

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 9 JULY 1912

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 9 JULY, 1912.

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

MEMBER SWORN.

Mr. T. W. BOUCHARD.

Mr. THOMAS WILLIAM BOUCHARD, having taken the oath and subscribed the roll, took his seat as member for the electoral district of South Brisbane.

PAPERS.

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

Correspondence between the Chief Secretary of Queensland and the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth respecting the erection of more central sugar-mills.

Return to an Order relative to attendance of members during the last session of Parliament, made by the House, on motion of Mr. May, on the 4th instant.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of reports from the Auditor-General respecting Savings Bank securities, Treasury bills, and sinking fund under the Government Loan Act of 1910.

Ordered to be printed.

ATTENDANCES OF MEMBERS.

RETURN TO ORDER.

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) laid on the table of the House the return asked for by Mr. MAY (*Flinders*) showing the number of sitting days and a register of the attendance of members of the Legislative Assembly during the last session of Parliament, and stating that such a return would be printed each year and included in the registers of the House.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS.

ALLEGED PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR
MESSRS. DENHAM BROTHERS.

Mr. MCCORMACK (*Cairns*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“1. Is he aware that there have recently been a number of consignments of potatoes from Southern ports, infested with moth borers and Irish blight, condemned at Cairns by departmental inspectors?”

“2. Does he know that in cases where the condemned potatoes were shipped by firms other than Denham Brothers, the goods were confiscated and destroyed, but that the potatoes shipped by Denham Brothers, though condemned, were released and allowed to go into local consumption?”

“3. Can he give an explanation of the preferential treatment to Denham Brothers?”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. J. Tolmie, *Toowoomba*) replied—

- "1. Yes.
- "2. He knows there was no differentiation between firms.
- "3. (a) There was no preferential treatment; (b) preferential treatment is not allowed."

PROPOSED BRANCHES OF CAIRNS RAILWAY.

Mr. THEODORE (*Chillagoe*), on behalf of Mr. GILLIES, asked the Secretary for Railways—

- "1. When does he expect to commence clearing operations on the proposed Malenda-Millaa Millaa Railway?"
- "2. When does he expect to commence the construction of the proposed Tumoulin to Cedar Creek Railway?"

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

- "1 and 2. Owing to the amount of construction work in hand, and the great difficulty of making the working survey through the dense scrub on the former line, it will be impossible to commence building them for several months."

EDUCATION OF ROCKHAMPTON STATE ORPHANAGE CHILDREN.

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*) asked the Home Secretary—

- "1. Is he aware that it is alleged that there are a number of children in the Rockhampton State Orphanage who are receiving no education?"
- "2. Is he further aware that it is being freely stated that the Rockhampton Orphanage buildings are in a dilapidated condition, and badly need renovating?"
- "3. If on inquiry these allegations are found to be correct, will he take such steps as are necessary to remedy these things?"

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

- "1. The only State institution at Rockhampton is the receiving depot. Children are continually passing in and out; but are not retained there except for medical treatment. There are only seven children there at the present time, four of whom are of school age.

"2 and 3. Yes, this was reported by the inspector in his last annual report, and plans have since been prepared by the Works Department for the erection of new buildings, and approval has been given for the calling of tenders therefor."

FREE RAILWAY PASSES TO DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. ADAMSON asked the Premier—

- "1. Did the Chief Secretary issue instructions, on 22nd April last, that free season tickets on the railways should be issued in certain centres of population to all children attending denominational schools who had attained the 5th standard or an equivalent?"

"2. If it was right and desirable to issue such free season tickets to children attending these schools, would it not

have been more in harmony with political decency to have waited until the general elections were over before issuing them?"

- "3. Is it his intention to issue such tickets to scholars of a similar standard of education attending private schools?"

The PREMIER replied—

- "1. No.
- "2 and 3. See answer to No. 1."

PETITION.

WYNNUM AND MANLY GAS LIGHTING COMPANY'S BILL.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*) presented a petition from the Wynnum and Manly Gas Lighting Company praying for leave to introduce a Bill to enable the company to supply gas or other light to the towns of Wynnum and Manly and their suburbs and for other purposes.

Petition received.

SAVINGS BANK STATISTICS.

On the motion of Mr. HUNTER (*Maranoa*), it was formally resolved—

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

"1. The number of separate offices which have been formed in connection with the Government Savings Bank.

"2. The names of the towns where such offices have been established.

"3. The names of those appointed to permanent positions in connection with such offices.

"4. The names of those acting as agents for the bank, together with the population of the town in which each branch office is established.

"5. The relative cost in each instance of establishing a separate branch Savings Bank as compared with the former method.

"6. The Savings Bank business transacted at the above places for the twelve months ended 30th June, 1912, showing—(a) The total deposits; (b) The total withdrawals."

JOINT COMMITTEES.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council, intimating that—

"The President, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Brentnall be appointed members of the joint committee for the management of the Parliamentary Library; the President, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Fahey be appointed members of the joint committee for the management of the Parliamentary Refreshment-rooms; and the President, Mr. Cowlshaw, and Mr. Hall be appointed members of the joint committee for the management and superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings; and requesting that the Assembly nominate a like number of members, with a view to give effect to the 8th Joint Standing Order."

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*), it was formally resolved—

"1. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the Joint Library Committee:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Lennon.

"2. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the joint committee for the management of the Refreshment-rooms:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Booker, and Mr. May.

"3. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the joint committee for the management and superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Petrie, and Mr. Payne.

"4. That these appointments be communicated to the Legislative Council in the usual form, in reply to their message of date the 9th instant."

DAYS OF SITTING.

The PREMIER, in moving—

"That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week; and that on Tuesday and Wednesday, and after 7 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, Government business do take precedence of all other business"—

said: This is a motion that has usually been submitted when the House assembles. The days and hours, I think, will be found convenient to members, and after the session wears on, if the business is found to be congested, we can do, as in the last and previous sessions, ask leave for additional sitting days. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I called "Not formal" to this motion principally for the reason shown in the remark made by the Premier at the finish of his speech a few minutes ago—that is, the manner in which work has been congested towards the end of the session. Now we are starting a new session, and it is to be laid down we are going to sit three days a week. That is the usual course that has been followed, and we know the custom towards the latter end of the session has been to sit five days and almost five nights a week, and business is rushed through in a manner which makes it impossible to give that attention to Bills that they should receive. I think we ought to sit four days a week earlier than has been the custom. I should certainly like to see the House sit four days a week, and rise earlier, so as to allow members time to get to their homes before Christmas, which has never been possible for any member who lives away from Brisbane. Apart from that, I object to the manner in which business is rushed through. I remember a protest was entered in another place last year, in which they said they were not going to stand that kind of thing again. A very vigorous protest was made against the manner in which business was being rushed through this Chamber and sent on to them. I think we ought to sit four days a week, as I do not think any member, when we get close to Christmas, and sit day and night like we have been doing, can give proper attention to the business of the House.

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*), who on rising was received with "Hear, hears!" said: I desire, in the first place, to congratulate the member for Gympie and also the member for Bowen on the able manner in which they moved and seconded the adoption of the Address in Reply.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: The Address in Reply, of course, indicates, as we all know, the very happy downfall that has been experienced, not only in Queensland, but almost throughout the Commonwealth. The prospects previous to that downfall, as has been indicated already, were particularly gloomy. I think that the rain we have experienced has, at any rate, given heart to almost every citizen and colonist throughout Australia. With reference to the programme itself, I must say that I am disappointed with the Speech that has been delivered to us. There are many subjects that are notified there that one can only say will receive his support when he sees the Bills. But I notice there are some omissions from the Speech that have previously characterised the Governor's Speech as submitted to this House. One, I think, has been before this House for some years, and that is a Trades Disputes Bill. I believe that that Bill was included in the famous Rockhampton programme, but the Government of the day seem to think that it is time that it was wiped off the slate, and evidently they have done so. Also another Bill that has been promised for some years has been omitted, and is one, I am sure, the hon. member for Ipswich has expressed himself in favour of on more than one occasion. That is a State Insurance Bill.

Mr. HUNTER: He is on the wrong side of the House now.

HON. J. W. BLAIR: He is inside, at any rate.

Mr. BOWMAN: There is a Bill promised that is naturally of interest to this side of the House, and that is an Industrial Peace Bill. But there is a Bill that I would very much like to have seen brought in by the Government, and that is a measure providing for public abattoirs. I believe there is an urgent necessity for such a measure as that being introduced and placed on the statute-book. The Under Secretary for Agriculture has written a very fine report as to the advisableness of such a thing, and of the necessity of dispensing with the present system of private slaughter-houses. Also he expressed very clearly indeed the urgent necessity for public abattoirs, seeing that to-day we are practically the only State in Australia that has not a public abattoir. The Industrial Peace Bill is, no doubt, the outcome of the recent general strike, and I believe a good deal will be said of the general strike during this discussion. I want to make it very clear that we as a party have always believed in the principle of arbitration as against strikes.

Mr. MORGAN: The results show differently.

Mr. BOWMAN: If my friend, the hon. member for Murilla, will just keep quiet I will be able to point out to him that it has been one of the principles that has been advocated by this party since its inception, and promised it to this House, and then withdrew it to substitute a Wages Boards Bill merely to please the hon. gentleman and others who sit for constituencies such as he represents.

Mr. Bowman.]

Mr. MORGAN: How do you account for the record number of strikes during the last year?

Mr. BOWMAN: There are times, even although there is labour legislation dealing with strikes—and I venture to say had the Referendum Bill been carried last year there would have been no difficulty at all in Brisbane, so far as the Brisbane Tramways' strike was concerned, and the Government know that.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: We sought to get greater powers on that occasion, and the people of Queensland, as well as of other States, said they thought the Commonwealth Parliament were seeking too much power.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, but this particular dispute was before the Arbitration Court.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman speaks about this matter being before the Arbitration Court. Was he not a member of the Government which strove

[4 p.m.] to prevent those men getting it before the Arbitration Court?

Did not the hon. gentleman's late leader, Mr. Kidston, offer to pay the expenses of preventing those men getting before the Arbitration Court?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He did pay them.

The HOME SECRETARY: What is the good of telling us that? It was before the court.

Mr. BOWMAN: It came before the court subsequently.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was before the court, and you know it. You have missed the mark.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have struck the mark.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are missing the mark, and you know it.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was there twelve months before anything was done.

The HOME SECRETARY: Whose fault was that? Was that not the fault of the Arbitration Court?

The SPEAKER: Order! If interjections continue to be made in this manner, I shall have to call to order every member who interjects. It is impossible for the hon. member to continue his speech under such conditions.

Mr. BOWMAN: When interjections are pouring in from right and left, from front and back, it is almost impossible for one to follow the thread of his argument. I was under the impression that I had an hour and a-half to speak, but I am informed that I have only an hour, and that being so I wish to refer briefly to the tramway strike. I suppose the history of that strike is known to every hon. member here, but it is just as well that it should be stated again, because the tramway employees have had a manager whom they have had to fight for eight or nine years to my knowledge. Eight years ago I was one of those who took a hand in trying to organise those men, and Mr. Badger, the business manager of the company, carpeted the ringleaders in that movement and dismissed them on the spot. The day has long gone by when any one employer can take up an attitude such as that and be tolerated by the people in any given place. We have a trade union law which gives us the right to combine, but this honourable gentleman seems to think that he is a law unto himself, and he does not want his men to belong to any association other than the

[Mr. Bowman.

one he wishes them to join. When Mr. Badger appeared before Mr. Justice Higgins at the Arbitration Court in Melbourne, he showed that he was opposed to unionism, and that he was doing his best to break the Tramways Union which was started. The tramway employees of Australia have an association known as the Tramway Employees Association of Australia. Our tramway employees sought to be registered as a branch of that association in the Arbitration Court. Mr. Badger was altogether opposed to his men having anything to do with men outside our own State. How did the Queensland Government act in 1910? I have on my notes a reference to their action on that occasion, and have given the information in reply to the interjection made by the Home Secretary. Why, the hon. member for Ipswich was one of the members who most strongly condemned the action of the then Premier, and said the House ought to rise up against such action; the hon. member even went so far as to say what stand he would take if the House was prepared to do that. Mr. Badger went on a trip to the old country, and when he came back he found that the tramway employees had formed a union, and he was very much against it, and would not recognise it. There was a plaint before the Arbitration Court, and he sought to have the registration of the union cancelled by the court. Mr. Justice Higgins told him that the order issued on the 11th May, 1911, was not approved by the Governor in Council, nor was it published in the *Government Gazette*, so that in his opinion it was unauthorised and invalid. When a deputation waited upon Mr. Badger with reference to the badge question, he told them that they could not be employed if they did not discontinue wearing the badge. I want to know what objection there is to a man wearing a badge, no matter to what organisation he may belong.

Mr. BOUCHARD: How about those who don't?

Mr. MORGAN: Intimidation of those who don't.

Mr. BOWMAN: It would take a lot to intimidate the hon. member.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, it would; you are quite correct.

Mr. BOWMAN: We have evidence to-day where private companies in other States have allowed their employees to wear badges, but Mr. Badger, in that high-handed manner which is characteristic of him, says that his men shall not wear a badge. Previous to the men going out on strike they became affiliated with the District Council of the Australian Labour Federation.

Mr. BOUCHARD: You admit that they came out on strike?

Mr. BOWMAN: At any rate, they were locked out. (Government laughter.) Mr. Badger said that if they persisted in wearing the badge he would not employ them. The matter was referred to the District Council of the Australian Labour Federation, and they wrote a most courteous letter to Mr. Badger, in which they asked if he would agree to a conference. Mr. Badger point-blank refused a conference, saying that he could see no reason or justification for a conference. There was a meeting held on the following Saturday—a meeting of forty-three unions.

Mr. HODGE: Members.

Mr. BOWMAN: No, there was not one solitary Labour member who took part in that discussion.

Mr. HODGE: I meant members of unions.

Mr. BOWMAN: There were forty-three unions represented. Each union was supposed to have two delegates, so that there were over eighty delegates present that afternoon.

Mr. HODGE: Representing how many?

Mr. BOWMAN: Representing thousands of union members. A resolution was unanimously arrived at, stating that, failing Mr. Badger coming to a satisfactory settlement by 6 p.m. on the following Tuesday, there would be a downing of tools by the unionists represented at that meeting.

Mr. MORGAN: And they have regretted that resolution ever since.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is a matter of opinion. Those men did come out, and I think there were about 20,000 men, youths, and women who took part in the procession.

The PREMIER: How many?

Mr. BOWMAN: About 20,000. Those persons ceased work on Tuesday evening. There was a procession on Wednesday morning, and I think that any hon. member who saw that procession will say that it was conducted just as quietly as any procession that he has ever seen in the city of Brisbane. There was another procession on the Thursday, and there was some trouble then, particularly in the Market Square, with reference to a lorry load of beer. Even the Premier admitted that he considered that it was a very unwise action on the part of the driver to go through that crowd in the way he did.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about the lorry load of potatoes at Victoria Bridge?

Mr. BOWMAN: I am not referring to Victoria Bridge. The Labour party waited upon the Premier and asked him to call Parliament together, and also to give permission to continue the processions, as we believed that it was a safety-valve for those who were out of work simply to have the opportunity of marching. The Premier agreed with us that it was a safety-valve, and said he would consult the Commissioner of Police on the matter. The hon. gentleman did consult the Commissioner, and the result was that the Commissioner refused permission to hold a procession. As we were returning on the Friday morning from the Premier's office, we saw what, I suppose, will ever be known in the history of Queensland as "Baton Friday." The charges that were made by the police I consider were altogether unwarranted. Old men were batoned that day. It has been said by many that there were few men injured. Anyone who cares to read up the daily papers will see for themselves what took place—that some persons were taken to the hospital, that the ambulance bearers took some away and dressed the wounds of others, and left them in the place where the incident occurred. There was a cry about the strike committee stopping food supplies, and a great deal was made of that cry during the recent election. I do not know whether hon. members are aware that there was another organisation that took a strong hand in their resolutions of stopping food supplies, and that was the Employers' Federation of Queensland.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: They were the cause of it.

Mr. LAND: Of course they were.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have three original letters that were handed to me by an employer of labour, which I propose reading. The first is dated 29th January, 1912, and reads—

"MASTER BAKERS' ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND.

"RE ANTICIPATED GENERAL STRIKE.

"67 Elizabeth street,
"29th January, 1912.

"Dear Sir or Madam,—In connection with the anticipated general strike, I am instructed to advise the trade that, should such be declared on Tuesday, the best course to follow is NOT TO DELIVER ANY BREAD ON WEDNESDAY AND FOLLOWING DAYS UNTIL SUCH IS SETTLED.

"If the strike occurs it will be wise NOT TO DELIVER, as property may be endangered and the drivers may be injured.

"It is advisable to have a double supply baked to-night, and the trade should, if possible, rush the work through, so as to deliver a double supply to-morrow (Tuesday). This is hurried advice, but it is the earliest opportunity we have of advising the trade.

"If the strike assumes any alarming proportions, it is considered advisable that no bread be baked at all, not even to be sold at the bakeries, because such bakeries may be rushed and property damaged.

"The trade is earnestly advised, for the safety of their property, not to send out any carts on Wednesday should the strike eventuate.

"This information will reach the trade much quicker than if a general meeting was called, as at the general meeting called on Saturday last it was considered the best course to pursue.

"This letter is being rushed through to catch the midday delivery, and the trade will be advised of developments as they arise.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"THOS. S. DAWBER, Secretary."

The next is dated 30th January, 1912—

"MASTER BAKERS' ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND.

"67 Elizabeth street,
"30th January, 1912.

"RE GENERAL STRIKE.

"Dear Sir or Madam,—You are expressly requested to attend a general meeting called for Wednesday afternoon, 31st January, at 2 p.m.

Business.—To receive report from delegates attending the Employers' Federation meeting as to what course it has been decided to follow by the federated employers during the continuation of the strike.

"Every member is requested to attend, as the business is of the utmost importance.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"THOS. S. DAWBER, Secretary."

Mr. ROBERTS: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Bowman.]

Mr. BOWMAN: Listen to this one, and then ask me what is wrong—

“MASTER BAKERS’ ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND.

“67 Elizabeth street, 31st January, 1912.

“Dear Sir or Madam,—At the special general meeting of the trade held this afternoon, the delegates attending the mass meeting of the Employers’ Federation reported the result of that meeting to the following effect:—

‘That it was resolved that the whole of the trading community of this city close down their businesses on Friday next, until such time that it is decided to resume.’

“The meeting held this afternoon resolved that this Master Bakers’ Association endorse the resolution of the Employers’ Federation, and that all master bakers cease baking bread on and after Friday next until such time as is considered advisable to restart; so that Thursday night, 1st February, will be the last day that bread will be baked to be sold at the bakehouse, and on no account is bread to be delivered either Thursday or Friday.

“Particularly note that no bread is to be delivered these remaining two days, and that Thursday is the last day that bread will be baked.

“The trade will be further notified of any other matter that may arise.

“I am, yours faithfully,

“THOS. S. DAWBER, Secretary.”

The HOME SECRETARY: What was the reason for these letters—for fear of outrages from the strikers?

Mr. BOWMAN: Were there any outrages?

The HOME SECRETARY: There would have been. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: There would have been!

The HOME SECRETARY: And there were.

Mr. BOWMAN: There is the proof from the Employers’ Federation.

Mr. KIRWAN: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: That they determined that no bread would be baked for certain days, that they would close down their businesses, and yet the strike committee, particularly during the election, and members of the Labour party, were branded by the hon. gentleman opposite as being the party that starved the people.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman who leads this Government to-day said that he was going to supply the people with flour. Did he do it?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

The HOME SECRETARY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN: How much flour was distributed in any part of Brisbane?

Mr. MORGAN: What became of the flour you had?

Mr. LAND: Special constables consumed some of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: We were also told during the election by some hon. gentlemen who sit opposite that there were children dying from want of ice. It is a deliberate lie

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Bowman.

Mr. BOWMAN: This was accentuated by the daily Press of Brisbane, which circulated those lies. They mutilated the truth and defamed the Labour party. The report of the general committee of the hospital is a clear proof that there was nothing more than the delaying of the building of a pavilion. Probably my colleague, Mr. Coyne, will be able to tell you more about that than I can, but I am certain that it was the intention, and was carried out, that the strike committee would not see any hospital or public institution in want of anything they required.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then what about the Children’s Hospital?

Mr. BOWMAN: The same applies to that as to the General Hospital.

Mr. HARDACRE: They got a permit. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: I think your department got a permit, if I mistake not.

The HOME SECRETARY: They did not.

Mr. COYNE: Your department got more than one.

The HOME SECRETARY: The strike committee demanded one, but they did not get it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask hon. members to listen to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition without interruption. The time at his disposal is only one hour, and I do not think it is fair to any hon. member who is speaking that interjections should be so persistent. Hon. members will have an opportunity of replying.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would like to ask a question. What did the Premier do to try to settle the strike? What did any hon. gentleman opposite do to try and settle the dispute?

Mr. THEODORE: Called out the military.

Mr. BOWMAN: When I read the account of the Prime Minister in England in connection with the colliery-owners and coalminers, I marked the contrast between the two men. One was big enough to forget himself, and come down and try to settle the dispute; while the Premier of Queensland simply sat there, and, if Press reports are correct, said: “They have got into the soup, and can stop there.” That report is credited to him; whether it is right or wrong, I do not know. Disputes, one would naturally think, existed only in Queensland, to hear many of the hon. gentleman’s speeches during the election, but one has only to take his morning paper to see the unrest that exists in almost every part of the British-speaking world to-day, and there must be a reason for that. In some cases I know that this is a question of wages; in other cases, it is a reduction of hours; and there are other conditions that sometimes cause men to resent the attacks that have been made on them by their employers. The attitude of the men in connection with the tramway employees’ strike was against a man who has shown—I have never spoken to Mr. Badger in my life, and I am not speaking personally in a vindictive way against him, but, taking his career from the time he has been in Brisbane up to the present time, he has acted the part of a despot towards the men who have been under him.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: Now, it was the original intention of the hon. gentleman to meet Parliament last April, but when the strike took place he resolved to make that the issue. He said he was going to send the respective members to their various constituencies, and ask what they thought. I have here a copy of a letter that was sent by the hon. gentleman, and it has been printed in the daily Press of Brisbane. He said—

“It would be absurd to invite such men to meet in Parliament and join in advising His Excellency the Governor as to the best means of promoting the welfare of the State, after they have paraded their complete indifference to that welfare and their decided preference of mob government to parliamentary government. Therefore, it is proposed not to hold another session of the present Parliament, but to bring these unworthy members before even a higher tribunal than Parliament.”

