

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Council**

**WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY 1911**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY, 1911.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Arthur Morgan) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE said: I desire first of all to offer my very hearty congratulations to the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn on his transference from another place to the more placid atmosphere of this Chamber. I am sorry he is not here to receive my congratulations in person, but I sincerely tender them, and I hope he will find the surroundings quite congenial. Amongst other matters mentioned in the Opening Speech is the proposed amendment of our licensing laws. This measure has been promised for several years. I think it is a very much-needed reform, and I regret with the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn that the Government have not seen fit to make a party measure of this very important proposal. If I understand aright, it was one of the measures in the Government manifesto at the last election and at the preceding election, and it does seem a strange thing that now, when they have no doubt matured their proposals, they have not had the courage to make it a party question. As to the details of the Bill, we shall know them more fully when the measure comes before us. I certainly hope that it will be in the direction of restricting the sale of intoxicating liquors and doing something in the way of minimising the evils of intemperance. Of course, I quite agree with

*Hon. A. Hinchcliffe.]*

those who have preceded me that it is not to be expected that we are going to make men sober by Act of Parliament, but I certainly think that we can, by legislation, do very much to mitigate the evil. I do not agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Murphy, when he suggests that this problem should be left to older countries to solve. I admit it is a problem of great magnitude and of very considerable importance. In fact, I regard it as the basis of many other reforms, and I do not see that it can be grappled with nearly so easily in older countries as it can in the younger countries. Another matter to which reference is made in the Speech is the proposal to amend the Wages Boards Act. Well, in my opinion, what between the defective legislation and in some respects the unsatisfactory administration, I do not think it would be an unmix'd evil if a proposal was made to repeal that Act. From the outset, as hon. members know, I was never enamoured of the proposal. Never at any time have I spoken enthusiastically in favour of the measure. When it was first introduced, it was introduced as a compromise between the request which was repeatedly made—and which was repeatedly promised—for an Arbitration Bill. We could not get that measure, and this proposal was sent down to us. I believe that probably in some of the factories it has had some slight effect in mitigating the sweating evil; but, in regard to dealing with industrial difficulties generally, it has proved very unsatisfactory and very disappointing to many of those engaged in the various industries. For instance, I believe the Clothing Trade Board have been sitting for something like three years, and up to the present time they have not arrived at a determination, and, so far as the public are aware, they are very little nearer a determination now than they were when the board was first constituted. However, seeing that it is intended to amend this legislation, and with a desire to give it a fair trial, I hope the Government will include in the amendments some proposal to remove what I think is one of the greatest bars to the success of the wages boards system, and that is the method of appointing the chairmen of boards. We all know that the representatives from the employers and the employees—there being an equal number of each—invariably disagree as to the selection of a chairman. The result is that the Government of the day have to step in and make an appointment. As a rule—in fact, invariably—all vital questions are decided by the chairman, and on all vital questions he is virtually the board. Now, that is not likely to give very much satisfaction. I think that either a police magistrate or a judge should be appointed to preside over these boards. It seems to me that much of the dissatisfaction that now exists arises in this way. There is another suggestion I would offer, and I think it is an eminently reasonable one, and one that would help to make the wages boards very much more effective, and would do good work in educating public opinion, especially as to the evils which exist in many industries. My suggestion is that, instead of the boards sitting in camera as they now do, they should sit in open court and allow their evidence to be reported by the daily newspapers. Such a practice has existed in New South Wales ever since the

[*Hon. A. Hinchcliffe.*

establishment of these boards, and it is admitted generally in that State that it has been eminently satisfactory, and has done very much good. In fact, in many cases it has done greater good for the workers than the actual determinations of the boards. I think it is a reasonable suggestion, and I hope the Government will take it into favourable consideration. Of course, the Governor's Speech—like all its predecessors—does not include all the proposals which we would like, but there is another measure which has been repeatedly promised—promised in manifestoes on several occasions by the present Government when Mr. Kidston was leading it, and by Mr. Philp, who was then in opposition, and that is the question of a Trade Disputes Bill—an amendment of the trade union law—in order that trade unions may enjoy those rights and privileges which it was thought were conferred upon them when the Trades Union Act was passed many years ago. This measure has given rise to a good deal of litigation in Queensland, New South Wales, and also in other States of the Commonwealth. Prior to that some very big cases took place in the old country, and it was on those cases that the weakness of the legislation—which was intended to confer rights and privileges on trades unions and to make them legitimate institutions—was discovered, and an amendment of the law was sought. After considerable agitation and delay, the amendment was secured in the old country, and has now been in force for five years. Repeated requests, by deputation and otherwise, have been made since then in Queensland to various Governments for a similar amendment of the trade union law. Yet, after years of agitation, after repeated promises, the Government are still making no effort to deal with this question, which is very important to a large section of the community. Previous speakers during the debate have made reference to the question of immigration. Well, I am not one of those—and never have been—who can get violently enthusiastic over the necessity for a great influx of population into this State. At the same time, I should like it to be clearly understood that I believe that no man who desires the welfare of this community can consistently oppose the entry into our midst of desirable settlers from abroad.

Hon. E. J. STEVENS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I think there are ample opportunities and that there is plenty of room for large numbers of people to come and settle amongst us. It is the methods and the system which have been employed for many years for inducing people to come here to which strong exception has been taken, and is being taken, by our party. I do not think it is a desirable thing that we should have shiploads of immigrants obtained from the old country per medium of commission agents, who get a per capita commission for every person they induce to come out here, irrespective of their qualifications and their fitness. I believe that the opportunities for settlers are seductive enough and that the conditions of life in this country can be made attractive enough to induce a much more desirable class of immigrants to come here than we are getting by our present methods, and that we can get them at less expense. The constant complaint from

visitors to the old country from Queensland is that this State is doing less than any of the States of the Commonwealth in the way of advertising its resources and its opportunities to people in the old country and in other portions of the Empire. We can secure a better class of immigrants by the expenditure of money in this direction rather than by sending home derelict politicians to deliver lectures and pass on the active work of selecting immigrants to commission agents in order that this country may be flooded with a number of people, many of whom come here from curiosity, and many of whom are unsuitable for the work that they expect to find here, and many of whom are undesirable citizens. Only the other day we had a shipload of men supposed to be navvies, of whom I venture to say nearly 50 per cent. never worked on a railway. I know some of them who admit that they never worked on a railway. I know one who is a glass-eye maker, and there is not much opportunity here for men of that class. I remember some time ago when we were supposed to be introducing large numbers of farm labourers we were really bringing out artisans—a class numerous enough here at the time to supply all requirements. I am not taking exception to immigrants coming here, but I contend that this system of State-aided immigration, carried on as it is, is not conducive to the best results. The money could be better expended in advertising our opportunities, not in magnifying them, as is done by some of the lecturers, and especially by some of the agents, for we know that when men come here they find things are not anything like what they have been represented to be. With regard to facilities and opportunities of getting on the land and engaging in other occupations when they arrive here, I would be only too pleased to support any proposal of that kind; but there is a general opinion in the community that the present system is not conducive to the best results. In the *Brisbane Telegraph* of 20th April of this year there appeared a leaderette dealing with this phase of immigration; and it is rather interesting apart from the fact that it supports the views to which I have given utterance. This is what it says—

