

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 1911

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER, 1911.

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

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year ended 30th June, 1911.

QUESTIONS.

REMOVAL OF POLICE FROM MAYTOWN.

Mr. DOUGLAS (*Cook*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Is he aware that all public business at Maytown has been suspended for several weeks past owing to the absence of the police officer in charge, who acts also as clerk of petty sessions and mining registrar, etc.?"

"2. What is the reason for removing all police protection from this locality?"

"3. Will he take steps to rectify this state of affairs by arranging for the immediate return of the police to the district?"

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

"1. No.

"2. For the performance of special police duty elsewhere.

"3. Instructions have already been issued directing the police on special duty to return to their stations as soon as possible."

REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS OF REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS COMMISSION.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. What sum of money was paid to each member of the committee for Redistribution of Seats Bill?"

"2. What time was occupied in the work?"

"3. Was the work performed in ordinary office hours?"

"4. Was such payment (if any) in strict accordance with Regulation 11 of the public service?"

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

"1. £210.

"2. The commissioners began their work on the 16th January, 1911, and furnished their report on the 27th June, 1911.

"3. Part of the work was done in office hours.

"4. Regulation 11 did not apply to the officers who made the redistribution."

RESUMED PORTION OF POWLATHANGA LEASE.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*) asked the Premier—

"1. When will the resumed portion of Powlathanga lease be opened for selection?"

"2. Will the township allotments be available on the same date? If not, when?"

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

"1. The resumption does not take effect until 1st March, 1912. The land will be opened for selection then.

"2. Yes."

PUBLICANS' LICENSES.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. How many new publicans' licenses were issued in Queensland during the last five years?"

"2. How many new publicans' licenses were issued in Queensland during the last year?"

"3. What is the total number of publicans' licenses existing at the end of last year?"

The HOME SECRETARY replied —

"1. The number of new licenses issued during the five years ended on the 30th June, 1911, was ninety-five.

"2. The number of new licenses issued during the year ended on the 30th June, 1911, was twenty-eight.

"3. The number of licenses existing on the 30th June, 1911, was 1,636."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. D. HUNTER (*Woolloongabba*) said: I rise to make a personal explanation. On Tuesday, 5th September, I asked six questions in this House. With a view to expedite business, I omitted the words "hundred pounds" in regard to the various sums mentioned in the question; but, according to *Hansard*, it would seem that I asked how many workers' dwellings have been erected for "over £3 and under £4;" how many for "over £4 and under £5;" how many for "over £5 and under £6;" and how many for "over £7." Now, as a matter of fact, I did not use the word "pounds" at all, after having asked the first question about the number "the contract price of which was over £200 and under £300." Every hon. member in this House understood perfectly well what I meant when I said "over 3 and under 4," "over 4 and under 5," and so on. They know that I was referring to "hundreds of pounds." You, Sir, reckoned that I should have used the full term "hundred pounds." Perhaps you were correct, but at the same time you were labouring under a false impression. I could not understand all you said, but from what I did hear I thought that you were only trying to keep us up to the mark. But when I saw this in *Hansard* I thought it made me look very foolish, and I want to have it put right.

The SPEAKER: I may be allowed to explain the matter. The House will remember that the hon. member for Woolloongabba asked six questions. The subsequent remarks I made had no bearing on the matter except that I pointed out that the hon. member was wrong in omitting the words "hundred pounds." He merely used the words "two," "three," "four," "five," and so on, omitting the words "hundred pounds" in each instance. It really amounted to an absurdity, and I called the hon. member's attention to it.

DEPORTATION OF HALF-CASTE FROM BOULIA.

On the motion of Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*), it was resolved—

"That there be laid on the table of the House copies of all the papers and correspondence in connection with the deportation from Boulia and detention in Barambah of a half-caste named George Speechly."

AMENDMENT OF TRADE UNION LAW.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of the debate on Mr. Theodore's motion, as amended—

"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; but this shall not apply to unions which contain in their rules a contribution for political purposes"—

Mr. COLLINS (*Burke*): When I was speaking on this motion on the 10th August I was arguing that we should have an amendment in the law, so that members of trade unions could contribute to a political fund. I am very pleased to notice that at the present moment one of the greatest trade union congresses that has been held for some years is sitting in the United Kingdom. In to-day's *Courier* appears the following cablegram:—

"The congress decided not to accept the Trade Union Funds Bill introduced by the Government unless the measure is so amended as to embody a complete reversal of the Osborne judgment, which prohibited the use of trade union funds for political purposes."

That congress represents nearly 2,000,000 workers in the United Kingdom. While I do not pose as a prophet, I may point out that what I said on the 10th August last, in reply to some of those who do not believe in allowing trade unions to have a fund for political purposes, has been largely realised. I then stated that one of the greatest intellects that England has produced—William Morris, poet, philosopher, and thinker—had reasoned out that the only thing that would bring about reform was a universal strike. Since the 10th August last we have had in the United Kingdom one of the greatest industrial upheavals the world has ever seen, which has to a large extent realised the doctrine preached twenty years before by William Morris, in his book entitled "News from Nowhere."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: "News from Nowhere" is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I read it many years ago.

Mr. COLLINS: It would do the Minister for Public Instruction no harm if he were to read it again. It is with the view of avoiding such disputes as those which took place in the United Kingdom that we seek an amendment of the law which will allow trade unions to form political funds. If the trade unionists in the old country do not get an amendment of the law in the way they have indicated in the resolution carried at their conference, they will more than likely have to resort to another big upheaval. In fact, in to-day's paper a late meteorologist of this State points out that they are on the eve of a social revolution in that country. If our legislators are wise in their generation, if this Government realises their responsibility to the community at large, they will immediately place upon the statute-book an amendment of the trade union law in the direction I have indicated; and I hope that before the end of the session the Government will introduce a measure of that kind, because after all it is their duty to legislate so as to avoid as

far as possible disputes of the nature of those I have mentioned. The organisation of labour is going on at such a rapid rate that before very long we shall be able to boast that we have 90 per cent. of the workers in our organisations, and if we get 90 per cent. of them, there will be no difficulty in our getting over to that side of the House. The Home Secretary, as a rule, talks about his democracy, and on more than one occasion has stated that he is a State socialist. If he wants to bring about an extension of what is termed "State Socialism," let him give trade unions greater power than they have at the present time. I noticed in the newspaper cablegrams the other day that the reactionary party in the United Kingdom—that is the party representing the wealthy classes—are now crying out against the law in force in the old country, and complaining of peaceful picketing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What is peaceful picketing—knocking a man over the head with a shillelagh?

Mr. COLLINS: No; it is not. Nor is it arming the police with rifles when there is no row on hand. Peaceful picketing—and I saw peaceful picketing in connection with the late strike—consists in interviewing free labourers and trying to persuade them not to work. Is there anything wrong in that form of picketing? It is merely moral suasion. But the idea of the Queensland Government seems to be to put rifles into the hands of the police, which has a tendency to cause a breach of the peace. That is not peaceful picketing. No Government should put a rifle into the hands of a policeman unless the opposing force is armed to the teeth. In the case of the sugar-workers' strike the men at Townsville were not armed, and why should the Government have taken the trouble to arm the police against a body of unarmed men, who were simply going to argue with the free labourers, and try to convince them that they were doing an injury to their own class by taking the places of the men who were on strike?

Mr. RYLAND: They were doing an injury to the State.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, as the hon. member for Gympie says, they were also doing an injury to the State.

Mr. RYLAND: And to themselves.

Mr. COLLINS: And to themselves, too. To-day not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout the world, nearly every trade union that is in the fighting line of the labour movement favours political action, because if we are going to capture the political machine—and that is our aim and ideal—we must have funds for the purpose. I do not deny that the aim and ideal of the organised workers of the world is to control the Governments of the world, so as to avoid trade disputes. So long as society is divided into two classes—the "Haves" and the "Have Nots," as they have been termed by Carlyle—so long shall we have industrial disputes and strikes. If we are allowed to use some of our funds for political purposes, we shall be the saviours of society, and shall be able to avoid those big industrial upheavals which have taken place throughout the civilised world. We have just witnessed a very big upheaval in one country, and I venture to predict that the next big strike within the

Mr. Collins]

next five or ten years will be an international one, bringing into line the whole organised workers of the world, because that is what we are really coming to. An international big upheaval will take place before many years are past unless the different organisations of workers, through their unions, and through being allowed to use their funds for political purposes, can capture the Governments of the world, and get what they desire. Unions do not stand still. Standing still means death to unions. We must all the time be aggressive, all the time fighting for better conditions, and it is owing to that very fact that we have made progress. Webb's "History of Unionism," which we have in the library—the history of unionism for the last 100 years—is very painful reading indeed. The fight we have had to maintain our position and the position we hold to-day has been a real up-hill battle against the powers that be. Just the same as in the early days the trades unions had to fight to get a Trade Union Act, so now the day has arrived when we must fight for an alteration of that law, with the view of avoiding disputes, because there is any amount of capital standing behind the powers that are opposed to us. It is the accumulation of centuries of wealth, and owing to that accumulation of centuries we too must be given an opportunity of making our unions political unions, to accumulate funds to fight the opposing forces. I was very pleased to read a telegram in to-day's paper—one of the most conservative papers you have in Queensland, the *Brisbane Courier*, but notwithstanding their conservatism they have to publish such cablegrams as this

Mr. CORSER: It shows their fairness.

Mr. COLLINS: Why, they have no fairness in them at all. Read the report of the hon. member's speech, and my own speech to-day. (Laughter.) As I read the other day, trade unionism in Germany has gone ahead by leaps and bounds during the past five years, and at the present moment the peace of the world, to some extent, depends upon the trade union movement in that country.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The hope of the Tories.

Mr. COLLINS: It is the hope of the Tories to save society, to save, may be, bloodshed between two great countries. Organised labour alone will be able to save this conflict between two of the greatest powers on earth.

Mr. RYLAND: Man's a man the world over, so brothers be for a' that.

Mr. COLLINS: That is what we are trying to bring about. An amendment was moved to this motion by the Minister for Public Instruction with a view of killing it, because we will have to vote against the motion as amended.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I am surprised.

Mr. COLLINS: The amendment reads—

"But this shall not apply to unions which contain in their rules a contribution for political purposes."

That is what the unionists in England are demanding at the present time, that they shall use their funds for political purposes, and that is what we in Queensland demand also. Under the present trade union law we have no protection at all, and we have been refused registration for one of the biggest unions in the State—namely, the Australian Workers' Association, and hon. members opposite might as well try to stop the waves

[Mr. Collins.

beating on the sea shore as to try to stop the progress of that union. In four or five years it may dominate not only the industrial but the political life of this State. It will represent the organised workers of this State in one grand union, with one grand object, the emancipation of man from man.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*): It was not my intention to speak on this question, but, as nobody else seems to wish to say anything, I do not see why I should not make a few remarks. As far as I can see, the whole trend of this debate is whether we are to be socialists or not to be socialists.

Mr. RYLAND: "To be or not to be." (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: I do not believe in socialism, therefore, if it comes to a vote, I will have to vote against a Bill of this sort. I think it is the unfortunate non-unionists who want protection. The non-unionists now are in a very peculiar position. (Opposition laughter.) I have had men working for me and then comes along a union delegate who wants them to take a ticket, and the men say, "Well, it is no very great advantage to me to take a ticket. What am I to do?" My advice always is to take a ticket. If I was a labouring man, I would belong to a union.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You belong to a union now.

Mr. GUNN: Of course I belong to a union. I think it is a very good thing to belong to a union, but it is a very different thing to compel everybody else to join a union. Why should people be compelled to join a union? All this sort of legislation, it seems to me, is to compel people to belong to different unions, and I do not think it is right to compel people to join a union against their will. Some people say there is nothing compulsory about it, but when you say to a man, "If you do not belong to a union, you cannot get a job," there is a lot of compulsion about it. You starve a man into belonging to a union.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Your union would not help you if you did not belong to it.

Mr. GUNN: Our union does not starve people into joining that union. I remember when there were no unions in Queensland, and I think the working man was just as well off then as he is now. He did not have any union levies to pay, and there are a very great number of other taxes that he did not have to pay.

Mr. FOLEY: He had no money to pay them.

Mr. GUNN: The old hands got on very well indeed. Seven or eight shillings a week in the olden times was just as good as twice that amount now. When I came to the colony with my father it was a very strange thing indeed to see a civil servant of any description. But now if you go down the street about three men out of every two you meet are civil servants. (Loud laughter.) The people of Queensland have to keep all these civil servants going. That

brings me to the question why I [4 p.m.] do not believe in so much socialistic legislation. All our complaints so far through this lengthy debate have been that so-and-so has not been getting sufficient pay, this industry has not

been getting sufficient protection. It is a fight really between employer and employee. The employer in this case is the Government, and the Government is always fighting with the employee. I think it would be far better if we encouraged more private industries; then the employee would fight the private owner or manager of the industry, and the consequence would be that the Government to-day would be a much better arbitrator than it is now. It cannot arbitrate very well with its own employées. That reminds me of a yarn which I heard a long time ago about a Mormon. He was arguing about the advantages of two wives over one. (Laughter.) He explained it in this way—the European, he has one wife, she fightee he; the Mormon, he has two wives, she fightee she. (Laughter.)

Mr. COYNE: Where would the man come in who is without a wife at all?

Mr. GUNN: The trouble is that at the present time we have so many civil servants. It would be much better if we had not so many people in our employ—if they were employed by private individuals. We could pass laws for their good housing, such as the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act—all those things I do believe in—but I think the Government are trying to do far too much in the way of socialism. We have the Ipswich workshops, with ever so many men employed there. Do any of those men support the Government that give them employment? Not one of them. (Opposition laughter.) Whenever we employ a man, no matter whether it is a private employer or as a Government, we make him an enemy right away. I do not know what the reason is. (Laughter.) Just the same way as if you lend a man £10, he is an enemy for life. (Laughter.) I think it would be much better if our railway rolling-stock was constructed by private individuals; we would get it cheaper than we do at the present time. We have far too much socialism. A Trades Disputes Bill means this: That you would still further persecute the non-unionist. The non-unionist at the present day is the man who is persecuted. When I was a younger man it was quite the reverse. At one time the unionist was supposed to have no rights, and there is no doubt that he was persecuted; but the unionist at the present time has any amount of protection. It is the non-unionist at present who wants protection.

Mr. COYNE: He gets police protection.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Have you read Mark Twain's "Mississippi Pilot"?

Mr. GUNN: I read Mark Twain's "Mississippi Pilot" many years ago, and the only thing I can remember about it is that Mark Twain said that the flashiest man he ever saw was the man who could jump in the air and knock his heels together three times before he reached the ground again. (Laughter.) There is a great deal said about what unionism has done, and that it has raised wages. No doubt it has raised wages, but, on the other hand, what has been the result? The manufacturer has had to raise the price of his goods. Take a boot factory, for instance. If the employees go on strike, and get a rise of wages, up goes the price of boots. Then again, the employer will perhaps put up the price too, and again there is another strike of the employees. They get a rise again, and up goes the price of boots

again. It reminds me of the time, when I was travelling in the far West, I had a new-chum with me, and I gave him some flour and asked him to bake a damper. He got the flour out and put water into it. Then he found he had put in too much water—made it too liquid. Then he had to put in more flour, and made it too stiff. There was always too much of one thing or too much of the other. That is the same as it is at the present time. The employee gets too high a wage; then the manufacturer has to raise the price of his products, and the consequence is like it was with this new-chum's damper which turned out to be sodden and had to be thrown into the creek. That is what your legislation will lead to if you are not careful. You will raise the price of products such as boots, clothing, until it won't pay the manufacturers to make them, and you will have to get them from aliens in foreign countries. I do not object to unionism at all: it is a good thing in its right place. It is like fire. Fire is one of the best servants we have got; it cooks our food and does a great many things that we could not do without. But allow fire to go rampant, and see where you are! It is the same with unionism. Unionism is a splendid thing if it does not go mad. I think unionism is going mad to a certain extent all over the world. What is the reason? Perhaps it may be that we have too much machinery. Machinery is perhaps doing away with labour in some cases; at any rate, it is extinguishing small trades. When I was a youngster, every now and then you came across a small shop where a man, called a cobbler, made boots for himself. He did not like unionism, he charged what he liked. At the present time these cobblers are extinct, and they go into big factories to make boots, and as soon as they go into the big factories they form unions. That may be the reason, but it is a fact that industrial disputes are more rampant in every part of the world. Every now and then we get a wave of socialistic ideas flowing over the world; whether this wave is going to down the Government, or perhaps down Queensland, I do not know. You must remember what a serious thing it was—

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What?

Mr. GUNN: The French Revolution. (Laughter.) It would be a very serious thing if we had a revolution in the British Empire or even in Australia.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Get rid of the cause, and there will never be anything like that.

Mr. GUNN: I think a great deal of the cause is this: We have that tired feeling and would like to get somebody else to work for us, and not to work for ourselves—or not too much. (Laughter.) We object to work ourselves.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and loud laughter.

Mr. GUNN: Another cause is this: We always like to divide up with somebody that has something to divide. I do not believe in divide-uperism, because I have a little to divide. But if I was on the other side and had nothing to divide, I would believe in divide-uperism. (Laughter.) There are a great number of people who advocate divide-uperism, especially when they have not got anything to divide up themselves.

Mr. Gunn.]

Mr. COLLINS: What authorities are you quoting from now?

Mr. MANN: He is mixing up socialism and communism.

Mr. GUNN: You can take the example of other nations that have tried socialism. There was also a colony of people went from Australia, under Mr. Lane, to South America, and I do not think they made a great success of socialism over there.

Mr. ALLEN: That was not socialism.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They had to live on monkeys and beans.

Mr. GUNN: That socialistic experiment broke down. There is another object lesson in connection with socialism which to my mind can be quoted as being inapplicable. Take the aboriginals of Australia. I do not think the aboriginals of Australia ever asked for a Trade Disputes Bill. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: Don't you think they want one?

Mr. GUNN: I think they are as much entitled to a Trade Disputes Bill as some of the people who are now advocating it.

Mr. COLLINS: You surely don't put us on a level with aboriginals.

Mr. GUNN: The aboriginal is the true socialist. He has to divide up with the rest of the tribe. If an aboriginal catches two 'possums, he has to give one to his fellow tribesmen. If he builds a gnyah that is too big for himself, then the whole tribe can come and live in it if they wish to do so. The aboriginals are the true socialists, and what have they come to? They have come to nothing, and that is what will happen to this resolution—it will come to nothing.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): I listened attentively to the humorous speech of the hon. member for Carnarvon, and his objection to the motion seems to be that it prevents a man from getting work unless he joins a union. The leader of the Government argued that the motion wanted to give the majority in the unions the right to inflict an injustice on the minority. The argument of the hon. member for Carnarvon was that a man would not be able to get work anywhere else if he did not join the union, and the argument of the leader of the Government was that members of the union would be compelled to contribute to the political fund of the union, whether they wished to do so or not. One argument was against joining a union, and the other was against joining a union or association for political purposes. They practically object to workers joining together in a body for political purposes.

Mr. CORSER: It is forcing those who belong to a union to contribute to that union for political purposes which they do not believe in. The minority have to be over-ridden.

Mr. HARDACRE: I contend the arguments of members opposite is an attempt to prevent workers joining together for political purposes. Why should not workers have the right to join together to carry out any objects as the majority might decide? The majority must rule in such cases, and the motion as originally introduced was an endeavour to allow workers to join together for political purposes and as a trades union.

[*Mr. Gunn.*]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: And practically to exempt them from any responsibility.