Mr. THEODORE: They sent back some of the strikers.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman said that he would not, but he meets us on the floor of this House to-day.

Mr. MORGAN: There are a good many less.

Mr. BOWMAN: With one less than we went out with; we had twenty-six. We lost some of our old fighting members—members who were a credit to this Assembly. We have got some new ones. We have got the hon. member for Brisbane, who defeated the Hon. E. B. Forrest—a railway striker; from the strike on to the bench in this House. We have Mr. Gilday, who was also a member of the strike committee. We have Mr. Coyne—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Warrego.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member for Warrego, and others here. Now, it was that, I suppose, which was in the mind of the leader of the Government, that he was going to wipe us out of existence altogether. We were told by quite a number of his supporters that we had gone back over twenty years. I contend that we have got the best vote that we ever got since we have been a Labour party in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: In the elections of 1909 the Government candidates got 81,611 votes, the Labour party 58,579, and the Independent party 14,576. There were 242,754 electors on the roll. At the general election of 1912 there were 309,590 on the roll. The Government got 110,817 votes, the Labour party 99,034, and the Independents 6,181. That is of the candidates who ran; I am not talking of the votes that were cast; the same applies in connection with 1909.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: There are not as many.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Labour party, at any rate, has increased their vote by 40,000, and I say it has made wonderful progress. I am satisfied that the strike, particularly in the country, did us a great deal of harm.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Why?

Mr. BOWMAN: Because we have lying, unscrupulous papers printed here in Brisbane circulating from one end of the State to

the other. But where the strike took place, right in the very centre, the hon. member for Brisbane sits here as a member. We gained four seats in the metropolitan area, and we lost one by four votes.

[4.30 p.m.] We lost another by thirty-one. My late colleague, Mr. Peter McLachlan, was defeated by four votes, and Mr. Sherry, who contested South Brisbane against the present member, was defeated by thirty-one votes.

Mr. MORGAN: How many seats did you gain in the country?

Mr. BOWMAN: Every squatting seat in Queensland came to us. We gained every pastoral seat. You should try to organise those seats for yourselves. When we consider that we had the Press against us, and when we remember the circulars and pamphlets that were issued and distributed, and when we remember all the money that was spent by the People's Progressive League in support of the Government candidates, I say that we got a splendid vote indeed—a total of 90,000 odd votes altogether, and I consider we did very well in getting twenty-five members in the House to-day.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: We were told that there was to be no victimisation, but I consider that that public inquiry in connection with the Railway Department was one of the most scandalous that existed in any part of Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: You would think it was a criminal investigation society when you see the answers that the men had to give before that committee. All I can say is this: that, so far as the strike is concerned, the Government of the day—or the Premier, I should say—took the opportunity of going into the country, thinking that he was going to gain a good deal by it—and which he did. (Hear, hear!) But I can tell the hon. member that had that strike not taken place there would be a bigger change in this House than there is to-day. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MORGAN: Then you admit that the strike was wrong.

Mr. BOWMAN: I am not admitting anything of the kind. I am admitting that it was to your advantage. You scored by it.

Mr. MORGAN: You thought you were going to score.

Mr. BOWMAN: I did score.

Mr. MORGAN: You thought you were going to get all the metropolitan seats.

Mr. BOWMAN: I thought we were going to blow you out. (Laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: You tried to.

Mr. BOWMAN: I did. Now, in connection with the strike I hope, if legislation is going to be introduced, that we will have an Arbitration Bill in place of the Wages Boards Act that we have got now. Let us have an Arbitration Court where we can settle our difficulties without resorting to a strike. There is no man—I do not care who he is—who believes for a moment that strikes are the best thing if there is a means whereby we can settle a dispute without it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: We also know that when a strike does take place there are quite a number of people not implicated in it at

Mr. Bowman.]

all directly as unionists who are affected by it. I say if the Government are anxious to avert any trouble—I do not know what their Industrial Peace Bill contains, but I hope it is not going to take away the right of any man to strike.

Mr. COYNE: Can it?

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not know, but I hope it will not provide that because there are times when men are driven to desperation to take that stand, even against some of the laws we have got now—even the present Wages Boards Act. The Premier gave a quiet smile when I mentioned the referendum a little while ago. To show the difference between the Wages Boards Act and the Arbitration Court, even in the trade which I happen to be a member of—the boot trade—we could only get a minimum wage of £2 per week from the wages board. At the first try at the Arbitration Court we got a minimum wage of £2 6s. for a start. That was some five years ago, and the minimum wage in the boot trade to-day throughout Australia is £2 14s. per week. Do you think we are going to uphold the wages boards when we can get a minimum wage like that from the Arbitration Court? It is not possible to expect men to do it. I have another matter to refer to, and it is in reference to a proposal to establish public abattoirs. I know this will be of some interest to the hon. member for Enoggera. In the report of the Under Secretary for Agriculture, Mr. Scriven, for 1911-12 the following paragraph appears:—

“ABATTOIRS.

“Reference was made last year to the need that is fast approaching for the establishment of State abattoirs in the different centres of settlement instead of the privately-owned slaughter-yards that are now the custom. Whether the control of abattoirs should be with the Government or with the local authority is not a question for discussion here, but the fact remains that the private slaughter-yard is objectionable from every standpoint, and should be replaced by a collective establishment over which control will be less irksome. Here in this State, in the twentieth century, we are submitting, with its concomitant evils, to a system that was condemned so far back as the Roman Empire. The slaughtering-yards of Brisbane are good, and have been brought into line with the latest improvements as applied to private yards, but it is contended that, for the public health and convenience, the time is passing when slaughtering for consumption can be carried on at indiscriminate locations, and the same may be said of the other large towns in the State. Building and settlement are going on everywhere, and the time is not far distant when the private yards will be pushed out beyond the limits of profit. In England and Wales there are about 100 public abattoirs, but it is in Scotland where this system is much more advanced than in any other part of the United Kingdom, and where abattoirs have existed under the law of the land since 1862, though the first agitation in this respect can be traced back to 1847. Of the 205 burghs in Scotland, 124 of these, or 60.48 per cent., have public slaughter-houses, according to the reports of Dr.

[Mr. Bowman.

Dittonar, M.A., M.D., the Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board of Scotland. Putting it in other words, nearly 90 per cent. of the town population of Scotland, or about 2,500,000 people, are supplied with home-killed meat from the public slaughter-houses.

“The chief drawback to the private slaughter-house is the absence of adequate control, in so far that according to the necessities of the trade, butchers must be killing for the meat supply of a town about the same time on each day, and especially so in climates such as this. It is quite out of the question for the officers available to be present at each yard at killing-time, and so perforce trust has to enter largely into the inspection.

“A point to be remembered in planning public abattoirs is the need for placing them as near as possible to the public saleyards, not only for the inspection of the live and dead animals, but also for the quick despatch of those condemned for disease.”

When we have a report such as that from a gentleman such as our Under Secretary for Agriculture, I think it is worth the consideration of this House, and the Government should take some notice of it. Those words were not simply put there to fill up the report. They were put there because Mr. Scriven, in my opinion, believed that it would do an immense amount of good to the people of Brisbane if public abattoirs were established here. We are the only State in the Commonwealth to-day that has not got public abattoirs—the only State. I have been to the Enoggera saleyards a few times, and I have seen lumpy cattle and diseased cattle sold there.

Mr. TROUT: As lumpies.

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, as lumpies. But I would like to know why butchers give as high as £5 for diseased cattle, when they can only get £2 5s. for the skin and tallow.

Mr. MORGAN: They get it from the German sausages.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would like you to eat them, and they would be good enough for you, too. (Laughter.) In Brisbane to-day we have got thirty-six slaughter-yards with five inspectors. The slaughtermen in many of the yards commence killing at about 2 o'clock in the morning, and many of the slaughtermen never see an inspector at that time. The distance of the various yards differs. Some are 10 miles away, and some are from 6 to 8 miles away in a different direction. Some are situated at Indooroopilly, another beyond Chelmer, and another yet on the Cleveland line. It would be impossible for an inspector to visit each of those yards, no matter how much he would like to do so. I have obtained this information from the secretary of the Butchers' Union, and the hon. member for Enoggera knows that either the hon. member for Ithaca or Mr. Crampton know their business fairly well. They give me this information, and it shows that it is impossible for the inspectors to visit all the yards. How is it possible, when there are thirty-six slaughter-yards, for five inspectors to be present at them all when killing is on? It is absolutely impossible.

Mr. COYNE: The Government don't want them to be there.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Government do want them—at any rate, I believe they do. It would be a good thing, not for mere party purposes, but it would be a good thing for Queensland if there was an inspector there, and it is for the good of Queensland that I am speaking about. I am informed that even if an inspector visited a butcher's shop it would be impossible for him to detect tuberculosis and many other diseases, as the meat would be all broken up. That information is from a practical butcher.

Mr. TROUT: It is not correct.

Mr. BOWMAN: I will allow the hon. member for Ithaca to deal with that.

Mr. TROUT: There is a case in point where a man was fined, and his meat was broken up in his shop in South Brisbane.

Mr. BOWMAN: That was an isolated case. We know that slaughtermen are supposed to notify the inspector when a bullock is visibly affected with any disease. If there is a telephone at the yard it is all right, but if there is not it would be difficult to do that. Again, the slaughterman who had done a hard day's work would be tempted to say nothing about it, as if he informed the inspector he would be compelled to wait and hang around till the inspector came—perhaps from some miles away—and he would have to wait there until he overhauled the carcasses. He would be compelled to cut up the carcasses if they were condemned, and see that they were taken to the boiling-pot. He would also be compelled to kill and dress another beast with the view of finding disease.

Mr. TROUT: That is not correct.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member, who is a master butcher, will be able to refute anything that I have said if it is incorrect. I make no pretensions of knowing anything about the butchering trade, but I am doing this in the interests of the public, and also of the Butchers' Union, and also in justice to the master butcher who is prepared to give a fair deal, as against some who are not as particular as they ought to be. I suppose the hon. member will agree to that.

Mr. TROUT: Why not give the truth all through?

Mr. BOWMAN: I am trying to get at the truth. This would be especially so of a small yard. Then the slaughterman would be prepared to do a great amount of extra work. Thus you see the temptation to pass a beast that would be otherwise condemned. Again, most master butchers do their own slaughtering, and those unscrupulous men have a free hand to distribute what meat they like to the consumers. I heard of a case where thirteen cows were killed at one meat-works. Twelve were found to have tuberculosis, and were ordered to be put into the boiling-pot. Those cows were milked for years in close vicinity to Brisbane, and the milk distributed to the public of Brisbane.

Mr. TOLMIE: Were those cows sold as fat cows at the meatworks?

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, and killed, and twelve of them contained tuberculosis. I am also told that a beast can be suffering from tuberculosis and so cleaned and cut up in the absence of an inspector, as to make it impossible to detect the disease. Mr. Crampton also informed me that dozens of slaughtermen had been working in yards for weeks without ever seeing an inspector, and always before the inspector's visit the meat

had been delivered at the shops. A man killing on contract for a number of small dealers would be tempted to pass diseased meat; otherwise, he would have to put up with endless trouble, which is obviously distasteful to contractors. Now, I would like to ask—and I hope the Secretary for Agriculture will take a note of this—I would like to ask him how many inspectors at present have passed the rigid examination that fits a man for the position of inspector. Perhaps it is unfair to ask for that information at the present time, but still when he is replying he may be able to give some idea. I would also like to know how many carcasses have been condemned in shops as compared with the number condemned in yards, and the number of visits paid by inspectors to each slaughter-yard. Two o'clock in the morning is the starting time of most yards, which means every opportunity for the unscrupulous master butcher who may be desirous of breaking the law. It would take one inspector to each yard, meaning that for proper inspection you would want thirty-two inspectors for the thirty-two slaughter-yards. And it is not very likely that they would be on duty at 2 o'clock in the morning. Now, the point is this: That the Commonwealth inspectors who inspect meat for export go down to our various meat establishments, and they see from the first bullock that is killed till the last, and no bullock, no sheep, no calf, and no pig is allowed to escape their notice. If the Commonwealth deem it advisable that that should be necessary to ensure pure wholesome meat going to the old country, surely, then, our Government should see that something is done so that we will have as rigid an inspection as the Commonwealth demands. If it is advisable to maintain our markets in the old world—and I think it is—for the meat that is consumed locally there should be just as stringent an inspection as for the meat that goes abroad.

Mr. TROUT: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: A man goes on to that board, and he waits there until the last beast is killed. No coming here to-day and stopping away for a week or two, and I have instances where some men have been working in slaughter-yards for six months and never saw an inspector. If we have some master butchers that are not unscrupulous enough to distribute diseased meat, I want to know why they go to the Enoggera saleyards and buy it at the price I quoted when I commenced my address? Why do they buy it? Those men do not give £5 for something that, according to law, they are only permitted to sell a portion of—namely, the hide and tallow, worth about £2 5s.

Mr. MORGAN: A little lump on the jaw does not mean that the animal is diseased.

Mr. BOWMAN: I am not talking about lumpy jaws. You must have a lump on your jaw or else you would not wag it so much. I say when men go there and do that, I contend it is the duty of the inspectors particularly to watch those bullocks. I am not going to name any butchers that buy, but I have in my mind now at least four or five such. As the hon. member for Enoggera knows, I was there and saw the bullocks sold.

Mr. TROUT: You do not infer that I bought them, do you?

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not. I believe the hon. member is one of the straightest and one of the best butchers in Brisbane. I have

Mr. Bowman.]

heard that even from men who have been employed by him, and even from officials of the Butchers' Union; but the hon. member knows those beasts are bought, and he knows they are bought by men who are prepared to kill them and send the meat on to the market for public consumption, and then we wonder why there is consumption, and why cancer is so prevalent amongst our people here.

Mr. TROUT: And I know the inspector follows them and sees them killed. There is not one killed from the yards that the inspector does not see, and I defy any man to contradict that truthfully.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have a little list here if time will permit me to read it.

Mr. TROUT: You can have any list you like.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member for Enoggera is judging every man by himself.

Mr. TROUT: That is the law of Queensland.

Mr. BOWMAN: The law is simply ignored. It is ignored every day in the week, and you know it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Nonsense!

Mr. BOWMAN: The very fact of having thirty-six slaughter-houses and five inspectors to look after them—how can they do it?

Mr. TROUT: They look after those beasts in particular.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have here—I got this personally last night from a slaughterman whose name I will not give, neither will I give the name of the butcher where he was slaughtering.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can you give the name of the inspector?

Mr. BOWMAN: I will give the name privately to the Secretary for Agriculture or to the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Will you stand by it?

Mr. BOWMAN: I will stand by it, because the man is quite prepared to stand by it, but I am not going to do as some hon. members have done in the past.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Will you give me the name of the inspector that should visit the yard?

Mr. BOWMAN: He cannot. Your own inspector admits he cannot do it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is his duty to see every one of those beasts slaughtered.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Fortitude Valley has occupied all the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

The PREMIER: He may ask for an extension.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*): I beg to move that the hon. member be granted an extension of time.

Question put and passed.

Mr. BOWMAN: I thank hon. members for the privilege. I do not want to encroach more than I can help. I simply

[5 p.m.] want to read this document, as it is an important matter. It is important to every hon. member of the House, and important for every citizen in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Might I inform the hon. member that an extension of time has been

[*Mr. Bowman.*]

granted to him, and the hon. member can occupy a further half-hour if he wishes to do so.

Mr. BOWMAN: The document reads as follows:—

“Commenced work at —, 28th August, 1911. Worked five weeks; was dismissed for insisting on getting wages board rates. The inspector visited the yard twice during the five weeks. Commenced work at —, on 18th October, 1911. List of killing at —.—

	Cattle.	Sheep.	Calves.	Pigs.
Oct. 18 ...	15	...	16	...
" 19 ...	4	...	50	61
" 20 ...	5	...	60	—
" 23 ...	45	...	30	—

One diseased (cancer); no one there to condemn it, and it went along for human consumption.

Oct. 24 ...	4	...	25	...
" 25 ...	18	...	35	17
" 26 ...	3	...	55	57

One bullock (tuber.) also sent to shops.

Oct. 27 ...	4	...	60	15
" 30 ...	15	...	15	—
" 31 ...	2	...	10	10
Nov. 1 ...	8	...	10	—
" 2 ...	2	...	13	40
" 3 ...	3	...	23	20
" 6 ...	5	...	10	10

One bullock with tuber. sent to shop.

Nov. 8 ...	—	...	—	—
------------	---	-----	---	---

Two pigs with tuber. sent along to shops.

Nov. 9 ...	5	...	20	40
" 10 ...	3	...	10	20
" 13 ...	4	...	—	15

One bullock (tuber.) sent to shops.

Nov. 14 ...	3	...	—	—
" 15 ...	20	...	—	—
" 16 ...	—	...	60	20
" 17 ...	—	...	—	10
" 20 ...	24	...	—	—
" 23 ...	—	...	—	50
" 24 ...	—	...	—	10

“No inspector had visited this yard during the time I was employed—viz., six weeks. The yard was in a filthy condition. All meat was sent in to Brisbane for consumption. Dismissed for insisting on award rates. Commenced work for —, 27th November, 1911—

	Cattle.	Sheep.	Calves.	Pigs.
Nov. 27 ...	5	...	40	...
" 28 ...	6	...	44	...
" 29 ...	8	...	50	...

One bad with abscess went to shop.

Nov. 30 ...	7	...	55	...
-------------	---	-----	----	-----

One with tuber. went to shop.

Dec. 1 ...	8	...	60	...
" 4 ...	5	...	50	...

Three bad with redwater went to shops.

Dec. 5 ...	6	...	40	...
" 6 ...	7	...	35	...

Four (redwater) went to shops.

Dec. 7 ...	6	...	40	...
------------	---	-----	----	-----

Three (redwater) went to shops.

Dec. 8 ...	7	...	60	...
------------	---	-----	----	-----

Four (redwater) went to shops.

Dec. 11 ...	5	...	45	...
" 12 ...	6	...	48	...
" 13 ...	6	...	50	...

One (redwater) sent to shops.

Dec. 14 ...	5	...	40	...
-------------	---	-----	----	-----

Two (redwater) sent to shops.

Dec. 15 ...	7	...	50	...
-------------	---	-----	----	-----

Three (redwater) went to shops. Inspector visited this yard once in two weeks.

	Cattle.	Sheep.	Calves.	Pigs.
Dec. 18 ...	5 ...	40 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 19 ...	4 ...	35 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 20 ...	5 ...	30 ...	— ...	— ...

Three (redwater) sent to shops.

Dec. 21 ...	6 ...	40 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 22 ...	7 ...	60 ...	— ...	— ...

One (abscess) went to shops.

Dec. 23 ...	1 ...	10 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 27 ...	6 ...	45 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 28 ...	5 ...	40 ...	— ...	— ...

One (redwater) sent to shops.

Dec. 29 ...	6 ...	50 ...	5 ...	8 ...
-------------	-------	--------	-------	-------

Two (redwater) sent to shops.

Jan. 2 ...	6 ...	40 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 3 ...	5 ...	30 ...	— ...	— ...

One with tuber. sent to shops.

Jan. 4 ...	4 ...	35 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 5 ...	8 ...	60 ...	— ...	10 ...

One with tuber. and two with redwater sent to shops.

Jan. 8 ...	5 ...	40 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 9 ...	4 ...	30 ...	— ...	— ...
„ 10 ...	5 ...	45 ...	— ...	— ...

“The inspector paid a visit on the 10th. Commenced work for —, 14th January. Worked three weeks; saw the inspector once only during that time.”

Those are the statements which have been made to me by a slaughterman whom I met last night. The facts were taken down while he was present. In Sydney, I am informed, there is Government control over slaughter-yards.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No; municipal control.

Mr. BOWMAN: In the event of there being sent to the abattoirs a beast that is visibly affected with any disease detrimental to public health, the animal is instantly destroyed, and the owner is liable to a heavy fine. Stock treated at the Sydney abattoirs are thoroughly inspected. A number of well-trained inspectors are engaged, and inspect every ounce of meat that leaves the abattoirs for human consumption. Every beast is thoroughly examined, and, if disease is detected, the carcass is cut down, the broad-arrow stamped on it, and kerosene pumped into it, thus making it absolutely impossible for sale to the public. All stock is slaughtered practically under the one roof, thus giving every facility for complete inspection.

Mr. TROUT: Are there any private slaughter-yards in Sydney?

Mr. BOWMAN: They have a public slaughter-yard, which we have not got in Brisbane.

Mr. TROUT: And private too.

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman favours public abattoirs or not.

Mr. TROUT: I will tell you in due course.

Mr. BOWMAN: At the meatworks, where stock is slaughtered for export principally, the Commonwealth inspectors examine every carcass and every gland in each carcass. They commence duty the moment slaughtering operations commence, and they remain at the works until the last beast is killed. Meat condemned by Commonwealth inspectors can be used for local consumption. I am only a layman, and do not understand butchering, but I have got certain facts, and I believe they are true. There is a practical

butcher in this Assembly—namely, the hon. member for Ithaca—and he will be able to say whether my statements are right or wrong. If I have made a mistake, then wrong information has been given to me, for I have given the information as I got it. On the face of it, I think it is the duty of the Government to see that public abattoirs are established. I believe they would be more successful if placed under Government control than they would be if placed under municipal control.

Mr. TROUT: You want proper inspection.

Mr. BOWMAN: I could give an instance of what was observed by a slaughterman, whom the hon. member knows. The man I refer to was working in a slaughter-yard for six months, and during that time he never saw an inspector at the yard.

Mr. TROUT: I say you want proper inspection.

Mr. BOWMAN: The same man worked for five months at another place that is known to the hon. member, and there he saw an inspector once a week.

Mr. TROUT: You have not got enough inspectors.

Mr. BOWMAN: And this man witnessed many diseased cattle slaughtered. Another slaughterman worked for another butcher, and he saw an inspector once in nine days. While working for another employer, the same man saw an inspector once a week. If I have done nothing else, I have shown the House that there is not sufficient inspection at the present time.

Mr. TROUT: That is so.

Mr. BOWMAN: And that it is absolutely impossible for five men to inspect thirty-two yards. I think the Government should act on the advice tendered by the Under Secretary for Agriculture, who, in his report, points out that in most of the large places in the United Kingdom they have municipal or national control of their abattoirs, and subject meat to the most rigid inspection. I claim, in the interest of every human being in Brisbane and throughout Queensland, that where there is an opportunity of getting meat inspected it should be inspected, and that abattoirs should be placed directly under the control of the State or the local authorities, because, without adequate inspection, no one is safe. The hon. member for Ithaca knows as well as I do what takes place at Enoggera Saleyards. The hon. member was at the sale the same day as I was there, and saw some cattle which it would be a disgrace to sell.