“On many occasions the *Telegraph* has commented on the undeniable fact that amongst the large number of immigrants coming to this country have been many of a highly undesirable sort. Specific instances can be cited to prove that physical, mental, and moral weaklings have been sent hither at the expense of the taxpayer, on whom, subsequently, the expense of keeping those weaklings, in hospital or penitentiary, has fallen. Those in authority point to the extreme difficulty of preventing an occasional weakling of the sort mentioned from being sandwiched amongst a body of really desirable immigrants. In the main that is quite true, and the difficulty mentioned is very real. But is that difficulty insuperable? And is it not possible to trace the agency through which undesirables were drafted? One of the *Telegraph's* cables of to-day tells of an interview with the leader of the Queensland Socialist party, Mr. Bowman, who has just reached London. He says that his party object to paying a bonus to emigration agents in England, because the tendency on the part of those agents is to think more of the number of emigrants they can secure than of the desirableness of the applicants. There is very much truth in that contention. In fact, it is well known that emigration agencies have sprung up in England like mushrooms in a hot-bed. That the average individual engaging in this business is only after the shekels goes without saying. The tricks to which some of

them resort are astonishing in their impudence. They keep dummy emigrants, through whom they secure the necessary papers for their undesirables, who otherwise never would pass the Agent-General's Department.”

Then it goes on to explain the method by which the dummy trick is worked, but it is not necessary for me to read that portion. The article goes on to say—

“Numerous cases of this sort have been discovered, and, of course, the only sensible conclusion is that when a girl cannot come here under her own name, there must be something wrong with her moral character, or with her physical health. It may astonish the authorities to know the number of epileptics, semi-idiot, and partial cripples that annually succeed in reaching here at the State expense. Of course, the majority of newcomers are of a highly desirable class, and such as they should be welcomed by the myriad. But the objection, as stated by Mr. Bowman, is perfectly valid, and the bonus system certainly requires very strict overhaul and reform, so that agents receiving bonus should be personally responsible for the cost entailed by the sending hither of any undesirables.”

I think there is a good deal of truth in those statements. Similar statements have been made by one or two previous speakers, and I hope, for the sake of the community generally, some steps will be taken to end the methods by which immigrants are obtained. I am entirely opposed to the system of State-aided immigration, especially the system of employing agents with a per capita bonus.

HON. W. V. BROWN: You do not object to the nominated system?

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I do not object to the nominated system; I think there is something to be said very much in favour of that. Of course there is a great outcry just now about the scarcity of labour. My contention is, that if it is necessary and a good thing in boom times for the Government to bring workers to the work, it is equally necessary and logical to ask that the Government, in bad times when there are large numbers of unemployed, should provide work for the workers. Of course I know there is a section of the community who are never satisfied unless there are at least a score of men scrambling for one man's job. That may be very desirable for the convenience and the pockets of avaricious employers, but not for the workers or the country generally.

HON. W. V. BROWN: It does not apply now.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I am not saying it does apply now, but I say there is always a section of the community who are never satisfied unless a number of men are tumbling over each other for one man's job. That is notorious, not only in Queensland, but also in other States of the Commonwealth. Another thing, a large percentage of the people whom the taxpayers pay to bring out here are disappointed with what they find on arrival, and go away to the other States. That became so notorious at one time that legislation was passed with a penal clause against any immigrant brought out at the country's expense crossing our borders within a specified period.

HON. W. V. BROWN: People come here from the other States.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: The people who come here from the other States are for the most part old settlers who get a know-

*Hon. A. Hinchcliffe.]*

ledge of the opportunities and splendid resources of this country, and are induced to come and settle here. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that they have done very much, especially in the farming districts, to stimulate our own settlers to better efforts and better results; and I think they should be encouraged to come here. But we are not getting immigrants brought out at the expense of the other States.

Hon. W. V. BROWN: Possibly.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You cannot tell that.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I do not believe the hon. gentleman thinks in his own mind that many of that kind find their way across the border to Queensland. I said just now that the opportunities in this country are seductive enough, and the conditions of life could be made sufficiently attractive, to induce labourers to come here; but I do not think it will be a very good advertisement for Queensland when it becomes known in the old country that we have in one of our agricultural industries at the present time a large number of men on strike for the miserable pittance of 7½d. an hour, and eight hours a day. I think that is a deplorable state of affairs, and what struck me when the matter was discussed in another place was the fact that no member on either side, whether he thought it or not, had the courage to say it was an unreasonable or outrageous demand. That is the position in the sugar districts, and it is a serious state of affairs that, in the most prosperous times Queensland has ever enjoyed, men should be struggling in this industry for the miserable pittance of 7½d. an hour and eight hours a day.

Hon. W. V. BROWN: They are found—they are provided with food.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: Yes. Twelve shillings a week under the sugar-workers' agreement, I believe, is the amount specified for rations; and they are now asking for £1 10s. and found or £2 2s. per week and find themselves. Surely to goodness, for such a class of work, having in mind the fact that it is only casual—and very casual at that—it is not an unreasonable request to make.

Hon. W. V. BROWN: Do you refer to cane-cutting?

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I am referring to the men in the fields, where the cane-cutters are working over ten hours.