Mr. COYNE: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. HARDACRE: There is nothing of that in this proposal at all. The workers wish to improve their position in two ways—to join themselves together for the benefit of their own trade, and in order that they may be able to do anything effectively to enable them to take political action. I will give one or two cases for example. We have the Wages Boards Act, but it has been stated that the Wages Boards Act is by no means perfect. If the trade unions think they cannot get justice under the Wages Boards Act, is it not right and proper and necessary for them to do what they can to get that justice which they require? And they want to get it by law. It was the same with the Workers' Compensation Act. Have the workers not got the right to join together to get passed by the Legislature legislation such as the Workers' Compensation Act, which is for their benefit? The only thing in the motion before the House is that the workers may be enabled to redress their grievances by the aid of the law of the country. There is nothing more in the motion than that. It has been argued that if the motion is passed, a man will not be able to get employment unless he joins a union. If such a state of things does exist, it is incumbent on those who object to this motion to bring in a law to prevent such a thing being done.

Mr. COYNE: How can such a thing happen?

Mr. HARDACRE: It can never happen, but I am just saying what can be done if it does happen.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Is it not happening every day?

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The TREASURER: We have had evidence of it.

Mr. THEODORE: Give us some evidence of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: The arguments which have been raised are arguments which could be made to apply against unionism at the present time. They say that a man cannot get employment unless he is a unionist. If it is a wrong thing to prevent him from getting employment when this motion is passed, it is a wrong thing now. But such a thing does not exist, and would not exist if this motion was carried. I do not intend to talk this motion out, but I want to get back to the main question as it was when it was first introduced into this Chamber. The Hon. the Secretary for Public Instruction very ingeniously attempted to side-track us by moving an amendment which really had the effect of killing the motion. I have an amendment to move on the question, and I hope we will get a vote on it and so get back to the original question. I move that the following words be added after the word "purposes"—

"Unless such rules have been or are hereafter adopted by a majority of the members of the union concerned."

If the motion is amended, we will see if the Government are in favour of it being passed or not.

Mr. LESINA: From what date?

Mr. HARDACRE: "Have been or are hereafter adopted." That will apply to any rules passed by the majority of the members concerned. It can only apply where the rules have been passed by the majority.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*): I would have voted for the original motion as amended by the Secretary for Public Instruction, but I cannot see my way to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Leichhardt, because I do not think that in political matters any majority have the right to coerce the minority.

Mr. LESINA: This is a case of the majority deciding for itself.

Mr. SWAYNE: People should have the right to return to Parliament the men they think best fit to represent them; and I would be the last to question that right. As far as unions are concerned, I am willing to concede that in the past they have been a benefit; but I think that at the present time unionism is being carried to extremes. I would like to point out that during the last few years we have had industrial laws and amendments of industrial laws by the dozen in the hope that they would put an end to strikes. But has that been the case? I do not think so. I find that in New South Wales between 1896 and 1903 they passed twenty-two measures to regulate the relations between employers and employed. In South Australia twenty-three such laws were passed; in Tasmania, 16; and in the other States similar legislation has been passed. But it has not brought about industrial peace as far as I can see; and I think that in the face of all this it is time to seriously consider how far we are going in this direction. In return for granting their wishes in this respect, we find the unions are banding together for the purpose of more industrial war—more battles between employers and employed.

Mr. COYNE: What does the Employers' Federation mean?

Mr. SWAYNE: They claim no special class privilege, at any rate; they don't claim compulsory preference. I remarked just now that we find the unions, on whose behalf this amendment is moved, are simply using whatever power they can get for the purpose of stirring up strife. And the worst of it is that in the promotion of these battles the majority of those concerned have not a voice—a rule these matters are decided by small minorities. I find that as far back as 1903 the Labour Council sitting in Sydney had before it a scheme described as follows:—

"The scheme which the Sydney Labour Council has before it for widening the scope of its operations, and aiming at permanent power over the affiliated unions, was much discussed in Labour circles to-day. The new idea is that the council should no longer be merely an advisory body, but that the unions shall be subject absolutely to the will of the Labour Council of New South Wales, the title by which it is proposed that the body shall be known in future."

Mr. COYNE: Don't you place power in the hands of the Cabinet?

Mr. SWAYNE: The idea is that the council is no more an advisory body to the unions, but the unions must absolutely sink their opinions and bow to the will of the Labour Council.

"Each union sending delegates to the council will be obliged to confer plenary powers upon

them, and in the event of the delegates as a whole deciding on some important issue the unions are to be bound by that decision absolutely, whether they approve of it or not. One clause of the projected new constitution sets out the position clearly and unmistakably—"every society and council affiliated shall agree to abide by the decision of the council in all matters requiring its intervention and judgment."

Mr. THEODORE: Are you quoting from the "Sugar Journal"?

Mr. SWAYNE: Before any strike was called on it used to be considered that those who had to suffer—those who had to bear the brunt of the trouble—should have the opportunity of voting by ballot; but this does not look like it.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What are you quoting from?

Mr. SWAYNE: I am quoting from a telegram to the *Brisbane Observer* in 1903. It is not an editorial, but a Press telegram, which I think will be admitted to give the facts. Then, again, we find that the *Leader*, the weekly issued at the *Age* office, contains a report concerning a proposed new organisation. This is dated 15th July, 1911—

"The report of the committee appointed to devise a scheme for closer organisation of unions was presented to the Trades Hall Council on Thursday, 6th instant, by Mr. Smart."

The recommendations included the following proposals:—

"That the Trades Hall constitution be amended to empower the council to control and finance strikes, and to secure a more efficient consolidation of unionism by grouping the unions into families of allied trades or occupations."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: It is a very good movement. Do you fear that?

Mr. SWAYNE:

"For defence purposes and delegation on the council, unions be grouped as follows:—"

And so on.

"Each union in a group shall annually elect representatives"—

And so on.

"All general trade disputes must be referred by the union concerned to the group executive"—

And so on.

"The council shall be composed of representatives from the various groups"—

And so on.

"The council shall establish a strike fund, to which every affiliated union (whether meeting in the hall or not) shall contribute a quarterly payment for each financial member. Should the council declare a strike, it shall have power to make a levy on all unionists not on strike, such levy to be collected by the officers of the various unions, and paid into the strike fund of the council as soon as possible. It is recommended that all contributions shall be based on members' earnings, and that sex distinctions shall not be recognised.

"When a strike has been declared, the council shall have absolute control, and may call out any unions or individual members it deems necessary to bring the strike to a successful issue."

The whole scheme is simply to prepare for

Mr. Swayne.]

industrial war. No doubt there was a time when the worker had to strike to get his rights.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SWAYNE: If such was now the case in Australia, I would be the last to deny him that right; but we are past that stage now. We have tribunals appointed to deal with any dispute; and unions have no more right to take the law into their own hands than individuals; yet we find that when these troubles are going on they claim to be above the law. In olden times we know that the nobility used to claim absurd privileges; but now we find it is the other side—the unions—who claim to be above the law. The other day in Queensland men claimed the right to break agreements; men were instigated to repudiate their debts and to assault and interfere with men following their lawful callings at the instigation of a union. In support of what I just said, I will quote from a Mackay paper of last month—

"A serious situation was created at Pleystowe yesterday by a mob of forty or fifty men visiting farms where cane-cutting was in progress, and resorting to violence to compel men to cease work. On Mr. Penny's farm, where five cutters were at work, it is alleged the mob entered the land and attacked the men with sticks of sugar-cane and inflicted severe punishment on each, one poor old chap, sixty-five years of age, receiving a cut on the head and injury to his collar-bone, while all the others were cut or marked with lumps from the blows."

Mr. HAMILTON: What are you reading from?

Mr. SWAYNE: I am reading from the *Daily Mercury*. (Opposition laughter.) The only papers that hon. members [4.30 p.m.] on the other side like to hear quoted are the *Sydney Bulletin* and the *Worker*—

"Other farms were visited, and intimidation used to prevent the men from continuing work. A lawless mob also entered the millyard and threatened the men on the carrier, and other riotous proceedings marked the outbreak. Mr. J. C. Penny, the manager, secured police assistance as speedily as possible; but at latest advices nothing has been done to bring the offenders to justice. Subsequently, two policemen were sent to the mill, and other precautions were taken to prevent a recurrence of the attack."

Mr. THEODORE: Did that prove it?

Mr. SWAYNE: We know the men were injured, and they did not injure themselves. They did not take sticks of cane and hit themselves with them; it was the work of a picket. Again, in a letter that I received from a friend in Mackay there was a description of a disturbance that took place there on a certain Saturday night not very long ago. Some young fellows came into town to play tennis, and they wore a blue ribbon, the colours of their club, and they had to seek police protection simply for wearing their club colours. Things have come to a pretty pass in what is called a free country when you cannot wear a blue ribbon in your buttonhole without your life being endangered. And yet the Opposition are asking for additional powers for men who do this sort of thing. I do not know whether these men were the leaders of the unionists, but there is reason for believing they were pickets. There is a case pending, however, in which one of their leaders is concerned, and, as I

[Mr. Swayne.

do not wish to say anything about a case that is sub judice, I shall not pursue the subject any further. At any rate, it is public property that such things as I have indicated are happening in more than one town in this State. No doubt the hon. member for Burke believes in such conduct, and is quite prepared to defend it, but I do not think the majority of the people in Queensland desire to see this state of affairs. Again, I notice in the telegraphed report of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in to-day's papers, that Mr. Deakin said—

"What could be said about the condition of affairs in Adelaide, where, for two days, passengers had to get a permit from the union officials to use the streets?"

There you are again—law-abiding citizens cannot walk in the public streets without obtaining permission from the body whom hon. members on the other side ask for additional powers for. It seems to me that they have rather too much power if they are able to compel citizens to ask for permission from them before they are allowed to walk in a public road. I think they have too much power.

Mr. COLLINS: They had to get permission to carry the mails the other day in the old country.

Mr. SWAYNE: Does that make it right here? Hon. members opposite tell us what has been done in the old country, but we must not forget that the wage-earner here has privileges that the wage-earner in the old country does not possess. But even if there were any justification for this sort of thing in the old country—and I do not admit that there is—that justification does not exist here, because there is a tribunal to whom they can appeal if they are wronged.

Mr. MULLAN: We want to make assurance doubly sure. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Mr. SWAYNE: Hon. members on the other side do not want anybody else to have any liberty unless they agree with them. That is what they are trying for.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: If you make the union conditions so good, you might join one, and participate in the benefits.

Mr. SWAYNE: We have heard a great deal about the Amalgamated Workers' Association, and its willingness to comply with the law.

Mr. HAMILTON: You will hear more of it before you die.

Mr. SWAYNE: I can quite understand hon. members on the other side do not want the other side to be heard, but it is only right that they should hear it. What was the action of the Amalgamated Workers' Association in promoting the late strike in the sugar districts, despite the fact that there was a tribunal ready to deal with the matter in dispute—and there was only one point in dispute, when it came to be sifted? Although there was a means of settling the dispute peaceably, the Amalgamated Workers' Association, by public advertisement, instructed their members to have nothing to do with the tribunal, but to strike instead. No matter what their good deeds may have been in the past, nobody can dispute the fact that unions have been guilty of bigger tyranny during the last few years than ever

they suffered from, and the need for their existence to a great degree has ceased. It is a question whether it is not desirable that the law should be so altered as to curh instead of increase their powers. Regarding the word "tyranny" that I used just now, that is rather a strong term to use, but I think I can justify its use.

Mr. THEODORE: Would you apply it to the treatment of the canegrowers by the directors and owners of the mills?

Mr. SWAYNE: There was no tyranny on the part of the millowners.

Mr. THEODORE: What was it—coercion?

Mr. LESINA: Moral suasion. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. THEODORE: Or plain intimidation.

Mr. SWAYNE: Going back to 1905, the following appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, under the heading of "The Grip of Trade Unions":—

"The Grip of Trade Unions.—If some wag were to inscribe over the lintel of the Trades Hall doorway, "All hope abandon ye who enter here," he could plead justification with considerable force, and would need to go no further than the No. 2 Arbitration Court for his data. The public has already learned that no unionist may free himself of the shackles of unionism if his union happens to be a party to a cause pending in the Arbitration Court. But all that that means is a long story, being gradually told to Judge Gibson by tradesmen who are from time to time sued for arrears. As nearly every union has a case pending, the membership rolls can be depleted only by death. If a man is starving or—to put a less sorrowful picture—if he wants to adopt some more profitable line of business to maintain his family, he may have to remain in his union, and pay the fees, as his resignation cannot be accepted. The grip of unionism may mean strangulation, but the helpless member cannot hope for freedom. Members in arrears are being sued in large numbers, and orders go out against them, with costs. But a humane judge spreads the payment over long terms. It is also a fact, as was shown in a case yesterday, that if a union fines a man for an offence, and sues for that money, the judge is compelled to order him to pay if the union books show that the fine was imposed in proper form. One man yesterday protested that he had been called upon for doing some extra work, and a statement was demanded. He refused it till he had heard the evidence against him. Thereupon he was fined as for a proved offence." Judge Gibson had to enforce payment, but he resolutely declined to allow costs, and, to further assist the man, ordered that he should pay the fine at the rate of _____ a week."

In the face of such facts, it is a fair question to ask what additional privileges they want.

Mr. MULLAN: You will surely vote for the amendment.

Mr. SWAYNE: Here is a case which was heard before the New South Wales Arbitration Court in the same year. I am quoting from the *Sydney Morning Herald*. There is a whole string of cases, but I have no time to go through them all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is very interesting. Go on. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. SWAYNE: This is one case—

"Against Alexander White, no order was made. He was said to be owing £2 3s. 6d. and 8s. costs, according to an order made in August last. But he explained that he was without means, and at present an outdoor patient at the Prince Alfred Hospital. He admitted having obtained £30 some time ago

for the sale of a house at Flemington, but he said he had paid this away to his butcher and baker and other creditors.

"The secretary said members were flouting the union all round."

That is pretty rough, isn't it? Again, to show how this constant effort to stir up strife between employer and employee is regarded by outsiders, and what injury it does to Australia, I shall quote an extract from the *Brisbane Courier* of the 23rd February last. It is as follows:—

"Sir John Sinclair, one of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners who recently visited Australia, in the course of an interview with a Press representative on his arrival at Plymouth, spoke enthusiastically of Australia's prospects. In his opinion, Australia was the saddest country he had ever seen, having regard to the labour problems confronting the Commonwealth. He had never heard more bitter expressions used by employees to employers, and vice versa, than in Australia. The solution of the labour question could only be reached by increased population."

I take leave to say that this bitterness is largely the work of persons connected with the bodies which seek this increased power. So far I have quoted from various newspapers which members opposite apparently do not like. I shall now quote from the *Worker* of the 8th October, 1910. The quotation that I shall make is an advertisement having reference to the enforcement of a levy that was made for the purpose of starting a Labour daily newspaper in Sydney, and is signed by W. G. Spence, president, and Donald Macdonell, secretary. No one can have any objection to any section of the community starting a newspaper to represent their views and interests, but I contend that it is not a fair thing to compel men who object to the establishment of such a paper to contribute towards the cost of establishing it. Mr. Spence and Mr. Macdonell say—

"The levy was imposed by a huge majority vote of the members themselves, and it is to be regretted that there is even one member in our midst prepared to violate union principles by trying to evade payment.

"For the information of such, therefore, we would quote section 68 of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1904. This is the section: "All fines, levies, or dues payable to an organisation by any member thereof under its rules may, in so far as they are owing for any period of membership subsequent to the registration or proclamation of the organisation, be sued for and recovered in the name of the organisation in any court of summary jurisdiction constituted by a police, stipendiary, or special magistrate."

That shows that members of trade unions are compelled to contribute towards the establishment of a newspaper, whether they like it or not. The mere fact that such an advertisement was necessary shows that there were many members who objected to pay the levy. Some of those compelled to furnish the capital to start the paper will never even see it. There is no need in such a country as Australia for such stringent laws and such tyrannical action as are there indicated. Coming back to the Sydney cases, I have here a newspaper report showing that a man was fined for not walking in a procession. Unless he paid that fine he would be debarred from getting a job. Why should a man be compelled to walk in a procession if he objects to doing so? But worse still is the rule of the Amalgamated

Mr. Swayne.]

Workers' Association which imposes a monetary penalty on a member who does not vote for a candidate selected by the union. This extract is from the report of a meeting held by Mr. Oakes in a Melbourne suburb during the last election contest. Mr. Kelly, a member of the House of Representatives, was speaking, and said—

"The rules of the A.W.U. at one time compelled its members to not only support any trade union objects (which he quite agreed with), but also compelled them to contribute to the funds of the Federal and State Labour parties, to the Sydney Worker, and, further, to swear to vote for the selected Labour candidate, the penalty for voting against him to be £3.

"An interjector immediately challenged this statement as false. Mr. Kelly then said that if this interjector would agree to vote and work for Mr. Oakes if the statement was right, he would be prepared to donate £50 to a hospital if it was false. To this the elector agreed.

"At the conclusion of Mr. Oakes's address Mr. Kelly, who in the interval had cabbed it to the city, again took the platform and requested the interjector to step forward.

"He then drew the attention of the audience to volume 1 of the New South Wales Arbitration Records, in which the registrar referred to the following rule:—

"Any member of the union voting or working against the selected Labour candidate approved of by the union shall be fined the sum of £3."

Mr. COYNE: He proved himself wrong by reading that rule, because it had been wiped out years before.

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes; it had been wiped out because the union could not obtain registration while they retained that rule; but we all know that during the last session of the Federal Parliament an amendment was made in the law with the object of enabling the unions to bring in that rule again. At any rate, that rule shows what the objects of those men were, and it is evident that it was only deleted under compulsion. The report goes on to say—

"Further on, the registrar said—

"Rule 113 of 1901 provides for a contribution of 2s. 6d. from each member's annual subscription to this journal (the Sydney Worker)."

What would members opposite say if we passed a law compelling people to subscribe to the *Brisbane Courier*?

"Rule 120 of 1902 provides for such subscription being 5s., and rule 121 that each branch may expend an additional sum not exceeding 1s. 6d. per financial member per year in support of newspapers owned and controlled by the union.

"The membership of the union was then 21,000. The registrar said further—

"This subscription for the present year would amount to £5,250, in addition to a possible subscription from the four branches of £1,575.

"Another rule Mr. Kelly referred to read—

"Branches deciding in favour of expending 1s. per member for parliamentary purposes shall place same to credit of a parliamentary fund, which may be used in connection with either State or Federal elections."

That rule clearly compels members to contribute to a political fund, which may be used to defray the expenses of a candidate of whom they disapprove. As I have already said, if the motion as amended in the way proposed by the Minister for Public Instruction is put to the House, I would willingly vote for it, be-

[Mr. Swayne.

cause I think it is desirable that an alteration should be made in the law in one particular direction. I think that funds which are subscribed for provident purposes should be earmarked for such purposes and protected, but I fail to see why a union in the case of its general funds should be protected against the action of its authorised officials. If, in carrying out the instructions of the union, a picket or other authorised official does an injury, I do not see why they should not stand in the same position as other employers. They should not have special exemption, and they should not have special privileges. It is a generally accepted principle that the employer is liable for the actions of his employee, and I do not see why these people, because they happen to belong to a union, should be exempt from that principle. In connection with my previous reference to the strike in the North, and my statement that the Amalgamated Workers' Association wished to bring about that strike—I have heard hon. members opposite say that the Amalgamated Workers' Association tried to prevent that strike, and I should just like to read a letter proving that they fomented the strike, that I do not think has been read in this House before.

Mr. COYNE: A new discovery.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Swayne's discovery.

Mr. SWAYNE: I quite understand hon. members opposite do not like what I am saying.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We are enjoying it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It does not look like it.

Mr. SWAYNE: I quoted on a previous occasion some correspondence dated 1st April. This letter is dated 6th April, and is written by W. McCormack to Mr. T. Howland, Mackay. It says—

"I am enclosing the circular letter in connection with our aims for the coming season. We have laid down the main point at issue and have not introduced any detail matter into the fighting platform. All outsiders will thoroughly understand what we are after, and should we be successful in forcing the employers to a conference, we should be then able to introduce other matters."

