

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 17 JULY 1912

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 17 JULY, 1912.

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

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—

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

QUESTIONS.

REMOVAL OF J. S. COLLINGS FROM COMMISSION OF PEACE.

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*) asked the Premier—

“1. Was the name of Joseph Silver Collings removed from the commission of peace during February last?

“2. If it was so removed, at whose instigation primarily and upon whose order finally?

"3. For what reason was the name removed?"

"4. Was any official notification conveyed to Mr. J. S. Collings that his name had been removed?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. The Government.

"3. Conduct unbecoming a justice of the peace.

"4. Yes; in the usual way—by notification in the *Government Gazette*."

ISSUE OF FREE SEASON TICKETS TO SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. ADAMSON asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. Since he authorised the issue of free season tickets from the 22nd April to children of denominational schools who have passed the fifth standard or an equivalent, will he also authorise that such tickets be issued to children attending private schools who have attained a similar standard?"

"2. How many free season tickets have been issued, and what schools do the children attend who have received those tickets?"

"3. Does he not think that it would have been more in harmony with political decency had he waited until after the last general election before he authorised the issuing of these tickets?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. K. M. Grant, *Fitzroy*) replied—

"1. The date authorised for the issuing of the tickets was the 29th April and not the 22nd April. The privilege extends to children attending approved secondary schools in the authorised centres.

"2. Particulars are not available at present.

"3. The date for the issuing of the tickets was fixed for two days after the date of the last general election."

I desire to point out to the hon. member that the answer to this question involves an expression of opinion, which, according to parliamentary practice, as laid down in the 11th edition of "May," page 250, should not be sought.

Mr. THEODORE: It is the Speaker who should say that.

WAGES BOARD FOR BRUSH, BROOM, AND BASKET-MAKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. BERTRAM (*Marce*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. Why did he refuse to establish a wages board for the brush, broom, and basket-making industry?"

"2. Why was no reply sent, as promised, to the members of the deputation which waited on him on 21st March last?"

"3. Is he still opposed to the establishment of a wages board for the brush, broom, and basket-making industry?"

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"1. Application was originally refused, but is now being reconsidered.

"2. See reply to No. 1.

"3. See reply to No. 1."

ALLEGED MURDER OF ARTHUR COZZELL.

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Is he aware that a man, by name Arthur Cozzell, is alleged to have been murdered on or near Turkey Station, in the Gladstone district, on 11th February, 1912?"

"2. What steps have been taken to discover the supposed murderer, 'George Daniells,' and also the present location of the girl, Edie Anderson, who is reported to have disappeared with him?"

"3. Has any inquiry been held as regards the death of Arthur Cozzell?"

"4. Has any reward been offered?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Systematic and thorough search of neighbourhood where crime was committed, and surrounding districts. Full particulars of crime, together with photograph and descriptions of the supposed murderer and the girl who is reported to have disappeared with him, have been published in the *Police Gazette*, and circulated throughout the Commonwealth and other parts of the world. The whole Police Force of the State has been on the alert in connection with this matter.

"3. The holding of the inquiry was arranged for in June, but owing to floods and other circumstances has been postponed.

"4. No."

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. THEODORE (*Chillagoe*) said: As a member prominently connected with the union movement in Queensland, I desire to address a few remarks on the subject of the recent strike.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Not done yet?

Mr. THEODORE: It has been said that the Government went to the country at the recent elections, making the sole issue the Brisbane strike, and it has been contended by certain supporters of the Government that it was the chief determining factor in returning them to this Chamber with a majority. I do not intend to go into the probable effect of the redistribution of seats, nor do I intend to dwell upon the fact that the Labour party increased its aggregate vote for Queensland at the recent election over the vote at the previous election by over 40,000 votes, and that the Government party increased its aggregate vote by only 29,000. I think it unnecessary at this juncture, however, to dwell upon this point. I merely desire to refute, so far as in me lies, the scandalous misstatements that have been made regarding the general strike; misstatements which have been made by members sitting on the other side of the