Hon. W. V. BROWN: I am assured that cane-cutters can make £4 to £5 a week—that they are doing so.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: Yes—some of them, by working excessively long hours, and doing work which very few men are capable of doing, because they have not the physical stamina. There are plenty of instances in every class of labour where men employed on piecework—a few men—can make large cheques, but I do not think it is very desirable that these men should be made the pace-makers in any industry; yet that is the case with contract labour in the sugar-fields. The conditions for which the men are contending

are, in my opinion, eminently reasonable, and I say that it will be a very bad advertisement for Queensland when they know that in prosperous times men are struggling for this miserable pittance of 7½d. per hour, and eight hours a day. I know that it is contended by some people that the sugar industry cannot afford to grant the conditions that are asked for,

{Hon. A. Hinchcliffe.

but I do not think that statement is correct, when we find the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—who are now blocking the way to a settlement of this difficulty—according to figures which were published in the Sydney *Bulletin*—and I believe they are authentic—made a profit last year of something like £400,000.

Hon. W. V. BROWN: But look at their capital!

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: In reference to that matter, here is an extract from a recent *Bulletin*—

“A company that will capitalise half a million of profits in less than four years, and then make the people pay a 10 per cent. dividend on that watered capital, as well as upon the actually paid capital, has forfeited its claim to be left alone, particularly when it handles goods which every household must buy. And if it calls for upholders of private enterprise to support and defend it, this paper replies that the Colonial Sugar Refinery has become one of the most dangerous enemies of private enterprise in the Commonwealth; and the moment private enterprise identifies itself with such rapacity as this company nowadays displays, that moment it plasters on its forehead a notice, “Beware of the beast. It is dangerous. Perhaps you had better kill it at once.”

It is a notorious fact that the bulk of the small cane-growers are quite willing to concede the terms which the men are asking, but they cannot because the mills refuse to crush their cane. I certainly think that, if it was for this reason alone, it is a misfortune that the recent referenda proposals of the Commonwealth Government were not carried, as they would have enabled the Commonwealth Government to put an end to this huge monopoly which is coercing the small men and making the workers suffer as they have suffered. It is nonsense, in my opinion, to argue that the industry cannot afford to pay a decent wage. A number of men who have been in the industry have made pretty comfortable fortunes out of it, and it seems to me a monstrous thing that they could pay this wage when times were not nearly so good, and now, when the cost of living has gone up, I suppose pretty nearly 25 per cent. in the last five years, it is impossible to pay the men a decent wage and give them decent working conditions. This Government, along with Governments in other parts of the Commonwealth, have always been railing against socialistic legislation, but we find that they are repeatedly giving us one-sided, lop-sided socialistic measures in many forms. We find that in order to help private enterprise they build railways to protect starving stock from the ravages of drought; they subsidise ships to carry away exports for the private enterpriser; they buy wire netting to put round his runs; they provide him with experts to teach him how to breed cattle and raise pumpkins; they send special commissioners to foreign lands to open up new markets for his produce; they provide bonuses for manufacturing sugar and other things, and offer facilities to get it to market to sell it to the people who pay the bonuses. As a matter of fact, they are always seeking to keep him well supplied with imported labour so that the local labourers will have greater difficulty in securing improved conditions. However distasteful this may be to some hon. members, these are notorious facts. But, when some fair consideration is asked for by the men who find the bone

and sinew, and who help to produce the large profits which big monopolies are yearly scooping in, that consideration is absolutely denied them. I certainly think that is not a desirable state of affairs, and it is not calculated to do us very much good in the opinion of very desirable settlers who may be thinking of coming to Queensland.

HON. W. V. BROWN: But you do not approve of the strike, do you?

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I approve of no strike until it is absolutely necessary, and I believe a strike is the only weapon that these men had. They availed themselves of every opportunity long before the trouble commenced. As early, I believe, as January last they sent an intimation to those concerned of their intention to ask for these concessions. I know it has been urged that they will not accept a determination of a wages board; but, when things were comparatively peaceful last year, a request was made from several sugar districts to the Secretary for Works, who is in charge of that particular department, for the establishment of a wages board for the sugar industry in those districts, and that request was refused. As I say, I do not desire, and never have desired, to see these industrial difficulties.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: What about the six hours a day for next year?

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I know nothing about a six-hour day for next year, and no such authoritative request has ever been made by the men who are engaged in this difficulty. I know that it was stated in one of the newspapers the other morning that such a suggestion had been made by some speaker at a public meeting, but there is no authority whatever for any such statement being made, or for saying that any demand is likely to be made in the very near future for a six-hour day. I have never heard such a thing suggested, except in the way I have mentioned—that I saw it stated in one of the morning papers. Probably the Hon. Mr. Davey saw it there too.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: Yes—made by an organiser named Martin.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: An organiser may have said it, but I am quite certain that he had no official authority from the men concerned to make any such statement. All that the men are asking for is what I believe every reasonable, fair-minded man will concede as a fair and legitimate request—a living wage and the ordinary conditions that obtain in nearly every other class of employment. I do not think that I need refer to any other matter dealt with in the Address in Reply. I would like to say, however, in connection with the sugar trouble, that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company are refusing decent wages and decent hours of employment. It was admitted by the police magistrate at Childers the other day that the conditions under which the men were asked to work were such as no human beings should be asked to comply with.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The case is *sub judice*.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I understand the police magistrate personally inspected the accommodation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: His decision is being appealed against.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I cannot help that. This is the statement which the police magistrate made after having inspected the accommodation provided for the men—

“The hut accommodation that the defendant found fault with was good, but the sink for washing plates, knives, etc., he thought was not equal to the requirements of so many men at meal times. Moreover, he found no light was supplied in the sleeping quarters prior to the electric light generated when the mill commenced and when the men struck work.”

I do not know that any appeal will alter that statement. It was the opinion, expressed by the police magistrate after having personally inspected the accommodation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not usual to comment on a matter that is the subject of appeal.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I am not commenting upon the merits of the case in any way. What I have read is merely an expression of opinion by the police magistrate, and I presume that that is not the point of the appeal at all.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: His decision is the point of appeal.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: Anyway, I am satisfied from my own personal knowledge of many of these districts that the conditions are anything but desirable, and, if hon. members will only take the trouble to inspect them for themselves and are impartial, they will admit that what is alleged is perfectly correct. I have nothing further to say.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: As the hon. member who has just sat down may be supposed to be a party leader—if there are any parties in this Chamber—I have heard him in absolute silence, without interruption—I think it is my duty, in the same *Hansard* as the hon. member's remarks appear, to endeavour to pay him the compliment of offering some reply to what has fallen from him. In the first place, he has jeered at the Government for not making the Liquor Bill a party measure. Well, a Government usually selects the ground upon which it will fight, and it is entitled to judge for itself whether it will make any measure a party question or not.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: An ex-Minister said he regretted the same thing.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I am only saying that a Government selects the ground upon which it will fight. In the general remarks that I am about to make I shall say nothing personal to the hon. member. I am dealing with the great party which he represents, and of whom he is the mouthpiece in this Chamber. The Government will select its own fighting ground, though I have no doubt it would be very satisfactory to the party to which the hon. member belongs if the Government weakly and foolishly made a party question of a matter on which there is a considerable difference of opinion. I am in hopes that it will be found, when the Bill is produced, that it is a satisfactory one, and that it will receive such a measure of support as may crystallise it into law and confer some benefit upon the community generally. I am not an extremist either way, and never was. The hon. member has referred to the Wages Boards Act. I do not think any reform legislation will ever please his party. I do not think any form of legislation will bind the adherents of that party. (Hear, hear!) It is impossible to introduce any legislation that will do so.