Those four words "introduce other matters" would certainly prevent that conference being held. When appointing any particular representatives to a conference, they should know exactly what matters are to be dealt with at the conference so that delegates can be instructed. Yet we find them privately arranging to introduce other matters. The letter goes on—

"Would be pleased to know the dates on which the various mills will start crushing in the Mackay district. We will require this information as early as possible so that we can act straight away.

"You will do well to get your members to understand what will be expected of them, and all should unanimously welcome a fight for an eight-hour day in the sugar industry.

"Hoping for success and an easy settlement of our difficulty."

It simply illustrates the point that I have made, that it is not desirable that they should have increased fighting powers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It is not fighting powers we want.

Mr. SWAYNE: Again showing how they flouted the laws of the State placed at their disposal for settling these matters, here is

another letter signed on behalf of the Amalgamated Workers' Union by J. Munro, and reads as follows:—

"Sir,—In order that there shall be no doubt as to the position of the A.W.A. in the dispute existing in this district, we have been instructed to make public the following:—

"That on no account whatever will the A.W.A. waver the demand for an eight-hour day."

They could have got that without striking at all. They could have got it through the Mackay Wages Board as they did eventually. The letter goes on—

"Acting under instruction from executive council, we absolutely refuse to meet any section of the employers in conference unless the demand is granted beforehand.

"Those employees who up to the present time have not ceased work are given until Saturday night next to do so. Those who remain at work after the time specified above will be recognised as scabs, and treated as such.

"With regard to the suggestion that the wages board should revise its determination and settle the dispute, we would like to point out that the proposal cannot be entertained as a likely solution of the difficulty, as there are a good many matters in dispute over which the board has no jurisdiction."

They again refused to abide by the laws of the State as placed at their disposal to prevent disputes. In conclusion, I should like to refer to the speech on this motion by the junior member for Rockhampton, Mr. Adamson, who avowed that their aim was to make these unions more and more political, to take them away from their proper sphere—that is, to improve the conditions in any industry—change them from being industrial trade unions to political organisations, having for their object the compelling of every man who works with his hands to vote their way of thinking or starve. That is really what it means. They claim the right of preference over everybody else, and now they claim the right to compel a man to join them, and if he does not join them he must starve, and they compel that man to vote for them whether he likes it or not. I certainly think we should do very wrong if we did anything to assist to bring about such a state of things as that. As regards these strikes that they are so anxious to promote, we must remember that there are sections who will never be satisfied. There are the professional agitators, the officers of the movement, who get all the distinction, kudos, and additional emoluments by the way they conduct the battle. Then there are the socialists pure and simple, and it does not matter how good the conditions may be, they do not believe in the competitive system, and simply use any advantage gained to entirely sweep away that system and bring about the State ownership of all production, distribution, and exchange. When the majority of people in a country desire that, we have nothing to say against it. The minority, of course, cannot prevent it, but what we object to is the minority forcing this on us. I certainly think that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Leichhardt makes the position clear and justifies me in voting against it.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I listened very carefully to the speech of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat with a sincere desire to ascertain if he really had anything

in the way of a charge to make in regard to the justice of the resolution now before the Chamber as amended in the direction proposed by the hon. member for Leichhardt, and I must confess my failure to see any logic, or coherent argument, in the case he has attempted to make out against this proposition. It appears to me what in this direction has been done in Great Britain may very well be done here. If a crude republic, or some of the Latin States in South America, where they shoot their presidents now and then, and take charge of Parliament, asked for this power, I could quite understand the hon. member's argument, but I cannot understand the fear that appears to exist in his mind. The mother of Parliaments has recently dealt with this matter. What the conservative Britisher can do, or the Imperial-minded statesman may do, we, as a self-governing State, may do. Why? Because of certain dangers which he apprehends will take place. What

[5 p.m.] are those dangers? That men will not be permitted to make a living. Does he believe that legislation passed by this Chamber, or any other Chamber in Australia, will prevent any honest man from getting a living? Does he sincerely believe that, or is he talking on the floor of this Chamber to the crowd outside, through *Hansard*? I am as much concerned and interested in the subject as the hon. member, and I can see no danger in this legislation if it is adopted by this Parliament. But if this Parliament does not do it, some future Parliament will take it up, because this kind of thing cannot stop; it is inevitable; it must come. It is the tendency of the time. Australia is an instance, by the fact that we have a democratic Government in power, but even in Great Britain and in other countries of Europe this thing is being recognised by special legislation.

Mr. D. HUNTER: We are going back to the old days.

Mr. LESINA: As a matter of fact, we are harking back to legislation which existed before. Anyone who reads Green, or who will take up Thorold Rogers's "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," or take up Froude, will clearly see that much of the legislation we contemplate passing to-day is a resurrection of legislation which was passed when economic conditions were very different; but there is no reason why it should not produce more beneficial results in our time, with the larger enlightenment we have to-day, and with the tremendous change which has taken place, which in economical development alone challenges us, in these times of modern education, to do something more for the worker than has hitherto been done by legislation in the past. I do not desire to base my case entirely on that. I do not propose to take up too much time in dealing with the matter. I do not apprehend any change from the passing of this resolution, but I think a great deal of benefit will result to Queensland if the Government will pass a Bill containing the principle contained in it. I suppose the Secretary for Public Instruction thought that he was very clever in moving the amendment which was adopted by the Chamber providing that this proposal to amend the law relating to trade unions, so that disabilities shall not operate, shall not apply to those unions which contain in their rules a contribution for political purposes. Now, the amendment of the hon. member for Leichhardt provides

Mr. Lesina.]

a means which will satisfy even the hon. junior member for Mackay, and it will also satisfy the members on this side. He will open the door, through this resolution, for anybody to come in if they like. It does not compulsorily impose any duty on any body or organisation; it simply opens the door, if they care to come in by a majority vote, under the terms of this amendment, they may do so. I do not want to shut the door in the face of these men, and yet the amendment carried by the Government side practically shuts the door for beneficial legislation of this kind in the face of large bodies of men who to-day have agreed by majority rule to give a certain proportion of their funds to political purposes. Whether there is any wisdom in it or not, is a matter that is entirely outside the scope of the resolution—as so much of the extracts which the hon. member for Mackay read from the newspapers is outside the scope too. If legislation is passed to amend the law relating to trade unions, in order to protect the funds of trade unions—a thing which is absolutely necessary, and which, even in conservative England, has become the subject of legislation—surely the same thing can be done here without danger to society! I cannot understand the train of thought of the man who believes society will be revolutionised, industry overturned, liberty endangered, and honest men not be able to earn a livelihood by the passing of legislation like this. And I am convinced that the hon. member does not believe in it, and he therefore has no right to make statements like that, which, by going out to the country, may lead many uninformed persons to think for one moment that we propose a motion of that kind. I contend that I can vote for a resolution like that without in any way imperilling the construction of society, or injuring trade or commerce, or interfering with the personal liberty of any man to obtain a livelihood, and perhaps there is no man in this Chamber but what believes it too. But perhaps on Thursday afternoons members will get up and say these things. I see that the Secretary for Public Works there is prepared to demonstrate that the carrying of such a resolution will prevent certain people from obtaining a livelihood. This amendment asks me to vote for a certain specific thing, and I can see no objection to voting for that specific thing. The hon. member for Leichhardt has carefully drawn his amendment, and the proposition itself needs no argument; it commends itself to any person of fair mind, for it simply proposes to open the door if this legislation is adopted, and permit such bodies to decide by a majority vote to adopt this principle.

Mr. HARDACRE: To come in if they like.

Mr. LESINA: They can come in by a majority decision under the terms of this amendment. What right have we to shut anybody out if they care to come in? Why should we pass legislation to keep certain men outside the benefits of an Act of Parliament? Surely hon. members on the other side who declaimed against passing certain legislation—in which declamation I joined at the time—will not specially legislate to keep unionists outside the benefit of such an Act as this! Will they throw them to the wolves?

Mr. D. HUNTER interjected.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member who interjects is a member of a certain order—the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters. Will he legislate to keep them outside the benefit of

[Mr. Lesina.

an Act like this? There are some members who at times become timid from the contemplation of a purely imaginary danger. The hon. junior member for Mackay, who is a gentle kind of a Government supporter—he is a gentle citizen at any time—has perhaps scared himself unnecessarily by a contemplation of the possible dangers involved in the carrying of this resolution, but I can assure him that there is no need to be scared. We do not propose a revolution in this.

Mr. HARDACRE: He may get something worse later on.

Mr. LESINA: He may get something worse later on. If they apply trade union funds for this purpose, as they have done in Great Britain, surely we may do the same thing without danger here! The hon. junior member for Mackay quoted certain paragraphs from newspapers published in Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland. So far as I am able to gather myself, all these paragraphs are written for and printed in newspapers hostile to organised labour. They said that on sundry occasions where labour disputes had taken place attempts had been made to assault persons—I believe in one case some person was assaulted with sugar-cane. I believe that that was the most serious case. At a time when industrial strikes were impending men went out with harmless sticks of sugar-cane, and murderously assaulted each other. The moral adduced from these statements from newspapers, which were read by the hon. gentleman with as much solemnity as if they were a revelation from God or from the Scriptures, was that one person was hit with a piece of sugar-cane in the course of an industrial dispute that took place in the Mackay district. It appears to me that to bring in matters like that is not conducive to the production of a frame of mind in which useful legislation can be contemplated in this Chamber with profit to the Chamber and to the State. We should keep out the consideration of such industrial disputes in a matter like this, and it will do more good. What did the hon. member hope to gain by bringing in the reference to the trouble in the Mackay district? I believe that over and above all industrial legislation every man has the right to strike.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: He has the inherent right to strike. (Hear, hear!) It is the right of the people to strike for their personal freedom when the opportunity arises, although we pass legislation to discourage strikes. I think that a strike should only be resorted to in the last extreme. But I can always contemplate a condition of affairs being reached ultimately when a strike is the only weapon left to a body of men who are seeking to defend some industrial, political, or personal right. For that reason, whilst I deprecate strikes, because I reckon that a big industrial upheaval is only first cousin to a civil war; it leaves behind it a legacy of hate, and, whilst I think they should be discouraged to every extent, nevertheless there are times when it is impossible to avoid a strike. In its last analysis organised Labour may have to strike to maintain their rights, and probably they will be victorious. A revolution started in a small way may end in men getting their rights, and an industrial conflict, when victorious, results in the same way. A general strike of a few weeks has probably gained more

reforms than perhaps years of legislation has succeeded in attaining. Nevertheless, I do not advocate strikes at all, because, although there may be a benefit from their operations, still they produce great evils. These evils should be avoided, if we can possibly do so. That is why we should encourage trades unions to prevent strikes, because they to some extent insure society against strikes. If we encourage trade unions, we will have one large industrial body, and if there is a strike the dispute can be easily settled; but if there are a number of little bodies striking here and striking there, and these little industrial disturbances extend over a large area, it will not be so easy to settle them all as it would be to settle one big upheaval. That is the reason why an attempt has been made in this State to prevent any protection being given to trade union funds, because, if, instead of having one large industrial organisation welded together—a great organisation which moves as one man at the word of command when it is necessary to strike for some industrial liberty or freedom and have the thing settled quickly—we will have a large number of disorganised bodies, who waste their funds and waste their efforts, and wind up in financial bankruptcy before it is settled. The result would be far worse to have a number of spasmodic strikes than to have one big strike.

Mr. HARDACRE: We want to protect their funds and allow them to contribute for political purposes.

Mr. LESINA: Yes; this motion is to make the way clear for the passage of legislation which will protect the rights and interests of the trade unionists, and by doing so make clear the way for peaceable settlement of industrial disputes rather than resort to warfare, industrial strife, and civil war, and I think the members of the Government will be well advised if they adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Leichhardt. The Government approve of legislation amending the law relating to trade unions on the promise of the late leader of the Government, Mr. Kidston, and of members sitting on the Government bench to-day. We ask not only to protect the funds of trade unions but to allow them to have a fund for political purposes to validate their rights and claims for legislative consideration. The hon. member in charge of the Education Department has inserted an amendment providing that the contribution of funds for political purposes should be excluded, but we have another amendment which asks that they only be excluded when asked by a majority of members to do so. What is wrong about that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Then a man who does not believe in the Labour platform will be excluded from getting work altogether?

Mr. LESINA: No one suggested that in the course of any speech over here.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes, the hon. member for Woothakata. He said they would not register the Amalgamated Workers' Association because all members had to support the Labour platform.

Mr. THEODORE: I said they would not register the Amalgamated Workers' Association as a trade union.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And anyone who does not believe in the Labour platform cannot get into that union and he will be debarred from getting work at all.

Mr. THEODORE: Not at all.

Mr. LESINA: The resolution is explicit enough, and the details that the hon. gentleman refers to might be subject-matter for consideration when a Bill gets into Committee. That is another question entirely. If the Bill is comprehensive enough to cover the whole field of industrial enterprise, we can deal with that in Committee. But this is an entirely different matter. We want to protect trade union funds, and the amendment of the hon. member for Leichhardt provides that it shall also provide political funds when decided on by a majority of the members. That sets aside any danger that is likely to occur as thought by hon. members on the other side. I do not seriously see where there is likely to be any danger at all either to society, to trade and commerce, or to the person of any working man by adopting a resolution of this kind. I believe in the event of a more rabid party coming into the House than that which now sits on the Opposition benches—an advanced socialistic party, for instance—the chances are that the Government will become more radical than they are, and they will pass the thing cheerfully then. Because we are moderate in our demands the Government will not pass it. The more you push the Government the greater chances you have of getting something from them, and the more inclined we are to be moderate the less inclined are the Government to give us anything. Any Government might give us what we ask for; the Imperial Government might give it to us without any danger to society. We would not ask for it if we thought it was likely to lead to any danger to society. If the liberty of anyone in Australia was imperilled by it, we would not ask for it. I do not think that any member on that side believes that we want to stop any man from getting work.

The TREASURER: It has been done.

Mr. MAY: Where?

Mr. LESINA: There are other times when we can deal with that matter. When we get into the Estimates on the Wages Boards, we can deal with that, and the Minister will then be able to discuss it with hon. members.

Mr. MAY: The Treasurer promotes strikes himself.

Mr. LESINA: I cannot imagine the Treasurer promoting strikes. This is one matter which receives too little attention. If the Government takes the thing seriously in hand, as they are pledged to do if they are carrying out the policy laid down by Mr. Kidston at Rockhampton, the time has come when they will have to deal with it. Otherwise it will come up at the next general election, and it will be taken up by an enormous number of trade unionists who have great influence, which is growing throughout Queensland to-day. The growth of trades unionism in Queensland has been enormous. Large numbers of the newchum immigrants are joining the unions as soon as they arrive here. They are voluntarily going and looking for union tickets, and it strikes me that the Government should only

Mr. Lesina.]

be too anxious to pass legislation of this description. I know an instance where thirty immigrants arrived in one small place, and by night time twenty of them went looking for union tickets. These are class conscious working men. They have been listening to advanced preachers in England and studying advanced literature. At the next election they will be on the electoral rolls, and there will be a big surprise waiting for the Government. I warn the Government for their own good. I believe that if they do not show more sincerity in the matter, this party has an excellent chance of getting back at the next election. I see little or no danger in passing legislation of this kind; and if the Government do not wake up to the need of it there will be repeated in this State the triumph scored by the Labour party at the recent Federal election. There is hardly a member on this side opposed to the motion; and even the hon. member for Fitzroy, I think, would act in sympathy with the hon. member for Leichhardt's amendment. I know I shall.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*): I have followed with a good deal of interest the remarks made by members who have spoken this afternoon; and I want to say at the outset that many members sitting on this side are not for one moment opposed to unions.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: For myself, I am a believer in unions—(hear, hear!)—and I think it is the duty of every man to associate himself with the body of people who will help him in connection with his own affairs. The hon. member for Leichhardt, who moved this amendment, endeavoured to draw a red herring across the trail; and he neglected to show that there is a vast difference between his amendment and that proposed by the Secretary for Public Instruction. It is all very well for members on the other side to say they do not desire to interfere with the rights of men. I say there is evidence that they are constantly endeavouring to do it; and I want to show, if hon. members will permit me to do so, that in addition to that, there are some members on the opposite side who are prepared—quite deliberately prepared—to throw the laws which they themselves have approved and accepted—they are prepared to throw those laws on one side and break them in case of an emergency.

Mr. COYNE: I think you ought to name them in fairness to the rest.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I would quote from the *Worker* of 12th August of this present year. I assume that no one on that side would for a moment indicate that the *Worker* would make any mistake in regard to a public announcement made by one of the gentlemen sitting at the congress held here some time ago. In this case it cannot be charged against the daily papers that they have not correctly reported the statements made; and I want to show that in some of these matters, it does not matter a single straw as far as some hon. gentlemen on the other side in connection with their actions are concerned—it does not matter a single straw whether the law is broken or is not broken, if it suits them at the particular time.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[*Mr. Lesina.*]

Mr. COYNE: I think you ought to make that plain.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am going to read a remark made by Mr. Cooper, and I notice that at this congress there were present the hon. member for Woothakata (Mr. Theodore), also Mr. J. H. Coyne, and Mr. A. Hinchcliffe. This is the statement made by Mr. Cooper. And lest I may be charged with reading only a portion of the statement, I will read the whole of what is reported here. And this is the point I want to drive home this afternoon: Mr. Cooper said that notwithstanding anything that might be done by an arbitration court, notwithstanding what might be done by wages boards, notwithstanding any agreement that might be entered into, if it suited him and his people, he would throw these to the winds and break them with impunity.

Mr. MAY: Who was Mr. Cooper?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. gentleman knows well that he was one of the representatives who took part in the congress recently held in Brisbane. Now I will quote from the *Worker* of 12th August—

“Mr. Cooper, in acknowledging the cordial greeting, said he was present representing the Queensland branch of his federation, and therefore he did not expect to be treated as a visitor. He agreed with the Townsville delegate, that the first step towards the consolidation of labour was to organise the transport workers under one executive body. He recalled the disasters that befell the waterside workers in the maritime strike in 1890, and again in 1893, and the eventual reorganisation of the union, and said the only way in which they could secure recognition was by entering into agreements with them. The men had benefited by the agreements. They were endeavouring to arrange that the agreements should end about the same time, and the employers were trying to prevent this. For years they had been working for conciliation and arbitration, and the large unions now were registered.”

Those are the points. If hon. gentlemen will write them down, and if they find they are wrong, I hope they will take the opportunity of publicly repudiating such statements.

“For years they had been working for conciliation and arbitration, and the large unions now were registered. In spite of the agreements, and in spite of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the men would down tools to-morrow if he ordered them to do so.”

Now I ask if I made a statement that is not borne out by the report that appears in the *Worker* of 12th August?

Mr. COYNE: What was he trying to prove? The loyalty of the members of the union.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I think he proved—apparently to the discomfort of members on the other side—that whether there were wages boards or conciliation and arbitration courts or anything of that kind, if the men could see that they had a right to down tools, they would break every law in order to do so. (Opposition dissent.) I ask hon. gentlemen if that conclusion is not borne out by what is stated here. (Opposition dissent.) I am sorry hon. gentlemen opposite take it so unkindly.

Mr. HARDACRE: We want to know what it means.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The action of these hon. gentlemen is characteristic of the action of some of the extremists connected with the Labour movement. What is the position in New South Wales? Even Mr. Beeby recognised that it was very important to try and avoid strikes.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But what has happened there? As soon as he endeavoured to do that, [5.30 p.m.] there was an attempt made to beat him at every turn by his own people. Lest that may be disputed, I will quote from the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 22nd July, 1911—

"The official organ in Sydney of the Labour movement has made an attack on the Minister for Labour (Mr. Beeby) in regard to the Industrial Arbitration Bill and other matters. Mr. Beeby is not the first of the Ministry who has come under similar censure. He stated yesterday that he was not much concerned with, or surprised at, the attack, as since the advent of the present Government the policy of the Labour organ had been directed solely at embarrassing the Ministry, and at possibly bringing about the downfall of the State Labour party."

Mr. COYNE: I fancy I heard Mr. Kidston say something similar to that some years ago.

