near Longreach; there were three blocks thrown open.

The PREMIER: Something very choice. There is plenty of land to take up.

Mr. COYNE: But it shows the hunger for land when so many will come along for one block of land, allowing that it was the most excellent land in the State.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The same has been going on for years.

The PREMIER: And will continue to the end of time.

Mr. COYNE: It will not continue to the end of time, because you will be removed from there.

The PREMIER: I should not like to live for ever—not here. (Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: I have a complaint to make with regard to the administration of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act. I have had a large number of complaints in my district, which I have sent along to the department, and it is annoying to have to send anything to the department in connection with the administration of the Act. You have to wait for months before you get a reply, and then

you find yourself exactly where you started. They will tell you they have communicated with the inspector, and the inspector will come either before or after shearing, and will not know whether things were right or not. He will tell them to have some trifling thing rectified at the next shearing, but he omits to enforce it in time, and the thing goes on like the brook.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Can you give me particulars of a case?

Mr. COYNE: I made a complaint last October, and got a very evasive reply in April last. It strikes me that the fashion in which we get a reply from the department wants altering. I want to show what sort of a report we get in connection with the administration of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act. The inspector, in making his report, says this amongst other things—

"When making his inspection at Beechal during September, 1908, the inspector found tents and everything up to the requirements of the Act, and was surprised when he ascertained that the management had to purchase new tents for the shearing—"

It is the following that I want the House to take notice of:—

"as the shearers cut the sides out of them after shearing to roll their swags in before leaving."

What has that got to do with the inspector?

The PREMIER: Did they do it?

Mr. COYNE: I do not know; we have only his statement for it, and his knowledge is second hand, as he got the information from someone else. Then—

"It was also stated that the shearers stole woollen sheets which had cost the management 15s. each."

Just fancy—woollen sheets! (Laughter.) Then further—

"It was further stated that at every shearing the shearers had to be provided with wool-packs for bedding, as they did not carry sufficient blankets for themselves."

How did he know that? He got the information from someone else, and the person who gave the information was a biased person. I think it is time we got away from this state of things. I have been asking for a special hut inspector in that district; it is a very large pastoral district, and there is a large number of huts to be attended to, and I think it would pay the department to send an inspector to see that the Act is properly carried out there. I would also like the department to alter the regulations, so that the inspector, if he discovers that anyone is wilfully contravening the Act, can take action, instead of having to appeal to the Minister and through the red-tape methods hitherto existing. It would pay the department to appoint an inspector, and the present state of things is not fair to those employers who provide good accommodation for their men. I want to say that these good employers are very numerous at the present time, but there are a few mean persons who would compel men to kennel up in filthy premises for weeks at a time, and probably contract diseases and disseminate them throughout the country, because shearers are a nomadic people. In the interests of the public health of Queensland there should be proper supervision and better inspection of the hut accommodation.

[Mr. Coyne.

The department should appoint a man for the large pastoral district of which Charleville is the centre.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Did you mention the name of that station?

Mr. COYNE: Yes, Beechal Station. I have quoted from a letter I received from the department on 15th June, 1910. I would also like to ask the Home Secretary whether it is a fact or not, as has been stated in the public Press, that certain of the inmates of Dunwich do the washing at the leper lazaret for the patients there, and that they are brought back from there to Dunwich, where the general public visit twice a week, or as often as they are permitted. I should like to know whether that is a fact.

The HOME SECRETARY: Full inquiry will be made into the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not usual to ask questions in the middle of a debate.

Mr. COYNE: It may be a peculiar method of conducting debate, but I had to formulate a question.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are disorderly at any time, and the hon. member should not invite them.

Mr. COYNE: Very well, I shall only say that if the statement made in the Press is correct, I do not think the Administration should allow that kind of thing, and I do not think it would be done with the sanction of the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will cause inquiries to be made into the matter.

Mr. COYNE: I am very pleased to hear that. There was another matter in connection with that institution, but I have no mandate to speak about it, and I think the more charitable thing will be to let it die out.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Is not the lazaret under the Federal authorities?

Mr. COYNE: There is a post office there, I suppose, but otherwise it is not under the Federal authorities. The hon. member for Woolloongabba, however, has always some fault to find with the Federal Government. Dunwich is not a quarantine station.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The lazaret is.

Mr. COYNE: Is the lazaret a quarantine station?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, it has been declared so by the Federal authorities.

Mr. COYNE: It is not a quarantine station.

The HOME SECRETARY: It has been proclaimed under the Act a quarantine area.

Mr. COYNE: What we regard as a quarantine area is a place where the passengers and crew of a ship are placed when pratique is not granted.

The HOME SECRETARY: This is a quarantine area, and the Federal officer gives permits to persons who visit the inmates.

Mr. COYNE: Of course I know that the Federal authorities have authority over quarantine areas under the Quarantine Act. However, I trust that the matters I have mentioned—namely, the matter in connection with land, the matter in connection with the Western Railway and men on the railway lines, and the matter of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act—will receive attention from the Government.

Especially is it desirable that we should have a special inspector under the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act at Charleville, in order to look after that large district in which there are a large number of shearing-sheds. With these few remarks, and hoping that the powers that be will take notice of the matters I have mentioned and try to rectify them, I shall now resume my seat.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Question put and passed.

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

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