*Hon. A. H. Barlow.]*

You can get at an employer; you can distraint upon his goods; and you can, if necessary, put him in gaol. But what can you do with the vast multitude on the other side? All these arbitration courts and wages boards appear to be a delusion.

Hon. A. A. DAVEY: Disfranchise them if they do not obey.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Oh, no! Even the judges of the Supreme Court are flouted. Even the judges of the Commonwealth are flouted. I do not think anything would really satisfy them. The hon. member let the cat slightly out of the bag when he talked about "pacemakers." He said he could not understand men who worked and who gathered up a big wage, and whom he called "pacemakers." Now that is exactly the position taken up by the hon. member's party. They want to reduce everybody to one dead level—to reduce the clever worker, the industrious worker, and the able worker to the level of mediocrity—in point of fact, not to allow him to become what the hon. member calls very cleverly "a pacemaker." On the immigration question, no doubt the state of affairs the hon. member would like would be twenty employers running after one man; but I do not think that will come about. I have not the slightest faith in the professions of the hon. gentleman's party that they want to see any immigration at all.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I do not think that is fair.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I think their desire is as far as possible to leave Australia to the natural increase caused by the preponderance of births over deaths. I may have my opinion, as the hon. gentleman may have his, and I hope he does not object to me expressing my opinion.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I do not object; but that is not a correct statement.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I think all the immigration they desire to see is the importation of bachelors' wives and old maids' children. We have in London a gentleman who must be admitted to know Australia—I do not think anyone can say that Sir Thomas Robinson is the wrong man in the right place; and as to the literature giving information about Queensland, the place is flooded with literature. We have been told a good deal about the "scalpers"—the sub-agents—but we have been informed by our responsible officers that we cannot do without the sub-agents, because the competition for immigrants is so intense. The other day a very small peccadillo by a "scalper" was brought under the notice of the Government in Brisbane, and in ten minutes' time a cablegram went to the Agent-General's Office to dismiss him. No Government could possibly do more than that. With reference to what the Hon. Dr. Taylor said the other day, I would have liked more particulars and dates to find out all about those erring ladies. If the hon. gentleman will furnish the Government with particulars—if he will give them the benefit of any information he can give on the subject, it will be thankfully received, and I hope he will give it without hesitation. The referendum would not have altered the position of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, because that company carries on business in several States. I leave the defence of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to one

[Hon. A. H. Barlow.]

or two hon. members who know a great deal more than I do about it; but I must say they make a mistake in including their Fiji business in the general balance-sheet, because in doing so they put themselves up as a cockshy by showing a large profit, a good deal of which is derived from the Fijian traffic, and has nothing to do with Queensland. As to the sugar-workers' accommodation business, let the law be carried out. The Government cannot have its eyes on everything—it is to a large extent in the hands of its subordinates; and I would penalise any official who fails to carry out his duties. There is the law; let it be observed and obeyed. We heard something from the Hon. Mr. Jensen and the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe about the Rockhampton programme. That programme may or may not be the policy of this Government—I do not know whether it is or not. The present Premier has not gone to a general election on the Rockhampton programme; and I think a large number of his colleagues are not disciples of the Rockhampton programme; moreover, the author of the programme has retired into a well-earned rest from political life. Therefore I cannot say that I hold myself or my colleagues bound by the Rockhampton programme. Now comes the great and burning question of a Trade Disputes Bill. That is a curious thing to talk about when the whole earth is filled with violence by strikes. I introduced a Trade Disputes Bill into this Council, and I then said I believed in the principle of combination, but that I could not for a moment sanction violence or insult or injury or coercion or breach of contract. Are these things going on at the present time? Let intelligent people outside ask themselves, "Are these things going on?" And is this a time to introduce a Trade Disputes Bill? One portion of the Bill is intended to legalise wrongful and unauthorised actions of the officials of unions. That is the Taff Vale case. Then we have the picketing. We were told—and I was contradicted when moving the second reading—that there is such a thing as peaceful picketing. I do not think there is such a thing. Now there comes the suggested amendment in connection with the Osborne decision, which is to the effect that, overriding the will of the minority, the funds of the union may be used for political purposes, to promote the return of members of a Parliament to whom that minority is root and branch opposed. That sort of legislation I do not think will, while this House exists—and I hope it will exist some time longer—meet with approval here. Modern militant unionism cannot get on without violence—it is impossible that it can. The officials make proclamations and issue manifestoes, and it is really a State within a State. How do we enforce our laws? If we make a law, it has what lawyers call a sanction; and if you do this thing or do not do another thing you suffer certain penalties. Now, what do we see in connection with modern militant unionism? You could not take up a paper within the last few months without seeing an account of some demonstration or riot or violence or insult. Now, I want to bring the public mind back to what occurred in the city of Adelaide, the capital of South Australia, which is blessed—or not blessed—with a Labour Government under Premier Verran. There was a strike in Adelaide about carting