Mr. MURPHY: You did not endorse Kidston, but you are endorsing Beeby.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Here is one who cannot be said to be controlled or directed by a party which is not a unanimous party in the New South Wales Assembly. Gentlemen are holding the reins of office who feel it to be their first duty to try to prevent strikes. No doubt hon. members have read their Bill, and I do not know that it would not be a good thing to embody some of the clauses of that Bill in our Act.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Beeby so realised the importance of dealing with these matters in a reasonable and fair way that he says, "We must try to avoid strikes."

Mr. HARDACRE: Are you arguing against unions?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am not arguing against unions; but I think I am showing very successfully that some people do not like when a man, seized with the importance of the position, and with a sincere desire to benefit his country, tries to prevent strikes. I ask, "Is not the man who tries to avoid strikes, and who tries to remove a difficulty out of the way—the man who tries at every turn to do his best to prevent dislocation of trade and industry—doing better service to the community than the man who at every turn is trying to promote strikes?" Apparently Mr. Beeby met with opposition from some of his supporters, and apparently he is to have meted out to him the treatment that was meted out to another very prominent gentleman not now in this House when he tried to do what he believed to be right in connection with this great State of Queensland. Apparently there is a section of the community which is willing at every turn to try and drive at an extreme pace to the detriment of those in the community who do not see eye to eye with them. We are trying to prevent some politicians having the right to conduct the affairs of Queensland.

Mr. COYNE: How are you going to prevent it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Is not the meaning of this resolution to try and place very largely in the hands of the politicians of this State the conduct of the affairs of a great number of unions?

Mr. HARDACRE: Why should they not have the power to conduct them?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The safety of the men lies in keeping themselves free from men who may, after all, only be political adventurers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Who are they?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If I know anything at all about the common sense of the men to-day, they recognise that the surest and the safest and the best way is to look at difficulties as they crop up, and try to settle them amicably. I was challenged by the hon. member for Clermont when, by interjection, I made the statement that it was not possible for some men to make a living to-day by reason of the arbitrary action which is sometimes taken by some of the people who are guided by the politicians.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The employers can play that game, too.

The SPEAKER: I have called the hon. member for Kennedy to order several times this afternoon, and I must ask him to obey my call to order. If he wishes to refute any argument advanced by any hon. member on my right, he will have an opportunity later on of doing so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What happened in connection with the Adelaide Shipping Company? I take it they had the right to do what any firm has a right to do in time of stress. They went into the open market and engaged men to go to Townsville and other places to assist them in their dilemma. We are told that men are free agents, and can do as they like. Were men able to do as they liked in this particular case? They were not. Is there any hon. member opposite who can contradict that statement? Was not the power of the union so exercised that finally the manager of the Adelaide Shipping Company had to make an arrangement by which those men left Townsville before the termination of their contract? And what chance have men like that unless they sell themselves, body and soul to some of the unions? This does not apply to all unions, for there are marked differences. But some unions are dominated by men who, I think, may be regarded only as carpet-baggers, whose only interest in Queensland is just for the moment to serve themselves, and then pass out of the scene after they have created a great deal of difficulty and trouble. I want to say a word or two now in connection with some remarks made by the hon. member for Woothakata when he originally introduced the motion. He said that trade unions are legitimate associations. I do not believe there is a man sitting on this side of the House who does not agree with that statement. Personally, I hold that trade unions are legitimate associations.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But trade unions are not legitimate associations if they are made vehicles for stirring up strife and interfering with men who are seeking to earn an honest livelihood. We

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

have been told that something in the nature of peaceful picketing is required. Now, what is peaceful picketing?

Mr. HARDACRE: Peaceful persuasion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There are two or three stages. I will admit that it is peaceful picketing when Tom Jones goes to John Brown, who is about to accept a position, and says, "Like a good fellow, do not go and work there. There are reasons why you should not work there." When John Brown refuses to listen to the persuasions of Tom Jones, so-called peaceful picketing enters another category altogether. In connection with the late unfortunate sugar strike, I ask hon. members whether there were not cases in which men were brought into court because they had gone for others for endeavouring to carry on the calling which they had adopted for the time being? That is also called peaceful picketing.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Then peaceful picketing is sometimes like this—going into a field where a number of men are at work, and hitting them with a shillelagh or something of that kind, and getting them out of the road. It is all peaceful picketing.

Mr. HARDACRE: No, it is not—it is intimidation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We have been told by hon. members this afternoon to look at what conservative England is doing. We have been told to look at what the House of Lords has done. Now, I want to ask hon. members if they have followed closely what has happened lately. Some of them apparently glory in the strike which took place in the old land.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: We regret the necessity.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But there are those in the old land to-day who think that a mistake has been made, and who think that the provision in the Trade Disputes Act should be amended. After all, this is more than a party question. I take it that the aim of every person who has any responsibility upon him should be to try to make it easy for men to work, and not to make it difficult.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Not very long ago there came to Queensland a very brainy man connected with the Labour movement in the old country—Mr. Will Crooks. And what has Mr. Crooks done since the very regrettable strike in the old country, which some hon. members on the opposite side apparently approve of?

Mr. COYNE: Hear hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He is now seeking to make it penal for anyone to strike without giving the other side a month's notice. And is it not evident that the saner and quieter men—the men who think and who feel that it is their duty to support the interests of the worker—believe that there is a very great danger of the worker being so driven and so harassed by the political adventurers—(Opposition laughter)—that they themselves will go down for a time, and that there will be a bigger question to be faced—namely, the loss to the community? It can-

not be denied that the man who by arbitration or conciliation can settle a dispute is doing very much better service to the community and to the worker—to the worker, too, let me emphasise that—than the man who urges workmen to strike, a course of action which, perhaps, leaves him in the end very much poorer and very much worse off than he was before the strike. An idle man who roams or loafs about the street is not benefited by that kind of thing. What is the position in Queensland? Have we not endeavoured in every way to meet the difficulties that have cropped up? I know that sometimes we are told that members on this side are conservative, but we are not conservative—we are liberal. We are liberal every time, and have a strong desire to help those who need help the most. Sometimes—I do not say that this remark applies to hon. members opposite—but sometimes one can almost hear the sound of the drum beating, apparently all noise and nothing else, while the real work is being done by members on this side of the House. Let me remind hon. members opposite that one of their duties to the very people whom they say they represent is to try to make the way clear for avoiding strikes rather than to help in the other direction. May I draw attention of hon. members to what has been done in Queensland to adopt lawful means for dealing with this matter? The wages boards have been referred to this afternoon. Sometimes it is argued that wages boards do not do all they might do to help individuals. I admit that the wages boards are not perfect; I admit that you may get cranks on wages boards just as you get them in Parliament.

Mr. McLACHLAN: On both sides of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I do not say they are on one side only, but I say that we get cranks in Parliament sometimes. The wages boards have at least brought the masters and the men together.

Mr. HARDACRE: Didn't you vote against the Wages Boards Bill when it was brought in?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No; the hon. member is making a misstatement; his memory is very short sometimes, and it is very short in this matter. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is no need for this particular amendment, because the wages boards provide a means for dealing with all these things. They are something more than a palliative, as some hon. members opposite say. To prove my statement, I shall quote the wages paid in some callings before the wages boards came into existence and the wages paid after the determinations of the boards. Before the determination of the wages board, the weekly wages of bakers, in the case of apprentices and improvers, were from 8s. 4d. to £1 2s. 7d., and the average wage was £2 6s. 10d. per week. After the determination of the board the wages for apprentices and improvers were from 8s. to £1 8s. 6d. per week, for adults £2 11s. 6d. per week. For foreman the rate before the determination was £2 7s. 6d. per week, and after the determination it was £3 2s. 6d. per week. I find on looking through this statement, which has been very carefully prepared, that the same kind of thing occurs in pretty well every calling in which wages have been fixed by a board.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

Mr. McLACHLAN: Don't you think organisation has something to do with it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member for Fortitude Valley is an excellent organiser, and that beaming countenance of his always helps in that direction. Again, take the occupation of carters. The wages paid to apprentices and improvers before the determination of the wages board were from 14s. to £1 1s. 6d. a week; and after the determination they were £1 2s. 6d. to £2 7s. 6d. and £1 17s. 6d. to £2 12s. 6d., casual hands receiving 7s. 6d. to 10s. a day or any part of a day. I shall not read any more of those figures. What I wish to show is that where there is a medium for dealing with these matters, that medium should be availed of. Members opposite have said a great deal with the view of proving that there is no way of getting over their difficulties without adopting the methods they have been advocating this afternoon. I say such is not the case—the best way is to avail ourselves of the provisions of our amending legislation.

Mr. HARDACRE: Have we no right to amend industrial legislation?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Of course we should amend legislation when it is found to be necessary to do so. The hon. member for Leichhardt will find that in the programme submitted there are proposals for dealing with matters which will benefit the workers of Queensland, and I hope he will lend his assistance to make the proposed measures a great success. We have heard something this afternoon to the effect that when a man is blocked from going to work, that is not coercion. I say it is coercion. May I remind hon. members opposite of what has happened and is happening in Lithgow, in another State, and what happened in some districts in Queensland in connection with the sugar strike? In Queensland, if men who had been working in the places of men on strike went into an hotel, the strikers tried to hunt them out. Another instance of "peaceful picketing."

Mr. HARDACRE: Are you opposed to unionism?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am not opposed to unionism, but I am opposed to a unionism which runs mad, and says it will not allow a man to work; and I am sure that every sensible man in the community is opposed to that kind of thing. The other day, when I was making my way home, I met a labourer whom I had known for years and years, and he said to me, "Can't you do something to prevent these awful strikes? They do not affect me very much, as I have a home and am pretty well off; I am perfectly satisfied, but I have to obey the order of my people and come out whenever they call me out. I do wish you would do something to put an end to that kind of thing." This motion says in effect that if the majority of the members of a union say that a certain thing must be done, it shall be done; and we know what that means. It means that two, or three aggressive men come along, and, figuratively speaking, they point a loaded pistol at the heads of the other fellows, and the other fellows have to get into line with them. By the amendment of the hon. member for Leichhardt we are asked to hand over a power of that kind to such people. There can be no association so bad, or whose influence upon the community is so disastrous,

as an association which, for the time being, is dominated for political purposes, with the view, perhaps, of gaining some political object, or enhancing the political position of some individual in that community.

Mr. HARDACRE: Then you are opposed to political organisations?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am opposed to political organisations when those associations say men are not to be free agents, and are to be coerced into taking certain action. I am not opposed to men combining and doing their best in connection with industrial matters. I want to assure hon. members that I have no desire to talk the motion out, because I am quite sure the good sense of the House will vote it out. Let me say, in conclusion, that there has not been one single argument from the other side to show the need for the amendment which the hon. member for Leichhardt suggested. Indeed, I do not think I have seen him get up and so quickly drop down. It looked to me as if he were ashamed of the very amendment he moved. Usually the hon. member goes very fully into anything he has to do with. I always give him credit for that, but in this particular case it seems to me he got hold of something like a hot potato and he dropped it as quickly as he possibly could. It seems to me the main object of this amendment is practically to wreck what would be a good motion; to spoil it, and make it impossible for the majority in the community to accept it, and in addition, it places an embargo upon the man in the community who wants to feel that he can belong to a union, to which he has every right to belong. It places an embargo upon him unless he is prepared to bow the knee to the men who control and direct—sometimes very unwisely, I think—the politics of the day on that side.

Mr. D. HUNTER (*Woolloongabba*): I hope hon. members, before voting for a motion of this kind, will look at it and read it very carefully over. I do not think any man can be a friend of unionism who votes for this motion, because it has this responsibility: That a majority of those members must be present at a meeting. It reads distinctly: "Unless such rules have been adopted by a majority of the members of the union." Many of the unions have to take a vote at their meetings. There is no other way, and unless you get 50 per cent. of the members present, it is impossible for them to carry it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Then they could not carry this resolution.

Mr. D. HUNTER: They could not carry it there, and by putting this in you are making it impossible for the unions to carry it. That is not the point I wish to make. Here is the Labour party—the party who want to get the unions into their power. Supposing the members of the Brewers' Workers' Union are asked to vote on the question whether they would join the Eight Hour Union, which has been established for a certain purpose—to commemorate the adoption of an eight-hour day in this State; a very legitimate thing to talk over and to be proud of. They wave their banners and are proud to think that they have established an Eight Hour Union, but they may have to contribute, when they go into

Mr. D. Hunter.]

that union, to what? For the Labour candidate's expenses, as at the last Federal election. They contribute to the Labour candidate's expenses, while on the Labour platform there is a plank, "State manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquor with the ultimate view of total prohibition." Here is another point: There are many teetotallers in our unions who are absolutely opposed to anything in the nature of the nationalisation of the liquor trade. All these questions have to be fought out. Are you in favour of nationalising the liquor traffic? Every teetotaller must vote against it. But here is a platform they immediately subscribe to if a majority of them happen to be in favour of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: If a majority decide to do so.

Mr. D. HUNTER: There is another plank: "Initiation and Referendum." Now, our friends on the other side do not believe in the referendum.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, we do.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You would not take it when it was carried—you refused to abide by the decision of the people when it was carried. That is another plank that every man opposed to the referendum would need to subscribe to. Then there is another. Numbers of unionists have freeholds. They are freeholders and have their own homes, and they do not believe in fixity of tenure, neither does my friend who moved this motion, because he has a freehold.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. D. HUNTER: A unionist may believe in freehold, yet on the platform, which a majority would decide on, there is this: "Fixity of tenure, leasehold only, with periodical reappraisements of rents."

Mr. MULLAN: What is wrong with that?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Those men have to go into that union and vote to stop all freeholds, stop the selling of lands by the freehold system, whether they believe in it or not, if the majority of their union says "Yes." That is the position. While the unions stick to industrial affairs they are on safe ground. They are perfectly justified in sticking to that and working as far as they can to improve their position, but when they are asked to vote for questions which they do not believe in, then it is undoubtedly doing an injustice. There is another point. The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters have found out a long time back that immigration is in their favour. The building trade is very busy, and when they join that Eight Hour Union they subscribe to that union, which sometimes pays the expenses of a Labour candidate who will strangle immigration. We know perfectly well that at union meetings it is not always the majority that carries a thing. There are three or four men in nearly all unions who talk more than any others, and very often they exercise an influence over the other members, who are afraid to speak, and things are carried because members do not care to speak, but when it comes to the question of putting their hands into their pockets to make them pay into a union which has, perhaps, on its platform, something which is going to operate against them, then you may depend upon it those men are not going to do it, and unions will split over non-essentials.

[Mr. D. Hunter.

Mr. THEODORE: Do you believe in an Industrial Disputes Bill?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I believe in an Industrial Disputes Bill.

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

SUPPLY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. J. Stodart, Logan, in the chair.)

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members,—Before going on with the business this evening, I should just like to say a few words. Since my occupancy of the chair I have endeavoured to place as liberal an interpretation upon the Standing Orders as possible, and to afford the greatest freedom to members generally by overlooking certain forms of disorder, such as frequent interjections, and the carrying on of conversations while members are addressing the Chamber. I find, however, that in certain quarters, on both sides of the Chamber, my leniency is being misunderstood. Hon. members will quite understand that my only desire is that debates in Committee should be conducted in an orderly manner.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: But this cannot be accomplished if they persist in frequent interjections, and in carrying on conversations all over the Chamber. I am sure hon. members desire to assist me, and that I have only to express a wish for the preservation of better order for them to respect it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That there be granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1911-12, a sum not exceeding £300, to defray the salary of the aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor—stated.

Mr. SWAYNE (Mackay): I should like to compliment the Treasurer on the concise and business-like way in which he has placed before us the Statement of our affairs. I think it is put in a manner that anyone can understand, and it also discloses a very satisfactory state of things. There were three points which occurred to my mind while listening to the Statement: First of all, as to how dependent we are on the efforts of the primary producer for the revenue necessary to carry on the Government of this State. For instance, to our total revenue of £5,320,000, our railway earnings and land revenue contribute respectively £2,550,000 and £772,242, or, altogether, £3,322,242 out of the total. Secondly, I think that the position shows the wisdom of devoting the amount we heard so much of last year for the purposes of the University. It will be easily seen that if it had come out of this year's revenue something would have had to go short—something would have had to be foregone, or else a deficit would have occurred. Another matter which forced itself on my mind was the way in which we are thrown back upon revenue derivable from the land. We may yet have cause to regret that the return of £1 5s. per head from the Commonwealth was not embodied in the Constitution. In the case of bad seasons and a change of policy on the part of the Federal Government, we have to

remember the fact that the £1 5s. per capita may not be continued, and it is obvious that with bad seasons the earnings on our railways, on which we are now more than half dependent to carry on the government of the State, will be much diminished. The Statement also emphasises the need for the vigorous development of our resources and the peopling of our lands. That is made very clear when we consider our present population. I think myself that the utterances on the other side during the debate have shown that it would not be a good thing for the country if the government was placed in their hands at the present time, because their chief ground of objection to the Government has been the borrowing of money; but it is apparent that unless we borrow money we could not build railways; and they also object to the spirited immigration policy of the Government. There is not an industry at present that is not hampered in development through shortage of labour.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It is not in the Mackay district.

Mr. SWAYNE: That is simply through an episode that fortunately does not very often occur; but I feel quite sure—I am not at all sure that it is correct, but we see it in the newspapers—that if such a thing did occur, it would be very soon absorbed in the large amount of employment in Queensland for every man who cares to work. It has been repeated over and over again that if it were only for defence purposes we must have population. I do not wish to labour that aspect of the question, but still it must be apparent to every thinking man. I heard somebody say last night that Mr. Fisher would be quite able to deal with any danger that arose; but I do not care whether it is Mr. Fisher or anybody else—he must have the people behind him. No one man can defend an empty country. In the desire there is over the whole of the world to acquire territory for expansion, the fact of the greater portion of Australia lying empty is very dangerous to us.

Mr. FOLEY: Do you really believe that?

Mr. SWAYNE: Cannot anyone see what a large area we have which would produce raw material for the textile industries of European countries, and the food supplies for a large population, making us a prize for any great Power? Would not the position of Australia appeal to anyone? I am not saying that any nation has asserted itself in that direction at the present moment, but as time goes on it is difficult to say what may happen, and I think it most desirable that we should increase our population, quite apart from the industrial aspect of the question. The Opposition, in spite of their protestations on this subject, are against immigration in any shape or form. They say that they are opposed to State aid—to money being voted for bringing out immigrants—those who are unable to pay the cost of their own passage. They say that they are not opposed to the immigration of people with capital to invest; but I ask them to look the matter fairly in the face, and say whether the policy foreshadowed by them in the Press is one that is calculated to induce men with money to come here and put it into Australian industries.

Mr. COLLINS: The Premier has told us that the banks are overflowing with money.

Mr. SWAYNE: A very bad sign it is when the banks are overflowing with money. It is obvious that, if we are to compete with a country like America, which is so much closer

than Great Britain, requiring a much smaller passage money, and so on, we must offer many inducements to get that class here. If the policy which hon. members opposite profess is put into force, then it will not induce people with money to come here and invest it. There is always a danger of industrial strife here.

Mr. COLLINS: Is it any worse than anywhere else?

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes; it is a good deal worse. So far as industrial strife is concerned, I know that the investor has to take his chance in any country, but in Australia he has not only to take his chance with the men immediately concerned—although there are other means provided for the settlement of these disputes—but he also has the powers that be against him in many cases. For instance, the other day what happened in the sugar industry? It was accentuated there recently when certain demands were made upon the producers. These demands meant the taking away from the producer all the profits of his labour. Instead of allowing the thing to be settled between them, what did we see? We had the Acting Prime Minister, the Attorney-General of Australia, entering the arena and taking sides at once.

Mr. COLLINS: He was supporting the weak against the strong.

Mr. SWAYNE: And he said that if these demands were not granted, he would take away the protection that that industry depended on. Then we had another member of the Federal Parliament threatening that if the demands were not acceded to, the industry would be transplanted to New Guinea and carried on with coloured labour.