Mr. TROUT: They are there every week.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have it on the authority of one of the most reputable butchers in Queensland that this kind of thing has been going on for ten years in Brisbane, and that nothing has been done to check it.

Mr. TROUT: That is, for the purpose of tracing them—knowing where they are going.

Mr. BOWMAN: If they acted on the principle adopted in Sydney, and shot a diseased beast at once, there would be no need to trace it.

Mr. TROUT: It would have been killed at the butcher's without inspection if we had not this law here.

Mr. BOWMAN: We have meat sold in our shops that ought not to be used for

Mr. Bowman.]

human consumption. Who knows who may be the one who will get some infection from diseased meat? The hon. member for Enoggera and Mr. Harry Baynes are two reputable master butchers, but I am not going to say that they are the only two reputable men engaged in the butchering trade, because I believe there are others.

Mr. TROUT: There are numbers.

Mr. BOWMAN: But there are numbers of unscrupulous men who do not care what happens, so long as they can buy stock and put them on the market for sale. I say that those are the men who are unfairly competing against the hon. member for Enoggera and other master butchers who are doing a fair thing, and for the people's own benefit it is the duty of the Government, on the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Agriculture, to establish public abattoirs, and I promise this House that they will not get very much rest while I am in it until something is done. (Hear, hear!)

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!" said: Following the hon. gentleman, I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. I think we shall all allow that the hon. members who have had that duty entrusted to them are a distinct acquisition to the House. The leader of the Opposition realised that on this occasion time is the essence of the contract, and I propose doing similarly. He expressed himself disappointed with certain omissions from the Governor's Speech—notably the Trades Disputes Bill. Well, if the trend of a Trade Disputes Bill as recently manifested in doings in the old land is any indication of what we should do, then I think we should studiously avoid putting such a statute on our books. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. THEODORE: What about the Rockhampton programme?

The PREMIER: The Rockhampton programme is not a matter for my consideration. (Opposition laughter.) Before proceeding to the earlier portions of his speech, let me deal with the latter portion—namely, that relating to public abattoirs. Now, we have arranged for a Royal Commission to inquire into the meat trade, as to the avenues of outlet, as to the means of treating the meat, and one of the questions which the Commission will look into is that of the necessity of public abattoirs.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If on the recommendation thereof it is found necessary to resort to public abattoirs, we shall certainly give effect to their recommendation.

Mr. BOWMAN AND HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I reckon, that as matters are now conducted, they are neither economical nor are they in the highest degree sanitary, and that the time has come when in a city like Brisbane, and doubtless other large cities, there shall be established public abattoirs.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: When in Melbourne, in January, I met a gentleman who I once knew in Brisbane, but who for many years has been in New Zealand, and he was an enthusiastic advocate of abattoirs; and he

[*Mr. Bowman.*]

talked to me especially in this regard, pointing out the enormous advantages to the community, that they had been established in really small cities, and had not become a burden upon the people. We are largely a meat-exporting country, and to the credit of the inspectors be it said that in the old land it is rare that they are able to point to any defective beast. On more than one occasion there have been statements made, which we have insisted ought to be traced to the bottom, and in every case but one I think I can say that it was found to be not the product of Queensland. We have a system of tabs attached to carcasses, so that we can quite readily and easily trace them. Therefore, I think it will be quite sufficient if I give the hon. gentleman the assurance that one of the questions which the Commission will be charged to investigate is that of the necessity of abattoirs.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Really the hon. gentleman's address may be divided into two parts—that of abattoirs and strike. I think he will be satisfied with the answer given as to abattoirs; I think he will be equally satisfied with the statement I shall make relative to the strike. (Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.) It is quite natural that the hon. gentleman should seek to cover up blunders that were made in the early part of the year, and he starts out by stating that but for the strike the matter would not have been brought before the Arbitration Court. I do not propose to make use of any harsh expression as from myself; I shall quote simply and only friends of the party sitting in Opposition. They will recognise at once that the Sydney *Bulletin* ever has been friendly to the Labour socialistic movement.

Mr. COYNE: Not at all. (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: What does the Sydney *Bulletin* say on this particular question. The hon. gentleman said that it would not have been before the court but for the strike.

Mr. COYNE interjected.

The PREMIER: During the whole of the hon. gentleman's speech I did not open my lips. While the strike was in its dragging middle age, it was suddenly discovered that the Federal Court had been sitting on the case of the original dispute, and had decided in favour of the tramway men, thereby declaring the whole strike business to be a superfluous futility. The leaders tried to cover up their fatal blunder by declaring that but for the strike their case would never have got into court. This tacit declaration that they did not know how to do a simple job of getting a case before the court also suggests the need of fresh blather-skites.

Mr. HARDACRE: Were the articles written by Peter Airey? (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: I do not know who the writers for the Sydney *Bulletin* may be, but I will quote some persons directly who cannot be influenced by the gentleman he has just named. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that some who had led in this movement had been returned to the House. He referred to a letter which I issued to all Government supporters, dated 12th March, and which was given full publicity in the public Press, it being quoted in extenso, in regard to the

action of certain members of this House, and I do not blush in having issued that letter. The hon. gentleman said that the challenge here thrown down had not been honoured. Let me remind him that the gentlemen who were most active in this matter are passed out. I believe that if the hon. gentleman himself had been in continual good health matters might have been otherwise.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would have been after you.

The PREMIER: It was because of his ill-health that he had to retire from the scene. The then deputy leader of the Opposition, during the first week of the strike, went down to Melbourne. It is perfectly true that Mr. Ryan, the present deputy, was pretty active. But let me quote the names of those who were most active, and who have been dealt with by the electors—Mr. McLachlan, Mr. Collins, Mr. Ferricks, Mr. Maughan, Mr. Mulcahy, Mr. Ryland, Mr. Mullan, Mr. Nevitt. (Laughter.) The whole of those gentlemen had been passed out by the electors.

Mr. LENNON: It is a misstatement as to Nevitt.

The PREMIER: If not passed out, never invited to stand. Allow me to correct that, because my case is so good that I have no need of the least scintilla of misstatement. It is quite true that Nevitt's electorate had been wiped out; I do not know what the plebiscite did. But it is significant that one of the most active men, who is not in the House—one of the most active men on the strike committee—was rejected in more than one case in the plebiscite.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Name him?

The PREMIER: Mr. Collins. In answer to this strong statement made by the secretary of the Bakers' Association, giving an intimation to their people not to deliver bread, what is the fact? That the drivers were called out, that the operatives were called out, that the bakers themselves did the best they could to supply the clamorous needs of the public, and as soon as possible get men on the carts to deliver bread to people in town?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Then the hon. gentleman made a statement about ice, and on that I shall quote to him from the *Brisbane Telegraph*, dated 1st February—

"The committee of the Children's Hospital have notified by advertisement that unless ice is permitted"—

Permitted, Sir, in this State!

"permitted to be supplied in the hospital, the lives of many persons will be endangered."

Mr. COYNE: What is the date of that?

The PREMIER: I said 1st February. Let me quote once more—

"The City and Suburban Ice Company has not yet received a permit"—

Think of it, in this country!

"to manufacture at the Musgrave Wharf, and there is need for the big institutions concerned to exercise economy, so that the stock of ice may last as long as possible."

There were two cases cited, as to which I have shown, that drivers and operatives were

called out, and that the bakers themselves did the best they could to meet the clamorous demands of the people; and as to ice, the statement made was absolutely incorrect. The hon. gentleman was wrong in saying that the people voted at the elections because of the misrepresentations of the Press. No; we succeeded at the elections because of the outraged feelings of the community.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

The PREMIER: We just know the circumstances quite well—that on that "heartening" Sunday, when the forty-three unions decided to go out at 6 p.m. on the Tuesday, they put their threat into operation, and on Tuesday, 30th January, at 6 p.m., the tramway men left their work, and other people left their work, and did not resume their work the following day. Let me remind you that on the 31st, the leader of the Opposition—here is the public proof—complimented the police on their patience. On the 31st the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr. Fisher, admitted in Melbourne that he had received a wire that the situation was rapidly becoming alarming, and business was paralysed, and Mr. Fisher further said that he considered the strike unnecessary. Now, on 1st February all the shops of this city were compelled to be closed, except the chemists. By whose authority? That is just where the point comes in. All vehicular traffic was stopped, bakers and butchers not allowed to ply their business, and may I even remind you that pickets were put round in case any butcher or baker might supply the people who were clamorous for food. Even the pilot service was stopped. Could there be anything more desperate than that, that not only the pilot service, but harbour employees, who have to look after the buoys and lights of the river at a time of the year when tempests may come down the coast, were pulled out, on the paltriest issue that ever came before any community.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman made a comparison. Never for one moment would I compare myself with Mr. Asquith—he is like a giant to a David. What is the difference? The workers in England had something about which to be troubled—here they had the mere wearing of a button! (Opposition dissent.) To get back to the suspension of traffic. Perishable goods were allowed to rot and to be carried away, utterly regardless of the settlers in the country, who for months past had been preparing for the market. From the 1st to 7th February the Customs collected in Queensland was £3,376 8s. 5d., compared with the preceding year of £18,816 15s. On the 2nd—the big Friday which the hon. gentleman designated "Baton Friday," but which I say was "Good Friday"—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

The PREMIER: I call it "Good Friday" because, by the action of the Government, we made it possible for men to maintain their liberty, and show their manhood. On that day the Customs were nil, and on the next day £10 8s. 10d. The hon. gentleman referred to a deputation to myself on the morning of the 2nd—that is Friday.

Mr. RYAN: You call it "Good Friday"?

Mr. KIRWAN: A day of batons.

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

The PREMIER: On that Friday the leader of the Opposition brought a deputation to me to seek for the intervention of Parliament. I at least could not see any need for the intervention of Parliament.

Mr. COYNE: You said they should stew in their own juice.

The PREMIER: I am glad the hon. member gives me an opportunity of referring to that. On the 3rd April I was at Rocklea, and someone in the audience said I had done nothing to stop the strike. The hon. gentleman, I think, said something to the same effect this evening. My reply was—

“Mr. Denham: I met four gentlemen and Mr. Badger on Friday night in the hope of bringing the strike to an end. At all times I have been anxious to help those who were induced to down tools, but at no stage have I done anything to help the strike committee and Parliamentary Labour party, who were responsible for the trouble. They, so far as I am concerned, can stew in their own fat. (Applause.)”

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: That is the report by the Brisbane *Telegraph*. The *Courier* had a condensed report, and possibly in the condensation omitted some portion. Those are the facts. I realised they were in the fat, and as far as I was concerned they should stop there. Why was all this confusion brought on Brisbane? What had the people of Brisbane, the people of Southern Queensland, done, that they should be reduced to the condition of a city besieged by an enemy? The people of Brisbane had nothing to do with the wearing of the badge. They were peacefully following their lawful avocations. Yet, on account of the actions of certain men during that strike, they were treated as if they were parties to it. The bakers' carts were prevented from going

[5.30 p.m.] around, the sale of meat was prohibited, and ordinary supplies were cut off, but it was not the fault of the public. There were delays in getting to the Arbitration Court, but it was by no means the fault of the public. I suppose it was the congested state of the Arbitration Court or some other reason which prevented it from getting there. Anyway, it was not the Government's fault. The question was before the court, and it was awaiting settlement there. The hon. gentleman said just now that he believed in arbitration. How can he say that either he or any of his party believe in arbitration, when this strike in Brisbane arose over a question which was before the Arbitration Court? What kind of regard can they have for conciliation and arbitration when they waive the Arbitration Court on one side altogether and say, “Let us exalt ourselves and be the dictators of Queensland”?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Of all the paltry matters out of which a strike could be evolved, this was the most paltry, and yet, if a hostile fleet in Moreton Bay had been blockading Brisbane they could not have more effectually blocked the city than certain persons did until the Government had once more assumed its functions. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. HARDACRE: It was Badger who did it.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman cannot get away from Badger. Hon. members [*Hon. D. F. Denham.*

are trying to cover up their confusion, but we will keep them to the point. (Hear, hear!) The tramway employees themselves in Adelaide regarded the badge question as being so unimportant that they could not be induced to strike. They declared that the badge question was of so little importance that they were quite prepared to await the decision of the court. But that was not the wish of the Labour party or the leaders of the strike committee in Brisbane. They decided, for some reason best known to themselves—which now, I dare say, they deeply deplore—they decided to inaugurate a reign of terror.

OPPOSITION dissent and laughter.

The PREMIER: The proof of this is in the actions of the members of the strike committee. There were notices posted at the Trades Hall during the strike. Here is one notice that was posted up—

“Man working at River terrace quarry.”

What was the object of that notice being stuck up there? It was obviously not to let that man continue to do his work at the quarry. It was posted up at the Trades Hall so that the men reading it would be impelled to go across to the quarry and make that man quit his work. Here is another notice that was pasted up at the Trades Hall—

“Such-and-such a company is supplying meat to strike-breakers. Pickets wanted.”

Mr. COYNE: Who put those notices up?

The PREMIER: I suppose that they were signed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COYNE: Do you say that I signed them?

The PREMIER: The intention was to intimidate, and, if needs be, ill-treat the wicked butcher. The “most exacting, capricious, and unreasoning of tyrants” were the terms I used in the letter, and I will show that it was so, and will prove it up to the hilt. Never was confusion, loss, and distress more wantonly thrust on a community by that precious strike committee. I will prove my assertion by the statements of hostile witnesses—at least, witnesses who are friendly to the strike leaders. Now, it will allowed that Mr. Beeby, who is a member of the McGowan Ministry in New South Wales—the Minister for Lands—it will be allowed that he does not belong to the Liberal party.

Mr. COYNE: It seems as if he does.

The PREMIER: Mr. Beeby said in regard to strikes—

“I regard the strike as a futile and wasteful method of fighting in a country like Australia.”

That was a severe rebuke for the leader of the strike committee. Then the Transport Workers' Council of New South Wales, of which the Hon. W. Hughes, Federal Attorney-General, is president, decided as follows:—

“Not in sympathy with the principles of general strikes. They are illogical and injure indiscriminately, and wantonly destroy amicable relations. . . . Considered an offence to the organisation if any member of any of the societies cease work or boycott any vessel in New South Wales waters from sympathy with Brisbane strike.”

That was an unmeasured condemnation of

the strike committee from that big, powerful organisation. Then the Newcastle Labour Council, upon receiving two wires signed by one "H. Coyne," chairman of the strike committee, invoking their aid, suggested that they should throw the wires under the table. Evidently they picked the wires up again, because a reply was ordered to be sent to Brisbane, refusing to help by calling out any of the unions. That was a repudiation of the action of the people here. Then the Hon. King O'Malley, Minister for Home Affairs in the Commonwealth Government, cannot be said to be a member of the Liberal party. In fact, he is a member of the Socialistic Labour party, and he agrees with Mr. Griffith, the Minister for Works in the New South Wales Labour Government. Mr. O'Malley says—

"That the general strike is a blend of imbecility and barbarism."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If I had used that language, then hon. members might have felt annoyed, but it comes from one of their own side, and he refers to the strike as imbecile and barbarous. I am sorry that the hon. member for Queenton is not here, as I wish to quote from a Charters Towers paper—the Charters Towers *Evening Telegraph*, which has always been, and still is, a supporter of the Labour party.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The Charters Towers *Telegraph*, in its issue of 28th February last, said—

"There was no need whatever for even the tramway employees to cease work. . . . The men who got them to do so were fools, and the men who started the general strike were criminal lunatics."

(Government cheers.)

The PREMIER: Here is an editor of a newspaper entirely in sympathy with the Labour party, and he refers to the leaders of the strike committee as fools and criminal lunatics. (Government laughter.) I propose still further to convict the strike committee out of the mouths of those who are not our friends. The Sydney *Bulletin*, which is distinctly favourable to the Labour Socialistic party, had the following in its issue of the 7th March:—

"The union existed in spite of him, and he accepted the situation as a matter of necessity. Then arose the question of the right of the men to wear the union symbol while on duty. It was really a matter of sentiment, for the union would be no more real, and no more or less powerful, whether its emblem was worn in working hours or not. But the point was regarded as one of importance, and after a certain amount of dust and clamour it was referred to the Federal Court for decision. And then the union, presumably at the instance of some racketsy person of the Coyne description, proceeded to wear the symbol without waiting for the court's decision, and thereby took the first step towards giving the game into the hands of Manager Badger."

It is just as well to read these extracts from the Sydney *Bulletin*, as there may be members of the House who did not read them,

and it will enable intelligent readers of *Hansard* to see what the *Bulletin* thinks of the strike leaders, and will show them that friends of the Labour party outside of Queensland were opposed to the strike.

"They drove union employers into sympathy with Badger from motives of self-interest. They deliberately branded unionists as a wholly undependable kind of labour—a kind whose word was never to be trusted because, even when it had no grievance of its own, it was liable to turn dog on its employer, however just and considerate the employer might be, at the bidding of a reckless strike committee. No attempt was made to take a referendum of the unionists; the apparent attitude of the committee was that they ranked with children or imbeciles, with no right save the right of obedience."

And the *Bulletin* added—

"To put the matter shortly, the tactics of the strike leaders didn't present one redeeming feature."

On the 14th of March the Sydney *Bulletin* had the following:—

"With their crazy beginning and their ineffective ending—their flamboyant assurances of certain victory and their tame surrender—their incapacity to hit the right man and their utter unscrupulousness about hitting the wrong man—their throwing away of almost certain victory and their gratuitous rush to certain defeat, there were few possible blunders that these strike committee-men did not make. As wreckers of a good case they were about the limit and the last possibility."

The Sydney *Bulletin* further stated—

"The hopelessly crazed doings of certain Labour leaders at Brisbane leave the essential merits of unionism just as before. These people merely show that the best of institutions can be discredited if the administration of them falls into bad hands."

I have convicted them out of the mouths of their friends. On the third day of the strike, having reduced the city to a state of siege, having wrought serious injury to workers, and having arrested all trade, a deputation, led by Mr. Bowman, waited on me. I want to call attention to this deputation. I have newspaper extracts of the reports of that deputation to refer to, and I can say that no member of that deputation refuted my statement as to (a) the holding up of food supplies; (b) the general arrestment of business; (c) intimidation of peaceful citizens; (d) the second authority which had been set up—brutal authority I termed it. No one refuted these allegations of mine.

Mr. HARDACRE: You never made use of them to us.

The PREMIER: I can only refer hon. members to the daily Press reports. I am perfectly willing to read them, but I do not wish to waste my time reading from newspapers. I could quote from the *Telegraph* to show what I say is true. Here is one headed "The Premier and the Labour party deputation."

Mr. LENNON: There were no reporters there.

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

The PREMIER: Hon. members can read it for themselves. I said that I would not call Parliament together until the authority of the Government was vindicated. I said that if the Government could not restore order they would make way for another Government that could do so. I said that the Government had a duty to discharge which they would do fearlessly, without harshness and without recrimination. In maintaining order the Government acts for no class but for all. Without order we have anarchy and mob rule, which is subversive of constitutional government. It must be allowed that in no sense did the Government flourish its authority, and in no sense did the Government provoke the strikers to resentment.

Mr. COYNE: You were at it all the time.

The PREMIER: That is not so. Some references were made to the police, but I leave that phase of it to be dealt with by my colleague, the Home Secretary, in whose charge they were.

Mr. HAMILTON: You took them from his charge.

The PREMIER: We allowed the Wednesday and Thursday processions, and the police guarded the route. Subsequently, on the day of the second procession there were violent disturbances in the Market square. Before invoking aid under section 119 of the Commonwealth Constitution I will show what the state of affairs was by reading from a letter from Mr. Finlayson, the member for Brisbane in the Federal Parliament.

Mr. BOWMAN: And he will represent Brisbane again.

The PREMIER: That is not worth while talking about. Mr. Finlayson said—

“It is quite impossible for any intelligent citizen of Brisbane to contemplate with any degree of equanimity the position of affairs in the city to-day. We are living on the edge of a volcano, and while the leaders of the strikers are doing their very best to uphold law and order, and consistently urging the men to avoid any disturbance of the peace, the fact remains that any quite unpremeditated action may precipitate a serious disturbance.

“As the days go by the danger will inevitably increase, and every good citizen should seriously consider what it may be possible to do to guarantee the safety of life and property.

The safety of life and property—that was the problem before the people of Brisbane at that time.

“In the name of peace, let us have something that would render unnecessary a continuance of the present critical position of affairs in Brisbane.”

He went on to say—

“Now he was satisfied that the next day the position would be of even greater gravity.”

It was on Thursday when the position was as described there, after midday—2 o'clock—realising the perturbed state of the city, the enormous numbers that were on the move—the leader of the Opposition, I think, mentioned 20,000—seeing the large numbers and the tumultuous spirit, it was quite possible that on the least provocation something dreadful might have occurred, ending in riot, bloodshed, and ruin. It was then, Sir, that I ascertained what provision was made

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

in the Constitution. Accordingly I asked His Excellency to cable to the Governor-General under the provisions of the 119th section.

Mr. COYNE: When did you do that?

The PREMIER: That was Thursday, about half-past 2 o'clock, and I understand that the hon. member for Warrego had sent one twenty-four hours before, in which he described Brisbane as being reduced to—

Mr. HARDACRE: There had been no violence up till then.

The PREMIER: I say, seeing the turbulence of the majority on the Thursday, and realising the multitude on the move, and what might occur at any moment—

Mr. HARDACRE: What might occur!

The PREMIER: Precisely so. It was just precisely what Mr. Finlayson was doing in calling attention to the perturbed state of affairs.

Several members of the OPPOSITION interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members will have an opportunity of replying later.

The PREMIER: Whatever may be said about my action, what can be said of the strike committee, who also cabled to Melbourne asking for military aid against the police? (Government laughter.) In my opinion, the Prime Minister had a very simple duty to discharge. It was, at the request of the Executive Government, to have given us the assistance of Commonwealth support.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: He violated the Constitution.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And probably Australia is the only civilised country in the world in which the military is not ready at a moment's notice to back up the civil authority.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What about America?

The PREMIER: Let me quote once more, because hon. members opposite are very unfortunate in their interjections. Let me quote the Minister for Defence, Senator Pearce, a member of the Administration led by the Prime Minister, the Hon. Andrew Fisher. Mr. Pearce made use of these words, and I would like the hon. member for Warrego to carefully listen to them—

“Law is the only element so far discovered by which communities can be kept together in units as nations. We have, in order to maintain ourselves as a nation, to uphold the laws of our nation, not only against foreign aggression, but also against internal aggression. The whole duty of government is summed up in that. It is to uphold and enforce the law. The people of Australia have declared that they will have a military system for the defence of Australia as a nation, and I will say that that does not merely mean that we will defend Australia from foreign oppression, but that we will defend the laws of Australia, no matter from where the attack may come, if that attack takes the form of force.