House and by the public Press. It is not my intention to go into the history of the general strike. That has been done by the hon. member for Barcoo and by the hon. member for Warrego, and a very fine résumé of what happened during that industrial upheaval was given in the Federal Parliament by Mr. Finlayson, Federal member for Brisbane. I should like to say, if I may be permitted, that I hope the Labour organisations will reprint that speech and distribute it very largely throughout Queensland, because it is a speech which contains a very fine history of the events leading up to the strike from a man whose knowledge of the events and happenings, and whose integrity and probity cannot be questioned, although the Treasurer the other evening, in a spirit of churlishness, did seek to cast reflections upon the veracity of Mr. Finlayson. But when we consider that the Treasurer was probably inspired by deep political bitterness, we can make a little allowance for him, and permit my statement to stand. I should like, first of all, to give my views upon the general strike doctrine. I think the general strike idea may now be called a doctrine. A great deal has been spoken about it and written about it during the last few years. It has formed the subject of many speeches and lectures, and also of a great deal of literary controversy. In my opinion, some upheavals in the nature of a general strike may be highly justifiable, and those who participate in them deserve considerable credit. On the other hand, in certain circumstances, a general strike may mean a violation of the dictates of common sense, and may be repugnant to the accepted idea of the requirements of public order. If we have regard to the conditions of the proletariat in all countries of the world—if we reflect that at least 80 per cent. of the workers of every country in the world are condemned to a miserable, hopeless, and laborious existence and to end their days in poverty and often under the most miserable circumstances—when we have regard to these things, I claim, without going into more elaborate particulars, that most of the general strikes that have occurred hitherto have been highly justifiable. The arguments that can be urged against a general strike can be urged with equal logic against every other kind of strike. The arguments that stand good in favour of a sectional strike are equally applicable to the general strike. I might say that each of these methods are the principles of bodies of workers who endeavour to secure better conditions or the elimination of evils in connection with their employment, not by legislative means, but by means of direct action. Men who are dissatisfied and have come to the conclusion that the ordinary methods of improving their conditions or securing redress of their grievances are not suitable to the occasion, have to resort to other means, even to violence. I should like to say that the union of which I have the honour to be president, the Amalgamated Workers' Association of Queensland, having a membership of 11,000, working in various industries and in every part of Queensland—that union has frequently had to resort to the method of direct action. There are no legal methods, no constitutional means, by which they can get favourable consideration to their requirements, nor can they get redress of grievances which are so apparent. Therefore it is that during the last four

years we have had strikes in the mining industry, on railway construction works, in the sugar industry, and against local authorities. These strikes have been eminently justifiable, because that has been the only means by which those men could improve their condition and attain the object for which they are banded together. On the question of a general strike, it is the circumstances which either justify or condemn it, and that has been the case in connection with the Brisbane strike. It is the circumstances which led up to the strike and which applied during the upheaval which justified that strike, and knowing, as members of the Government do know, that it is always the circumstances which will justify or condemn the actions of a body of men in the eyes of the public—knowing that, their every action has been taken with due regard to that principle. They have had a desire to create circumstances which are unfavourable to the men, in order that the men may be discredited in the eyes of the public. I shall ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give regard to the correspondence on the subject of the application by the State Governor for protection from the Commonwealth Government during the recent general strike and the refusal thereof by the Commonwealth Government. In this correspondence is given the first evidence of the intention of the Government to create unfavourable circumstances for the strikers in the eyes of the public. I may say that the title to the correspondence is wholly misleading and erroneous and it would have been nearer the mark if it had been entitled "Correspondence on the subject of the application of the State Government for the military to shoot at the public of Brisbane."

Mr. KIRWAN: Hear, hear! Why do they not state it straight out?

Mr. THEODORE: I would ask your attention to what the Premier said in this correspondence—his deliberate attempt to bulldoze the Governor on the merits of the strike in Brisbane. In his letter dated 1st February he says—

"I may state, for Your Excellency's information, that the city of Brisbane, in consequence of the current strike, may at any moment be the scene of riot and bloodshed. Already matters have reached the stage at which the State police are unable to preserve order, and firearms have been employed to prevent the constabulary arresting a man guilty of riotous conduct."