Mr. FOLEY: What about our Government sending out the police?

Mr. SWAYNE: Members opposite seem to object to any protection being given to property against such strife as that. It seems that the owner is an outlaw who has no rights and should have no protection of any kind. Is a policy of that kind likely to induce people to come to Australia and spend their money here? It means a curtailment of work, and so on. Someone said something about the large sums of money locked up in the banks. I do not think that in a young country like this it is a good thing to have so much money locked up like that. I suppose they are getting, perhaps, 3½ per cent. for their money, but, as a matter of fact, that money ought to be earning 7 or 8 per cent. in the development of our resources. We have plenty of mineral shows where that money could be invested to advantage. Surely it is not contended that all our mineral resources have been exhausted!

Mr. MURPHY: No; not nearly.

Mr. SWAYNE: Well, how is it that people will not put their money into it? It is because the employer is to have no rights and no protection. I am not saying whether it is right or wrong, but simply pointing out that with the policy of the party opposite it is not to be expected that people will invest money to develop our industries and employ labour. I have a little booklet here for which I have to thank the hon. member for Gympie for supplying me. It is called "What the Labour Platform means," printed from the Brisbane *Worker*, by "Qui Vive." On page 9 it says—

Mr. Swayne.]

"That is why the Labour movement should be class conscious—that we may, by our deliberate effort and our calculated enthusiasm, accelerate the process of transition from private ownership for private profit to common ownership for the common good.

"The process will be a gradual one, but it need not be a slow one. It will proceed step by step, but the steps may follow quickly upon one another, if so we are minded."

Now, that may be all right. It may be the proper state of things, but at the same time it is not an announcement that is likely to draw people with money to Queensland, when they say there that it is going to be nationalised in the near future.

Mr. COLLINS: What about England?

Mr. MURPHY: The same thing goes on there.

Mr. SWAYNE: But the people who advocate that policy are not in power in England.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, they are.

Mr. SWAYNE: But they are in power in the Commonwealth.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not doing any harm in the Commonwealth.

Mr. SWAYNE: There is a lot of money lying idle in the banks in Australia instead of being put into mining "shows."

Mr. COLLINS: There are no strikes in the mining industry.

Mr. SWAYNE: If a certain political party had their way they would deprive them of protection of any kind. It never deterred investment in the days before this policy became so prominent. Then, on page 23, it says—

"There is a third, even more important—State settlements, at which the unemployed may obtain work as a right."

Mr. MURPHY: What harm is there in that?

Mr. SWAYNE: In an overcrowded country it may be desirable. In Germany they have something of the kind, but in a country like this there is no need for it whatever. It means it will be done for certain men at the expense of those who do the work.

Mr. MURPHY: Did you read the speech delivered by Lloyd-George the other day? It was the best socialistic speech that has been delivered for years.

Mr. SWAYNE: I have read a good deal of what has been going on in the old country lately, but the conditions there are not similar to the conditions we have got here. (Opposition laughter) Then, on page 24, it says—

"The workers would demand higher wages"—I have nothing to say against that so long as there is a fair share given to the other man. (Hear, hear!) Then it goes on—

"The workers would demand higher wages—that is to say, a higher and ever higher proportion of the wealth they create—until at last the margin of profit would be so small that the system which is built upon profit would collapse into irremediable ruin."

Mr. FOLEY: What do you say against that?

Mr. SWAYNE: It is not calculated to induce people to invest capital in Queensland—the prospect of nothing being left for the investor. I think a good many people will agree with me on that point. That attitude is not likely to induce the investment of capital for opening mineral "shows" or anything else, and that must react disas-

trously on those they are so anxious to benefit. I was talking about the sugar industry just now, and as I represent a sugar district, I may be excused if I mention it in a debate of this kind. I notice that there is some probability, judging by the Press telegrams, of a commission being appointed in connection with the sugar industry, and I hope it will be on the lines of the one appointed some time ago.

Mr. FOLEY: The Australian Sugar Producers' Association?

Mr. SWAYNE: I hope that it will be impartial, and that it will inquire into every phase of the industry; and, if it does that, it will be of advantage. No one in the sugar industry has the slightest to fear from any disclosures that may be made. I am glad to see that such a commission is contemplated, and I hope that it will eventuate. It was my purpose when speaking on the question of a State refinery, only I was shut down so suddenly the other night, to suggest an amendment that it was desirable that such a commission should be appointed. Now I would like to refer to a statement made in Queensland lately, which, if correct, would go to show that the industry had no claim for a protective duty, without which it would be impossible to carry it on. It was stated that the cost of production with black labour in Java was just as great as with us, though we are paying the highest wages paid by any agricultural industry in the world. When I heard the statement I was rather staggered; but on going into the thing I found it was not correct. The statement was based on some figures copied from the "International Sugar Journal," which were given by Mr. Prinseng Geerlig. There the cost of production in Java was given at £7 5s. 11½d. a ton, which was also stated to be the cost of production in one of our mills. But I find that the basis of comparison was not a fair one. The price quoted in connection with our mill was an exceptionally low one, a mill that paid an exceptionally low price for the raw sugar; and the average for the ten mills under Government audit was higher. And several items included in the Java cost were not included in the figures given for the Queensland mill. For instance, in Mr. Geerlig's figures, totalling £7 5s. 11½d., I find such items as "packing, commission, transport of sugar, wear and tear, new machinery, interest on floating capital"; but when brought down to the basis on which the Queensland figures were given, these would be omitted, and the total would have come down to £4 13s. 11½d. Regarding our cost of production, in Appendix VI. to the Auditor-General's report for 1910, it will be found in column 13 that the average cost was £8 4s. 6½d. per ton, to which has to be added the rebate out of the excise which the raw material gets. Unless the Queensland grower got that remission he could not produce the raw material; therefore it must be added to the cost. Adding the rebate of £3 to the £8 4s. 6½d., brings up the cost to £11 4s. 6½d., as compared with the cost in Java, on the same basis, which would be £4 13s. 11d., the cost here is nearly three times as much; and in view of the gravity of the position if the statement were true as affecting our claim for protection, I thought it right to point this out. Coming back to the Treasurer's Estimates, I am pleased to see that there is an increased amount put down this year for agriculture;

[Mr. Swayne.

and I believe in the present Minister controlling the department, because I feel sure that he will do his utmost to push on the department. The Agricultural Department is sufficiently important to require the whole attention of a Minister, without having to attend to another department as well. We have had some excellent Ministers in charge of this department; and I am proud to say that my colleague compares favourably with any of them. I have already pointed out the need for encouraging the development of our natural resources with the view of adding as much as possible to our production of primary products; but I regret to say that in two very important directions this is neglected. One is the promotion of

tropical agriculture, and the [7.30 p.m.] other the rearing of cross-bred sheep, and sheep of British breeds. Last year I alluded to the same thing, but I regret to say that nothing has been done, and I would like to draw attention again to the figures I gave in this connection—

“As showing the money that is going out from Australia at the present moment in industries that could be successfully carried on so far as the natural facilities are concerned, I should like to lay the following remarks before the Committee. I notice by our last Commonwealth Year Book that we are sending out of Australia something like £3,127,000 for articles, many of which, as far as our natural facilities are concerned, could be produced in Australia. For instance, we are buying rice to the extent of £184,000; rubber goods, £176,000; raw cotton, £17,000; sugar and tapioca, from the Straits Settlements, to the extent of £42,000; ginger and spices, £68,000; oils and nuts, £294,000; kapok, £82,000; bags and sacks made from jute, £984,000; tea, £968,000; cocoa and chocolate, £159,000; coffee, £24,000; flax and hemp from the Philippines, £51,000. I do not for one moment anticipate that we will be able to produce all these, but it is a fit subject for consideration by our Agricultural Department as to what can be produced in tropical Queensland.”

I would like to see the department take up this matter seriously. I think an establishment should be provided in the North where both experimental and educational work in tropical production could be carried on. The other industry I have mentioned—the breeding of cross-bred and British breeds of sheep—could be carried on in conjunction with agriculture in many places on the other side of the Range and also at many places on this side of the Range. I have been in districts in the South where it is being done, and there are many parts of Queensland where it could also be done. On this same subject I said last session—

“As to the value of that industry to the States mentioned, it is hard to ascertain definitely, because the term “frozen mutton” is used with regard to both sheep and lambs; but I notice in one of their Year Books that 592,000 carcasses were exported from Victoria in the year 1907. I suppose that would mean a circulation in that State of from £250,000 to £300,000. As showing what has been done in New South Wales in this industry, I might point out that at three of their experimental farms—Wagga, Glen Innes, and Bathurst—they have flocks of different British breeds of sheep, and are continually experimenting as to the sorts best adapted to those districts and best adapted for the English market. I should like to see our department enabled to take up such work as that.”

I was then unable to give the exact figures as to the exports from New South Wales,

1911—3 H

Victoria, and South Australia, but I am in a position to do so now. Last year New South Wales exported 338,000 carcasses; Victoria, 718,131; and South Australia 154,379. Queensland only exported 12,000—a very poor showing for this State, and one that our natural conditions do not justify. It is a matter worthy of attention, and I should like to see something done in the matter. I know it was tried here and the industry attained certain dimensions and then it went back. There was correspondence in the Press on the subject. The breeders held that they were not treated fairly by the buyers, and the buyers held that the breeders did not supply the proper article. Which was right I am unable to say; but if our department work on the same lines as the departments in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, the matter will soon be set at rest. Coming back to the business outlook, I think that with our natural resources and the money we have at our disposal, at present to a great extent lying idle, there is a big opening before us. But the great means of fostering development is industrial peace. Extracts from the legislation of the Commonwealth and of several of the States of New Zealand have been collected by council, to which I should like to draw the Committee's attention, and it would not be out of place if our Government were seriously to consider the advisability of placing something of the same kind on our statute-book for the prevention of strikes. I hear hon. members on the other side laughing. Perhaps they think that this might derogate to some extent from the importance of their organisations; but it seems to me that, now that we have means at our disposal for dealing with industrial questions, unions that were formed as fighting machines are as great an anomaly as it would be for the Great Powers to maintain their expensive navies and their great armies after arrangements had been made for universal peace. This is no fad or far-fetched idea, as will be seen by the following extracts from this legislation and the report of counsel on the subject:—

“*Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904.*

“(Section 6.)

“Under a penalty of £1,000 this Act provides that no person or organisation” shall, on account of any industrial dispute, do anything in the nature of a lockout or strike; but no proceedings for this penalty can be instituted without the leave of the president. An “organisation” means an organisation registered under the Act. Any organisation of employers or employees which, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with the demands of any employers or employees, orders its members to refuse to offer, or accept, employment is considered to be guilty of a lockout or strike.

“*WESTERN AUSTRALIA.*

“*The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1902.*

“(Section 98.)

“This Act imposes a penalty of £50 on any person who (a) takes part in, or does anything in the nature of, a lockout or strike; or (b) before a reasonable time has elapsed for a reference to the board or court, or during the pending of proceedings before the board or court, suspends or discontinues employment or work; or (c) instigates to, or aids in, any of the above Acts.

Mr. Swayne.]

"NEW ZEALAND.

"Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Amendment Act, 1908.

"The provisions of this Act are as follows:—Every striker bound by any award or industrial agreement is liable for striking to a penalty not exceeding £10. Every employer bound by any award or industrial agreement is liable for a lockout to a penalty not exceeding £500. But, if judgment has been obtained against any industrial union, or industrial association, of which the worker or employer is a member, the worker or employer is not liable. Anybody inciting, instigating, aiding, or abetting an unlawful strike, or unlawful lockout, is liable, if a worker, to a penalty not exceeding £10, and if an industrial union, industrial association, trade union, employer, or any other person than a worker, to a penalty not exceeding £200. An "unlawful strike" is a strike of workers bound by an award or industrial agreement. An unlawful lockout is a lockout by any employer bound by an award or industrial agreement. In the following cases the defendant is deemed to have aided or abetted a strike or lockout, unless he proves that he acted without the intent of aiding or abetting it—if he makes a gift of money or other valuable thing to any person who is a party to an unlawful strike or lockout, or to any industrial union, industrial association, trade union, or other society or association of which such person is a member. If a majority of the members of any industrial union or industrial association are parties to a strike or lockout, the union or association is considered to have instigated the strike or lockout. (The Act contains special provisions concerning such industries as gas, electricity, milk, meat, delivery of coal, and the working of tramways or railways.)

"NEW SOUTH WALES.

"Proposed Legislation.

"On the 31st May last Mr. Beeby, a member of the present New South Wales Ministry, introduced a Bill to provide for the regulation of the conditions of industries. Part 4 of this Bill contains provisions to the following effect for the prevention of strikes and lockouts:—For striking, the court may impose a penalty not exceeding £50. But, here it is a defence if the striker can prove that, at the time of giving the notice mentioned below—

- "(a) At least nine-tenths of the employees on strike did not belong to an industrial union. (An industrial union is a union registered under the Act); and
- "(b) No industrial agreement or award was then in force; and that—
- "(c) The strikers had given to the Minister or Under Secretary reasonable notice of the intended strike, or of conditions of dispute or unrest likely to induce a strike.

"It will be observed that all three conditions (a), (b), and (c) must exist to constitute a defence. The court *must* order that the amount of the penalty is to be a charge on the defendants' wages, present and future. The employer, being notified, must pay the wages into court, and no assignment by the striker of his wages will enable him to defeat this law. If the striker is a member either of a trade union or an industrial union the court *may* (not *must*) in addition order the union to pay out of the union funds an amount not exceeding £20 of the penalty. But, before doing this, the court must hear the union. The court cannot make the order on the union if it is proved that the union *bonâ fide* endeavoured to prevent its members from doing any act in the nature of a strike or lockout, or from taking part in a lockout or strike, or from instigating to or aiding in a strike or lockout. If either an industrial union or a trade union of employees takes part in any act for which the striker is liable, as above, the court may (not *must*) order the union to pay a penalty not exceeding £1,000. The court may also suspend the registration, or cancel the registration of the union. The court may

[Mr. Swanne.

also cancel any award. To escape these penalties it is no defence for an industrial union to prove that it gave notice to the Minister or Under Secretary; but it is a defence for a trade union to prove that the union had given to the Minister or Under Secretary reasonable notice of the intended strike, or of conditions of dispute or unrest likely to induce a strike.

"The Minister or Under Secretary may, at any time before or during a strike, direct a secret ballot to be taken of the strikers concerning the declaration or continuance of the strike. Any person hindering the secret ballot is liable to a penalty not exceeding £20. This penalty also is a charge on wages, present and future, and the employer, on notice, must pay the money into court.

"As regards lockouts, there is a penalty not exceeding £1,000. But it is a defence to prove three things—namely, that—

- "(a) At least nine-tenths of the employees locked out did not belong to an industrial union; and
- "(b) No industrial agreement or award was in force; and that
- "(c) The employer had given reasonable notice to the Minister or Under Secretary of the intended lockout, or of conditions of dispute or unrest likely to induce a lockout.

"The court may grant an injunction against continuing to instigate to, or aid in, a lockout or strike. Penalty, imprisonment not exceeding six months, or the offender may be committed for trial. An industrial union of employees may make an agreement in writing with an employer, or any other industrial union, for a term not exceeding three years."

That is what has been done or is being done in New Zealand and the States of the Commonwealth, and I certainly think that, in view of recent occurrences, those measures are well worth our consideration. The most disturbing factor in our industrial life at the present time is the apprehension concerning big strikes which may be widespread in their influence, and I believe that legislation somewhat on the lines indicated in the quotations I have given—I do not say that such legislation should be copied altogether, but that it should be on those lines—would be of advantage to employer and employed in Queensland. During the debate something has been said about the State ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, coalmines being especially mentioned, and we know that that is a plank in the platform of the Opposition. I have on previous occasions expressed my disbelief in the efficacy of State ownership and control of industries. It may not be out of place if I read an extract showing what evidence the chief accountant of the Closer Settlement Board in Victoria gave with respect to the State coalmine in that State—

"He reported to a Select Committee of the Legislative Council that, in addition to £36,000 expended on capital account out of loan money, a sum of £46,694 had been paid out of revenue on the expectation that the sale of coal would recoup the money and show a profit. But this brilliant anticipation was bitterly disappointed, for only £22,249 was received from this source, and when other small assets were added there was still a dead loss of £21,833. "The money had not disappeared in any way; it has not been received," said the witness, Mr. McIver. The plain English of the affair is that it had cost, under the skilful management of the State, about £2 5s., or thereabouts, for every £1 worth of coal it had to sell. But this is only part of the story. Mr. Fitzpatrick, the chairman of the Railway Commissioners, testified that the railways practically carried the coal for the bare cost of the working expenses—1½d. per ton per mile—losing the 3/5d. per mile usually added as

the share of interest on capital account for each mile run. Furthermore, Mr. Fitzpatrick stated that the loss to the railways in the purchase of 373,000 tons it will require for the service of the year ending 31st December, 1911, will be £45,692, on the basis of the comparison between the cost of New South Wales coal hitherto in use with that from Wonthaggi. The problem, therefore, is how far the community can gain by raising coal at a cost of £46,694 in six months, carrying it to Melbourne at a loss, and forcing the very department which bears the loss on the carriage to buy it at a further loss of £45,692 on a year's supply. As the State has to make up the loss of both the Mining and the Railway Departments, which, without counting that on the carriage, will be £88,758, it would be interesting to know where the gain to the taxpayers really comes in."

I think that shows that it does not mean all that is anticipated, and the sanguine expectations of hon. members opposite in connection with the State ownership of coalmines and other forms of production will not be borne out. The same thing applies in connection with a State refinery, in which connection it was pointed out by an hon. member favouring such an establishment that its output could be carried at special low rates on the Government lines. Businesses that have to depend upon concessions of that kind are not run on legitimate business lines, and not only in the cases I have indicated, but many others can be quoted where similar results have obtained, and I think those who object to the State taking on things in this connection, have considerable reason for the opinion they hold. In conclusion, I should again like to express pleasure at the position disclosed by the Treasurer's Financial Statement, and I note with pleasure that increases have been given to various employees in the civil service. I think the time has come when another class in the community who work very hard, and I suppose work the longest hours of anybody in the community, should receive consideration. I know they have already received a certain amount in the remission of taxation, but if the coming year is as prosperous as anticipated, and if the Treasurer gets £105,000 in interest upon the transferred properties, I think it will be up to the Government to consider what they can do for the farmer next session. They have done a good deal already in remitting taxation, but I think they have a claim for further consideration. I trust the matter will be gone into before the Treasurer makes another Statement. I only hope that next session we shall have the same Treasurer making a similar Statement, and that the prospects will be as good as disclosed by him last week.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): I think the hon. member who has just resumed his seat devoted the most of his time in talking about strikes. He has been talking about strikes the whole afternoon. I understand the sugar strike was settled some time ago, and I think it is just as well, when these things are settled, not to speak in any direction that may tend to create discontent again. I have listened very carefully to most of the speeches delivered on this Financial Statement, and I can honestly say there have been no more misleading statements made than those made by the Premier. The other evening, when speaking on this question, the Premier spoke in a boastful way. He used these words: "Is there the slightest depressed times for Queensland?" I answer that in a practical manner: Yes. While I am one of those who don't care

about meeting hard times, or trying to bring about hard times, yet every sensible member of this House must recognise that at the present time Queensland is on the verge of a very bad time if we do not get a good fall of rain.

Mr. CORSER: It is coming.

Mr. PAYNE: I hope it is coming.

Mr. CORSER: It is raining now.