“At present, as far as I know, the only way by which the Commonwealth Parliament is able to protect itself or a State from domestic violence is by its Defence Force.”

Senator Pearce is right. Law is the only

element so far discovered by which communities can be kept together as a nation. The Prime Minister violated the Constitution, and as a subterfuge referred to the Defence Force Act. I have laid before the House the papers which have been printed, and they are in the hands of hon. members, and as they go fully into the question from my standpoint, it saves me the necessity of an elaborate reply. I am satisfied, as far as I am concerned, to say that the Government of the Commonwealth—(Interruption). Suffice it to say that the Commonwealth violated the Constitution and referred to the Defence Force Act. The Executive Government of Queensland is the authority to determine the need for Commonwealth assistance—

Mr. HARDAORE: No!

The PREMIER: And not the Prime Minister. What information had Mr. Fisher after all? He is living 1,000 miles away from here, and the information which he obtained doubtless reached him from the source already referred to—namely, the strike committee, an interested body of irresponsibles. The Prime Minister of the Commonwealth listened to the statement of an interested body of irresponsibles against the demand of the Executive Government of one of the sovereign States of Australia.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If the people of Australia are willing to submit to the terrorism of irresponsible persons, whether in unions or out of unions—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Or even Governments.

The PREMIER: What use is parliamentary government if irresponsibles are to be the dictators of affairs? Governments are useless excrescences unless they are able to preserve law and order. The unions had lawful means, and the people who felt aggrieved had lawful means of seeking the object they desired. Every man and woman in the Commonwealth of Australia has an equal voice. If syndicalists are in the majority and want to stop industry; if syndicalists want to starve the community there is no need to resort to force.

Mr. THEODORE: What are you reading from?

The PREMIER: I am discussing this proposition from an intelligent point of view.

Mr. THEODORE: You are reading your speech.

The PREMIER: I am not reading my speech. I have made copious notes so as to succinctly get over the ground and not to scatter myself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I ask your protection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chief Secretary is in possession of the Chair, and I must ask hon. members to allow him to proceed with his speech without interruption, in the same way as I asked them to give a fair hearing to the leader of the Opposition. I regret exceedingly to say that some of the oldest members of the Chamber on my left and on my right are repeatedly interjecting.

The PREMIER: If the irresponsibles wished to stop industry they could pass a law—if they could get a majority—pass a law forbidding anyone to work without a

permit. When Queensland joined the Commonwealth it was an open understanding that we voluntarily surrendered the control of military affairs clearly upon the understanding that in case of an invasion or domestic violence the authorities would come to our aid. Now let me quote from the official records of the debates of the Australian Federal Convention, third session, Melbourne, 1893, dealing with this very question. This is the section—

“The Commonwealth shall protect every State against invasion, and on the application of the Executive Government of a State against domestic violence.

“Amendment suggested by the Legislative Council of Victoria.

“After ‘State’ insert ‘or where in the opinion of the Governor-General it is necessary for the preservation of the public peace.’

“Mr. Gordon: I object most strongly to this interference with the State. The State is the proper party to ask for protection, and not the Governor-General, who is not a resident of the State, and may be badly advised.

“Mr. Barton: The State should be entitled to demand protection.

“The amendment was negatived.

“Clause 112 was agreed to.”

Therefore, in the course of a few moments it was passed that in the case of any disturbance within a State the Executive Government should be the determining factor as to whether aid was needed or not.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It is precisely the same in America.

Mr. RYAN: Are you going to take any action?

The PREMIER: I will carefully consider that on getting the best legal advice. I do not know whether the hon. member will be prepared to accept a retainer or not. The Government must see that every citizen is allowed to go about his occupation without being maltreated or intimidated. The hon. member, in the course of his remarks, referred to Mr. Asquith and the attitude Mr. Asquith took in relation to the coal strike. Let me refer the hon. member to Mr. Winston Churchill, then Home Secretary, and whose sympathy has never been questioned in relation to workers and labourers. What did he do? He did not hesitate, as Home Secretary, to send the military to the disaffected districts, and he did not hesitate about calling out the troops, public safety being the first consideration he regarded.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: His successor did not follow his example.

The PREMIER: I will quote, if you like, two Frenchmen. Clemenceaux, who was looked upon as a passionate advocate for Labour, did not, when Premier, refuse to call out troops. Briand, who is distinctly a socialist, did the same thing. I say we did not ask for troops. What we asked for was, under section 119, the protection of the Commonwealth authority. The situation on Thursday was distinctly appalling.

Mr. THEODORE: He was a renegade.

The PREMIER: I do not know who are renegades. I am just now dealing with the socialists in France, and I am not familiar

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

with the methods of renegades. The Prime Minister of France did not hesitate to call upon the troops when occasion demanded. It is the business of the Government to protect its people, and to see that its affairs are carried on. Now I do hope that out of this turmoil good may come, and I believe that the Peace Industrial Bill, which will shortly be submitted, will provide for an effective remedy against all such turmoils in the future.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I quite believe it is not possible; it is not practicable to say, "Thou shall not strike," but it is possible to make a provision by which, before men do strike, they shall have time to think. We shall table a Bill in the course of a few days which, I believe, will protect the community, and especially the workers in the community, who need to be protected against their bad and false friends.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Some people say the State has no right whatever to interfere in trade disputes—that such interference is mischievous, that we should merely watch the combatants, and see that there should be fair play on both sides. But, Mr. Speaker, the State has a duty. Something far more is expected of the State than merely to look on.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What did the Government do in the strike?

The PREMIER: I made it possible for work to be carried on. I made it possible for men to get about their work. (Hear, hear!) In no sense and at no time was the Government in any degree a partisan.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Opposition laughter.)

GOVERNMENT LOAN ACTS 1910 AND 1911 AMENDMENT BILL.

RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council returning this Bill without amendment.

GOVERNMENT STOCK BILL.

RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council returning this Bill without amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

The PREMIER, resuming, said: You will remember that the strike arose in connection with a request to wear a certain badge with which the people of Brisbane generally had no concern, and I think it will [7 p.m.] hardly be averred that the numerous unions called out were intimately concerned in the matter. In no sense was the State a partisan in the dispute. All that the Government sought to accomplish was that men who desired to go about their business should be permitted to do so, and I think it may be said that the State was a greater friend to the workers than

those who sought to deprive them of their employment. A large number of the men who were thrown out of employment at that time were, I think, brought out unwillingly.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who said so?

The PREMIER: I said I think they were brought out unwillingly. A large number told me they were brought out unwillingly.

Mr. BOWMAN: Told you?

The PREMIER: Yes, a large number told me. It was made possible by the Government, through the assistance given by special constables in maintaining law and order, that the work of the State could be resumed. The trade of the port was wholly arrested, and there was an effort made to arrest the trade of the ports as far north as Cairns. Happily, there are leaders in the Labour movement to-day, not in this State, but in other States, who regard a general strike as a barbarous method of settling trade disputes, and the organisation of which the Federal Attorney-General is president set its face sturdily against any such proceeding. In our Industrial Peace Bill we seek to devise means for the adjustment of labour troubles and labour difficulties, and to settle disputes on their merits, and not merely on the ground of emergencies, conveniences, or exigencies. A fair ground of settlement must be provided, and I think it will be admitted when the Industrial Peace Bill comes before the Chamber that we have at least endeavoured to secure such a common ground of adjustment. (Hear, hear!) I shall now in the briefest possible manner refer to other matters, and the justification for referring to them is not that they were raised by the leader of the Opposition, but because they find a place in the Governor's Speech. These matters were referred to at the conference of Premiers held recently at Melbourne. They are matters of interstate concern. One is the matter affecting the Government Savings Bank, and the other is that of investing larger powers of legislation in the Commonwealth. The Savings Bank question was dealt with at the conference of Premiers, and Mr. Fisher, by invitation, attended to give his views on the question. I shall quote from his remarks his idea of a basis of settlement which would avoid overlapping—a settlement which would prevent the Commonwealth Savings Bank overlapping the State Savings Bank. I shall now quote from Mr. Fisher—

"That last clause means that it will give to the State three-fourths of the amount available when State Savings Bank is taken over, and also three-fourths of the new deposits afterwards that are available for investment."

This proposal was that the State should transfer to the Commonwealth 25 per cent. of the moneys available, and also 25 per cent. of the new business. That was Mr. Fisher's proposition. At the present time I think the whole of the States have upwards of £60,000,000 in their Government Savings Banks. It was £60,000,000 in January, and I dare say by this time the amount is £63,000,000 of £64,000,000. Mr. Fisher then proposed that with respect to all new deposits the State should receive 75 per cent., the Commonwealth to have for its use 25 per cent. The conference gave due consideration to his request. It was apparently his idea that if the Commonwealth got 25 per cent. of that money they would be satisfied, and Mr. McGowen, Premier of New South Wales, took up that idea, and eventually submitted

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

a proposal which gave the Commonwealth command of that money, but instead of the States being debtors to the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth was debtor to the State. The conference was unable to agree to the proposal. Mr. McGowen withdrew his original motion, and moved the following in lieu thereof:—

“That the conference is unable to agree to the proposal laid before it by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, but makes the following offer in lieu thereof:—

“1. That, in consideration of the Commonwealth Bank refraining from entering into Savings Bank business the States agree to provide on loan to the Commonwealth Bank, on terms to be arranged, a monthly amount equal to 25 per cent. of the increase in excess of deposits over payments in the States' Savings Banks.

“2. That such arrangement commence on the 1st day of January, 1913, and continue for a period of five years from that date.”

Mr. Fisher was unable to accept that proposal, so the thing remained in statu quo. Each State had then to do what it deemed wisest and best, and, having in mind the distinct attitude taken up by this Assembly last year, it was considered wise that we should reserve for ourselves the control of our Savings Bank.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Until recently we had Savings Bank agencies conducted at some 120 or 130 post offices in Queensland. There are upwards of 400 railway stations at which we conduct post office work, and at which it is quite competent for us to transact, as has been done in many cases, Savings Bank business as well. At present, or until recently, one-half of our business was controlled at our own offices, and about one-half at post office agencies. Before we had any idea of the Commonwealth entering into Savings Bank business, I had intimated to the Prime Minister our intention to take over the control of branches in populous places, such as Toowoomba, Warwick, Maryborough, Townsville, Charters Towers, etc. During the last ten years we have paid the Commonwealth Government for conducting our Savings Bank business at their branch post offices a sum of £61,000, so that it would have been quite sound business to have carried on the obligations ourselves and paid and received money at our own offices. I think it will be allowed that the facilities which the State offers are equal to any the Commonwealth can offer, and that in some respects they are superior. We naturally hope, as it was fervently expressed in this Chamber last year, that the people of the State will continue to do their business with the State Savings Bank, and have their investments under their own eyes and used for the benefit of their own State. That explains the attitude of the Government in regard to this matter. There was a genuine offer made on the part of all the States to work with the Commonwealth, and the proposal which was made by Mr. McGowen was accepted by the conference of Premiers. I am not quite clear whether Western Australia came in or not, but, apart from that State, the proposal was accepted by the States.

Mr. HUNTER: South Australia was not represented.

The PREMIER: Mr. Bath, of Western Australia, was in some regards their representative. The other matter to which I wish to refer in the briefest possible manner is that of investing the Commonwealth with larger powers—industrial and otherwise.

Mr. RYAN: What is “otherwise”?

The PREMIER: That refers to monopolies, combines, and such like. Mr. Holman, the Attorney-General of New South Wales, introduced this subject in a very able speech indeed. The point at variance between New South Wales and ourselves was mainly the extent to which the proposed increased powers should be conferred on the Commonwealth. Mr. Holman did not attempt to confer special powers on the Commonwealth with respect to trade and commerce, but merely with respect to industries and monopolies. I think it will be found convenient, as the Attorney-General is specifically concerned in this matter, to introduce this measure in the other Chamber, so that it can be discussed there before it comes before us. The draft Bill has practically been agreed upon, and is contained in the report of the Interstate Conference.

Mr. HAMILTON: Only the State Governments are introducing that measure?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Did not Mr. Holman draft the Bill?

The PREMIER: Mr. Holman was present, but I think the terms of the measure were settled by the Attorneys-General of Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania, and Queensland. The Attorney-General of Western Australia was not present. The means of securing the alteration of the Constitution is, as we know, by referendum. There was a referendum taken last year, and certain answers were given. We all felt then that it was desirable that wider powers should be conferred upon the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Constitution Act provides the means for conferring such powers without resorting to a referendum.

Mr. HAMILTON: You said last year you had sufficient powers to deal with any alteration.

The SPEAKER: At this stage I propose to lay down the procedure with regard to extensions of time. The Standing Order says that an extension of time may be granted, but where an hon. member has not concluded his speech, that would mean that another hon. member would have to move that an extension be granted, and thereby lose his right to speak. It would be obviously unjust to enforce that rule. It is also patent to hon. members that an hon. member who has spoken could not move such a motion. Therefore, where I see a distinct inclination to continue his speech on the part of the leader on my right or on my left, or any member in charge of an important measure, or making an important statement, and I see that he has exceeded his time, and the further information he wishes to give should be included in his speech, I shall rise and put the question, without calling upon any hon. member to move the question: That the hon. member be allowed further time to continue his speech.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. D. Armstrong.]

Mr. MURPHY: I think the Standing Orders lay down very clearly certain times for speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen to the hon. member at some other time. I cannot allow debate on this occasion.

Mr. MURPHY: I think you ought to listen to me. The question has been put to the House, and I have a perfect right to express an opinion.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member may attack my action at some future time if he chooses. I have laid down the course of procedure which appears to be good. If that is wrong, then he must attack the Speaker in the proper way.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not think you have any right to lay down any course of action in contradiction to the Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

Mr. MURPHY: Like Mr. Willis. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: The question is—That the Hon. the Chief Secretary have extended time to continue his speech.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: Thank you. Allowing for the interruption, which has taken five minutes, I think I shall not exceed my hour. I was remarking that there was a means provided for securing larger powers to the Commonwealth, without resorting to a referendum. Section 51, subsection 37, states that the Parliaments have powers to make laws with respect to matters referred to the Parliament of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliament the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law. The Conference decided that each House should be asked to pass an Act vesting further power in the Commonwealth.

Mr. HARDACRE: Offering.

The PREMIER: "Referring," that is the expression used. Of course, if they do not choose to accept it, that is another matter. The Conference decided to take that course, and by a majority settled the terms of the Bill which should be submitted to the respective Parliaments. It is too much to expect that a huge machine like the Commonwealth Constitution Act should be perfect from the very jump. I think it is Rudyard Kipling who talks about a ship finding itself; and some difficulties have revealed themselves in connection with the Constitution. When you remember that it is a Constitution that has to control a vast continent like Australia, with varying conditions, varying products, and varying circumstances, it is rather remarkable that it should be so successful as it has been. Certain difficulties, however, have revealed themselves, and we think, without at all trespassing on the sovereign rights of the various States, and without undermining the Federal spirit, that the remedy may be provided. The lines upon which it is proposed to provide the remedy are as follows—I am not quoting the whole Act, but just as briefly as possible paraphrasing the contents of the Act: To prevent and settle disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State. To provide that an award or order of the

Commonwealth Court shall be a common rule of industry in the States concerned, and shall prevail, even though such industry may be subject to the order of a State industrial authority. So that, on cases being referred to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court, an award or order may be made a common rule, which shall prevail, even if it conflicts with the State order or rule. Then as to the "otherwise," in regard to which the deputy leader of the Opposition inquired just now, that is to give power to the Commonwealth to control or to acquire combinations or monopolies, when such business or industry extends beyond the limit of any one State, when such combination has been declared by the High Court to be in restraint of trade, or to the detriment of the public. I know there are some who take exception to the High Court having a say in this matter. I think, however, it will be allowed that, however people feel, there may be an effort on the part of Parliament to control certain monopolies extending beyond one State, which would not be acquired when considered in the cold light of a judicial court. Then the leader of the Opposition, in his speech, referred to boot-makers having a certain wage here and a certain wage in New South Wales. Now, where competition is seen to exist between the States which may be brought about by wages paid, the State industrial tribunal shall refer the complaint to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court, and the Conciliation and Arbitration Court of the Commonwealth shall have power to adjust the matters complained of, and prevent unfair competition. Now, I think in the matters that we shall ask the House to consider by and by to refer to the Commonwealth Parliament, so that powers may be enlarged and the Constitution work more smoothly, it will be practicable to meet every case that has come up for the last ten years. The Liquor Bill will be presented again. There were not a few who last year argued that because the House was practically in its last session it was hardly fair that a question of such a momentous nature should be dealt with by the Parliament. That argument no longer exists; we have been to the country, and are back again, and surely this House is competent to deal with it, and I hope that the Liquor Bill will find a place on the statute-books this session. Other matters to be introduced, and which I feel sure will receive kindly consideration, are those affecting public service superannuation, measures dealing with the mining law, and statistical returns, which, I think, will receive the concurrence of the House. Many other important matters will be dealt with. All the Bills have not been enumerated in the Speech; there are quite a lot of others, which will be proceeded with if time permits. There is ample business for the House, and if a spirit of "sweet reasonableness" obtains, I think we shall get through these measures this year.

Mr. RYAN: Does it always prevail?

The PREMIER: I think so; it prevailed last year, and I think we shall find that the business of the session will go along smoothly. (Hear, hear!) We meet under very happy auspices. The leader of the Opposition happily remarked in the opening of his address that the rains which have fallen have altered the face of affairs. Of

[Mr. Murphy.]

course, there will be a shrinkage in flocks, but the rains have not only averted a calamity, but have saved the State in its national interests. The agricultural outlook has never been brighter, bigger areas have been placed under crop, and rains have been of such a genial character that the wheat and other crops are looking well. Last year it surprised everybody the extent to which dairying was maintained, yet this year I think we shall put up a big record, because never to my recollection have prospects looked as good as they do at the present time. Employment on the whole is very satisfactory. As to our troubles which have arisen during the recess, we shall be able to evolve legislation that will smooth the course of industrial matters, and owing to the beneficence of Providence we may look for a good season, so that I trust that this first session of the nineteenth Parliament of Queensland will be one in which a great advancement will be made in every possible way. (Government cheers.)

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*): Like the two previous speakers, I wish to offer my congratulations to the hon. members who moved and seconded the adoption of the Address in Reply. I can honestly say that they acquitted themselves very creditably. I happen to be one of those whom the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat said it would be absurd to invite to meet in Parliament to advise his Excellency in regard to matters of legislation. I am pleased, however, to be here, not at the hon. gentleman's will, but at the will of the electors whom I represent. I regret that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to repeat to-night, if I do not mistake, the same statement that he made in that letter—that members on this side of the House were unfit to meet here to join in advising His Excellency—I see he does adhere to that. I think that that is only one of the unprecedented things that have taken place at the hands of this Government. We were discussing the other night the unprecedented action of the Government in suppressing the financial position before the last election.

The PREMIER: It was not suppressed.

Mr. RYAN: The hon. gentleman says it was not suppressed, but I will rely on the earnest and dispassionate consideration of the matter by the electors of Queensland, and I am quite certain that if they had the opportunity of perusing *Hansard*, and seeing what took place here last week, they would come to the conclusion that what I said was not too severe, when I stated that there was a deliberate suppression of the financial position at the last election.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: The Chief Secretary has gone through a list of quotations from different sources—from the *Sydney Bulletin* and other papers.

The PREMIER: All friends of yourselves.

Mr. RYAN: I was going to remark that, at the same time that the *Sydney Bulletin* was writing in the manner that the hon. gentleman referred to, it was also stating that the electors of Queensland ought to remove the Denham Government, or they

would make themselves the laughing-stock of Australia. If one portion is to be believed as true, why not the other.

Mr. FOLEY: He did not quote that. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: No, it did not suit him to quote that part. But I do not intend to go into every detail of this strike. There is a broad line of demarcation between the party represented by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat and the party led by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. The party whom the hon. gentleman represents is a party which is opposed to the organisation of labour—to trades unionism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: That is not so.

Mr. RYAN: I will proceed to prove it. I intend to prove it out of his own lips, and by the actions of his own Government. That party is opposed to the organisation of labour; they are supporting a combination of capital. The broad line of demarcation between us is that we are for the greatest good for the greatest number, and we believe that one way of attaining that, and fighting the combination of capitalism—the combinations which are being seen in America, and are being seen in Australia—we believe that one effective method of fighting them is by trades unionism.

Mr. MACROSSAN: Using it as a political instrument entirely.

Mr. RYAN: Using it for the purpose of fighting capital, and I think that unionism that has not something of a political nature in it is not worth much. That party of organised labour supports the Labour party, and therefore they fight the Government.

Mr. MACROSSAN: But not lately.

Mr. RYAN: Now I say that the Government were the cause of the general strike. (Government laughter.) I said that during the election, and I say it now. From the speech of the Premier to-night, [7.30 p.m.] and from this Address which we received from His Excellency, I also say that the trades unionists of Queensland and of Australia will have to wake up, because that party over there is becoming more and more determined to fight them. The Premier rose in his place to-night and flippantly referred to the fact that he was leaving out the Trades Disputes Bill. He said if one might judge by the proceedings of trades unionism in England there would be no Trades Disputes Bill here. The hon. gentleman said, "The Rockhampton programme is not a matter for my consideration." No, of course not. He has been placed there by his majority through the misrepresentation that took place during the recent election.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: He feels himself in such a position now that he can flout the Rockhampton programme altogether. He was never friendly with the late Premier, Mr. Kidston, for various things that happened between them, and although a coalition was formed, and although the Rockhampton programme was the basis of that coalition, the hon. gentleman now tells this House that the Rockhampton programme is not a matter for his consideration. And he is quite justified in saying that. The people of Queensland put him there without any programme

Mr. Ryan.]

—they put him there with a blank cheque, and he is quite justified in turning round and telling the people of Queensland that the Rockhampton programme has nothing to do with him, and that the Trade Disputes Bill has got nothing to do with him. Let me say what I have to about the general strike, for which this Government is responsible.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. RYAN: The trouble centred round the Brisbane Tramways Company, Limited, and Mr. Badger. It is well known that Mr. Badger was always opposed to trades unionism. He comes from the home of trusts—from America—and by his association and training there he decided when he came to Brisbane that unionism should have no place with his company. And the Queensland Government assisted him in his attempt to defy the Commonwealth law.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: The Queensland Government assisted him to defy the Commonwealth law and did it with public money.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: And subsequently they allowed him to defy the State law. Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: And backed him up, too.