matters. A member of Parliament, an organiser and secretary of a union, actually issued passes to permit people to go up and down the King's highway—to drive people up and down King William street, Adelaide. On one occasion they mobbed a cart, took out the horses, and told the man in charge that if he did not get away it would be the worse for him. In another case the proprietor of a flourmill said, "Very well, if my men won't cart this flour, I must cart it myself." He put it on his motor-car to take it to some retailer, but they forced him back to his place of business and compelled him to put the flour back into his store. Turn up the records, and you will see that there is no exaggeration in this. And when the Labour Premier, Verran, was appealed to he said he had no evidence; he did not know what was going on; he had no proof, no reports. This thing went on several days. Is a civilised community in the twentieth century going to submit to this kind of thing? Does not that bear on what I said in connection with the Trade Disputes Bill—that I could not consent to a measure supported by coercion and violence? Now, we hear a great deal about "scabs" and "black-legs"; and these opprobrious terms are thrown at respectable men. To be called a "scab" because you exhibit manliness and independence by thinking and acting for yourself is rather an honour. Our medical friends will tell us that a scab is a healing process. The "scabs" really heal the wounds of society, and the term "blackleg" is thrown at decent men by other men who are not blacklegs but blackguards. If there is an open sore which does not heal, you know you are in for erysipelas or an ulcer, or something of that kind, and the poor man called a "scab" is really one of the saviours of society endeavouring to break down tyranny to which no respectable reasonable man should submit. At any rate, it is better to be a "scab" than the slave of secretaries and delegates, and it is very much more honourable. It must be distinctly understood that we are now, speaking in our legislative capacity, in a state of civil war. There is a line drawn, and everyone must be on one side or the other—there is no middle course possible. I have a great deal to live down—a great deal to repent of—a great deal as regards votes I have given in this House and elsewhere. I was led by maudlin sentiment and sympathy—I had no pecuniary interest to gain—into courses which scores of people, quite as good or better than myself, also took. This may appear severe, but the truth must be told. The statement made by my hon. friend must not go uncontradicted; the public must not be allowed to forget Adelaide, the disgraceful disturbances in Wales and other places, and that these disturbances were not the work of respectable men, otherwise law-abiding, but the work of people who urged them on to some Utopia they are never likely to attain. With returning sanity we may have a better state of affairs; and for that, without bitterness, we must work—we must endeavour to bring it about. With regard to the conference of Premiers, I may say that I welcome my friend and late colleague, the Hon. Mr. Haw-

[4.30 p.m.] thorn, to this House. He is a decided acquisition to our debating power, and a man of very large administrative experience. If he should feel it to be

his duty, while I have the honour to be where I am, to bring forward any criticism, I shall listen to that criticism respectfully and pay attention to what he says. I do not object at all to a Premiers' Conference, even if it would have the effect of my Premier going to this conference. I do not think that the present Premier will give away one scintilla of our State rights. I am quite certain he will not. It may be that his exposition of the position might have a good effect in converting some of the other Premiers from the error of their ways, if they have any. I listened to the Hon. Mr. Norton with great pleasure. I cannot say that I know very much about this artesian bore question.

Hon. A. NORTON: It wants looking into.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: It wants looking into, as the hon. member says. But it is quite possible, from a cursory glance at some of the regulations, that the hon. member's friend did not give the requisite notice. In the papers I laid on the table yesterday there are certain schedules of notices that are to be given to the Hydraulic Engineer as to the size of casing before operations are commenced. I am not prepared to say that this was the case, but it is highly probable that the difficulty arose in that way. However, I will submit the hon. member's remarks to the Treasurer. I come now to the land question. The Hon. Mr. Beirne proposed that homes should be made for people who are coming here, and scrub cleared, and all that sort of thing. Now, I consulted one of the most experienced members of this Council—who has forgotten more about agriculture than I ever knew—and he says that such a scheme is impracticable because the scrub would grow up again. He said that a clearing must be cultivated, that it cannot be allowed to lie fallow, and that, unless a person is appointed as a bailiff, or a resident gardener as it were, the thing would be unworkable. I heartily wish that something of the kind could be done. Canada has been much bolstered up, but Canada is a poor place. I was reading Professor Goldwin Smith's "Autobiography" the other day. Goldwin Smith spent the latter part of his life in Toronto. There is no pleasure in being in a place where the thermometer goes 40 degrees below zero, and where, if you lie in bed, the breath from your mouth freezes on the sheet in front of you. I also found in that book—what I did not know before—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a cruel regulation that no house or homestead shall be built within half a mile of the line. Without flattery, I think that in Mr. Denham we had one of the most active and capable Secretaries for Lands we had ever had. We have a worthy successor to him—a very industrious gentleman—and I think that with these two in consultation, they will be able to evolve a satisfactory scheme of land settlement. Land settlement cannot be forced. It cannot be completed in a day, and I think some of the States are going a little too fast.

Hon. P. MURPHY: Queensland has been fifty years in existence, and yet she has only 600,000 people.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: That is so, and for the life of me I cannot understand the reason of it. I have heard the hon. member deliver himself very many times on this

*Hon. A. H. Barlow.]*

question, and have applauded him. My hon. friend, Mr. Hawthorn, said something about the adjustment of the revenue. It is always well to pay your way. It is always well to meet all accounts that you can get in by 30th June, and we have no certainty what the Federal Government will do in any year. After the bank note circulation business I am prepared for anything that the Federal Government will do. I would be surprised at nothing, and therefore it is just as well to get all the accounts squared up. As to the stamp duties, it is very easy to take off duties, and possibly some of those duties might be taken off if we can afford it; but it is very much easier to take a duty off than it is to put it on. In agriculture we are making a steady, not an immense, progress. Very likely West Australia is going too fast. I think, from what I can see, that that State is preparing itself for such a crisis as we had in Queensland in 1866. I do not think they have the agricultural land, and they are swarming people in at a rate entirely incommensurate with what I understand of their resources, and it is highly probable before long they will get what we did in 1866. With regard to the sugar-mills, it is not intended to erect mills in excess of the demand for sugar, because if you get a surplus of any protected article that surplus has either to be exported or destroyed. The Bill, when it is presented, will be found to provide an automatic process which will prevent the trouble referred to. I also believe that the Liquor Bill will be acceptable. I am quite certain there will be no mistake about the Health Act Amendment Bill. The food adulterator will come off very second-best under the measure. The Hon. Mr. Norton has had a large experience in regard to stock. He said that high rents were a cause of over-stocking. That may have something to do with over-stocking, but I am inclined to think that, where the temptation to make a profit is so great, a man will crowd stock on in good seasons when stock and wool are both bringing high prices, whether rents be high or low. No doubt over-stocking is a dreadful evil, and there can be no doubt that it is a shortsighted policy, but it is one of those things that you can hardly interfere with. I do not think that high rents have so much to do with it as the hon. member thinks. With regard to the beauty spots, I entirely agree with the hon. member. Perhaps as a community we are yet too raw and too commercial—we are not sufficiently esthetic—and, if these beauty spots can be preserved let it be done. (Hear, hear!) Let them be preserved something like Yellowstone, in the United States of America, is preserved, and various other beautiful places. While I do not desire to cry "stinking fish," we must remember that we have got most plentiful times now; but they cannot last for ever. I hope that any trouble may be long deferred, but the present pleasant state of affairs cannot last for ever, and we must try to get on sound ground. If we have only peace, there is nothing to prevent our becoming a great and prosperous community. If I felt it my duty to deal somewhat trenchantly with the question of the Trade Disputes Bill, I did not do it in any spirit of unkindness; but it is necessary that the community should be reminded of these things. It is necessary that the people who have never voted should vote. It is necessary that people should wake up from the sleep in which they are