Mr. PAYNE: I hope the rain is coming, and if it would assist it by saying, "It is coming," I think we ought to do nothing else but say, "It is coming" all night and adjourn, but I know that will not bring rain. I think any man who occupies the position of Premier of this State should not try to misrepresent the position. What is to be gained by misrepresenting these things? At the present time thousands of sheep are dying weekly in Queensland from starvation. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANN: Is that where the Western line is being built?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes; the end of this Western line is absolutely the driest portion of Queensland at the present time. There is a report appearing in the *Courier*—and I hope every member sitting on the front Treasury bench will read it—that they are killing all the lambs in the Charleville district at the present time to save their mothers. Let any practical man who knows anything about stock go out to the Enoggera saleyards at the present time and see the class of sheep and bullocks that are being sent in to supply the Brisbane market with beef and mutton. All these things are staring the Premier in the face, and yet he rises in his place and in a boastful way tells us that Queensland is booming—that Queensland is not on the verge of bad times. I say it is. I trust sincerely that before the month is out we shall have had sufficient rain to clear away all doubts about bad times. (Hear, hear!) I trust that will be so, but I have been in Queensland for thirty years and I have lived in parts of the State where the drought operated very severely—not one drought only—and I know very well what it means, and I say, as a somewhat practical man in these matters, that we are on the eve of very bad times. The Premier also said that there was no boom. He asked: Is there anything in the nature of a boom? If there is no boom in Queensland at the present time, I do not think there will ever be a boom.

Mr. MANN: We are spending about £3,000,000 of loan money.

Mr. PAYNE: If there is no boom in Queensland at present, for the life of me I do not see how a boom could be brought about. We have had six of the most prosperous seasons that have been known in Queensland since it has been inhabited by white people—six of the most prosperous seasons!

Mr. CORSER: That does not make a boom.

Mr. PAYNE: I am sorry that any member of this Chamber should interject that prosperous seasons have no tendency to create a boom.

Mr. CORSER: It may have a tendency, but it does not create a boom.

Mr. PAYNE: On top of those six prosperous seasons you have had the highest prices for produce that I have ever seen in Queensland. You have only to look at the price of property in the metropolitan area. Just take four

Mr. Payne.]

years back and take the value of property then and what it is now. Take house rents in and around Brisbane, and they tell us there is no boom. A place you could get for 8s. a week a few years ago you have now to pay 18s. a week for.

Mr. CORSER: Brisbane is not Queensland.

Mr. PAYNE: It applies all over Queensland. I have travelled as much as the hon.

member, and it applies in every [8 p.m.] locality I have visited. You can go to Barcaldine, Longreach, or

any of the inland towns of Central Queensland, and it is not possible to get an empty house, and still hon. members opposite tell us it does not apply to Queensland. When you see a boom in a large centre of population, it must, in the nature of things, indicate that things are prosperous.

The TREASURER: You would not like to see it otherwise, would you?

Mr. PAYNE: No, I would not; but it is not correct for hon. members to point out that we have no boom.

The TREASURER: There is a big difference between a boom and prosperity.

Mr. PAYNE: I claim that you have a boom here. You have a boom in house property at the present time in and around Brisbane. The least hon. members can do is to speak of these matters as they find them. Before I touch on the Financial Statement I would like to say a word or two in reference to the Home Secretary's speech. Anyone could see that he was trying to speak with that loud voice of his to the electors of Rosewood, North Brisbane, and Toowong.

Hon. R. PHILP: He was not so loud as the hon. member for Burke. (Laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: The Home Secretary has one of the strongest voices in the Chamber. It was really amusing to hear him. He was crying shame on the Opposition, which is now the Labour party, and asking why, when they had an opportunity of supporting a Government, and were practically the life of the Government—why they did not insist on those reforms? If there was anything at all in that statement, would it not equally apply to members on the front Treasury bench at the present time? The Premier and the Secretary for Public Instruction and the hon. member for North Rockhampton and the hon. member for Woolloongabba supported that Government. But any sensible man who knows anything about the coalition between the Morgan Government and the Labour party, knows that the Labour party coalesced with the Morgan Government on two questions only—adult suffrage, and an understanding that they would not vote for anything that would violate the principles of their platform.

Mr. MANN: Manhood suffrage and financial sanity.

Mr. PAYNE: I was not here when the coalition took place; I came in the first session afterwards, but I understood that the only stipulation of the Labour party with the Morgan Government was adult suffrage, and the Labour party was justified. It was an honest compact that they would support the Morgan Government if they introduced legislation giving all adults outside lunatic asylums and gaols over twenty-one years of age a vote, and the Labour party thought that by doing that—by putting the voting

[Mr. Payne.

power in the hands of the people—they were doing their share. They also stipulated that under no consideration would they vote in any direction that would violate the principles of their platform.

Mr. FORSYTH: They did. By selling land, which was against your platform. They sold as much in one year as the other Government did in two years.

Mr. PAYNE: It is no good trying to gull anyone in that direction. The Government, while the Labour party was supporting them, may have sold land, but we know that this Government, or any Government that occupies the Treasury benches for the time being, under the existing laws of the State, can sell land, and never mention it in the House. We know that the question of selling land never came up in this Chamber while the Labour party were supporting the Morgan Government. This Government can sell land up to a fixed figure every year without consulting this Chamber at all.

Mr. FORSYTH: You don't believe in the sale of land at all.

Mr. PAYNE: I feel certain that the only object of the Home Secretary was to try to reach the electors of Rosewood, Toowong, and North Brisbane, and he says the electors of Queensland are sensible people and he will leave the matter in their hands. Although a man may get up here and say certain things in a loud voice, we know that the majority of the electors are intelligent enough to know whether it is correct or not, and we are satisfied that as far as these by-elections are concerned the speech of the Home Secretary will have no effect one way or the other. Coming to the Financial Statement, a great deal has been said about immigration, and it is always thrown across the Chamber that the Labour party are altogether opposed to immigration. The Labour party takes the stand that before you tax the people of this State to bring in more people you should make the conditions better for those who are here. I claim that if the Government were to spend the money that is now devoted to bringing immigrants here, in placing our own people on the land, in ways such as sinking artesian bores, putting people on the land cheaply, and giving them a start with the object of making a comfortable home and making this country as good as any other place—I say you would have the right class of immigrants coming here with very little assistance. The plea of this and the last Government was that they were not bringing immigrants here to compete with the labour market. How many immigrants did they put on the land? How many immigrants have started business? I venture to say that 85 per cent. of the immigrants who landed here are out in the open labour market, and if that is correct, are they not competing one with the other? If this Government was sincere and in earnest about making this country a prosperous country, their first duty would be to place the people we have already here on the land. There are hundreds of people in my electorate who are hungering to get on the land, and they cannot get any.

Mr. LESINA: That is what the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners say.

Mr. PAYNE: When a scarcity exists so that you cannot place all your own people on the land, is it not a lot of nonsense talking about bringing immigrants here and

putting them on the land? I have no hesitation in saying that these immigrants should be treated like anyone else when they come here, but if any priority is given it should be given to the sons and daughters of the old pioneers of this country. I remember what the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners said in their report, and I will not forget their remarks in reference to the old pioneers of the Commonwealth, including those of Queensland. They said that if ever a monument was to be erected to anyone it should be built to the old pioneers who had gone out into the wilderness, opened up the country, and reared strong, healthy families. Yet every Government seems to ignore these people. This Government seems to be advertising a lot of false reports saying that we have got millions of acres for thousands of immigrants to come here, whereas our own people cannot get land. I will just quote a little paragraph from the report of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners on this matter. Under the heading of "Receiving the Immigrants," it says here on page 164—and this applies to the whole of the States of the Commonwealth—

"We inspected the place on the 2nd of January, six days after the arrival of the immigrants, and found it nearly empty. Of fifty-five domestics, everyone had got engagements the first afternoon, nearly all going into service; of the single men only about twenty had not yet found work. The married couples had not been so fortunate. Some of them without children had found employment on farms; some had placed their families in lodgings, and had gone to the country as single men; but so far as we could learn not one of the married men with children had yet got a situation on a farm where his wife and children could go with him. We were told that it was a holiday season, and that all these men would shortly find suitable places in the country, but it was clear that single men were most in demand."

I claim that if the Government bring married men here and they are at a disadvantage, it is not the correct thing to do. If the peculiarities of Australia are not adapted to married men, the Government should not bring them here at all. There is also another article in this report of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners. The reason I quote from this report is that the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners were a body of scientific, educated, smart men, independent of everybody. They came here and they wrote a report. They did not mind whether it pleased or offended anybody, and anyone who peruses that report can see that it was written fearlessly of everybody. They say on page 143, under the heading of "Housing"—

"While in fairness it must be said that on many places the accommodation and food are all that can be desired, it is true that in certain cases, in some districts more than in others, a deplorable want of proper accommodation is evident. This dependence on single men is one of the most undesirable features of Australian country life.

"All sorts of frivolous reasons are given: 'cannot get married men,' 'don't like children about the place,' 'no means of getting education for the children,' 'men don't want to get married till they go on their own,' and so on.

"Stations employing as many as thirty or forty men have no cottages; some have a few; the highest proportion found was ten married men to sixteen single, which was on a place in South Australia, rightly considered a model. Another objectionable phase is the

demand for married couples without children, so that the wife may be available for work. Surely this housing question demands the earnest attention of those in authority. The Commonwealth needs people to defend it, and where can a hardy race, capable of defending it, be better raised than on the farms and stations of the country? Certainly they cannot be imported as good."

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that there is a good deal in the remarks of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners. As an Australian native myself I know very well that the conditions in these large industries, such as the pastoral industry and the sugar industry, are such that single men are more acceptable. They are handier, as it were, and as they have no encumbrances, they can live in a tent.

Mr. MULLAN: And they live cheaper. That is their object.

Mr. PAYNE: There is no doubt that that is the reason to a great extent why the single men get the preference over the married men. I think that it is time that men who claim to have a title of statesmanship about them at all should recognise that the time has arrived—and gone past—to take some notice of the remarks of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners. Their remarks must appeal to every man here. What better class can you get to defend the country than the native born? Hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches say that it is highly desirable to fill up our vacant spaces if only for the matter of defence. They pretend that that is the reason why they are bringing immigrants here. As a matter of fact, those immigrants are not here twenty-four hours before they are over the borders to the other States. The Government ignore the most natural, practical, and scientific way of filling this country for the purposes of defence, and that is by settling the people who are already here upon the land, so that they may have homes of their own, and rear strong, healthy families. With all due respect to the immigrants who come here from abroad, I consider there would be a greater desire to protect this country in the minds of the people born and reared here than you could get anywhere else. Yet this Government have done nothing at all in that direction. I trust that my remarks, if they will not do anything else, will draw the attention of the Government to the report of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners. They were an independent body of men, and did not write their report to please anyone, and it will be worth the while of the Government to take notice of what they said. Something has been said about the Government exceeding the vote for immigration. I do not like repeating what others have said, but I heard it yelled out in a defiant kind of way from the Government side of the House when this was mentioned, "Yes, we have exceeded the vote, doubly exceeded the vote, and don't you think we have done the right thing?" If the Government were entitled to exceed the vote on the immigration question, why could they not exceed it on any other question? We have always been told that this House is the boss, as it were, of the purse strings of the people, but when we have a Government that has been voted £50,000 for a certain purpose—for bringing out immigrants—exceeding that vote by twice as much—£119,000 they spent altogether—where is the logical argument to say that they are

Mr. Payne.]

correct in exceeding that vote to that amount? It is a lame excuse to say that they are bringing the people out here for purposes of defence. It is a serious thing, to my mind, to exceed a vote by such an amount and then to say that they were justified in doing it. Then they will tell you that this House is the boss, as it were, of the purse of the taxpayers of the State. The logical conclusion I come to is that if it is right for the Government to use more than twice the amount of money voted for immigration, they would be equally right in using double the amount voted for any other purpose.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Where is it going to end, anyhow?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not know where it is going to end. I have expressed my opinion; and I am not going to say any more on the subject of immigration just now. With respect to railways, I find from the Financial Statement that our railways, as usual, have contributed considerably towards the revenue. But while I suppose that is a pleasing feature to everybody, I say that the Government, with all their boastings, are not yet paying the men responsible for the running of those railways a living wage. What I would call a living wage is a wage on which a man can keep a wife in honest comfort, and rear a family. Suppose a man who has a wife and four children gets 8s. a day, or £2 8s. a week. Say the wife is economical—which she must be to provide meals for the family at 4d. a head—she may manage so that the cost of living will be only 2s. a meal for the family of six. With three meals a day, and nothing in between—no fruit—that would be 6s. a day or £2 2s. a week. That would leave 6s. a week for house rent, wood, and so on, to say nothing about clothes at all. We know they cannot do it. Every man, if he likes to be honest, will admit that unless the wife earns money by sewing or rearing poultry or in some other way, it is not possible to rear a family on the amount of money the husband is receiving from the Railway Department.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I thought you were arguing just now that the cradles in Queensland were empty. Now you are arguing that there are big families.

Mr. PAYNE: I am not arguing about cradles being empty; I say this Government has given no encouragement to fill the cradles, and sensible people can account for the falling off in the birth rate—the artificial means, and that kind of thing; and you can hardly blame a woman for not bringing children into the world when she cannot see her way clear to give them honest comfort—when she can see nothing but starvation for them. If the Government were honest in desiring to build up a Defence Force for this country, they would build it up by means of the native-born, and do everything to assist them.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: I spoke just now about what could be done on 8s. a day; but where do the men with only 6s. a day come in? I dare say there is such a thing as running a Government department on business lines; but the whole thing wants going into in an honest way; and the least thing that should be done in regard to our railway

[Mr. Payne.

servants is to give them a living wage. I notice there is something in reference to railways completed and railways in course of construction; and among them is the Great Western Railway, Section A, from Wallal. In this connection I will not lose an opportunity of repeating what I have said several times already—namely, that this railway from Wallal in the direction indicated is going to be disastrous; and even at this late hour the matter is worth considering by the Government. They should not allow themselves to be pulled either way, but deal with the matter on its merits. With regard to Section B, I have been advocating that line to start from Longreach. Some people will say it is political wire-pulling; but though in going from Longreach it might run through my electorate, it is a peculiar coincidence that I have gained very little political kudos for advocating this line. In 1905, the year I was returned to this Chamber, Mr. Morgan, now Sir Arthur Morgan, introduced the section from Longreach to Stonehenge, 88 miles some chains. The Longreach people, in their blindness or narrowness, did not want the line to leave Longreach—as is generally the case where there is a township at the terminus of a railway. The tradespeople naturally think that the line moving on will deprive them of some business. I told Sir Arthur Morgan then that that was the proper line to build. I was asked my honest opinion by some of my friends in the House; and I told them it was not possible to build a section of railway through a better portion of Queensland than from Longreach to Stonehenge.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did not Longreach refuse it at the time?

Mr. PAYNE: There may have been people in business in Longreach who did so; but the people in the whole of the surrounding district were clamoring for the line. By my advocacy of this I may be making some political enemies; but when it is a question of a big expenditure of the people's money, I say that if a man allows himself to be pulled one way or the other by anybody he has very little backbone. State railways have always been made a non-party question by the members of the Labour party. They recognise that on such a matter every man should be at [8.30 p.m.] liberty to exercise his common sense. I hold the opinion that even at this late hour it would pay the Government very well indeed, before going on with either the Wallal-Tobermory extension or the Blackall extension, to let the engineering experts in the Railway Department decide which are the best routes to follow, and treat them both on their merits. If that were done, I am quite satisfied which routes would be chosen. The Longreach connection is some 18 miles nearer than the Blackall connection, and it runs through better country, and, according to engineering experts, it would cost £1,000 a mile less than the Blackall line. I know that there is an agitation going on at the present time in reference to this line, but that agitation has not moved me in the least. Every hon. member knows that ever since the question came up I have advocated the connection from Longreach, and I moved an amendment last session substituting Longreach for Blackall. I have no axe to grind in the matter.

It is a matter of indifference to me, from the personal point of view, which route is chosen. I may gain a little political kudos in some quarters a little lower down, but I am satisfied that in Longreach I shall lose by it; but I repeat that the man who has not sufficient backbone to stand up for what he knows is the proper thing, and who will allow himself to be pulled by anybody in reference to the construction of a railway, is not fit to be a member of this Chamber. The extension from Walla to Tobermory is like a dog's hind leg, and no statesman can ever lick a railway like that into shape. Before the Government go too far, they should get an honest opinion from their experts, and, if that is done, I am satisfied the present route will not be adhered to. I am satisfied that both that route and the Blackall route would be wiped clean out if they were left to experts to be dealt with on their merits. Everyone knows the way in which these lines were brought before this Chamber. Every hon. member knows that the only information we had on the subject was the report of Mr. Amos. Mr. Amos may be a very clever man, but his report was based on a flying trip that he took in a motor-car, and the motor-car never touched the line at all. It simply ran from Charleville straight out to Adavale. If Mr. Amos had recommended that the line should be built over the route taken by him in the motor-car, he would have done the right thing. We had no plan, section, or book of reference in connection with any of these lines. It should be above party when you have to deal with the expenditure of between £9,000,000 and £10,000,000.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was not a party question.

Mr. PAYNE: The hon. gentleman can tell that to someone who was not here last session. I am not going to argue the question with him. I am satisfied about its being a party question, and I am satisfied that the whole system on which those lines were brought in here was rotten.

The PREMIER: What?

Mr. PAYNE: It was rotten—rotten to the core. We had no plans, no sections, and no books of reference, and, taking into account the amount of money involved, the least that this House could have done was to see that that money was expended in the right direction.

Mr. LESINA: What is the right direction?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: From Longreach to Jundah, of course.

Mr. PAYNE: That is my opinion, and from Charleville to Windorah Crossing. I am satisfied that, if it were left to the experts of the Railway Department, and they were not hampered in any way, that would be their verdict also. Experts from the Lands Department should be sent to decide which is the best route so far as the lands are concerned, and the railway experts should also be allowed to give an honest opinion. If they decided that the routes adopted are the best, I might not be convinced, but at all events I would be more satisfied than I am at the present time. Considering the enormous amount of money involved and the insufficient information with which hon. members were supplied, it

is the duty of the Government, before going one inch further, to make a full investigation.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is to-day's Longreach telegram that is moving you in this matter.

Mr. PAYNE: I hardly think that is fair criticism. I told the hon. gentleman that I had got that telegram, and I made no secret about it, and how the hon. gentleman can say that that telegram has moved me in this matter is beyond my comprehension. Every hon. member knows the stand I have always taken in the matter. When I moved my amendment I did not ask for the support of a single member of the Labour party. I appeal to my friends of the Labour party. They had a right to vote one way or the other, and there was no pressure on my part to get them to support the amendment. I take the same stand now. If the Government are not prepared to submit the question of the routes to their experts, then all I can say is that they are prepared willingly to waste the taxpayers' money. I wish to make another little quotation from the report of the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners in regard to closer settlement. They impressed me as an independent body of men whose opinion was well worth taking notice of. The Government have told us that they have been doing a great deal in reference to closer settlement. To be honest, I suppose they have done something, but they could have done a great deal more, and, unless they do something to clip the wings of the gentleman they have in the Survey Department, he is going to interfere greatly with closer settlement. The hon. member for Gregory has also raised this question.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Is that the Surveyor-General?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. I do not want to keep on repeating a matter, but there was a case in my own electorate which illustrates what I say—a case so glaring that even squatters talked about it. A selection was thrown open on the resumed portion of Evesham. According to the original survey, the selection embraced a water frontage. A man applied for it, and was lucky enough to draw it, but when he came to pay for the improvements he discovered that there had been a severance made, and that the whole of the water had been cut off from the selection. The result was that he came down to Brisbane, and threw up the selection.

Mr. MANN: What did they do to George Kerr?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not know what they did to George Kerr, but I know what happened in my own electorate in a part of the country that I am well acquainted with. I think it is time that the Government made some serious inquiry into the matter. I notice that the Scottish Agricultural Commission, at page 144 of their report, express their opinion about land settlement. They say—

"No doubt those who have adopted the policy of a graduated land tax know well what they are doing. Much can be said for a nation of small landholders. Much can be also said for a policy which prevents freehold in the hands of any private individual whatever."