Mr. RYAN: We need only hark back to December, 1910, when the then Premier, Mr. Kidston, supported by all the hon. gentlemen now on the front Treasury bench, and most of those sitting behind them, actually allowed public money to be spent to prevent the registration of the Brisbane Tramways Employees' Association. Under the Commonwealth law trades unionism is encouraged. You cannot take advantage of those laws unless you have unions, and before unions can take advantage of the law they must be registered. But Mr. Badger wanted to prevent the registration of that union, through some of those who were non-unionists. He, the Premier, and the Attorney-General had a confab together, and the Premier said, "Certainly, we will spend the public money on them. We must put down trades unionism." They allege that they are not against trade unionism. That is all moonshine. They are against it, and I will show that they are. Let me quote from the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair. I will read what he said on the occasion when a motion was moved for the adjournment of the House, by Mr. Ryott Maughan, who was then member for Ipswich with him.

The PREMIER: What date are you reading from?

Mr. RYAN: December, 1910.

The PREMIER: It is pretty ancient history now. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: If the hon. gentleman will remember me speaking from that corner of the Opposition cross bench on that occasion he will remember that I said that that motion for the adjournment of the House was the most important that had come before the House since I had been a member. I said it would play a great part in the next general election in Queensland. Has it not

[Mr. Ryan.

done so? Has it not been proved? This is what the hon. member for Ipswich said in 1910—

"I do not regard this matter from the point necessarily of unionism or non-unionism at all—that is a matter which can be dealt with by unionists and non-unionists themselves, but what I take strong exception to is that there should be exceptional treatment of any unit of the public, or any aggregate unit of the public. If assistance is to be given by the State to any individual, or body of individuals, to fight their case before any court, where is it going to end? If the State were going to provide legal assistance, both in civil and criminal matters, indiscriminately, I would have no *locus standi*; but, if exceptional treatment is going to be meted out with the funds of the taxpayer—to be handed out to help—

"Mr. D. HUNTER: This is an exceptional case.

"Mr. BLAIR: There is no exceptional case whatever. It is tantamount to nothing more than class assistance, and the Premier is giving the whole case away when he states that he would use the funds of the State to resist any attack by the Commonwealth Government on our own system of wages boards."

Now, there you have the first declaration by the Government that they are behind the Brisbane Tramways Company.

Mr. BOWMAN: Their ex-Attorney-General.

Mr. RYAN: That is a fact known to all trade unionists throughout Brisbane and throughout Queensland. When this trouble became accentuated later on, Mr. Badger was dismissing his men because they belonged to a union. I have no hesitation in saying that he was doing that, and, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Higgins, he was doing it. When Mr. Badger was dismissing his men it became apparent to them from the continued delay of the hearing of the arbitration case, and from the manner in which this Government had assisted Badger, that there would be no members in the union by the time the hearing of the case came on. (Hear, hear!)

The PREMIER: Is the Government superior to the Arbitration Court?

Mr. RYAN: No, fortunately for Queensland, the Government is not superior to the Commonwealth Arbitration Court; but the Government spent public money to delay the proceedings of that court to prevent the registration of the union, and everybody with common sense knows that the court was delayed in that matter.

The PREMIER: Was this recent trouble delayed by them?

Mr. RYAN: If the hon. gentleman will follow me, he will see that that was the start of the delay. Then Badger started to get rid of his men because they belonged to a union. I have been looking through all the papers, and I am convinced from the letters I have read that Badger was dismissing the men because they belonged to a union.

Mr. MACROSSAN: Would they not have a good action for wrongful dismissal?

Mr. RYAN: The hon. gentleman knows that it would be very difficult to prove that.

The only place where it can be proved is in the Arbitration Court, where there is a different system of taking evidence from the ordinary courts of law. Mr. Justice Higgins, when he heard the evidence, was amply satisfied that, first of all, Badger tried to prevent the formation of the union, and then, when he could not do that, he resorted to other means, and formed a hostile union—the Independent Workers' Union. (Opposition laughter.) It was something in the nature of Mr. Packer's union, which is the sort of union which the Government is in favour of.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: It was because the men were convinced—and they had their wives and families to think of, too—because they were convinced of the injustice that was meted out to them, they said, "Our manhood will not stand it." (Hear, hear!) And I admire them for it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The case was before the court. Why did not they wait the result?

Mr. RYAN: That same argument was pointed out to Mr. Justice Higgins. Why did not they wait for the case to come before the court? At that very time the majority of the Tramway Union throughout the States were wearing the badge at the time the Brisbane men put it on.

Mr. WHITE: Not the majority.

Mr. RYAN: Yes; I say that the majority of the union in Australia were wearing the badge at the time the Brisbane men put it on. The Brisbane men thought that they would do likewise, as they consider that they had a right to wear it. I think myself that the men had just as much right to wear the badge until the question was settled as Badger had to say that they should not wear the badge. Mr. Justice Higgins thought so, too.

Mr. LAND: And so do I. (Government laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Justice Higgins, it must be admitted by everybody, is a man of broad intelligence.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: And partiality.

Mr. RYAN: I am sorry to hear that word used from the other side of the House. I do not think that any man occupying a judicial position is biassed in any way—wilfully biassed—and yet that suggestion is thrown out by an hon. member opposite. Mr. Justice Higgins was never a member of the Labour party.

Mr. MORGAN: He was very near it, though.

Mr. RYAN: I am sorry at the hon. member still persisting in his remarks against a judge of the High Court, and saying that he is biassed and shows partiality. He was not put there by a Labour Government, and when he takes his seat on the bench he takes an oath to do equal justice between rich and poor. He did that, and it is a discredit to any member of this House to say that he did not do so. Whether his law is right or wrong is another matter—his powers are so limited owing to the Commonwealth Constitution—but he substantially arrives at a just decision. He could not have arrived at that decision after the compulsory conference if there had not been a strike in Brisbane. I myself prepared

the document that was wired down to him with regard to the case in Brisbane, and it was put fairly strong in order to get the court to intervene and have a compulsory conference. The hon. gentleman said that I made myself fairly active. If I made myself fairly active, I had only one view in being so, and that was to bring to an end the unsatisfactory position that existed in Brisbane.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: Time and again I remarked to hon. gentlemen who now sit on the front Treasury bench, "Why don't you end this thing?" and the everlasting answer was, "It is not our duty to interfere. It is our duty to do nothing."

The PREMIER: Who said that?

Mr. RYAN: It was said by the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. MACROSSAN: How would you have ended it?

Mr. RYAN: The Premier said that all that they had to do was to maintain law and order.

The PREMIER: And we did it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: Yes, we will say you did it. It is nothing to be so very proud about that it was done in the manner it was. There is one thing that has come out of this that will go down in the history of Australia, and that is that the Commonwealth Labour Government refused the assistance of the military when they were asked.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: That is a matter I intend to deal with at a later stage of my remarks.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were traitors to the Constitution.

Mr. RYAN: The hon. gentleman may say that, but the leader of the Opposition in the Federal House says that there was no breach of the Constitution. I do not wish to be drawn off by these interjections. I was proceeding to say that the Government were assisting the Tramway Company to defy the Commonwealth law, but they did not manage to do it.

The PREMIER: Are you speaking of something recent?

Mr. RYAN: I am speaking of December, 1910. I am coming to 1912 to show the consistency of the Government in their attitude. Badger refused to allow these men to go to work with their badge on, and he wrongfully dismissed them, as Mr. Justice Higgins found, when he said, "This is not a strike; this is a lockout." When he refused to do that he had at once to shorten the number of cars he was running on his lines. He was at once unable to comply with section 49 of the Tramways Act, which provides—

"That the company shall, at their own expense, provide and run cars in sufficient numbers for the accommodation of the public from the hours of 7 in the morning until 10 o'clock in the evening of every day except Sunday."

Mr. MACROSSAN: Was it not open to any individual to take proceedings under that section?

Mr. RYAN: It is not for private citizens to take action when the Government should take action. If the Government had stepped in as they were requested to do by a deputation of this party—if they had stepped in

and prosecuted the Tramway Company for not running their cars in sufficient numbers, Mr. Badger would have had to take on those men, and there would have been no general strike at all.

Mr. MACROSSAN: Why did not your party take action?

Mr. RYAN: When the hon. member has a little more experience of constitutional government he will know that if our party took action it would only lead to greater difficulty under such circumstances. It would only have made the Government more determined to fight. If the Government had prosecuted the Tramway Company, even supposing it had only resulted in a fine, the mere fact of the Government moving would have been sufficient to make Badger give way, and bear in mind at this period there was no general strike at all. That was the time for the Queensland Government to step in and say, "You shall run the trams. It is unfair to compel those men to leave their badges off. You are fighting unionism. Get on running your trams, and take the men back." Was not that a way of settling it? Of course, that would not suit the policy of the Government. Does the Government think the trades unions of Queensland did not thoroughly understand that from these two actions of the Government combined they were fighting trades unionism—that they were their natural enemies? Of course, they did. And still the Government say they are in favour of trades unions, and the Premier comes down to-night and flippantly tells the House that the Trades Disputes Bill is wilfully left out of the programme. He is quite at liberty to say that, because he did not go to the country with a programme at all. He asked the people to take him on trust.

Mr. HUNTER: And they are sorry for it.

Mr. RYAN: Where the people of Queensland knew about the strike, about Brisbane, South Brisbane, and other places, what was their verdict? The men who took an active part in the strike are here to consult and advise the hon. gentleman to-night.

The PREMIER: Where the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth went, how did he fare?

Mr. RYAN: The Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—I will deal with him in due time.

The PREMIER: Was he not able to make the facts known?

Mr. RYAN: Of course, he made the facts known to those he was able to address, but the Government had all the Press behind it, and Mr. Fisher could not make known a little piece of information that every member of the Treasury bench had. He was not able to make known this little bit of information that came from England from the financial advisers that money could not be got under 4 per cent. He wasn't able to tell them that.

The PREMIER: He told them a lot more.

Mr. RYAN: He said the Premier would be in difficulties before he was, and what he said was correct.

The PREMIER: No; he was wrong.

Mr. RYAN: The Government suppressed that information with regard to the finances.

The PREMIER: Not true.

Mr. RYAN: And the people of Queensland only got the account of the strike that

[Mr. Ryan.

was sent to them by a prejudiced Press and by misrepresenting speeches of those who were supporting the Government.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What were you doing?

Mr. RYAN: I was doing my duty. I was travelling about as much as I could, but while I was addressing audiences of 500 or 600 the hon. member was up on his pulpit in the morning addressing thousands. The *Brisbane Courier* and other papers were doing the work for him. There is no use trying to hide the fact, as everybody realises that the Press is a great factor in fighting an election.

The PREMIER: What was the *Record* doing?

Mr. RYAN: The *Record* was doing its duty, and Central Queensland did its duty, and the hon. gentleman comes back from Central Queensland a little weaker than he was before, as a result. Does not that prove what the *Daily Record* was doing? If the Government had done its duty on that occasion with regard to running the trams there would have been no general strike at all. But they did not realise the position. I know that Government supporters were coming up in the morning to the smoking-room quite jauntily, and I reminded one that there was a danger of a general strike. "Oh, nonsense," he said, "there will be no general strike at all. It is absurd nonsense to think of it." The Government did not realise the seriousness of the position that they had brought about by their attitude towards unionism.

The PREMIER: What the strike committee brought about.

Mr. RYAN: When the strike took place, what did they do? They wired to Mr. Fisher to help; "send the military."

The PREMIER: We did not. We asked him to exercise the power under section 119.

Mr. RYAN: If the hon. gentleman did not ask for the military, what on earth did he ask for?

The PREMIER: He asked for the application of section 119.

Mr. RYAN: Well, he got section 119, (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: Unfortunately he did not, but he did without it.

Mr. RYAN: I am coming to section 119 in one moment. I just want to read here a quotation which was cited by Mr. Finlayson in speaking in the Federal House in the very able speech he made there on the general strike, and one that I hope will be given more publicity than will be given in *Hansard*.

The PREMIER: You know they are going to placard it.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Finlayson quotes from Mr. Haldane as follows:—

"Now, the soldier is a person who is different from the ordinary citizen in this, that he is armed with a deadly weapon. Moreover, he comes out in a military formation. The result is that if he appears unnecessarily he creates an impression in the minds of all those who are about of a hostile character. His very menacing appearance may lead to the very thing which it is his purpose

to prevent—disturbance. For that reason, in the War Office, we are very averse to allowing the military to be employed. We are compelled to do it; we have no choice; we have to obey the law; but we always tend to insist—and while I am there we always shall insist very strongly—on this, that we are called out legally and not illegally.”

The PREMIER: Just what we did.

Mr. RYAN: While Mr. Fisher is Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, I think he will not insist that he is called out legally and not illegally, and I hope, whatever Government is in charge of the Commonwealth, they will do their duty and exercise their discretion in saying whether they shall give the aid of the military or not.

The PREMIER: That is a new interpretation of the Constitution.

Mr. RYAN: It is not a new interpretation. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the Commonwealth Government shall not refuse the use of the military forces because he asks for it?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He lost his head.

The PREMIER: What did the chairman of the strike committee do?

Mr. RYAN: What did the leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament state on this very question? The matter of whether the military shall be used to suppress domestic violence in cases of industrial upheavals is a very important one, and perhaps this refusal of the military is the most important question that has cropped up during this trouble, because it is one that will go down as a precedent, and I am very pleased to say it is a good one. The leader of the Opposition, speaking in the Federal House on section 119, as reported in *Hansard* of 27th June, page 85, says—

“Every honourable member by this time must be perfectly familiar with that section of the Constitution which reads—

“The Commonwealth shall protect every State against invasion and on the application of the Executive Government of a State against domestic violence.”

“The word ‘shall’ therefore covers both applications. The Commonwealth ‘shall’ on the application of the Executive Government of a State protect it against domestic violence. The Prime Minister in his reply said—

“His Government did not admit the right of any State to call for their assistance under circumstances which are proper to be dealt with by the Police Force of the States. The condition of affairs existing in Queensland does not, in the opinion of my Ministers, warrant the request of the Executive Government of Queensland, contained in your Excellency’s message, being complied with.”

The PREMIER: How did he arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. RYAN: “That answer was plain—”

The PREMIER: What information had he?

Mr. RYAN: I wish the hon. gentleman would allow me to finish the quotation.

“That answer was plain. I admit that under that section it was within the competency of Ministers to return that reply. The word ‘shall’ in the section of the Constitution which I have quoted is mandatory, it is true, but that word as applied to a Government would receive the ordinary interpretation, which requires a Government to shoulder responsibility. It is just possible that some State Premier upon losing his head might ask for support from the Commonwealth when it was not necessary.”

I did not notice that those last words were in it, but I could not have quoted more apt words to suit the position than those words of Mr. Deakin’s. The position was that the State Premier had lost his head, and he wired for the military. The position taken up by Mr. Deakin is evidently that the Commonwealth Government may exercise its discretion. Is the Commonwealth Government to be an automaton simply because the State Premier wires there is riot and bloodshed in Queen street, when we know there was no such thing? Supposing the military did come. Were they going to protect the place against domestic violence which did not exist? That is proof that the Premier lost his head, and I think a good many of his supporters lost their heads, and I think if Parliament had not been dissolved they would have lost their seats too, because they were sworn in as special constables. (Laughter.) It would be news to me that there could be seventy-two constables members of this Parliament, and if there could not be seventy-two there could not be one. In my opinion, those members who became special constables ran in in the same ill-considered manner that the Premier wired down to Mr. Fisher, and they became special constables. At any rate, before they could be nominated for the elections subsequent they had to be absolved from their oaths.

Mr. TROUT: If they were called on were they not bound to serve?

Mr. RYAN: They were not called on. I know if they called on me, I would not have served.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You are not a patriot.

Mr. RYAN: Whatever may be the case, I think on occasions of that kind it is the duty of members of Parliament to keep aloof.

Mr. MORGAN: Why didn’t you keep aloof?

Mr. RYAN: I do not know whether the hon. member was a special constable or not.

Mr. MACROSSAN: What is your opinion of the strike? You have not given us a definite pronouncement yet.

Mr. RYAN: I will give a definite pronouncement in my own time. (Hear, hear!) I am pointing out the cause of the strike was the Government’s attitude towards unionists. They so inflamed the men by the fact that they used public money to fight them, and then they allowed Mr. Badger to openly defy the law and not run his trams—they so inflamed the men that a total of 20,000 men stopped work.

The HOME SECRETARY: Voluntarily?

Mr. Ryan.]

Mr. RYAN: Voluntarily. There was no compulsion, and when it came to recording their votes at the election they showed by their votes around Brisbane what they thought about the Government.

Mr. TROUT: What did they do in the country?

Mr. RYAN: The hon. member who is interjecting wants me to make a pronouncement with regard to the strike. I do not believe in a general strike, but I [8 p.m.] justify everything that was done by gentlemen like Mr. Coyne when the thing was brought about by the Government. (Government laughter.) If a revolution takes place and is caused by the Government, as that was, that is another thing, but I am decidedly against a general strike as a means to settle a dispute if there is any other effective machinery to settle it. The Labour platform, which I have signed, contains a plank affirming that disputes should be settled by arbitration.

The PREMIER: This matter was before the Arbitration Court.

Mr. RYAN: It might have been before the court, but let me add that every effort was made to prevent it coming before the court. I am now fighting a broad issue, a broad general question. That matter would never have come on for hearing if Badger had succeeded in getting the registration of the Tramway Association cancelled, as he tried to do.

The PREMIER: What is wrong with the court?

Mr. RYAN: I do not think there is anything wrong with the court, and if I had my way I would extend the powers of that court very considerably. The Government are bringing down a proposal to do away with the possibility of strikes. There would be no necessity for an Industrial Peace Bill if they had allowed the referendum to pass when it was before the electors of Australia in April last year. Mr. Justice Higgins pointed out that he had only power to deal with disputes extending beyond any one State, and that he could not interfere with the general strike, though he was able to interfere with and settle the tramway strike.

The PREMIER: Why didn't they await his decision, and avoid all confusion?

Mr. RYAN: The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that if he had his way it would not be decided yet.

The PREMIER: A precious court, is it not?

Mr. RYAN: The hon gentleman says "a precious court." The sooner the trade unionists of Queensland thoroughly understand that it is Governments like the present Government in Queensland that they are fighting the better. With one hand they are handing the unionists an Arbitration Court and Industrial Peace Bill, and with the other they are giving them the Commissioner of Police with batons, and while saying that they are the unionists' friends they are fighting them all the time.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: And taxing them.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and taxing them, too. The Government are bringing in a proposal

[Mr. Ryan.

to refer certain things to the Commonwealth Parliament.

The PREMIER: Is that right?

Mr. RYAN: It certainly is not right, and I am surprised that a Government which should have some intelligence should think that by referring certain matters to the Commonwealth they can bring about the same thing as can be brought about by an amendment of the Constitution.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Constitution provides for it.

Mr. RYAN: The Constitution provides for it, I understand, but it does not provide for it in a way which is adequate. When we went into federation it was because we could not get six States to agree upon certain matters which could be carried out by one Parliament elected by the whole people. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how six Parliaments of the Commonwealth of Australia—the Denham Government in Queensland, the Labour Government in New South Wales, and the other Governments in Victoria, South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania—are all going to agree to pass exactly the same measure through the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of each State? They must pass exactly the same measure, or it will be useless. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me, or the people of Queensland—he may tell his own supporters, but he cannot tell me—that he is at all serious in thinking that every State will pass exactly the same measure. Such a measure should be dealt with by a national Parliament elected by the whole of the people of Australia.

The PREMIER: Remember last year.

Mr. RYAN: I remember last year, and I remember last election. I remember also the last State election, but though this sort of misrepresentation may go on for a time it cannot last. I would rather be fighting here among twenty-five men in a cause that I know is right than be fighting over there with forty-seven men for the maintenance of monopolies.

The PREMIER: We are fighting for liberty.

Mr. RYAN: The Government pretend that they seriously propose conferring certain power on the Commonwealth Parliament, but it is really for the purpose of preventing the referendum being carried, and then they say they are fighting for liberty. They are fighting for trusts and combines. What party do the trusts support? Do they support the party on that side of the House or the party which sits here? What Government is trying to fight combines? The Commonwealth Government tried to fight the Coal Vend, which was fined £20,000, and now they are fighting the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. But while the Constitution remains as it is, with all its technicalities, those monopolists can get out of a case. Amend the Constitution in the way the Labour party want to amend it, and allow the representatives of the people to say what are monopolies, and you will have legislation which will be effective; otherwise, you will have laws which can be easily evaded. The Federal Attorney-General, speaking in the Commonwealth Parliament the other day with regard to the Coal Vend, pointed out

that there is only one thing certain, and that is that the Coal Vend is carrying on exactly in the same way as they were carrying on previously, but they cannot be got at because there were legal technicalities in the way. If you start to define a monopoly, someone will always find some way of evading that definition. I am impressed by the fact that the present Government have dropped the Trades Disputes Bill. They have nothing to do with the Rockhampton programme; they are swelled up now with their success in regard to the strike, and they think they can control everything and carry Queensland with them. It is our duty—I feel it is my duty, as far as in me lies—to try to stir up the great mass of the people to a consciousness of the fact that this Government are their enemies.

The PREMIER: Only the people do not believe you.

Mr. RYAN: I am quite satisfied, as I said a moment ago, to fight on and fight on until they do believe me, and until they do believe this party. It will not take very long to make them do that if the Government use much of the suppression they did during the recent election.

The PREMIER: We will blow that sky-high.

Mr. RYAN: The leader of the Opposition dealt with the subject of pure food. There is no subject in which the great mass of the people are more interested than the supply of pure food, and there is nothing that more influenced the Labour members of the Federal Parliament in favour of the referendum than their desire to give the people pure food. The people will understand that with regard to the referendum the Commonwealth Government are going to propose as contradistinguished from the spurious article offered by the Premier of this State. (Laughter.) Oh, the hon. gentleman knows that it is spurious, or he would not have proposed it in the local House of Lords.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are the only Simon Pure.

Mr. RYAN: The people, too, have to consider the cost of living. The Government come down with proposals settling industrial disputes, raising wages, and so on; but all these measures are useless if you cannot control prices. Every man and every woman on the electoral roll knows that the cost of living is going up and up, and that it is going up faster than wages are going up. We find that when wages of the coalminers in England were raised the price of coal went up 2s. 6d. per ton, and the same kind of thing has happened in Australia. And unless we are prepared to give the Commonwealth power over monopolies in a definite way, we shall have the cost of living going up still further. The people need pure food and cheap food.