[Hon. A. H. Barlow.

at present wrapped, and that they should do something to free themselves and their country from what, if it is not checked, will develop into a wretched and terrible tyranny. I say this in no unkind spirit, but day after day the evil is being accentuated. No demand, when it is granted, seems to be satisfactory. I saw a distinct statement that a proposal for a six-hour day had been carried.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: That was not an authoritative statement. It was only the statement of an individual.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I do not know whether it was official, as they call it in Labour circles, or not. I give the hon. member the credit of saying that it was not official; but, unless the public wake up and realise the present state of affairs, industrial disturbance and dislocation will go on until I fear to foresee the end. I say this as one who has done much to promote humanitarian and industrial legislation for no profit to myself—from nothing but a desire to benefit others, and all the thanks I have got for it can be expressed in the word "Nil."

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. W. GRAY: I listened to the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe regarding the sugar industry, which, after the pastoral industry, is the most important industry which we have in Queensland. I have been identified with the sugar industry for over thirty years. I claim to have been one of the active pioneers who opened up the tropical North—Cairns, Mourilyan, and the Johnstone River—when it was a fever-stricken district. I can therefore claim to have some knowledge of the working of the industry, and I say that, if there is one factor more than another that has made the industry prosperous in this State, it is the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. In every district in the tropical portion of the State where they have settled down, they have induced young men to come from the Southern parts of Queensland and other States and grow sugar. The majority of those young men had never seen sugar-cane before they went there, and they knew absolutely nothing about its cultivation. I look upon what the Colonial Sugar Refining Company has done in those districts as something in the nature of establishing technical colleges in connection with the sugar industry.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: That does not justify them in sweating the men there.

Hon. G. W. GRAY: I will tell the hon. member about sweating presently. Many of these young men emanated from Brisbane, and they are now prosperous, and their prosperity is entirely due to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Those young men went there without any means, and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company not only gave them the wherewithal to grow cane, but they imported plant cane of the best varieties, supplied them with tools and implements, and subdivided their estates and sold the land to these men at a very moderate price. To-day the whole of those farmers hold their own title-deeds. The cry originally was that the sugar-planters were big monopolists, and that the mills were controlled by men who grew their own cane. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company were the first to break up that system by subdividing their estates into small areas and creating the small holding

system. Anyone going into any of these districts will hear the praises of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company sounded throughout the districts. I have no hesitation in saying that. It is a great misfortune that during the period of thirty years of which I am speaking there should have been all these disturbances with regard to labour. In the earlier periods they very nearly annihilated the industry—I refer to the years 1885 and 1892, when the Griffith Government caused the disturbance, and subsequently when we became federated. When that time arrived, I took the opportunity of clearing out of the industry on account of the labour difficulty, because I knew that on that question there would be trouble. Though it was being bolstered up by the bonus, I took the opportunity of clearing out of the industry, because I realised the uncertainty of getting labour. Troubles have had to be faced ever since then, and within the last few days we have had the object-lesson of seeing two farmers, on account of the strikes, selling their properties for what they could get. They were farmers for thirteen years on the Logan and Albert—well known to the Hon. Mr. Stevens—before they went to the Johnstone River; and I do not hesitate to say that we had no better or more typical farmers than those two men. They came to Brisbane with the view of going to the Solomon Islands, because they cannot stand these strikes and troubles in connection with labour. Those are only two instances, but others are bound to follow. I am sorry the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe has attacked the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, because I know they have done a great deal of good in the tropical North, which would not have been the prosperous place it has become if it had not been for the company's money and the technical knowledge they brought to bear on the industry, because for several years they had experts travelling over the world acquiring new methods of economy. In mining gold can be now saved at half the cost of years gone by; and in the sugar industry the same tonnage of sugar can now be got from half the amount of raw material required years ago, which is largely due to the knowledge introduced by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. It is distressing to see strikes extending through districts where there is an abundant crop of cane; it is enough to discourage the sugar-growers. And I may tell the hon. member that there is no other industry in Queensland, not even the pastoral industry, in which labour receives so much of the profits. Canecutters working by contract earn very large cheques. As the Hon. Mr. Brown interjected, they earn from £4 to £5 a week. They do that by working long hours. The mills are idle six months in the year; and when crushing starts they must work night and day to crush all the cane, which deteriorates if it is allowed to stand over from year to year. Therefore, at the close of the day's work, you must have ready at the mill as many trucks of cane as you have put through during the day. The system of day and night work which obtains in the sugar industry necessitates an abundance of labour, and that question is a serious one, because the labour is not forthcoming. I would now like to offer my congratulations to the Government on their big railway policy. When the Bills were passed last session, I said I thought there should

be some measure tabled side by side with those Bills providing for the labour to build those railways. I am glad to know that the Government have been equal to the occasion, and have brought out navvies to assist in the work. My hon. friend opposite took exception to their introduction, pointing out that some of them are not suitable for the work; but I think it is pardonable if there are isolated cases of that sort among 600 men. Under the circumstances I think the hon. member's censure is undeserved. The Speech contains no reference to a Land Bill, for the reason that last session we had a very comprehensive measure, which is doing good work. And that measure, side by side with the railways, is bound to be so attractive that there will soon be an influx of people, and we shall no longer have reason to complain of want of settlement. The hon. gentleman also talked of a boom in Queensland. I do not think we have a boom here. It is good, solid prosperity—the outcome of seven prosperous seasons—and there is no boom about it. I would like my hon. friend opposite to tell us what he means by a “boom.”

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I said that if it was a fair thing in boom times to provide workers for the work, it was equally fair in bad times to provide work for the workers.