In that paragraph of the Premier's letter there are three deliberate lies. The first statement that in consequence of the strike bloodshed was imminent was intended to convey the impression to the Federal Government that the strikers were contemplating an attack upon certain citizens of Brisbane. That was a malicious lie, as the current newspapers will prove. The further statement that the police were unable to preserve order is also refuted by the newspaper accounts on that and the following day. The statement that firearms were employed to prevent the constabulary effecting the arrest of a man guilty of riotous conduct is another malicious lie. On the question of the contemplation of the strikers to indulge in an orgy of bloodshed and make a brutal attack on the citizens, let me quote

Mr. Theodore]

from the *Courier*, a partisan paper in favour of the Government, and a paper not likely to exaggerate anything in favour of the strikers. I will read what it says on the question of public order on those two dates. It was on 1st February that this correspondence was addressed to the Governor, in which it was stated that bloodshed was imminent. The *Courier* says—

“The Trades Hall was at once the storm centre and the point on which interest centred. There at an early hour a large crowd assembled. Members of the different unions on strike appeared to form up in the streets, as procession after procession continued to arrive. Each new batch was received with wild cheers, and the crowd slowly augmented, until by 10.30 Turbot street and adjoining thoroughfares, and the park above, presented a sea of faces. The men were orderly in their demeanour, and little drunkenness was observed. The Police Commissioner last night (Wednesday) reported that there had been very little disorder.”

On Wednesday night very little disorder! At 2 o'clock on Thursday—less than twenty-four hours afterwards—the Premier had advised the Governor to wire the Governor-General, asking for the military to shoot down the people of Brisbane in order to avert bloodshed! The irony of the thing! This is another extract from the *Courier* of the following day, and refers to the incidents on Thursday, the precise time when the State Government made application for the military. The *Courier* says—

“A well-known brewery firm was desirous of removing several barrels of beer which lay exposed in the sun at the Roma-street sheds. The lorry got safe to the sheds. . . . On arrival in Market Square the vehicle was blocked by a huge mob, who seemed determined to prevent its passage.”

It must be remembered that this huge mob—a mass of 20,000 citizens—were gathered in Market Square, listening to an address from the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Bowman. The lorry deliberately attempted to make its way through this dense crowd of people, and the newspaper goes on to remark—

“The driver attempted to force his way through, and the vehicle was then slowed across the square and brought to a standstill in the gutter. The mounted police rode into the crowd. . . . Foot by foot the ‘red ribbonites’ gave way. . . . With the roadway sufficiently clear the order to double was given, and with the police as a body-guard and a line of troopers behind, a dash was made down Albert street to Mary street. Many thousands participated in the mad dash. . . .

“The Commissioner of Police next appeared on the scene in his motor car. . . . Finding the crowd now getting increasingly angry and turbulent, the police were ordered to charge them, and, . . . batons were drawn to drive back the surging mob.

“The crowd was driven back from Albert street to Queen street, and another crowd that had gathered was dispersed in another direction. . . .

[*Mr. Theodore.*

“Just at this juncture a shot was fired; no one seemed quite to realise from whence it came.”

Mr. COYNE: Oh, yes; they knew where it came from.

Mr. THEODORE: I quote that paragraph to show that two of these statements in the Premier's letters were false—that firearms were not used to prevent the arrest of any person guilty of riotous conduct, because no one, on the showing of the newspapers, seemed to realise where the shot came from. It is known since that a policeman fired the shot, a sub-inspector, and that has not been denied by the Minister in charge of that department. It is evident to anyone with a particle of common sense and fairness in his composition, and who has read the newspaper reports of the occurrence, that firearms were not used to prevent the arrest of anyone on that day, yet an attempt was made to bulldoze the Governor, and foist the same story on the Federal Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It was specifically denied that the police fired the shot.

Mr. BARBER: A policeman did fire it.

Mr. THEODORE: I should like to point out that when the Home Secretary was speaking the other day, he never made mention of the shot, nor did he make reference to the statement in this letter that shots were fired to prevent the arrest of any person. It was a deliberate untruth when it was made.

Mr. LAND: It was a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOWMAN: It was justified.

The SPEAKER: It is never justified.

Mr. BOWMAN: I was justified in saying it last night when the Minister for Works was using language that was a wilful perversion of the truth.