The PREMIER: We will give it them.

Mr. RYAN: The Government will give them dear food. I think the leader of the Opposition is to be congratulated upon the exhaustive manner in which he dealt with the question of public abattoirs. If the Government were really in earnest in their desire to provide pure food for the people they would not have allowed Brisbane to remain so long without public abattoirs. There was one item of misrepresentation which the

Government made a lot of. It has been said that during the strike women and children were starving in the streets of Brisbane.

Mr. BARBER: It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. RYAN: Of course it is absolutely untrue. The people of Brisbane knew that, but the people in the country did not know it.

The PREMIER: They would have been but for the intervention of the Government.

Mr. RYAN: In the next breath the people were told that the Government were supplying people here with flour at cost price.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is correct.

Mr. RYAN: How much?

The HOME SECRETARY: At less than the Government paid for it.

Mr. COYNE: How much?

The HOME SECRETARY: Something like 60 odd tons, and at less than the Government paid for it themselves.

Mr. RYAN: Perhaps it is due to the fact that I said on several occasions during the election campaign—I think the hon. member for Maranoa did, too—we mentioned 35 tons of flour that was bought at a much less price than I was told the Government were giving for it, and, naturally enough, the Government then sold at the price we bought at. But I would like to know who was the friend that got the Government order for the flour. What middleman did they pay?

The HOME SECRETARY: No middleman.

Mr. RYAN: It is really too funny. I did not intend to go into the details of that strike; however, they will soon be a thing of the past. But there are some features which stand out and which will make history and precedents, and it is with regard to that that I desire to speak.

Mr. BOWMAN: "Black Friday" will be remembered.

Mr. RYAN: "Black Friday" will be remembered. The Premier called it "Good Friday." That was the day on which Christ was crucified. I wish to say one word on the action of the Government in appointing five members to the Legislative Council, which are apparently all political appointments. The rejected candidate for Fortitude Valley was forthwith made a Councillor. The same remark applies to the others. Can the Government believe that they are doing the right thing in making these appointments? Do they think that the people of Queensland will shut their eyes to such things as these? But I suppose they have that supercilious confidence by the fact that they are returned here without a policy. They can do anything, and make any appointments they like, and they can tell the people of Queensland afterwards, "You sent us here without any programme." The first occasion on which the people of Queensland will have an opportunity of speaking—that will be during the Federal election—I believe that they will give a complete answer to the action of this Government in suppressing the information they did during the recent election campaign in Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: Beware of prophesying.

Mr. RYAN: I am not prophesying.

Mr. R.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): Before the reply to the Speech of His Excellency goes through I desire to say a few words, more especially as I was, perhaps, made the biggest butt personally during the recent election campaign. I do not suppose there were ever so many lies and misrepresentations levelled at any one individual in Queensland as there were at myself, judging from the number of pamphlets sent out from the organisations that own and control the crowd of the opposite side throughout Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about your own pamphlet?

Mr. COYNE: I do not remember any pamphlet sent out by me, or any pamphlet sent out that I had any connection with, either officially or otherwise, so that the Home Secretary was entirely wrong when he said I was associated with pamphlets that were sent out during that campaign.

The HOME SECRETARY: Or bulletins.

Mr. COYNE: Strike bulletins were not issued during the election campaign, but there was an election bulletin, with which the strike had no connection whatever. The Premier to-night repeated a number of mis-statements which were made during the recent election campaign in connection with the strike which took place in Brisbane. The leader and deputy leader of the Opposition have dealt with the broad principles which were at stake during that great fight. The hon. member for Barcoo pointed out that the pressure was becoming so great on the members of the Brisbane Tramway Union that it had reached the breaking point when the crisis was brought about. I hope that some members on the opposite side, anxious as they appear to be to allow this to go through, will try and prove that Mr. Badger was not getting rid of the unionists in his employ as fast as he could. The Premier, when the hon. member for Barcoo was speaking, said, "Why didn't you go to the Arbitration Court, seeing the thing was before the Arbitration Court?" Now, it was cited before the court—that is practically a lawyer's term—but when the thing would be determined by the court was an entirely different thing, and until the determination the tramway union employees had no redress whatever. They were suffering all the time; they were being ousted from their employment on the most trifling pretexts. Just because he was a couple of seconds late at the terminus, that sufficed to get rid of a man who was regarded as a prominent unionist in the Tramway Employees' Union. Now, a union is just like a country; it can stand a certain amount of pressure, a certain amount of tyranny, but a time must come, if this tyranny is persisted in, when they will revolt, just as the people of a country must revolt.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: Against whom?

Mr. COYNE: Against the conditions under which they are suffering. Evidently what caused the 22,000 unionists of Brisbane, and the thousands of unionists throughout Queensland, to take the extreme action which they did was because they were not alone fighting the Brisbane Tramways Company or Mr. Badger, but because the Premier of Queensland, representing a majority, evidently, of the State, otherwise he would not be on those benches, aided and abetted Mr. Mr. Badger to down and kill trade unionism in

[*Mr. Coyne.*

Queensland. When these men were trying to carry out the law of the country in applying for registration as a trade union of the Commonwealth under the conciliation and arbitration law, a few non-unionists in the Brisbane Tramway Company, at the instigation of the manager of the company, came along to the Premier of the State. They tried to prevent the registration of the union, but they failed. What was the object of the Government in trying to prevent these men from getting their case before the Arbitration Court when they applied for registration under the Act? There could be only one reason—because it was the genuine trade unionists who were applying for registration, and it was because of their antipathy to trade unionism that they wasted the money of the taxpayers of Queensland to prevent these men from complying with the laws of the country. The Chief Secretary a while ago said that the matter in dispute was a trifling matter—that it was merely a matter of wearing or not wearing a medal. That was only a small detail in the business. It is well known that Mr. Badger came here from America with the reputation of being a union smasher, and when the party led by the present Premier heard that there was such a man in their midst, they went and embraced him with open arms. It was not a question of wearing the badge alone, it was a question of bringing the matter to a head in the interests of these men. The men said: "We may as well come out straight away as unionists—not sink our principles—come out and fight as unionists against those people who are opposed to industrial unionism, and we will put the manager of the Tramway Company to the test by wearing the emblem of our union." It has been said that that was in the plaint. Allowing that it was in the plaint, that fact did not alter their position in the slightest, because, if the case was not forced before the Arbitration Court in some way or other, there would be no unionists in Brisbane to fight their cause when the case did come before the court.

Mr. VOWLES: You told the unionists it was not in the plaint.

Mr. COYNE: That is absolutely untrue. That was a misstatement made during the election campaign.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: You did not deny it.

Mr. COYNE: There are a thousand and one different things that I did not deny, because I was never asked about them. It was absolutely futile on my part to try to refute them. The unionists of Queensland recognise that Mr. Badger, at the head of the Brisbane Tramways Company, assisted by the Employers' Federation throughout Australia no doubt, and more especially by the Government of Queensland, were making the most determined attack that was ever made on the whole structure of industrial unionism in Australia. They recognised that the ball was up. It was thrown into the arena, and they would have to play the game for all it was worth, and forty-three unions in Brisbane, without being incited in any way by outside influences to take any extreme step, of their own volition decided on the step they took on 28th January last.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It was under misrepresentations.

Mr. COYNE: There were no misrepresentations at all. They met there, and knew their own business. My [8.30 p.m.] experience of trades unionists is this: Whatever stand they take up, they are very rarely in the wrong.

Mr. BOUCHARD: They were misled on this occasion.

Mr. COYNE: If they had my hon. friend the hon. member for South Brisbane and his baton there they might have been led a bit better. No doubt the hon. gentleman will find a big field for his endeavours in another quarter than the quarter I was connected with on that occasion. I will endeavour to show you that the unionists of Queensland recognise that this was the biggest attempt, the greatest attempt, and the most determined attempt ever made to pull down the whole structure of trade unionism which has taken ourselves and our forefathers hundreds of years to build up to its present state. They were determined to fight the matter out, as they did not regard it as a trifling matter at all. They regarded it as a most serious matter. Whether the step they took was the correct one or not, was another matter altogether. They were provoked to take the extreme step they did, and their action was fully justified. I want to remove one or two misunderstandings in connection with misrepresentation in the Press about myself. The Premier no doubt quoted what he saw in the Press about the wire that I, as president of the strike committee, sent to the Commonwealth Government at the instigation of that committee. What I said on that occasion was, that when the citizens of Brisbane, who were acting quite peaceably, were treated in the manner they were by the regular police and special constables—they were treated in a scandalous and brutal manner by the police—when we saw how the citizens were being treated, we came to the conclusion that it was time we made some move to protect the people from the police. (Government laughter.) The hon. member for Dalby can laugh. There is no doubt that he was comfortably ensconced in his little villa at Dalby, and he did not know what was happening in Brisbane.

Mr. VOWLES: I saw a large number of men who were thrown out of work as a result of the strike.

Mr. COYNE: If the hon. gentleman had seen his women folk getting buffeted about in the streets by men who had spent the best part of their lives in gaol, he would have done something to protect them from these men with their illegal weapons. The hon. member for Warwick shakes his head, and treats my remarks in a light and airy fashion, but he cannot deny the truth of what I am saying. I challenge any hon. member here to deny the truth of what I am saying. I consider that the brutal and uncalled-for conduct of those special constables was never witnessed in this part of the world, or any other part of the world, up to this day. The other day in England there was a crisis, which is still existing, and it was of far greater enormity in point of numbers than the Brisbane strike. The men in charge of the Government of England, who hold far greater power than the members of the Government here, and in whose hands the control of the whole of the destinies of the Empire are placed, acted quite

differently to what our Government acted under somewhat similar circumstances. The British Government was asked for police protection to enable the employers to convey scab labour to take the place of the men on strike.

Mr. MORGAN: What do you mean by scab labour? What is a scab?

Mr. COYNE: A scab is a man who only works when there is some industrial trouble on.

Mr. BOUCHARD: A free labourer.

Mr. COYNE: No, he is not a free labourer.

Mr. BOUCHARD: He is an independent labourer.

Mr. COYNE: He is not independent because he is so seldom out of gaol; he does not get a chance of getting work. A scab is a man who never works except when there is some industrial trouble on, and his fear of the police and his fear of going back to gaol, where he spends most of his life, makes him go to work where men have gone on strike, and thus he sucks the last drop of blood out of the men he displaces. When Mr. McKenna, the Home Secretary in the British Government, was asked to send the police to protect the scab labour he said: "No. This Government is not going to be a party to provoke men to commit a breach of the peace." What was done in Brisbane? There was no trouble and no disorder of any description whatever up to the Thursday, which was the last day on which a procession was held. I think that everybody, including the Premier and the Commissioner of Police and everyone else, will admit that men who are accustomed to live active lives must have something to do to occupy their minds. That was the opinion of the leader of the Opposition and also of the strike committee. They knew that these men and women must be given something to do so as to prevent the possibility of any disorder.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You had the disorder on the Thursday.

Mr. COYNE: We had it on the Thursday, but how did it happen? I will tell you how it happened, because it has been put quite differently by those who have already spoken.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Are you going to justify it?

Mr. COYNE: I am going to make my speech in my own way. I will tell hon. members in connection with that disorder that when the procession arrived in the Market Square on the Thursday—you will remember that the hotels were supposed to be closed during the period of the strike. There was supposed to be no drinking carried on at all, although I know cases, because I saw them myself, where drink was served by hotels. I was brought out of the Trades Hall to see it on several occasions. In spite of the proclamation that was issued prohibiting the sale of liquor, there were a number of hotels in Brisbane that had an open door during that time, and they served drink to the special constables and their friends.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COYNE: I saw a special constable come out of an hotel and take off his badge and give it to his mate, and he went in and

Mr. Coyne.]

got a drink, too. I saw it done at Daniell's Hotel and Lennon's, and also at the Hotel Cecil.

Mr. BOUCHARD: That is not true.

Mr. COYNE: It is absolutely true, as I saw it myself. I would rather believe what I saw with my own eyes than 10,000 special constables.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you say you saw them selling liquor?

Mr. COYNE: I did not see them selling liquor, but they must have done so, as the hotel-keepers are not usually so generous as to give it away. Hon. members are trying to draw me away from the matters I wish to refer to in the time at my disposal.

The HOME SECRETARY: Don't you let them.

Mr. COYNE: I shall not. I was proceeding to speak about the wire I sent to Mr. Fisher.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the disorder on Thursday afternoon?

Mr. COYNE: There are so many interjections that it is impossible for me to continue my speech in any sort of order. However, I do not wish to avoid anything, and I will speak about the Thursday disturbance. After the procession, the members forming the procession were drawn up and addressed by the leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Finlayson and Mr. Brennan, Federal members. Mr. Bowman advised the men not to commit any breach of the law, and to go to their homes, and they had previously carried out his instructions in that regard to the letter. Just then a lorry loaded with beer drove into the square. The unionists regarded that beer as of scab manufacture, carried on a scab lorry driven by a scab driver. Was that not enough to provoke them to commit some crime or something that might be construed into a crime? The men were advised to be perfectly orderly, despite what provocation they might receive, but that was evidently too much for them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the incident at North Quay, when the food was taken.

Mr. COYNE: I can tell you about that.

The HOME SECRETARY: So can I, because I saw it all.

Mr. COYNE: It was only done to provoke the men. When the lorry drove up with beer, in the Market Square, there were thousands of men surrounding it, when a force of police rode up from Roma street barracks and scattered them. With regard to the North Quay incident, the men just went up to see if the driver had a permit. (Government laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: What right had they to ask for a permit in a free country?

Mr. COYNE: I will tell you all about the permits, as you do not like them. There were no drivers competent to drive at that time that were not under the control of the strike committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: That man could drive all right.

Mr. COYNE: There were about twenty men there. There were an equal number of police who came out from Roma street ready to provoke the men to commit a breach of the peace.

[Mr. Coyne.

Mr. MORGAN: Were you there?

Mr. COYNE: No.

The HOME SECRETARY: I was. What about the waggonette and the lady?

Mr. COYNE: What was that?

The HOME SECRETARY: They made the lady take her provisions away.

Mr. COYNE: That is too silly altogether. Private people drove their conveyances wherever they liked, and no one interfered with them. The Government Departments had to get permits, and I will tell you something more about them. I can tell hon. members that if they do not alter their tune with regard to industrial legislation they will have the permits again. (Government laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: The public said "No."

Mr. COYNE: With regard to the wire I sent to Mr. Fisher, I want to say first that the actions of the strike committee have been misrepresented by our friends opposite. What I said in regard to Mr. Fisher's wire was that if the *Courier* report was correct, even Mr. Denham only applied for military assistance after he had permitted that outrage on the public on that "Baton Friday," when the police went up to Market Square. For what? Not to prevent disorder—there was no disorder. The leader of the Opposition had already told the people to proceed to their homes.

The HOME SECRETARY: They did not go; that was the trouble.

Mr. COYNE: They had been notified that there would be no procession.

Mr. MORGAN: But they did not take any notice of it.

Mr. COYNE: How do you know?

The TREASURER: They went down George street.

Mr. COYNE: I am asking you with regard to Market Square. What did the police march across Market Square for? An armed force—a military force. What did they do that for? Not to prevent disorder. They never said they anticipated disorder. They said they went to put down lawlessness and there was no lawlessness there.

Mr. BOUCHARD: There had been.

Mr. COYNE: When?

Mr. BOUCHARD: The day before.

Mr. COYNE: Oh, I see. Because it happened twelve months ago it was going to happen again. I, at the instigation of my committee, wired—not being a lawyer, and not understanding the law in connection with these matters, and neither did any of my committee—

Mr. BOUCHARD again interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to cease interjecting. He has interjected sixteen times since taking his seat on that bench.

Mr. COYNE: I then applied, thinking that the people of Queensland who were offending nobody—I thought it only a fair thing that we should apply for some protection against the brutality of the Government and their minions. My committee thought we would be able to get that protection from the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and I applied there, and of

course I got a reply back stating that he could not grant such a thing. I was satisfied with that. But I also wish to mention—the papers stated that I boasted that I got in twenty-four hours before the Premier. What I said in Toowoomba, and what I said to my electors, and what I repeat here, is that I applied for this protection after the trouble on the Friday morning, and if the Brisbane newspapers reported the Premier correctly, then he was twenty-four hours after the strike committee in applying for the same military aid. With regard to bread: it has been stated that there were people starving in Brisbane. That is absolutely untrue.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were certainly on the verge of starvation. The Home Department knows that there were people in a very unenviable position—unfortunately foster mothers, too, with little children.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, we took care of the foster mothers during the strike.

The HOME SECRETARY: On 3½d. coupons.

Mr. COYNE: On five bob coupons, and they were all honoured.

Mr. BOUCHARD: That was only a blind.

Mr. COYNE: We don't want to blind anybody.

Mr. BOUCHARD: You only blinded them as to the amount of funds you got from the South.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about the balance-sheet?

Mr. COYNE: There will be no trouble about the balance-sheet when the unions are ready to receive it, and they are going to take no dictation from the Government or any men like the Premier, who told the strikers to "stew in their own juice."

The PREMIER: Only the leaders.

Mr. COYNE: I think it is only a fair thing, if we have to produce our balance-sheet at the instigation of the Home Secretary and the Premier, that we should have a look at the People's Progressive League balance-sheet and the Employers' Federation balance-sheet. Now, as to this matter of bread: I solemnly assure the House that there was not one morning during the five weeks the strike lasted that I did not appeal—there were five or six meetings a night despite the efforts of the Premier—there was not a meeting addressed during that five weeks that there was not an appeal made to the people that if they knew of anyone wanting food to come along and they would be supplied, and in not one case during that five weeks did any man, woman, or child stand up in the streets of Brisbane or in the halls where the meetings were held, and say anybody was hungry.

The HOME SECRETARY: You said on the morning after the strike that no person in Brisbane could get a loaf of bread without a permit.

Mr. COYNE: We knew what the Employers' Federation were doing. Do you think we did not did not know what was going on? And when we knew they were trying to starve the people of Brisbane, we had to work to provide food for the people, and we succeeded, and on the Thursday there were 45,000 loaves of bread ready for people, despite the resolutions of the Employers' Federation.

Mr. BOUCHARD: For those who had coupons.

Mr. COYNE: For anybody who wished to purchase. What I said in connection with the purchasing of bread without a permit, as the Secretary for Agriculture had reference to it in the rags in Toowoomba, which have misrepresented me on a thousand occasions—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Every paper that does not support you is a scurrilous rag.

Mr. COYNE: They tried to outdo the *Courier*, and when they can outdo such a loathsome production as the *Courier* they must be pretty bad. I pointed out to my audience in Toowoomba—of course, you will see by what I am saying that the abstract was taken out and the context lest sight of altogether—I pointed out that the grand object lesson, the grand economic lesson, that was taught to the workers of Queensland by the general strike was never to be forgotten. They had been shown the great power they possessed, and how they could stop all wealth production if they wished to. Why, I said, on that Thursday the strike committee which was appointed by the unions to manage their business—although the Premier reckons it was an irresponsible position—a very irresponsible one—could, if they so desired, prevent the wealthiest man in Brisbane from purchasing a loaf of bread without a permit from them. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has a very poor idea of what responsibility means.

The HOME SECRETARY: The strike committee apparently had a very poor idea of it.

Mr. COYNE: What I pointed out was that the workers had proved to themselves that they had that power, because when they all ceased work all wealth production ceased.

Mr. MORGAN: So did the food supply.

Mr. COYNE: Also the manufacture of food, if you like. (Government laughter.) It was all arranged. They went back, and they produced the food, but they were not going to produce food and allow non-unionists to distribute that food, after the fight they had put up.

Mr. TROUT: Non-unionists cooked for you.

Mr. COYNE: Where?

Mr. TROUT: I know. Where you were staying.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member knows nothing about it. As a matter of fact, I stayed at the Trades Hall during the whole of the strike.

Mr. TROUT: You did not get all your food there.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, all my food. Now, about this bread. We pointed out we were going to distribute that bread by unionists, and we were going to manufacture it by unionists.

Mr. MORGAN: And let the non-unionists starve.

Mr. COYNE: I am referring to distribution and production.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have a hard job to excuse yourself.

Mr. COYNE: We would not allow non-unionists to run round with carts in Brisbane, seeing we had the power to prevent them to come in and manufacture that food.

Mr. Coyne.]

It was said we were starving people. Nothing of the sort. Nobody was hungry; and the 22,000 people who were on strike did enough to provide for the people of Brisbane. I pointed out the great power of the worker, and the great lesson taught, and the power shown by unionism on that occasion.

Mr. MORGAN: You showed that if he stopped work they starved.

Mr. COYNE: I maintain that during the time the hotels were supposed to be shut the only people who were drunk in Brisbane were the special constables. Do you deny that?

The HOME SECRETARY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. COYNE: These men were brought in allegedly to preserve the peace. Why, there was no possibility of even the slightest breach of the peace in Brisbane were it not for the special constables, and the crime record will show that in no other week, either before or after the strike, were there such a small number of breaches of the peace. What was the record of crime during the time the hotels were shut up, and during the more serious part of the strike—that was, the first part?

Mr. BOUCHARD: You ought to know.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, I do know; but there were no crimes except the crimes of the special constables, a good many of whom were drunk on duty. What happened? I know that this happened, and no doubt my friend, seeing the company he was in at the time, knew something about the blackguardly conduct of some of the special constables, amongst whom were the worst types of criminals in Australia. I am not referring to the civil servants, a great number of whom were brought in against their will. I say a large number of the worst criminals and the worst characters in Australia were amongst the special constables.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: What rot!

Mr. COYNE: Why, down here, at the back of the Hotel Cecil, the most filthy and lewd remarks that were ever uttered by human beings were used by special constables to young women at the back.

The HOME SECRETARY: Were you there?

Mr. COYNE: No; but I had all my work out to prevent some of the men blowing out the brains of those blackguards.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. COYNE: Make no mistake about it; and, while in a drunken state in Queen street, they jostled women and girls as they were passing them. Do you know that happened?

The HOME SECRETARY: Did you see them? It is absolutely false.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the remarks of the Home Secretary. I saw it, and what I said is absolutely true.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said the statement is absolutely false.

Mr. COYNE: On one occasion a drunken constable fell into Pike's door, and insulted women and girls as they were going by. His mates forsook him, and abandoned him to two constables who came along, and one of the constables took their numbers off so that they could not be identified—at any rate, by

[Mr. Coyne.

their numbers. After taking their numbers off they ran him off to the lockup, and nothing more was heard about it. On another occasion a drunken constable came

along George Street, near the [9 p.m.] Transcontinental Hotel, and with a baton deliberately cracked the skull of a man talking to a uniformed constable on the footpath. What about that? What about the brutes who rode into the people at the Transcontinental Hotel corner? What about the special constable who split the skull of a man near the Transcontinental Hotel?