Hon. G. W. GRAY: One other point to which I would like to call attention is the proposed meeting of the Premiers in connection with the question of giving away the rights of the States. I think that before the Premiers meet we should know the questions they want to discuss. It was never intended when we federated that we should give away State rights. I should not be surprised at them asking that we should go cap in hand for permission to borrow the necessary amounts for the building of our railways. I see that £2,000,000 have been borrowed already. The Speech says it was obtained on satisfactory terms, and the Minister in charge will no doubt give further information later on. Referring again to State rights, there is a proposal that Queensland should give away the site of the Marble Hall, the building selected by Mr. Kidston in London, to the Federal Government; also that the one selected by Mr. Bent should be handed over in the same way—that the whole thing should be put into one. If that is done, we shall lose our position as States. The State Governments are already overshadowed too much by the Federal Government, and if we agree to have one big building in London and cancel the arrangements already made for our representatives there, it will be the beginning of the end in regard to dispensing with our rights. I rose particularly to refer to the sugar industry, and I think that if my friend opposite knew as much as I do about what the Colonial Sugar Refining Company has done for the sugar industry he would not speak as he does of their profits. The Hon. Mr. Barlow very properly said their enormous profits are largely due to their operations in Fiji. Their operations in Queensland are very small compared to their operations in Fiji, where there is cheaper labour.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: Don't you think that what the men are asking is a fair wage?

*Hon. G. W. Gray.]*

HON. G. W. GRAY: I have not followed what they are after. I know the work they are doing is in the tropical North, and they get large pay. At the end of the week, if they work overtime, they make £4 or £5 a week.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: If they work all round the clock they make big money.

HON. G. W. GRAY: The season lasts only six months, and if they want to make big cheques they will work while [5 p.m.] the cane is there to cut. I have been up and down the coast since the labour from the Southern States has been working in the industry, and I know from my own knowledge that those men go away with very big cheques. I would like to ask the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe what those men get per ton for the cane.

Hon. A. HINCHCLIFFE: I do not know what they get per ton, working by contract.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I would like the hon. member to inquire—I speak particularly of the tropical North. If the hon. member does inquire, he will find that it is only the contract system of working that induces them to return to the sugar districts year after year. I again offer my congratulations to the Government for what they have done during the recess. At the time of Mr. Kidston's retirement we regretted losing him. He did very good work during his term of office as Premier, and laid a good foundation, and I think that his successor—judging by the indications we have had—is building on solid foundation in a very practical way. During the recess he was very active travelling through the Northern districts, which means decentralising the feeling a good deal. I think that in Mr. Paget we have a capable Secretary for Railways. He also has been travelling through the Northern and Western districts where all these railways are going, and he has already made very good progress. I therefore think that, although we all felt losing Mr. Kidston, some of us are now changing our minds, and think that with Mr. Denham as Premier we shall lose nothing by the change. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Question—That the Address in Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor—put and passed.

#### PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS IN REPLY.

HON. A. H. BARLOW moved—

“That the Address, as agreed to, be presented to His Excellency by the President, the mover, and seconder, and such other members as may be present at such time and place as His Excellency may appoint.”

Question put and passed.

#### POLICE JURISDICTION AND SUMMARY OFFENCES BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

HON. A. H. BARLOW said: This is to a large extent a Committee Bill. I shall

[Hon. G. W. Gray.

be very brief—I hope not to detain hon. members for more than half an hour. The Bill is to take effect from the first day of March, 1912. It repeals twenty-five Acts. Hon. members will see a number of blanks, which refer to money matters with which we are not competent to deal. Those blanks will be filled up in print when the Bill is being considered by the Assembly, and will be supported by a message from the Crown recommending the necessary appropriation, and, after being agreed to there, the Bill will be returned to this House, when it will be for us to say whether we agree or do not agree with the amendments made by the Assembly. The Bill begins with an enormous interpretation clause. I shall be indebted to the legal members and to the other members of the Council if they will go through the interpretation clause and see if they can suggest any improvements. Of course, the interpretation clause is very often the mainstay of a Bill. Part II. deals with “Miscellaneous Offences.” It specifies the penalties that shall be imposed on persons who hinder the police, who deceive the police, or who commit assaults on the police, or who make rescues from the police or bailiffs, or who fraudulently make a seizure of goods; on persons who through false process in a court of justice levy blackmail, or lodge informations which are false; persons who harbour the police during the hours of duty or serve them with drink during those hours; persons who discharge firearms or fireworks in a public place without authority, or who throw stones, or create false alarms of fire, or who set fire to growing crops, and so on; persons who attempt to do any damage to a public garden or zoological garden, or to any library or museum; persons who commit any damage of a public or a private nature to a house; persons who trespass on enclosed lands, or leave gates open. It permits persons who are pestered with goats, swine, pigeons, or geese to kill those creatures. But they must destroy their remains, or cause them to be burned within twelve hours—I presume it will not be right to consume the pigeons themselves. It then goes on to provide penalties for persons who commit offences in connection with vessels by borrowing them—the offence which, when applied in connection with horses, is known as “soldiering.” It provides the penalties for “soldiering” boats or vehicles. It deals with persons who commit wilful damage as tenants; persons who levy oppressive and illegal distress; who—I have a marginal note which perhaps may amuse hon. members—who commit the offence known as “shooting the moon”—that is, persons who clandestinely remove goods by night to avoid distress. Then there come the usual penalties in connection with drunkards. Those penalties are not fixed—they are the maximum penalties unless otherwise specified. There are penalties for persons who procure intoxicating drink for drunken persons, or who abet prohibited persons in procuring drink. Then there is a chance given to a drunkard to take the pledge. If he takes the pledge, the sentence on him is suspended. Then, if a person is