A statement like that, coming from such gentlemen, is worth quoting. At any rate, I hope that when the Government are making

Mr. Payne.]

resumptions they will get a fair deal. I know that the Act states that they shall get a fair deal. I do not think they should get the best land in a holding. While I do not believe in large holdings, I think that where a man has done hard pioneering work and opened up country, it would not be a fair thing to take all the best land from him when making a resumption. But the trouble is that in their resumptions the Government take the most inferior land.

Mr. BOOKER: Not always.

Mr. PAYNE: I do not say they always take the most inferior land, but I know from observation that they often resume land in an ill-shape, with, perhaps, 1 mile of water frontage and 8 miles deep, instead of making the resumption in a way which will be convenient for settlers. My complaint is not altogether that the Government take the worst land, but rather that the design of the land resumed is unsuitable. They often take a long narrow block, as they did in the case of Evesham, where the land resumed is 8 miles long, and has only 2 miles water frontage. That is not the way to resume land and settle people on it in such a way that they may become prosperous. The Government say a great deal about the wonderful pastoral industry, and about its being the greatest industry we have in Queensland. I suppose that from a revenue point of view it is our biggest industry, and I suppose also that the Government would not be at all surprised if I told them that they are doing more at the present time to harass that industry than any previous Government have ever done—that is, in connection with the administration of the Water Conservation Act. I know that the Treasurer thinks I exaggerate this matter. I have no desire to misrepresent it in any way, but I say that unless the Government immediately bring about some alteration in the regulations under that Act so that settlers may make provision for dry times, the position will be very serious. Imagine a man in my electorate, whether he be a small selector or a large leaseholder, having to make application months before he can get his bore put down. And then those putting down bores have to use a particular kind of casing. I believe the difficulty in that matter has been got over, but even now three kinds of casing are required, so that a man must be a little bit of a millionaire if he wishes to put down an artesian bore.

The TREASURER: You will be pleased to hear that everything is working most smoothly.

Mr. PAYNE: I am glad to hear that. I do not wish to say anything offensive, but I must say that the hon. gentleman passed the same remark before, and when I made inquiry afterwards I found that everything was not working smoothly.

The TREASURER: You gave me some cases which on examination were found to be myths.

Mr. PAYNE: The only objection in those cases was that the men had no legal standing because they had not got their leases. But any practical man would see that it was not a question of whether they had got their leases or not—it was a question of putting down an artesian bore in preparation for a dry time. It was well known that they were going to get their leases later on. Why, then, should the Treasurer, who is a practical busi-

ness man, say that because they had not got their leases they should not be permitted to sink for water? Unless a man puts down an artesian bore when he has an opportunity of securing the plant, it may be twelve months before he gets another opportunity of putting down a bore, for the boring plants are not tumbling over one another in that part of the State. Another thing to be borne in mind is that there may be natural surface water in the vicinity of a place where a man wishes to put down a bore at the particular time that he makes application for permission to sink for water, and two or three months afterwards that water may be gone. All these matters ought to be taken into consideration by the department. With all due respect to the Treasurer, I say that theoretical knowledge in this kind of thing is no good at all. What you want is a practical man. "An ounce of practical knowledge is worth a ton of theory." A theoretical man may feel that he is doing right in pursuing a certain course, and at the same time he may be doing a very wrong thing. I hope that the Hon. the Treasurer is correct in saying that things are working smoothly now, but I had several complaints after he made a similar statement on a previous occasion.

The TREASURER I am afraid you will not be convinced.

Mr. PAYNE: Well, I hope the hon. gentleman is correct. Something has been said in the course of this debate about the dairying industry. The Scottish Agricultural Commission say something on that subject, and though they speak about Australia generally, their remarks will apply to Queensland. Therefore, as I have already quoted their report on other matters, I may as well read what they have to say about dairying in Australia—

"One of the most sorrowful sights to be seen in the Commonwealth to-day is the eight or ten year old child of a thriving dairyman milking cows morning and night, and spending all his spare hours slaving about the farm. A case like that is not common, but it is still too often met with. If schooling must be attended to, church-going ought not to be neglected."

While some people may not think very much of that, I think even those few words from this independent body of men should be taken into consideration. The hon. member for Clermont has brought up some very pathetic cases, and I thought he was going to the extreme, but since reading this report I am quite satisfied that every word the hon. member said in this direction is absolutely true. When we find that in a prosperous—we are always blowing about our prosperity and wealth, and I have no hesitation in saying that Queensland is the best State of the whole bunch, properly managed, I will conclude my remarks by saying to the Government that the matter that was brought up in this Chamber by the hon. member for Clermont in reference to those children working in dairies wants looking into. If they find out that there are such pathetic cases as children falling to sleep when going to school, as described by the hon. member some time ago, they should make such a state of affairs impossible.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member for Mitchell, as a rule, is very interesting. I listened very patiently to the hon. member this evening, but he did not come up to his reputation. He was a

[Mr. Payne.

regular Jeremiah, and he bewailed the condition of Queensland, I was going to say from "Dan to Beersheba."

Mr. PAYNE: They were facts.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: When he states they are facts, and it is a boom and not prosperity, he is stating something which is not in accordance with facts. The State, as a whole, is going through a period of great prosperity. The hon. member also stated that in places in the State sheep were dying by the thousands.

Mr. PAYNE: That is so.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I accept the hon. members statement, but because in a State that comprises 670,000 square miles of country a portion of it, however rich, is not blessed with a very copious rainfall, and that portion is losing some sheep, that is no cause for alarm. Why, it is almost the normal condition, and one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that there is scarcely a year passes but what in some part of the State there is not sufficient grass and water for the stock that is depastured there.

Mr. PAYNE: That is not correct. I have seen years when there has been no scarcity.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member knows what I am stating is perfectly correct: that in parts of the State, unfortunately for Queensland and for those people living in that portion of the State, nearly every year the condition of the climate is such that some stock die, however much the owners may wish to keep them alive; but that does not prove that we are on the verge of exceedingly bad times. The hon. member said we were on the very verge of a bad time in Queensland.

Mr. PAYNE: That is so.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: All I can say is that I join with the hon. member in wishing that we shall receive such a fall of rain that the bad time the hon. member expects will not come about.

Mr. PAYNE: I hope so, too.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I express that wish.

Mr. FERRICKS: Depending on Nature.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not depending on Nature, but in the interests of all persons in the State. With respect to depending on Nature, surely the hon. member who interjects knows perfectly well that those depending on the primary industries are depending on Nature to a very great extent.

Mr. FERRICKS: We overcome that by irrigation.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member has stated something that I knew when the hon. member was a little boy going to school. The hon. member represents a district which is fortunate in having an underground sea of water, and although they have practically a dry climate for a sugar district, they are able, under very economical conditions, to produce from under the soil the water that is necessary to grow the crops.

Mr. FERRICKS: We want you to conserve the water that isn't under the soil.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The question of conservation of water in a large country such as Queensland, with the population we have at the present time, must be very carefully considered. The hon. member will give me credit with having, for quite a number of years, taken a great interest in this matter. Although we may take an interest in such matters as the conservation of water, the time, perhaps, has not arrived when we can economically do that. At the present time the Treasurer has quite a number of surveyors out who are engaged on that very work—that is, the measuring of streams and the watersheds of those streams throughout the State. However, that is a question about which the Treasurer knows more than I, as it is in his department. That is the first step, and I think even the Labour party, in connection with the question of water conservation, must go step by step.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are taking 2-inch steps.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You want prodding along.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I was under the impression that with respect to the department that I have the honour to administer, where it is a question of spending loan money for the purpose of constructing railways, I rather wanted holding back, and that my steps, instead of being 2-inch steps, were rather steps taken with seven-leagued boots—taken with seven-leagued boots in the interests of Queensland

[9 p.m.] absolutely. The hon. member for Mitchell had a good deal of fault to find because the vote for last year was exceeded, more particularly in reference to immigration, but the total vote was exceeded.

Mr. PAYNE: I did not say anything about the total vote.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member said the immigration vote was exceeded, and if the immigration vote was exceeded, why not every other vote? With the exception of two votes in two of the departments every vote was exceeded.

Mr. PAYNE: Not to the same extent.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not to the same extent! Why, I exceeded the money voted by Parliament for my department by £24,000 above the excess in the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You spent a lot of revenue as well.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am speaking of revenue. With respect to the administration of departments, as the year goes on, if it is a prosperous year, all members of the House and the taxpayers of the country demand an increased expenditure; and where we have other people coming into the country and more prosperous conditions, the Government is compelled to spend an increased sum in the administration of the departments that are under their care. Take the Railway Department. Last year a certain sum of money, which I thought was sufficient to carry on the work of the department for the twelve months, I found was not sufficient by £81,000. But why did I find it necessary to spend £81,000 more than the vote? It was for the reason that the traffic had so increased. We were obliged to spend £81,000 more than was voted in order to earn £156,000 more than what we estimated we should earn. So that the argument of the hon. member that votes

[Hon. W. T. Paget.]

should not be increased when the business of the country is being carried on is absolutely fallacious. He knows perfectly well that every year—it does not matter whether the votes of certain departments are not spent—whatever Government may be in power, that Government has to come down next session with the Supplementary Estimates for the money spent during the year in excess of the money voted.

Mr. PAYNE: But not to the same extent that you exceeded the immigration vote.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The immigration vote was £50,000, and we spent £119,000, and I think the extra £69,000 was spent in the interests of this State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Question!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is quite reasonable that hon. members opposite should question what I say. When I sat over there I frequently questioned what was said on this side of the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Quite sincerely?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Quite sincerely, and I give the hon. member for Kennedy the kudos of believing that he is sincere in differing from me on this question. He does not believe that it is a good thing to bring people to this country in the way we are bringing them now, but I believe it is a good thing to ask those in the country from which some of us came to come here and share the prosperity which we are now enjoying.

Mr. COYNE: Do you believe that exceeding the vote to that extent is a good principle?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Talking of it as a good principle, I do not think myself that it is always wise for people when they are running a business—whether it is the administration of a Government department or a business of their own—to very greatly exceed the sum of money that they expect to spend; but under certain conditions it is an exceedingly wise thing to do that, and these people were offering to come here. At the present time the Chief Secretary is receiving nominations from our own people in this State for friends in the old country to the extent of 700 a month. Surely that is the best class of immigration that we can get from over seas! When people who come here are prepared to send home to their friends, and tell them to come out and share their conditions here, surely that is the best class of immigration that we can get, and I think the Chief Secretary would be wrong in refusing to receive these nominations.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Do you think the end justifies the means?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks that I belong to the order of Jesuits or not, but I am not at all certain that at times the end does not justify the means, especially when that end is the means of bringing the friends of people to this country who otherwise would not get here. I would point out that although the vote was exceeded by £69,000, some £23,000 or £29,000 of it was paid for nomination fees, so really the money actually spent on immigration by the State was something under £100,000. The hon. gentleman had a great deal to say about the Great Western line, and I interjected in a friendly way that probably a certain telegram

[Hon. W. T. Paget.

that had come down from Longreach to-day had reminded him that he should say something about this matter—that is, the Longreach to Jundah extension.

Mr. PAYNE: Nothing of the sort. If I had never got that telegram I should have said just as much.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I will take the hon. member's word; there is no reason why he should not say it. I had a telegram from Longreach to-day in the same words as the one which came to the hon. member.

Mr. PAYNE: I showed you mine.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I would like to point out to the hon. member who is now proposing that the routes of certain railway extensions should be altered, that it was Parliament which approved of the route of the railway last year—it was a majority of members of this House which not only approved of the Bill I brought in containing full particulars, but authorised the expenditure of the money on that railway.

Mr. PAYNE: Did you give them the full particulars?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes; absolutely. I fail to see how the hon. member can say that the Bill for the Great Western Railway was not brought before the House in an honest manner.

Mr. PAYNE: It was not.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member repeats his charge that I brought a Bill in for a railway in a dishonest manner. I say he is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. PAYNE: No; I did not say dishonest.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The fullest information was given that lay in our power. We do not pretend in our department to be in possession of all the facts relating to every square mile of country in Queensland.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You did not give your surveyors a chance.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We gave them all the particulars we could.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: They went over the country in a motor-car.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What does it matter about a motor-car? Hon. members are trying to draw me off the track. What I want to point out is that the proposition was brought before the House by me in the hope that it would serve the best interests of Queensland.

Mr. PAYNE: It is not going to do it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Time will prove that what I say is correct, and probably that what the hon. gentleman says is incorrect. With respect to the debate that has been proceeding in the last few days on the Financial Statement, it was quite pleasing to me to hear so many encomiums passed on the Budget Speech introduced by my colleague, the Treasurer. It is not for me in any shape or form to "paint the lily or gild the refined gold."

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Why all this defence from the front Treasury bench?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No, it is not defence.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have something to say about the department which I am the head of, and when the hon. member for Maranoa tries to make out that there is a great deal of defence from the front Treasury bench, I tell him that he is mistaken. The reason I am speaking is not to reply to any attack, for certainly no attack has been made, but to give hon. members opposite some information that they are not in possession of at the present time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The deputy leader of the Opposition, when speaking in connection with the men who have been brought out from the old country to build lines in this State, made use of these words—

“Mr. LENNON: If only one atom of the true condition of affairs had been mentioned to them, and the conditions they would have to work under were only mentioned to them, they would never have come out here at all. They have been dragged out.

“The PREMIER: No.

“Mr. LENNON: These men are being brought out here in such large numbers that I am seriously apprehensive that we will have hundreds and hundreds of our men, who have been working on these railway lines for years, thrown upon the unemployed market.

“OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

“Mr. LENNON: I am apprehensive that that is what will happen. These labourers who have been brought out and sent to Wallai, Rockhampton, Mackay, and other places, will mean that in many cases the local men, including many deserving men who have worked for years as navvies, will be thrown out of employment.”

I may be pardoned for saying something about the manner in which these navvies have come out, and the conditions under which they were engaged in the old country.

Mr. LESINA: They have all joined the organisations.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That does not matter. It has been said that these men were brought out under conditions of which they were not aware. The acting leader of the Opposition said that they were being dragged out. Let me tell him the conditions under which these men came out here. I hold in my hand a copy of a circular which was issued to these men when they made application in England for employment in Queensland as railway navvies. I have not time to read it through, but it has been frequently stated that the men were misled with respect to the wages they were to receive when they came to this State.

Mr. ALLEN: Why did they strike?

Mr. THORN: The agitator makes them strike every time. You know that.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I point out that clause 2 says—

“The men are wanted for the very extensive railway construction work which is now in progress in various parts of Queensland, and they must be prepared to go wherever their services are required. On arrival in Queensland they will be received by the Government officials and will be conveyed to the place at which work is available.”

That is railway construction work. Then clause 3 says—

“The wages will be paid in accordance with the rates current in the particular district in which they are employed, which are now as

follows:—Southern division, from 8s. to 9s. per day; Central district, from 8s. to 9s. 6d. per day; Northern district, from 9s. to 10s. 6d. per day.”

Then paragraph 4 says—

“Although work is assured to competent men at the wages stated, they will not be under contract and will have full liberty to leave the work when they think they can do better for themselves.”

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What can be plainer than that? How can any man—I will not say any hon. member—say that these men have been brought out here under conditions of which they had no knowledge? The other paragraphs in this circular simply state the conditions under which they are to present themselves for medical examination, and it goes on to say here in paragraph 12—

“No large outfit is necessary, nor need it be new; but as the voyage is from six to seven weeks, sufficient changes of linen should be taken. Emigrants should take all the clothes they have, whether old or new; but, if possible, not less than the following for the voyage and subsequent use:—”

Then follows a list of useful clothing that they might bring along. I think that that is a complete answer to the assertion that has been made that these men have been brought out here under conditions of which they were ignorant.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Up to the present we have brought out 950 of these navvies. I will say this, and I say it advisedly, in spite of what the acting leader of the Opposition said about these men displacing the local men—I say that that statement is incorrect.

Mr. LESINA: Are they not doing so?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Absolutely not doing so.

Mr. LESINA: Only in the one case?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will give him the facts. Some four or five months ago we had 3,000 men on railway construction works in Queensland. We brought into the country 950 navvies. To-day we have 5,100 men at work on railway construction works.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: So that the assertion that was made that these men we were bringing along were displacing the men we have had working for us is incorrect. As the Minister administering that department I would not put up with that state of affairs for one minute.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I would not for one minute allow any man who was imported here to displace any of the men who have been working for us in the Railway Department.

Mr. COYNE: Your colleagues acted differently in connection with the sugar-workers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am speaking about the Railway Department.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It might have happened without you knowing.

Hon. W. T. Paget.]

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I desire to give some information if hon. members will allow me. We heard a great deal about the strike at Wallal, but these men are quite satisfied to go on with their work; they are quite satisfied with the conditions, and they are quite satisfied with the rate of pay.

Mr. COLLINS: Who interfere with them?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I would not like to say that the hon. member for Burke interferes with them when he goes up to the Mary Valley. I would not say that for a single moment. When the hon. gentleman visits the railway camp on the Mary Valley he goes to see these men, not for the purpose of interfering with them, but for the purpose of telling them what a glorious thing unrest is. (Laughter.) I am certain that the hon. gentleman would tell them what a glorious thing unrest—especially industrial unrest—is. (Laughter.) Of course we cannot expect that every man who gets on board a train from the steamer, and is sent out to the various places—we do not expect every one of these men to stay out there and work. That would be expecting something that would be unreasonable. I will tell hon. members this with respect to this great strike that we have heard so much about among the imported navvies at Wallal. One would think from the telegrams that came forward and the great capital that was made out of it, that there were some hundreds of imported navvies there. The first excuse given for this so-called strike was that we had charged for those men £2 each for their tents. What did I do? I had made every effort to see that the Railway Department should have tents, flies, blankets, stretchers—all necessaries—ready for the men, if they desired to purchase them. If they did not desire to purchase them, there was no need to do so. I consider that the excuse was a very paltry one.

Mr. LESINA: You treated those men better than you treat Australian navvies, as a rule.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No, I would not do that. The only reason why I tried to take them in hand was because they came here as strangers in a strange land—(hear, hear!)—and I appointed one of the manliest men in the department, Mr. Lewis, to look after their welfare, and he is doing it exceedingly well. What is the fact? The tents cost £1 7s. 2d. each; and the actual cost of all the necessaries it was thought advisable to get was the amount charged to the men.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Cutting out the poor local storekeeper.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: In the handing of 500 or 600 or 700 men in one day, it was only right that I, as head of the department, should see that they got their requirements as cheaply as possible and without any trouble to themselves. What happened about this Wallal strike? The immigrant navvies who were being paid 9s. a day, and expressed dissatisfaction after they had been talked to, demanded 10s.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Who talked to them?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I leave hon. gentlemen to consider that for themselves.

[Hon. W. T. Paget.]

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: You cannot name one who did so. The Australian Workers' Union did not tell them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I asked for a report as to why those men struck—whether they were overworked—green, as it were, from a long sea voyage; and the report I got was that the work done to the time they downed tools was worth 3s. a day.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Is that the sort of men you bring out?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is the usual intelligent interjection of the hon. member.

Mr. LESINA: Were those men fully extended?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The instructions I gave when they landed were that they were not to be fully extended, but were to be allowed to get their hands hard and their muscles in trim and become acclimatised a bit before being required to do a fair day's work.

Mr. LESINA: The Australian labourer could run rings round any of them. He does it, too.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That may be; but we like to give other people a show sometimes. I heard a good deal about the large numbers leaving the camp—leaving it in sixes and fours and twos. If two sixes, two fours, and two twos had left the strike camp, there would have remained the enormous number of three in the camp, because there were only twenty-seven altogether. It was said that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the men outside.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The usual lying Press!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There is no lying Press about it. With regard to what is being done for the navvies on this line and other lines, I may say that the Young Men's Christian Association has taken part of the work from our shoulders. The department tried recreation tents and amusements for the men, but we failed to interest them; and I am thankful that the Young Men's Christian Association have stepped forward, and on the Oakey to Cooyar line they are doing excellent work.