The HOME SECRETARY: What man was that?

Mr. COYNE: The man was in the Chamber just after dinner, and was speaking to me about his wounds. His skull was split open by a drunken special constable.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: By whom was he treated?

Mr. COYNE: I am not in a position to give that information now, but if the hon. gentleman will ask the question to-morrow I shall be able to supply him with the information.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He got his skull split at an hotel, I suppose.

Mr. COYNE: No; near the Transcontinental Hotel, while he was speaking to a constable. While he was so engaged this drunken special constable came past and broke the man's skull with a baton without any provocation whatever. Those are the lovely preservers of the peace we had during the strike. There is one thing I should like to mention to show the love the Government had for trade unions or industrial unionism. At the time the strike was on it came to my knowledge that there were four deserters from His Majesty's Navy who were working on the trams. The fact was known to the police, but the police took no action to deal with those deserters. The fact that the men were working on the trams was also made known to the Naval Commandant, but evidently he had no power to deal with the matter, because the men did not belong to the Australian Force. Would not the police, at any other time, have been only too glad to snap one of those deserters, or the four of them, and send them back to their ship? But during the strike, though aware that the men were there, they never lifted a finger to send them back to their ship, and the men may be on the trams now for anything I know. At 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning I have seen motor-cars travelling without any side or tail light, and going at the rate of 40 miles an hour in Queen street.

The PREMIER: Queen street is like a cemetery at that hour.

Mr. COYNE: If the hon. member went to the Co-operative Store in Queen street at that hour and saw what was going on there, he would not make that interjection. These special constables indulged in jostling or sat on the footpath expectorating all over it, and committed every offence for which men are punished every day of our lives, and not one word was said about it. We have been told that dynamite was placed on the tram lines. Among those 22,000 men were some of the most expert users

of dynamite in their ordinary avocations, blasting and that sort of thing, that you could find in Australia.

The HOME SECRETARY: Some of it was very cunningly laid, I admit.

Mr. COYNE: Such men making a hash of that kind of thing is one of the most absurd notions that anyone could conceive. There was no dynamite laid. The Premier knows, and so does the Home Secretary, that whenever the leader of the Opposition or any member of this party addressed the men they advised them that they must observe the law and keep the peace, in spite of any provocation that might be offered to them; and that was done, and that is why my friends opposite are so annoyed. The sending of police with bayonets into the Market Square was like a comic opera.

The HOME SECRETARY: You told us they were armed to the teeth.

Mr. COYNE: So they were, but if I had had charge of those men I would never have dreamt of keeping the whole Police Force of Brisbane cooped up in the Market Square as they were kept. They could have been wiped out of existence in five minutes if we had desired to wipe them out; there was no escape for them; they were simply cooped up, and if we had divided their attention into seven or eight different channels, we could very soon have wiped them out. That is what I have to say about that comic opera army.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They were a very fine body of men.

Mr. COYNE: It is a deliberate lie for anybody to say that any of the strikers attempted to use dynamite.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a fact, all the same.

Mr. COYNE: Then, why didn't you prosecute them?

The HOME SECRETARY: We should have done so if we had only had the chance. We did all we could.

Mr. COYNE: If what hon. members opposite say about this matter is true, why were not some special constables told off for special duty while the ordinary police went out to inquire into the matter, and find out who were the men who were guilty of such conduct?

The HOME SECRETARY: When we found out what had been done we patrolled all points and stopped it.

Mr. COYNE: We have heard that story so long that it does not affect us. Those who have been connected with industrial troubles have heard that story so long and so often that they do not take any notice of it. What about the loyal Britishers on the other side of the House, and their conduct during the strike? Every one of the men working on the tramways was a British subject, and as British subjects they were fighting for their rights. Even the Premier cannot deny that they had those rights, and these loyal subjects of the King come out against them, use all the power they possess, and ask the Commonwealth Government to enter the city with their military, not to prevent disorder, but to intimidate the workers who were fighting for their rights.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is that why you asked for the military?

Mr. COYNE: I wanted to protect the people from your police, and I had good cause to make the application I did. When I wired the people were being threatened, and if the people behind the police had only pushed them on there would have been no escape from those bayonets. If one drop of blood had been shed that day, the Premier and the members of the Ministry would have been responsible for it. If the Government had had a chance they would have had us in gaol long ago. Their desire was to lock us up, to rob us of our liberty, to hang us, or to have Coyne's blood at any price. (Government laughter.) But they never had a chance.

The PREMIER: Is that the reason you said if communicated by telephone you would give yourself up?

Mr. COYNE: I did not want to see thousands of people implicated, and if the police had come with all their force to arrest me, I would not say what would have happened. So I said, if any of you want me, ring me up on the telephone. There is surely nothing very wrong about that, unless the Premier wanted me to do his bidding and break the law in some way or another, and that I would not do. But who is the person those loyal members gave their protection to? A man who, when a chimney stack was being erected, and the workmen proposed to hoist the Union Jack when they reached the top, as is customary in such cases, refused to allow them to do so unless they put the stars and stripes above it. That is the man they were protecting; that is the man who was the object of the care of those loyal subjects who prate so much about their loyalty to the King, and then fill the city of Brisbane with the drunken scum and criminals of Australia.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you say that those men who came from the country were the scum of Australia?

Mr. COYNE: I am not going to allow the hon. gentleman to put words into my mouth that I did not use. What I said was, that amongst these special constables were some of the greatest criminals in Australia, and some of the greatest scum of the earth. As I have only a limited time to speak, I shall now pass on to another topic. There are things which a man may say in the heat of an election campaign, and for which there may be forgiveness, if not some justification, but when a man who does not know you goes out of his way to hurl the greatest insult that can be conceived against a reputationally conducted man, I think such statements call for some refutation. The way in which I have been maligned during the recent election campaign is almost unprecedented. In nearly every case I have found that I have not been maligned by men of bad character. One man at Kingaroy stated that I had never worked a day in my life, except for two months when I was driving a coach for Cobb and Co., and spying out the land, and doing a bit of sharpening.

The HOME SECRETARY: Didn't you say you had been on strike all your life? If you were on strike, you could not have been working.

Mr. COYNE: I never worked for one moment for Cobb and Co. in any position whatever. Up to the time I came to this House, and more than half my lifetime,

Mr. Coyne.]

have I lived in Queensland, and those stories were going into circulation amongst men and women who have known me during that period of time. It had no effect there. I reared my family there. So far as being a sharper is concerned, I have never bet £5 in sweeps or anything else since I was 22 years of age. I have never bet 5s. on a horse in a race, I have never played two-up in my life, nor played dice. Had I been putting up for an electorate where I was not known, that might have had some effect, and no greater insult can be given a man who has reared his family as respectably as he possibly could, as I have endeavoured to do, than a remark of that sort. I am going to tell you who it was made by. It was made by a man who some time previous was the proprietor of a license on the Western line, somewhere between here and Toowoomba, and a man who had the reputation of being the greatest expert robber of drunks in Australia—who would first get men drunk in his hotel and then rob them. There were other men. What were they? We had them around Brisbane—said by the Peoples' Progressive League, no doubt. What were they? Why, the fingers of some of them were dripping with the blood of their latest victims they had murdered in their factories and shops by their sweating; and there are numbers of sycophants who are living on the previous parasites, and those are the fellows who have been vilifying me throughout the country. I challenge any of them to prove that their statements are correct. You had detectives going around Brisbane during the strike, inquiring from people if they knew anything about Coyne and his antecedents. I say that under the circumstances the extreme step that was taken by the Brisbane strikers was absolutely justifiable. If the Government had done their duty that would never have happened. They did not do their duty. They failed to do their duty all along. We had a beautiful picture of the Home Secretary going on his motor-car at top speed to Southport, knocking stumps, posts, and everything else down. (Laughter.) We had the Treasurer going away to the Blue Mountains, and the Secretary for Agriculture and the Secretary for Railways disappeared altogether.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is about equally as truthful as the rest of your statements.

Mr. COYNE: The Chief Secretary disappeared, too; he was going to let them "stew in their own juice." From the very time that this trouble originated, on the 18th January last, up to the time that the strike eventuated, and afterwards, this party did everything that was humanly possible to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Mr. HARDACRE. Hear, hear!

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Badger refused to meet the representatives of the men.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did he refuse to meet the men?

Mr. COYNE: As a union, he did. He refused to meet the representatives of the men.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We know that Judge Higgins compelled them to.

The PREMIER: Then why strike, if he could compel them?

Mr. COYNE: The strike brought about that early hearing of their case. The Government failed to do their duty, and

[Mr. Coyne.

through their failure to do their duty the strike took place. This party went to Mr. Badger, used every mediator that could possibly be used to try and bring about a settlement—the Archbishop of Brisbane, the Rev. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Finlayson, and others. Then he would not meet them. I got an invitation to the room of the Secretary for Public Works one day. He had been in solemn conclave with Mr. Badger all morning, but when we went there we found nothing at all to do. Mr. Barnes would meet us and discuss it, but we could not do any business with him. If he had had any authority to act for Mr. Badger we could have done something towards a settlement.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): I must congratulate our young members, who, like myself, perhaps, have very little experience in this House, and I am sure you will bear with us when we come to speak. (Hear, hear!) I am very glad to see by the Governor's Speech that he has travelled over this great State of ours. It would be a great benefit to the State if members had the opportunity of travelling over the State more than they have. I remember coming down one time from Winton, and meeting a gentleman who had spent a great deal of his time in the West, and he thought that if Parliament sat in Winton members would know more of our State than they do. I could not help thinking, while we have been sitting here, about our railways. I thought a great fuss was made about that $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I could not but think that we did not look at our railways in the light that we ought to do, and that we do not place them before our creditors in the light that we ought to do. Those people who lend us the money have a perfect right to know what the railways are bringing in, and while we only give them credit for $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it is nearer $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. that they bring in. I made special inquiries at the Lands Office this afternoon about the difference in the rents of land where we have no railways, and I find that where we have no railways the rents of Crown lands are offered as low as 5s. per square mile. In some places where we have railways, land is leased up to as high as £15 a square mile. I will take as the average £4 per square mile. That would leave at least £3 15s. per square mile to the credit of the Railway Department, which it does not get the credit of at all. That £3 15s. per square mile would more than cover the interest and redemption of the railways. Again, we find that land where there are no railways was offered for selection or sale by the Lands Department at 30s. per acre, but after the selectors guaranteed the railway, the same land was thrown open again, and sold readily at £6 per acre. In all fairness to the Lands Department, and the people in the country who are contributing this revenue, the Railway Department should have the credit of that £4 10s. per acre, which the Lands Department would not receive except for the railway. I make this statement because on some of our railways we have charged freights to an amount more than the value of the goods. I might mention soap, kerosene, and one or two articles which cost quite as much to take them 400 or 500 miles inland as what the goods are worth on the coast. I have no objection to raising the railway men's wages. It was mentioned by the Commissioner for Railways that something like £120,000 or £130,000 was added to the railway men's wages, on the ground that they had earned it. But they

have not earned it all, by any means. I say that the men who paid the freights have earned a portion of that, and should have had a certain portion of it in reduced freights. I am quite willing to divide that amount with the workers, but we have a perfect right when revenue is coming in like that to expect some reduction on our railway freights. One Opposition member was speaking about cheap food. As one of those producers, I want to know if we are going to put wages up, and be penalised from 25 to 50 per cent. on all our implements to enable the wages of the workers in the city to be kept up. If we are going to pay reasonable wages, and give good hours, I claim that we in the country have as much right to an eight-hour day, and to the benefit of the improved finances, as what the city people have.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: If we are going to pay these high duties, which in some cases amount to 200 per cent., how are we going to get cheap food?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Do away with the middleman.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Do you expect us to work sixteen hours a day to produce cheap food? I maintain that the time has come when this Government—and I am supporting this Government because I believe they will do it—gave a little consideration to the people in the country. People in cities have had the control of things long enough, and every burden of taxation for the last ten years has been brought forward with the one aim of placing the whole of the taxation upon the people in the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: Rub it into them. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I will rub it in to anybody who is not doing right. I am here to speak on behalf of the people in the country, and on behalf of those who are producing the nation's food. I want to say who are the real friends of the worker. I am a worker myself, and have worked as hard as any man. We were talking about the extra $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on our railway loan. Who gets that money?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The city.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: If we are going to build railways which cost £2,000 a mile, at least £1,500 out of every £2,000 will go to our workers and engineers. The remainder will go to rolling-stock. The Government who spends this money is the [9.30 p.m.] best friend of the worker. It is the money that the Government gets that makes the big demand for labour. If there is no demand for labour, the worker will not earn any money. It does not matter what decisions are given by Arbitration Courts or wages boards, if there is no demand for labour they will not get the work to do. In my own electorate I have seen many lovely homes erected by the workers. Where did they get that money to build those houses? It came out of the loan money of the Government, and who gets the benefit of it?

Mr. THEODORE: The boodler. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Does the boodler build our railways? (Laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: Who are the men who rob the farmers?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is you city men who rob the farmers. (Laughter.) But we have had enough of it, and the farmers are beginning to look after themselves. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) We have plenty of honest dealers in this city. There are men I have known for years and have dealt with them, but there are men in our midst, like in every other business, and they are nothing but rogues and vagabonds. (Laughter.) I shall have the pleasure of asking before long that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into some of their acts.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE: Is that a copy of the rural workers' schedule you are looking at?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No, it is not. The man who drew up that rural workers' schedule was not a worker at all. He was not a worker but a Trades Hall man.

Mr. FOLEY: And isn't he a worker?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No. (Laughter.) I would like to point out that in the dairying industry alone we are distributing about £200,000 per month. The whole of that sum is distributed in trade. We arrange all our shipping ahead; we take the trouble to see that that is all arranged beforehand. If you are going to do any business at all, you must do all your shipping ahead. We distribute £200,000 per month in the export and home trade, and if the distribution of that money stops, who is going to suffer? It is not the dairyman who is going to suffer, but the worker. That £200,000 circulated every month gives a lot of employment to employees in the shops. They all get the benefit of it in wages. I was in the shipping department of the Midland Railway Company, in Liverpool, and I know something about strikes. I always noticed that when there was a strike on there were a number of men who came into prominence who never did any work, and only came forward when there was a strike on. The moment the workmen down tools, these men come into the field and indulge in all sorts of liberties. I have seen these men throw the tiles from the roofs of the houses down on to the people below, and the working man got the blame for it.

Mr. RYAN: That is the same as happened in the recent strike.

Mr. FOLEY: The worker always gets the blame.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No doubt the very same thing occurred in Brisbane. I do not believe that the honest working man who does a hard day's work would do a thing like that. At the same time, when a large body of men like that are called into idleness, they must be given something to do, as it is impossible to control them. They are all right so long as they have got plenty to do, but when they have nothing to do they get out of control. The same thing happened in Brisbane, and the Government in bringing in men from the country to protect the people in the streets were also protecting the working men too. The Government in doing that only did their duty. I have a son who is in New Zealand at the present time, and if he had been home he would have been a special constable. I know of a case where two ladies driving in a cab in Queen street were stopped because they had some parcels with them. They were stopped by some men and asked where they got the parcels. The

Mr. Bebbington.]

men saw the labels on the parcels and one of the men got into the cab and made the cab-driver drive back to the place where the parcels came from. Any man who would not serve as a special constable when cases like that were happening is not worthy of being called a man.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Any man who would not defend his wife or sister in cases like that is not worth calling a man.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I would have served as a special constable myself when I heard of that incident.

Mr. HARDACRE: Could not the ordinary police have dealt with it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Decidedly not. I will not say any more about the strike, as there are others who, no doubt, will have something to say about it. With regard to our railways, an hon. member on the other side said that we were offering 4 per cent. for our loans, and yet the guarantors were only guaranteeing 3 per cent. While I believe in the guarantee lines as possibly the best way of getting away from political lines, I say that they are an injustice to the country people. Who helped to build the city lines? Who built all the lines near the coast? Did not the country people contribute towards their cost? Yes. And they are not asked to guarantee 1 per cent. And yet the country people have to guarantee any lines that they wished to have built in their districts. It is the same with the most northerly railway on the Flinders and the most southerly line on the McIntyre. I have been on the McIntyre myself, and know that before the line was built there were large areas of land there from which the Government received nothing in the way of rent. Immediately settlers came along and guaranteed the railway the land was taken up at 4d. an acre. You see the amount of money that was brought in before the railway was built. Yet at the sittings of the Land Court at Goodwindi the other day the lawyer for the Lands Department said to the settlers: "You are responsible for the rise in the rent, because the railway was built there." The settlers said: "No, we guaranteed that railway, and we should not have to pay more rent because we were responsible for bringing the railway here." The lawyer of the Lands Department said that that was a matter between the selectors and the Railway Department, but the Lands Department would make them responsible for the rise in the rent. The selectors guarantee the 3 per cent. to the Railway Department, and the Lands Department come along and make them pay more for their land.

Mr. MURPHY: Which lawyer won?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Lands Department won, of course. The man on the land had to go down, as he always does—every time. (Laughter.)

Mr. LAND: And yet you support the Government.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You people are responsible for it with your leasehold policy. Your leasehold policy is responsible for it. That is another thing I wished to speak about. The other day I was up on the Kingaroy line, and I visited a selection. The selector and his wife were the happiest

couple I ever saw. We walked up on the hill, and the selector said to me: "When I came here first I came through where that gate is with my axe on my shoulder, and I cleared the first 100 acres on bread and treacle, and the storekeeper gave me credit for the bread and treacle." If a Labour Government had been in power, and only gave a lease for that land, that man would never have done that work. It was only because he got the freehold, and knew that he was working for himself that made him do that. There is a perpetual lease principle existing in our present Land Act, but I trust that the Government will continue with their freehold principle, as people will not go in for leasehold when they can get the freehold. I would ask the hon. member for Leichhardt one question in connection with land settlement. There is a station not far from Emerald called St. Helens. I was on that station when it was offered for £500. There were a lot of settlers there who would have liked that station cut up into 10,000 acre blocks, and to get one. I am giving the hon. member a chance to refute this. That station was offered for £500, and the hon. member was asked to come down here and ask the Government to repurchase it. He went away, and no more was heard about it, but a private man came up after a bit and bought the station, and it is now worth £20,000. I want to know why the hon. member did not secure that land for his people, if he is so favourable to land settlement? I give him this opportunity of telling his own constituents what he did in the matter.

Mr. HARDACRE: I approached the Secretary for Lands, but he would not do it.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Explain that to your constituents. (Laughter.) I would like to point out that we want more for the country than we have had in the past. We need the wants of the country attended to. We want them brought up to the level of the cities, and we want the House and the Government to give the country people schools of arts and other facilities of that kind. In the cities they have everything, and unless life is made better and easier in the country, there will be a greater rush into the cities. If you want to keep the people in the country, and want them to produce cheap food, then give them the best conditions possible and make their lives as comfortable as possible. I thank hon. members for their courtesy.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): In rising to address the House to-night in connection with the very important questions that have been raised in the debate on the Address in Reply, I feel that I will not be able to do justice to them. At the beginning I might be permitted to remark, as a member of the Labour party, that we are not the "stinking fish" party. As a young Australian, and as one who has studied the questions that agitate the public mind, I may not have arrived at a correct judgment, yet I am bound to ally myself with that party whose principles, as I understand them, justify them in calling themselves the national party. We have heard a great deal during this debate about what the Labour party did in connection with the general strike. I, as a member of that party, do not give my adherence to the principle of a general strike, but there are times when

[*Mr. Bebbington.*]

these things are forced upon us, and when there is no other possible alternative between that or doing a thing which would redound with anything but to our credit. It may not be out of place to briefly refer to the chief circumstances which brought about that state of affairs. The hon. member for Barcoo referred to the chief circumstances that preceded the general strike, and I think he clearly demonstrated to impartial minds that the Government who occupied the Treasury benches previous to the last general elections, under the late Premier, Dr. Kidston, had determined to fight unionism. What is the exact position? You have in this State an alien who defies the laws of the Commonwealth, and who is supported in his defiance of those laws by the Ministry for the time being, who are freely prepared to spend public money to bolster up this individual, and, later on, when this same alien, without any more rights politically than a Chow gardener, defied the State law, the Government stood behind him and placed at his disposal all the powers that the Constitution allowed them, and then we have them coming here and endeavouring to convince its members that they stand for the maintenance of law and order irrespective of class. I say, from my place in the House, as I said from the hustings, that the Denham administration are responsible, by their masterly inactivity in making no effort to settle the dispute, for the strike. As one of those who went through the strike—as one of the victimised railway men, and one of those whom the people have sent here—I deem it my duty to give my views regarding their action in connection with that strike. The question, narrowed down, simply means this: Did the Government, recognising their responsibilities, take those measures that they were justified in taking in order to bring about a settlement of the difficulty? We hear preached from the Treasury benches the grand lesson of arbitration and conciliation. I was rather surprised to hear the Premier endorsing, at the close of his speech, that he, at any rate, is now a convert to the principle of arbitration. I remember the time when members who stand by the principles of this party advocated conciliation and arbitration in this House met with very little encouragement, if not determined opposition, from members occupying the Treasury benches in those days—the grand old Liberal party of those days—and it was not until the influence of labour in politics was felt that we had the question of conciliation and arbitration brought within the sphere of practical politics, and had some measures placed on the statute-book for the carrying out of that principle. If the Prime Minister of Great Britain did not think it beneath his dignity, nor the high responsibilities of his office, to endeavour to bring about a settlement in connection with the coal strike, why, might it be asked, did not the Premier of Queensland do likewise? I was rather amused to hear the Premier pointing out that those men were justified in going on strike—

The PREMIER: There is no court of conciliation there.

Mr. KIRWAN: Just so.

The PREMIER: And none of the resources we have in this country.

Mr. KIRWAN: Quite true; and when the men wanted to avail themselves of the privi-

leges of the Arbitration Court, what did the hon. members sitting behind the Premier do? What did members of the Cabinet associated with him do? Did they show their belief in the principle of arbitration? They tried to bring about a similar condition of affairs which the hon. gentleman says exists in Great Britain at the present time, where they have no court such as we have here. If the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Prime Minister of New Zealand could find time, and did not think it beneath the dignity of their high office to act as mediators in endeavouring to prevent a strike, and, when the thing had actually occurred, to bring about a settlement of the strike, I think even the Premier of Queensland, if he had recognised the high responsibilities of his office, and had not been overcome by a desire to show an absolute partisan spirit, might have made an effort.