very drunk, he may be remanded to a hospital for treatment. On the conviction of a habitual drunkard, notice is to be sent to the Commissioner of Police, and the Commissioner is to take certain action. When the court is satisfied that a married man is a habitual drunkard, the property of his wife and various other things are to be protected, and vice versa, where the wife is a habitual drunkard, protection is given against the seizure of effects. Street musicians and singers must move on when they are told to do so. Pilfering cargo out of vessels is dealt with, and persons who have goods in their possession which appear to be stolen must give a good account of themselves. A person, being a carrier under an agreement to deliver the same within any specified time, who does not do so, is liable to a penalty. Then the owner of any vehicle used for the conveyance of goods must have his name painted on the vehicle. Any person, not being the licensee of licensed premises—this refers to houses of entertainment that are not public-houses—must not open his premises for the transaction of business earlier than 6 o'clock in the morning or keep them open later than 12 o'clock at night. That does not apply to a coffee stall. Then people must not trade on Sunday, the exceptions being apothecaries and chemists, fruiterers, and vendors of temperance beverages. Then the Bill prohibits shooting on Sunday within the limits of any city or town. Then persons having places of amusement are not to be allowed to permit games to go on there on Sunday, and there must not be any playing for money or betting there. Then there must not be any playing for money or betting anywhere on Sunday. Any person who disturbs religious worship shall be liable to a penalty—that is the law now. Then comes a very important provision, and one well worth the consideration of the Council. Any person who breaks up a public meeting, or creates a disturbance thereat, is liable to a penalty. That will, at any rate, give one political party a chance of being heard at public meetings. If it is enforced, it will prevent gangs of organised blackguards going about from one district to another disturbing meetings of people who never disturb their meetings. People who disturb meetings are to be proceeded against on the authority of the chairman of the meeting. Any police officer above the rank of sergeant may enter any cinematographic show, and, if he finds anything degrading or immoral, he may put a stop to it, but there is to be an appeal to a police magistrate. Boxing matches and shows are put under the control of the police. Part III. deals with "Vagrancy." It is very comprehensive, and—in my opinion rightly—deals with fortune-tellers, rascals, both male and female, who extract money from poor credulous people by promising them all sorts of things that can never be accomplished. Then there is a provision to prevent the singing of obscene songs by persons who are confined in a police station. The regulations regarding brothels are exceedingly vigorous, but I do not think they are a subject for *Hansard*. They are very vigorous indeed, and they not only apply to the keeper of the establishment but to the landlord, if he knowingly and willingly permits the use of his premises for that purpose. Then there are

enactments against gaming. They also touch the person who allows his land to be used as a means of access to or exit or escape from a gaming-house. There was a case in Melbourne where they had a subterranean, or nearly subterranean, tunnel, which was all hooks and jags by which they could defend the gaming-house just as if it had been a fortification. Any person who allows his property or his land to be used for such a purpose as that will be liable to a penalty. Then the Bill deals with what is attracting attention now—the case of persons found in a gaming-house. Then we have stringent provisions about lotteries and unauthorised "totes" and the agency "totes," persons who receive money for the use of their premises for gambling, persons who exhibit gambling placards, and so on. The clauses are enormously long. Then there are clauses dealing with unlawful games and cheating. The totalisator is not to be used by infants, and infants are not to make bets, and circulars relating to betting are not to be sent to minors. There are provisions enabling the police to enter into premises, and any person arrested can be compelled to appear as a witness. Money unlawfully won may be recovered. Then there is an unsavoury part about obscene and indecent publications; and the next relates to the protection of children. The bookmaker is wholly abolished. Both in public, on the racecourse, and elsewhere he will be a thing of the past if this law becomes effective, and there will be no betting except on the tote. Then there are extensive provisions relating to neglected children. Youths under sixteen years of age are not to be supplied with tobacco, and young people under that age are not to use tobacco in any form.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: That is only in public places; it should also provide that they must not use tobacco elsewhere.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: It will not be lawful for any person under fourteen years to have firearms in his possession; and the Governor in Council may from time to time declare this section to be in force in any part of the State. Then there are some very good provisions relating to cruelty to animals. If a person finds an animal abandoned, diseased, injured, or disabled, it may be killed on the authority of a justice or a veterinary practitioner. There is to be no cock-fighting or keeping places of that description, and dangerous dogs may be killed. Vivisection is not permitted except under regulations, and then it is to be performed by a medical or veterinary practitioner. Then comes a long provision with regard to stock-stealing. Stock salesmen are to be licensed. There are strong provisions as to waybills, receipts for stock, illegal slaughtering, records of slaughtering, delivery of hides and skins, defacing brands, purchasing defaced hides, and notices to travel. This is important to pastoral members. The proviso of section 3 of the Brands Act of 1872 Amendment Act is repealed. That did not require notice of travelling stock if the number was under 200. Then there are most stringent provisions as to gold-dealers, gold-stealing, and so on. A man may have a general license to deal in gold; and there may be a special license to buy waste gold. Records of gold-buying must be kept, and returns given to

*Hon. A. H. Barlow.*

the Commissioner of gold bought. Machine licenses may be granted. A declaration as to the origin of gold must be made if required. In a prosecution, the possession of gold must be accounted for by the defendant. Export of gold must be accounted for. No gold is to be sold by persons under fifteen years of age. The provisions of the law relating to pawnbrokers are practically re-enacted here. Then comes the part relating to the second-hand dealer commonly called "Bottle O," who must be licensed, and must be above sixteen years of age. Then come the traffic regulations, which are re-enactments. Motor vehicles are defined, and there are regulations as to speed, licenses, and the numbers that may be carried. Everybody who drives a motor will have to get a license, which is not to be granted to anybody under fifteen years of age. If he exceeds the limit of speed his license may be forfeited; and if the vehicle emits smoke or stinks it can be dealt with.

HON. B. FAHEY: What about raising the dust?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: When, owing to the presence of a motor vehicle, an accident occurs, the driver must stop and see what is the matter. The part relating to motor vehicles also applies to persons in the public service of the Crown, so that Government motors will be licensed. If a police officer finds a person removing furniture between 8 o'clock in the evening and 6 o'clock the following morning, he may inquire into the circumstances. That is another case of "shooting the moon." Then there are provisions for searching and making arrests in brothels, for breaking open gaming-houses and the easements of gaming-houses; also a number of other powers of entry with which it is not now necessary to trouble hon. members. The police may search places for neglected or ill-used children. There is a humane provision that if any animal is impounded or confined, any benevolent person may supply it with food and water and recover any reasonable cost. Then there is power to search for meat supposed to have been unlawfully slaughtered; to search for stolen gold; and to search second-hand shops. Any person who signs a charge at a watch-house may be bound over to appear as a witness. There are also provisions as to special constables. There is a provision by which the "phiz-gig"—a person employed by the police to trap offenders by taking part in the show and giving them away—is protected from being deemed an offender or an accomplice. Any person who gives a false name and address may be punished; and the servant who commits an offence under instructions from his master is protected. Then there are some legal provisions as to what really constitutes stealing; there is the limitation of actions; there are general provisions as to regulations, and there are certain schedules. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

Resumption of the debate made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The Council adjourned at twenty-six minutes past 5 o'clock.

[*Hon. A. H. Barlow.*]