Mr. LESINA: They are better satisfied now than they were before.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I provided tents and all necessary materials for recreation.

Mr. LESINA: Not literature?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes.

Mr. LESINA: Not Bibles and tracts?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No. We do not supply tracts in the Railway Department—we only build railway tracks. (Laughter.) I repeat that excellent work is being done by the association; and I desire this work to be carried on, if possible, under similar conditions at all the big camps in connection with our railway works.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And with respect to the men, especially those who are building the North Coast

Railway, I hope the Lands Department will reserve certain areas for them, so that when they have earned sufficient money, they may make a start on the land themselves.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The deputy leader of the Opposition also had something to say about the land purchased recently by the Government, and said that instead of paying £23,000, we ought to have got it for £14,000. I have no hesitation in saying that for a portion of that land the Railway Department was negotiating, off and on, for four years; that the people who owned it, so far from being anxious to sell, were not at all anxious to sell; but in the end the family wished to close accounts, and we were able to purchase the land, which I thought it was desirable to obtain in the interests of the traffic on the North Coast Railway.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That shows you should reserve more land when you are building your railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This land was purchased for the purpose of building engine and carriage sheds and all the workshops that now occupy so much space at Roma street. A scheme has been propounded for the remodelling of the Roma-street yards, more especially in view of the enormous expansion of traffic that has taken place during the last two years.

[9.30 p.m.] and which I feel certain will grow, with the new railways that are being built, and with the continuance of good seasons that we are going to have. In remodelling the yards we must sweep away all the engine and carriage sheds that are there at the present time. It is proposed to duplicate the line between Roma street and Mayne Junction round by Normanby, and we have started to bring the whole of the goods traffic round by Normanby in place of bringing it by way of the Central Station and Roma street. We propose to duplicate that line when we have prepared the land sufficiently, and get the buildings ready for engine and carriage sheds. Last night some question was asked, by way of interjection, as to whether part of this land would be reserved for workmen's homes. I have very much pleasure in saying that the higher portion of the land, and the best portion for residential purposes, is to be reserved for that purpose.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I visited the place with the Commissioner before we purchased the land, and we arranged that a certain portion of it should be reserved for workmen's homes. It is quite necessary that we should look ahead for many years in all the requirements of goods and passenger traffic; and with the acquisition of these 95 acres at Mayne I feel quite certain that all the requirements for the next fifty years can be met in the directions I have just indicated, and also for the building of a yard for the marshalling of goods trains, so that goods can be received at Roma street in the ordinary way, and the trucks, irrespective of where they are to go on the North Coast line, will be sent out to the marshalling yards at Mayne, instead of being marshalled at Roma street, as they are now, and taking up an immense amount of room, and interfering very considerably with the traffic.

The whole work will hereafter be done at Mayne. The works at Mayne will give us facilities for remodelling Roma-street yards, and the estimated cost of remodelling Roma street is about £500,000.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That is not much.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Hon. members will find that a sum of £100,000 is placed on the Estimates for the starting of the work this year—£30,000 in one direction, and £10,000 in the other. The purchase of the higher land at Mayne—although we gave a higher price for it—is distinctly economical, for the reason that we hope, with the aid of some mechanical appliances for shifting the spoil, to make the whole of the spoil economically available for filling up the lower land that will be required for the marshalling yards, instead of having to carry it a long distance. At the present time we are cutting down the ridge upon which the Commissioner's old offices stood, and we are sending the spoil out to Mayne to start the work; and when we have levelled this particular place at Roma street we propose to build a large receiving-shed which will afford, at any rate, some temporary relief from the congestion that occurs at certain periods at Roma-street Station. I think hon. members will agree with me that it is quite necessary we should, as far as possible, give all the facilities we can for not only the traffic we have at the present time, but also for the traffic for at least twenty years ahead. In referring to the marshalling yards at Mayne for the North Coast line, I do not wish hon. members to be under the impression that we are omitting the fact that at Wolston we own a large area of land where it is proposed to put down a marshalling yard for the whole of the Southern and Western traffic. That is a matter that will also have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. MURPHY: You will want another loan directly.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is quite impossible to serve the wants of the community in railway requirements unless we spend money. That is the difficulty. If I could supply the people's wants without spending money, I would be very glad to do it.

Mr. MURPHY: But last session we passed a £10,000,000 loan, and all that money is already allocated. Does this imply an additional loan?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: With respect to the total mileage of railways built and being built, I have a little later information, perhaps, than was contained in the Treasurer's Financial Statement, as necessarily it was prepared a few weeks ago. At the present time the total mileage of State and privately owned railways open in Queensland is something over 4,000 miles. That is lines on the 3 feet 6 inches gauge. The mileage of lines under construction is 1,640, and the extensions approved of by Parliament to be commenced shortly, total 611 miles. That includes portions of the Great Western Railway and the North Coast Railway. The lines under construction, excepting the portions of those two lines, total 16. We have at present only two lines—with the exception of portions of the Great Western Railway and of the North Coast Railway—that have been authorised by Parliament that have not been started. One of those lines is the line from Woodford to Kilooy, 17 miles in length; and

Hon. W. T. Paget.

the other is the first section of the line from Miles to Taroom, 44 miles 6 chains in length. I will not take up the time of hon. members by giving the cost of these lines, but if hon. members would like any further information I shall be very pleased to give it to them.

Mr. LESINA: It might be useful to the electors of Rosewood, I should imagine.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I think it would be very useful to hon. members of this House. Hon. members will have gathered from the Treasurer's tables that the railways paid £3 18s. 10d. per cent. last year, and we had a surplus, over the interest bill, of £76,000. That is a matter upon which hon. members, irrespective of which side of the Chamber they sit on, should congratulate the country and themselves. The gross revenue from railways last year was £2,706,888. The expenditure was £1,563,119, leaving a net revenue of £1,167,511. When hon. members have an opportunity of reading the Commissioner's report, which I tabled this afternoon, they will see that the actual earnings on the actual cash we have spent on our railways—something like £25,000,000 up to the 30th June last—amount to £4 10s. 2d. per cent.; I think the exact figures are £4 10s. 1½d. per cent. Of course, those figures do not agree with the Treasury figures, because the Treasury charges the Railway Department—and rightly so—with all the moneys floated. The figures I have given are the earnings on the actual cash spent on the railways. If we debit the department with depreciation on loans, I suppose the department will be charged with something like £2,000,000.

Mr. MULLAN: What about the accumulated deficits?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The accumulated deficits have always been paid by the taxpayers of the State, and the surplus, like the £76,000 of last year, goes to help the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, the cash we paid into the Treasury last year amounted to £4 8s. 2d. per cent.; our earnings were £4 10s. 1½d., but of course we did not get it all in. I should like hon. members to remember that the return is the highest we have ever experienced in connection with the Queensland railways. When the hon. member for Leichhardt spoke about the extra earnings last evening, and said they were made up from the revenue brought in by the carriage of railway material, I was able to tell him that we carried railway material—that is, rails and sleepers—at actual cost. Sleepers for new railways are carried at the rate of ½d. per ton per mile, or 4s. 2d. per ton for 100 miles, and the ordinary rate for that class of traffic would be 13s. 9d. per ton per 100 miles. Rails were carried at the same rate—nameily, 4s 2d. per ton for 100 miles—and the ordinary rate for that class of goods is 8s. 9d. per ton for 100 miles. I am pleased to be in a position to state that no profit is made on the carriage of material for new lines.

Mr. MULLAN: But you show that you are making a profit out of the taxpayers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The interest on the money borrowed must be paid by the taxpayer, whether he pays it by rates and fares, which are not excessive, or pays it by direct tax. The estimated revenue from the railways for the current

[Hon. W. T. Paget.

year is £317,570 above the amount received last year, and I am exceedingly pleased to be able to inform hon. members that £84,800 of that increase has been earned during the first two months of the year—that is, July and August. If a proportionate increase is continued for the twelve months, instead of the increase being £317,000 as anticipated, it will be over £500,000.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: But you always underestimate your railway revenue, you know.

Hon. R. PHILP: Not always.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: During the same two months we have expended £49,700 more than we expended during the two corresponding months of last year, but in that expenditure is included an extra fortnight's pay for the men, an item which was not included in last year's expenditure. With regard to the building of rolling-stock, there has always been a great deal of talk in the House and outside about the shortage of rolling-stock on the railways of Queensland. There is no doubt that for some years the Railway Department was starved with regard to the building of rolling-stock, but during the last three years we have been making an effort, as far as is consistent with the money at our disposal and with economy, to make up for past deficiencies. Last year we built 921 vehicles at a cost of £339,910. Those vehicles included 39 locomotives, 25 lavatory carriages, 15 other cars, and 842 wagons. We have now under construction 92 locomotives, 22 lavatory cars, and 1,091 wagons, a total of 1,205 vehicles, the estimated cost of which is £558,878. Of the work done last year we built 9 locomotives and 626 wagons in the Ipswich workshops at a cost of £137,497; and we had built by contractors 30 locomotives and 216 wagons, at a total cost of £144,851. We have now under construction at the Ipswich workshops 12 locomotives and 964 wagons, the cost of which is estimated at £206,361. We have 80 locomotives and 127 wagons being built under contract for £319,392. It will thus be seen that although very large quantities of rolling-stock are being turned out at the Ipswich workshops, we are not in any shape or form starving outside shops. We are endeavouring to keep them in as full work as we can. A great deal has been said about the increased expenditure on the whole Estimates. I would like to ask members opposite where they would propose any reduction. Would they propose reducing any of the items on the Estimates as presented to them, especially where wages and salaries are concerned? I would like to tell hon. members what the reclassification has done for the railway employees. During 1909-10 the classification increases amounted to £16,089, and the special increases were £3,219; 1910-11, £40,000, special increases £4,055, and we propose, in 1911-12, for which hon. members have the Estimates before them, to make those classification increases £117,956, of which £95,000 is increased classification to the lower-paid men in the Railway Department.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That with the £25,000 given to them last year for the same purpose makes a total of £120,000 increase of classification in two years. That raises every man in the Railway Department—at any rate when he is over twenty-one years

of age he gets 7s. a day, and those men, fifteen months ago, in some instances, were getting 6s. a day. So I think hon. members cannot but agree with me when I say that a fair thing is being done to bring the railway men's wages up to a fair level.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Their purchasing power has been reduced, you know.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I would like to say, also, that the railway men got an eight-hour day in 1908. My time will not permit me to give the balance of the information that I prepared for hon. members, but I would say, with respect to the criticism of the Financial Statement, I was rather surprised to find hon. members opposite had so little to say. I really thought that after six or seven months' preparation they would have been able to make some very forcible criticism. I again congratulate the Treasurer upon the very able Statement presented to the House, and the very full exposition he gave to the country of the state of the finances, and also for the exceedingly prosperous times we are enjoying in Queensland at the present time. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassijern*): I do not intend to say very much at this hour of the night, but there is no doubt the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Booker, was quite correct when he said some of the criticism offered against the Statement was the criticism of dreamers.

Mr. COLLINS: Dreamers generally prove to be correct.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I will show they were not correct in one statement the hon. member made, at any rate. I think we can say that the present Government are exceedingly capable administrators, and I think they are exceedingly hard workers. I do not think we ever had a Government in Queensland the members of which were such keen workers as the members of the present Government, and when we remember the number of sudden deaths there has been amongst public men of late years in the different States, I think there is a great danger that members of a Government like this will overwork themselves.

Mr. MURPHY: We are quite prepared to give them a spell. (Laughter.)

Mr. WIENHOLT: During the day a Minister has to attend to his official business, and in the evening he has to attend to his parliamentary duties, and every week when the rest of us go home, he has to attend some function and, perhaps, has to travel some hundreds of miles by rail, and, if he has any spare time at all, he has to put it in receiving deputations. A man cannot continue at that rate. We cannot have clear minds if we are overworked, and I think members of this House should realise that and not expect too much from Ministers. The Premier has said that we should keep full sail to the breeze. That is perfectly true; at the same time, I think the skipper ought to have a very keen eye as to the weather. There is no doubt that good seasons are essential to the State's prosperity, but there is one big security that we have now that we did not have during the last drought—that is, the country is in a very much safer con-

dition. The hon. member for Burke, one of those dreamers I was speaking about, said only a few bores had been put down. I think the number of bores put down since 1902 will run into four figures. I have not been able to get the exact figures, but it would be hundreds and hundreds, and that will give hon. members an idea how much better able we are to resist the influences of a drought if it comes. I would just like to mention one particular instance. Some years after the drought I travelled down Mitchell towards Bollon. Over 100 miles of country was lying open with not a single hoof on it—all wiped out in the drought, and no water on it. What is the present state of that country? As soon as you leave Mitchell you get on to a run called Bonus Downs. That was wiped out in the drought. Now they have three bores there and they have a great deal of other improvements. Further on you come to Albiglassie, dried out in the drought. They also have artesian bores, and then you come to Cytheria, Tomoo, and Wild Horse Plains—all dried out in the drought, but all now have artesian bores flowing right through the country. That is going on all over the West, and I really believe if we had another drought like what occurred in 1902, with the improvement in water that has been made in Queensland and other matters, such as fencing and so on, and with our past experience—I do not think we would lose one-third the number of stock we lost in 1902. That seems to me to be one of the greatest safeguards the State has. A good deal has been said about our loans maturing. I think we will really make money out of these loans. The chances are we will get all the money we want at 3½ per cent. That will mean a saving of about £35,000 a year—that is, if they float all the loans on a basis of 4 per cent. into 3½ per cent. stocks. We may get them even a little cheaper. I cannot see that there is anything to fight about in that respect. The weak point about our finances is this: We have not the entire control of our own finances. What I mean is this: The Federal Government, rightly or wrongly, have put on a land tax, and the Treasurer must allow for a certain loss in income tax on account of that land tax. I know one estate has to pay £5,000 in land tax, and that amount will have to be taken off for income tax purposes. So I say we are not absolutely secure in the control of our own finances. The Federal Government may have other means of taxing us. Already they propose to tax Crown leases. Some members opposite think we have only been

[10 p.m.] scratching the surface of our taxation. I am sure it is a very unpleasant thing to have to put on further taxation, and a very obnoxious thing to do. Personally, I think the taxation in Queensland is very high. There is one thing which I think will have a sobering effect on any dreamer who is placed in the position of Premier or Treasurer of this State—he has to find £1,750,000 a year interest in London. The figures may be wrong. If it is more, it is all the worse, the money has to be found. If that amount has to be raised, it can only be done by Queensland being in a prosperous state. You cannot play ducks and drakes with the finances and the prosperity of a country.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is what we have to bump up against by and by.

Mr. Wienholt.]

Mr. MURPHY: We are adding to the interest bill every year.

Mr. WIENHOLT: There is the question of immigration. One hon. member has said that he is a whole-hogger. Personally, I am not. That is one thing that we ought to be a little bit careful about. Putting it in a nutshell, I believe in quality before quantity, and I think it would be very unwise—probably the Government are not doing so—to have any fixed agreement which would prevent us slackening off with immigration if we see signs of anything like a set-back. I think we should be able to discontinue it without having to break any big contract. What I dislike in our finances at present is that I think we are going to spend too much loan money next year. I think £3,000,000 is too much. From a purely business point of view, it may be a good thing for the State to spend that money at once, but what I am anxious about is this—I think if we do have a bad time and things are slack, that is the time when we do not want to cut down our loan money. I would rather spend that money then, so that the men employed on our lines will not be thrown out of work—or, if they have to be thrown out of work, the reduction will be done gradually in a number of years, and not with any sudden jerk. There is one industry that is rather a glaring contrast to anything else—I refer to the mining industry. I do not know much about that industry, but it ought to be the best represented in the House by the number of mining members returned; but there seems to be a wet blanket over it, and I am not at all sure that hon. members who represent the mining industry—I do not say wittingly—but, whether wittingly or unwittingly, are not the very people who are putting the wet blanket there.

Mr. MURPHY: The mining industry is not as dull as people make out.

Mr. WIENHOLT: The hon. member for Gregory distinctly said three times, in reply to an interjection of the hon. member for Moreton, that a certain mine ought to be worked. That mine has been worked, and so far at a loss. The hon. member said that they should go on and be made to work. Just think what that means to an investor! Think what it means to put money in a mine and lose it, and then be compelled to work it! That would frighten anybody. While some of those hon. members are no doubt genuinely trying to get the best conditions for the miners themselves, they want to be very careful that they do not check off investors in our mining industry by rather injudiciously advocating measures which would frighten investors.

Mr. HAMILTON: The local representatives are not dealing with it—they are holding it.

Hon. R. PHILP: They are not going to spend any more money. I have spent some money already.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I want to say a word or two on land matters. I think the Government are doing their best to increase our land settlement. Some hon. members opposite have said that this is a squatters' Government. All I can say is that if it is a squatters' Government they acted in a very

[*Mr. Wienholt.*]

funny way last year when they resumed estates in the Burnett. They had three bitter law cases over it. I think they did the right thing; they paid very fair compensation and have made the land available. How can they be called a squatters' Government when they do that? Another member complained that in a certain district the pastoralists were unfairly treated, that they were made to pay too big a proportion of some guarantee. That is very inconsistent. Another member quoted a case where the Government were unwilling to make resurreptions, but I think if we look into a case of that sort we will find that there was probably land already opened that had not been taken up. I believe that the best thing that could happen to any lessee is to have the full resumption taken from him. Many men have been ruined in Queensland by holding too much land. The lessee knows exactly then what he has, he pays less rent, and he has not the feeling that if he puts down a bore there it will be for the next comer. The lessee in the West should not be opposed to having the full resumption taken from him.

Mr. HAMILTON: Some are anxious and some are not.

Mr. WIENHOLT: Then there is the dairying industry, which the hon. member for Carnarvon has said can do without spoon feeding; that it can stand on its own feet. It is evidently going to be one of the industries which will be the backbone of the State. There is a great deal more to be done in that way. I was only speaking the other day to an expert in condensed milk, and he said there was a splendid opening up North for the production of condensed milk. I notice that there is an increase in the Agricultural and Stock vote of £14,000. If the Treasurer can afford it, I think our stock inspectors could well be paid a little more. In my district, the latest appointment has been an excellent stock inspector. You will have to pay well if you get the right man, who is to be a sort of guide, philosopher, and friend to all the farmers in the district. Members are inclined to criticise them—I do not think they criticise them harshly—but some of them have been inclined to say that the Government are spending too much money.

Mr. HAMILTON: Too much loan money.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I think the increases which the Government have given to the lower-paid civil servants show the direction in which they wish to go. I am sure the Treasurer would willingly make further payments to the lower-paid civil servants if he could.

The TREASURER: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: And he can only do so by increasing the prosperity of the country. The hon. member for Mitchell, who made a common-sense speech, advocated an increase for the men on the railways. What he said was perfectly true. But the best way we can afford to pay the men more than we do is by carrying more freight. That is the thing to give us the money to make this increase in the wages of the lower-paid servants. I notice that the Public Instruction vote is a big one and an increasing one, but I think we get good value for it. If there is one thing we should be proud of it is the way our Public Instruction Department is

being carried on. (Hear, hear!) There is no country in the world more up to date than we are in education. Even this little matter of the itinerant teachers—the idea is an excellent one. I give the Government every credit for the way they are administering this department. I do not wish to say anything further, but I will just say this about the Treasurer: I do not wish to flatter him, but I think that one of the strongest safeguards we have in Queensland finance at present is in the Treasurer we have.

Mr. MURPHY: What, after Mr. Hawthorn?

Mr. WIENHOLT: I consider that the Treasurer is an exceedingly capable Minister, and if anything goes wrong with the finances of the State—if it is necessary to put on further taxation and things go back—I believe that the Treasurer is courageous enough to face the difficulty at once. I do not think he will allow things to slip back by degrees. Whatever is to be done, I believe that he will do it in a courageous manner, and he will let the people of Queensland know how they stand.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday.

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