The PREMIER: You are aware I did make an effort, are you not?

Mr. KIRWAN: We were told that the Premier said at Rocklea, according to the report in the *Courier*, that they could "stew in their own juice."

The PREMIER: The strike committee.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is no use for the hon. gentleman to try and qualify his words now. He referred to the strikers in general, and he had not time to disabuse the public mind of the enormity of his offence on that occasion until he found there was a possibility of losing the elections over it. The general impression is that the men were hauled out on strike by some power that exists in the Trades Hall. I would like to say, as one of the delegates who attended both conferences, that the general strike was the unanimous wish of the unionists of this city.

Mr. MACROSSAN: Did you join in the wish?

Mr. KIRWAN: When I come to the question of dealing with the particular strike, the hon. member will have my views on it. The unions decided to come out on strike, and when they decided that they decided for these reasons: They recognised that a regiment of the great Australian army of unionists was likely to be wiped out. That regiment appealed to them for assistance, and they said, "Are you going to see the right of combine denied to us? Are you going to see our rights as Australian citizens trampled on by this Yankee exploiter?" And if the unions of Brisbane had turned a deaf ear to the call for assistance by the tramway men, they might just as well, there and then, have disbanded their unions once and for all. During the South African war, when there appeared a possibility of the Union Jack being hauled down in that part of the British Dominions, what active part or interest had the residents of

[10 p.m.] other parts of the British Dominions in the struggle? And yet we have hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and their apologists throughout the State of Queensland and the Commonwealth of Australia, who said it was the duty of every Britisher, irrespective of what part of Her Majesty's dominions he resided in, to rally to the standard and keep the Union Jack flying in South Africa. "My country, right or wrong," they said; and we know what happened in this city to men who dared to exercise their rights as Britishers, and expressed their opinion about the South African war, and those who were responsible

Mr. Kirwan.]

for it. And if it was right for those Britishers, whether Australians, Canadians, or whatever part of the British Empire they might be resident in, to go to South Africa, if they thought fit, in order to maintain the flying of the Union Jack, then I say the unionists of Brisbane were more than ever justified in rallying to the standard and keeping the union flag flying.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: If any argument were required for the referendum to be passed when it is submitted to the people again, we have it in connection with the recent strike. When the question was submitted to the country before, the Premier and those on his side of the House told the people that there were ample powers under the State Constitution to deal with any question arising. And yet the same hon. gentleman, during his trip down the coast at the last general election, gave as an excuse in one of the Northern towns the reason why he did not take the same action as Mr. Asquith, that, while the power of the British House of Commons was unlimited, the power of the Queensland Parliament was limited. Now, when was the hon. gentleman telling the truth—when he addressed the people during the referendum campaign or when he spoke to them during the election campaign? However, at whatever time he may have been telling the truth, the exact facts of the position are plain—that if the referendum had been carried it would have facilitated the settlement of industrial disputes. I may say here, without committing myself to approval of the measure forecast in the Governor's Speech, that if that Bill contains provisions that will help in any way to get justice for employees or employers, or will help in any way to prevent strikes, the strongest advocates of the measure will rise in their places on this side of the House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: The Premier, in the course of his address, at some length endeavoured to prove that the city of Brisbane was in an awful state—in fact, that the condition of affairs was so bad that he was compelled to wire to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth for assistance. We heard a great deal about the action of the Prime Minister in refusing the military. Now, I contend that the Prime Minister was perfectly justified; and I am proud to belong to a party that is represented in the Federal Parliament, and that the people of Australia, have called upon to administer its national affairs—a party which has a Prime Minister who was courageous enough to stand up and refuse to send the military to Brisbane to shoot down workers, their wives, and their children.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: As I touch on this question, it may not be out of place to quote just a few opinions—not of Labour men—not of Labour supporters—but, adopting the attitude of the Premier, I will quote some of those good staunch Liberals and their views on the action of the Prime Minister. There was a debate in the Federal Parliament last November, when a motion was moved in the Senate by Senator Rae. The motion was—

“That, in the opinion of the Senate—

“1. The Defence Act should be so amended as to clearly set forth that the

object of creating a Citizen Defence Force based upon universal compulsory military training and service is for the purpose of defending the Commonwealth against possible foreign aggression, and, therefore, under no circumstances should any person so enrolled be compelled to bear arms against any fellow Australian citizen notwithstanding anything contained in the oath of allegiance or in any other conditions of compulsory service.

“2. That the foregoing resolution be conveyed by message to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.”

During the debate it was pointed out that under the present Constitution the Commonwealth Executive had no option but to grant the military if asked for by the States. Senator Clemons, I understand, is one of those grand Liberal lights in the Senate, and in the course of the debate he said—

“Who is to decide what is domestic violence?”

“Senator GARDINER: According to this section, the decision rests with the Executive Government of the State concerned.

“Senator CLEMONS: Certainly not. The Executive Government of the State may apply to the Commonwealth Government for protection, but the latter is not bound to comply with the application.”

On the next page, 2160, Senator Gardiner said—

“I believe that this is the very interpretation which, under other conditions, our honourable friends opposite would put on the section. I believe that it is not capable of any other interpretation, except, of course, a strained one.

“Senator CLEMONS: If you say that, you put the Commonwealth Military Forces practically at the caprice of a State Government. You can imagine a State Government saying, “This is domestic violence,” when it may be nothing of the sort. Is the Commonwealth going to listen to that?”

It was pointed out that the Commonwealth Government were not bound to send the military simply because the Executive of any State, in a panic-stricken moment, saw blood and riot where none actually existed; and when they saw fit, as happened in the case of this State, through the Governor of the State, to slander law-abiding citizens. Now, let me quote one of the papers of our city. I do not think anyone would accuse the *Telegraph* of being a Labour organ; yet let me say this for the *Brisbane Telegraph*—that though there are many times when you cannot agree with its articles or arguments or its views, still it makes an attempt to reason a case out. On 21st June, in an article on “No Confidence,” referring to the motion of censure in the Federal Parliament, the *Telegraph* said—

“This motion of censure is primarily based on the refusal of the Prime Minister to call out the military during that late seditious strike in Brisbane. The Prime Minister has been supplied with an irrefragable answer to the indictment now levelled against him. Immediately on the receipt of the Prime Minister's refusal, the State Premier almost tri-

[Mr. Kirwan.

unphantly declared that the military were not required to preserve order, as he had ample civic forces at hand to protect the community, and his confidence was well proven by the sequel. All that apart, however, the question whether the Commonwealth Government—Fisher Government, or any other Government, does not matter—is bound—constitutionally bound—on the demand of a State, to call out the military should be finally settled. Most certainly that question will not, for it cannot be settled by carrying this motion of censure on the Fisher Government, for even should it be carried it would not set any precedent nor establish any constitutional interpretation binding on any future Government. The assumption in regard to section 119 of the Constitution is that its terms are mandatory, and not permissive. That is a very doubtful contention. Indeed, it is a contention that appears to be absurd. Did the framers of the Constitution intend thus absolutely to geld the executive Government of the Commonwealth of all responsibility? Such a suggestion is grossly ridiculous. Assuming it to be sound, what a series of splendid absurdities may be drawn from it. Would the Commonwealth Government be obliged, on the panic call of a defaulting State Government, to disperse constitutionalists with gatlings and cavalry. Surely the Commonwealth must have discretionary power to decide whether or not any disturbance in the State amounts to domestic violence likely to lead to wholesale insurrection against constituted authority."

It would thus be seen that there are authorities that can be quoted on the Liberal side who view this question dispassionately, and who give judgment in favour of the stand taken by the Prime Minister. We heard a great deal to-night when the Premier was speaking about how he maintained law and order. One would imagine that an awful state of affairs existed in the city of Brisbane. I say that, in the first place, the Government broke the law; and, in the second place, the only persons responsible for any disorder were those people the Government specially enrolled to preserve order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: The ordinary rights of a citizen in the city of Brisbane were practically suspended. All those grand privileges we hear about that are guaranteed to us, not only by the British Constitution, but also by our own Constitution, were entirely suspended. You could not stand in any of the leading streets of the city and speak a few words to a friend without being moved on. As we know perfectly well, that on the Friday and Saturday, if you did not move sufficiently fast to satisfy the judgment of some of those special constables, they gently tapped the back of your head—some of them—with a baton.

Mr. RYAN: Absolutely illegal.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is the first time I have known of such powers being exercised without first reading the Riot Act. If the disorder was of such a character as it is said to have been, I contend, if the Government were sincere in their desire to preserve order, and if they had any respect

for the law-abiding citizens of the place, they would have read the Riot Act; and then, if the disorder still continued, they could have exercised those powers. But nobody would seriously contend that any such disorder existed, or that any such violence was at any time attempted, nor is there any evidence that such violence was going to be resorted to, that the wholesale batoning of men, women, and in some instances children, should be resorted to. During the election campaign some of the Ministers, and a number of their supporters, actually wept on the public platform when describing the awful harrowing scenes that in their imagination existed during the terrible time when the city was held up by the strike committee. I remember reading some of their speeches about women and children who could not get bread; yet, when the women of Fortitude Valley went to Enever's bakery, in Leichhardt street, they were batoned. Can the Premier, or any of his apologists deny that? I charge the Government with taking no action whatever to prevent dastardly outrages being committed on peaceable law-abiding citizens waiting for bread to be baked. The hon. member for Barcoo, the other evening, asked a question in connection with a special constable. A peaceable old gentleman was standing talking to a policeman in uniform near Scott's boarding-house in Roma street, when one of those specials, for no reason whatever, drew his baton and struck him, and the man dropped like a log into the water-table. The Home Secretary had the audacity to tell the hon. member, in answering the question, that there was a riot. There was no riot at all. Those are the facts; and I challenge anyone on that side to refute them. The man was let go.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Wasn't he made a C.M.G.?

Mr. KIRWAN: It's a wonder he wasn't made a C.M.G.; he is just as much entitled to it as some of the recent appointments. There are men who, in the excitement of the moment, and to express their disgust and difference of opinion regarding men who had taken their positions, used the word "scab"; but let us remember that during the by-election not very long ago, at Rosewood, the Premier of the State of Queensland used the word "scab" on a public platform.

The PREMIER: In reply to an interjection.

Mr. KIRWAN: And he embellished it with an adjective to make it more expressive of his feelings. Men who used that word during the late industrial upheaval were hauled before the magistrate, and fined heavily; but when a special constable batoned an unoffending citizen the Government made no attempt to preserve law and order.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The special was sacked. What more do you want?

Mr. KIRWAN: Reference has been made to the strike of railway men. I would like to say a few words in connection with that matter; and would like to place the facts of that strike of railway men before the House. And I shall have something to say afterwards about the attitude of the Government towards the railway men who went out on strike. The facts, briefly summarised, are that it was intended to wait upon the

Commissioner for Railways on the Monday morning previous to the general strike, in order to discuss with him the question of the supply of coal to Mr. Badger. The Commissioner was not in Brisbane, but the Deputy Commissioner expressed a wish to meet certain representatives of certain railway organisations, and have a chat with them. Accordingly, representatives of the Engine Drivers' Association, Firemen and Cleaners' Association, a section of the guards—not the Guards' Association—and the Queensland United Railway Employees' Association, formed a deputation and waited upon the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Pagan, and discussed with him the question as to how the strike was likely to affect the railway men. It was pointed out to Mr. Pagan that the feeling was pretty strong among railway men that if the question reached an acute stage—that is, if a general strike eventuated—the men who were unionists could not go back on their mates, but would assist them to try to effect a stoppage of the supply of coal as far as Mr. Badger was concerned. After the representatives had spoken, the Deputy Commissioner intimated that he was not prepared to give a decision just then, as it was a matter of very serious import, but said he would give a decision next day. We went to him the next day, and received his decision, which, summarised, was that he was a common carrier, that he had entered into certain contracts, and that he would have to fulfil those contracts. In conclusion, he said he would not ask any railway man to shunt or haul coal that was loaded after 6 o'clock that evening. That was on the Tuesday, and the general strike eventuated at 6 o'clock that day. The Deputy Commissioner further stated that coal on wheels up to that hour would have to be drawn by drivers or shunted by shunters. One of the representatives present of the Engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association said he could pledge his association to loyally accept the decision; the representative of the guards spoke in a similar strain. Mr. Hanlon, a shunter at Roma street, and myself as the representative of the United Railway Employees' Association, intimated that we could not pledge our associations, but that we would lay the Deputy Commissioner's answer before our association at a special meeting which had been convened for that night, and would afterwards convey the decision of the members to Mr. Pagan. A mass meeting was held that night in the Protestant Hall, and the question was fully thrashed out. Various statements were made during the strike as to how the railway men came out. One statement was that a lot of men who were not in the railway got into the meeting and voted in favour of the strike. I give that statement an emphatic contradiction. It was also said that a number of lad porters were responsible for the strike. That is equally untrue. The whole question was fairly laid before the members. I gave my pledge to the Deputy Commissioner that I would lay the facts before the meeting, and I think I carried out that pledge faithfully. I laid the full facts before the meeting, and some men present thought I did not speak as I ought to have spoken, but I recognised the responsibility which rested upon my shoulders, and pointed out that to go on strike was a very serious matter, and that they had to consider that a number in the hall

[*Mr. Kirwan.*]

who were in favour of the strike were not unionists. I further pointed out that they were Government employees, and, knowing the Government as I did, I warned them that if they went on strike they must be prepared for the worst. Any man who says that the railway men were misled, or that they went out under a delusion, states what is not true. Every man in that room that night knew perfectly well why they were going on strike. I appealed to them as a body of men to decide according to their own conscience, whether they would strike or not, and said, "Once you come out in a body, stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight." The men decided to go on strike. Out of that large meeting of nearly 500, only twelve voted against the motion; and let me say to their credit that those twelve came out with their mates, and some of them are victimised to-day. What action did the Government take in connection with the railway men after the general strike was over? After a lot of serious consideration, they decided to appoint a Board of Inquiry. I contend that the reasons given for the appointment of that Board of Inquiry are mere subterfuges. That Board of Inquiry, to my mind, was brought into existence for no other reason than to humiliate the men. If you will only look at some of the questions which were put to some of the men, and note how the men who stood up in front of the board and told the truth, and did not lie, have been victimised for their manhood, you will see evidence of my statement. If the men had gone into that room, and said, "I am prepared to obey the regulations; I won't strike again; I am sorry I had anything to do with the strike; I believe the Trades Hall people were responsible for the strike," and if they had mentioned certain leaders of the strike and denounced them, those men would have been put on again. But because they asserted their manhood they have been victimised—the Railway Department has no room for those men. Let me say here that those who stand for the principles of manhood, and who say they are prepared to do a certain thing again because they believe it is right, are the men who will render the best service to the Commissioner and the travelling public. I should like to know from the Minister for Railways how the work of the highly-paid officials who constituted that board was done while they were holding the inquiry. They were away from their posts for a fortnight, and yet apparently their work in the Department was done as well as when they were present, or perhaps better. If those men could be spared for a fortnight, what constitutes their work in the Department? If they could be spared for a fortnight to cross-question and humiliate men, I think their services should be dispensed with altogether. Speaking as one among the humbler ranks of railway employees, I may say that if one of my staff was absent through illness, I was compelled to get a man to take his place; but apparently these highly-paid officials can absent themselves from their responsible offices for a full fortnight in order to conduct a partial inquiry, and their work goes on as well as if they are at their posts. At any rate, I have not heard of any trouble while they were sitting as a Board of Inquiry. Who is responsible for what has taken place in connection with that inquiry? Is it the Minister or the Cabinet or the Commissioner? Who is responsible for the

fact that any man who gave straightforward evidence at the inquiry has not been again employed by the department? I should be sorry from my place here to attack any official who cannot defend himself. As far as Mr. Evans, the Commissioner, is concerned, the general opinion in the railway service was that he was an official [10.30 p.m.] who was prepared to give a fair deal to the rank and file of the service. Whether he is responsible for this or not, I cannot say. I should be sorry to think that he is, but some of these railway men to-day are walking the streets of Brisbane, unable to get a day's work, simply because they asserted their manhood, and decided to come out and stand to their mates and try and keep the flag of unionism flying. I want some of the Ministers to rise in their place and justify this system of slow starvation that is the result of this vindictive policy of victimisation that they have instituted as far as these men are concerned. How have they treated the men who have gone back, men with a first-class record and long service? They have made them start at the bottom of the ladder. What is worse, there are some partisan officials in this department. The day of reckoning will come—the Liberals will not always occupy the Treasury benches.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Victimisation!

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Retribution.

Mr. KIRWAN: Someone calls out "Victimisation." I do not stand as an advocate of victimisation—I do not believe in it; but if these officials believe in this vindictive policy that they are carrying out—whether it is under the instructions of the Minister or the Commissioner or the Cabinet, I do not know—if they get a dose of their own medicine they would have very little reason to complain. I hope that such will not be done. I am appealing on behalf of the men who have gone back, and I ask this Government if they have any feeling at all—

Mr. BOWMAN: Any "bowels of compassion."

Mr. KIRWAN: If they are not absolute hypocrites, and if all their talk about starving women and children is sincere, to give the men a fair deal. I believe the Treasurer shed crocodile tears on the platform at Bulimba about the women and children who could not get bread, and yet his Government by their vindictive action is depriving these women and children of the ordinary necessities of life. I would also like to point out that the general public are suffering through this policy. The majority of the staff that worked with me at the Central Station are back in the Railway Department. Some are in the goods-shed, others are scattered at Toowoomba, Dalby, and other places. It was generally admitted that previous to the strike the staff at the Central Station was efficient, and that the work was carried out satisfactorily. At the present time these men are not being put back at the station, although it would not mean displacing anyone else; it would be no injustice to the loyalists. The department has even gone to the extent of victimising the loyalists in its desire to carry out this vendetta against the men who went out on strike. They have brought men from Dalby, Warwick, Toowoomba, Gympie, and Maryborough to Brisbane to fill the men's places, and dragged them away from their homes and families. The position is now that these men could be sent back. I know of one instance in which

a striker in Brisbane wants to get back to a certain place this side of Ipswich. There is a loyalist there, and it would suit him to be at Brisbane, because his family resides here, but the department will not grant an exchange, simply because they would be doing a favour to a striker. Does the Minister know that this is done? If he is not aware of it, it is time he inquired into some of the working which is going on in the department. During my period at the Central Station I endeavoured to get a staff which would be quite sufficient. Brisbane Central Station is the only place in the Commonwealth where you see lad porters doing men's work and getting boys' wages. The whole plan of the Central Station is a disgrace to the Government. If the Sydney mail train comes in on an evening on which it is raining, and there is an extra coach on the train, you have all the luggage bundled out, and the passengers stand in the rain to get their luggage.

Mr. WHITE: Shocking!

Mr. KIRWAN: If a certain number of strikers who went out at the Central Station could do the work, I want to know why the same number cannot do it at the present time, and why an extra staff has to be employed? Taking it altogether, I think the Railway Department could do with a very good overhaul. The hon. member for Drayton argued that there should be some decrease in the freights consequent on the increase in the railway revenue. I say that the railway men of Queensland are the most efficient staff in the Commonwealth, and they are the worst paid, and there is not a bigger sweating institution in Queensland than the Railway Department. The men who do the work do not get the pay, and there are lads doing men's work only earning from 18s. to £1 5s. a week. There are lads in the parcels office at the Central Station getting less than £100 a year, doing work the responsibility in connection with which should entitle them to a much larger salary. But if the railway men of Queensland are not prepared to make some determined move in the shape of unionism, then their present conditions, as far as wages and hours are concerned, will continue. I might finish up my reference to railway matters by asking the Minister to observe the conditions under which the women have got to work in the carriage-shed. The conditions there are an absolute disgrace, and I challenge the hon. gentleman at the head of the Railway Department to produce a doctor's certificate to show that these women are working under humane and proper conditions. Medical testimony can be produced to show that these women are suffering from various sicknesses, all brought about by the filthy, dirty, and insanitary conditions surrounding that shed. The hon. member for Murilla stated that a large number of those who took part in the processions never did a day's work. The interjection is characteristic of the hon. member and of the party he is supporting, as they are never tired of slandering the workers. The majority of the men who took part in the processions were honest and industrious workers, and it ill becomes the hon. member for Murilla to slander such men. If he repeated such a slander outside he might be sorry for it.

Mr. BOWMAN: They would slander him.

Mr. MORGAN: I did say it on the public platform outside.

Mr. BOWMAN: You said it in the dark.

Mr. Kirwan.]

Mr. KIRWAN: The Premier in his remarks wished to infer that the transport workers of Sydney were not in favour of the Brisbane strike, and would not assist the strike in any way. I remember the Premier making a declaration that he was going to open the port of Brisbane, but by his action he closed the port more effectually than the strike committee could have done. When the transport workers of Sydney became aware of the actual facts of the Brisbane strike, they decided to render assistance, and they gave it in this way: When a ship arrived in Sydney from Brisbane and it was found that it was loaded by free labour, it was hung up in the harbour, as the transport workers would not touch it. That was how they helped the Brisbane strike. The position became so acute that the shipping companies in Brisbane would not take cargo for Sydney.

Mr. COYNE: There is no such organisation as the Transport Workers' Federation.

Mr. KIRWAN: I am glad of that interjection. It shows that it was a movement on the part of our opponents to down the Brisbane strike. While I admit that the strike did a certain amount of harm to the party, and while I admit that we gave our opponents a weapon to use and enable them to carry on a campaign of misrepresentation and mendacity unequalled or unheard of in any political struggle previously, and enabled them to beat us in the country; still, in the commercial centre of Brisbane, where the strike took place, where the strike was well known, where we were told that the shops were hung up and the women and children were crying for bread after all the terrible acts of violence that were supposed to have been committed, we returned a striker as member.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: It was none of my seeking to try to get into Parliament. I wanted to go back to my job in the Railway Department, as I had no desire to seek political honours. But when I found I was victimised and refused permission to re-enter the service, although my record was a first-class one, as the Commissioner himself could testify if he liked, as I did my duty to the Commissioner and to the travelling public—when, therefore, a body of workers asked me to stand, I acceded to their request, never thinking that I was going to be successful, and that I would be returned as their representative. However, I am here, and I hope I shall do nothing nor say anything during the course of my career in this Assembly that will bring discredit on myself. On all occasions I will do my best to uphold the best traditions of this House. (Hear, hear!) Although I may express my opinions fearlessly and most unmistakably, and reserve my right to criticise strongly the actions of my opponents on the Treasury benches according to the rights and privileges of this House, I hope I will do nothing to bring discredit on myself. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed. The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

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

[*Mr. Kirwan.*