The SPEAKER: There is no justification for unparliamentary language being used in this Chamber on any occasion, either by interjection or any other way. If hon. members cannot couch their language in parliamentary terms, it is a regrettable reflection on this Chamber.

Mr. THEODORE: I hope that this interjection will not be taken as applying to myself.

The SPEAKER: No; it applies to the hon. member for Balonne, who interjected.

Mr. THEODORE: I wish to emphasise that there are three misstatements in that letter. The statement of the police being unable to preserve order is, on the face of it, an obvious falsehood, because the newspaper report which I have read shows that the police had complete control of the crowd on Thursday, the precise time at which this telegram was despatched. The Home Secretary the other night read some of the correspondence referring to the distribution of flour. Quoting from a letter which had been despatched to each local authority within the metropolitan area, the Home Secretary said—

“The delivery of flour to the depôts will be at the cost of the Government,

as also will the cost of distribution thereof. Adequate police protection will be accorded to all concerned."

That letter was despatched on 2nd February, about twenty hours after the letter had been despatched to the Commonwealth Government asking for the military to shoot down the people because the police had been unable to keep order. How on earth are they going to reconcile those two statements—the statement on the one hand to the Federal Government that the police were unable to maintain order, and the statement, on the other hand, that the Government would guarantee police protection whilst flour was distributed to any portion of the city? I think they are at complete variance with each other, and bear out what I said, that there was an attempt on the part of the Government to create false circumstances, to make the public of Queensland view the general strike in a wrong light, and draw wrong deductions and conclusions in order to injure those who were engaged in that movement. I would like further to say that apparently His Excellency was, as it was intended by the Premier, entirely misled as to the importance of the happenings then going on in Queensland, because we find that he repeated to His Excellency the Governor-General the misstatements that had been made to him by the Premier; in fact, he supplements them, and asks that protection which is provided for under a certain section of the constitution should be forwarded to Brisbane. The Premier's statement goes to the Governor, and his advice for that statement to be forwarded to the Federal authorities does not square with his statement of the case to Sir John Quick a few days ago. It appears that Sir John Quick has been put up in the Federal Parliament to make out a case for the State Government of Queensland, and he applied to the Premier for information as to his reasons for making application for the military, and we find that the Premier made statements to Sir John Quick entirely at variance with the statement contained in the letter to His Excellency the State Governor of Queensland. This is his statement to Sir John Quick, and I should like to call the attention of hon. members to the different circumstances that he says influenced him in this letter, compared with the letter which he sent to the State Governor. He says—

"Request for Commonwealth protection proceeded from Police Commissioner, who considered his force unequal to cope with general strike developing into an insurrection. Agents of strike committee compelled business men close premises and their employees to cease work except where permit was granted by strike committee, force being employed to secure obedience, even physicians ordered to get permits to visit patients. Bakers and butchers prevented from trading and cabmen from plying. Vehicles loaded with goods could not proceed without police protection. At time State Governor made appeal for Commonwealth help Brisbane streets were in possession of many thousand strikers, behaving riotously and menacingly, and real control of affairs was in hands, not of State Government, but of strike committee. In such circumstances, I respectfully came to conclusion police

inadequate preservation order, life, and property, and invoked Commonwealth aid."

That is entirely different from what he told the State Governor. He told the State Governor that firearms were used to prevent the arrest of persons guilty of riotous conduct, and asked for the military to be sent to help maintain order. I wonder

[4 p.m.] the hon. gentleman did not touch on this when he was speaking the other night, and try to explain this change of front. Not satisfied with one occasion maliciously deceiving the Governor in regard to the circumstances of the strike, he made the circumstances still more unfavourable when he again wrote to the Governor; and his letter, dated the 5th February, 1912, is in its way a perfect pearl. I do not think it can be described by any milder term. This was after the refusal of the Commonwealth authorities to send the military. He says—

"I am sure no one regrets more than His Excellency that his Ministers should have thus shown their contempt for a statute which is the source of their existence and authority, and the charter which formally sets forth the mutual obligations of Commonwealth and State. When the Australian States consented to renounce their separate military establishments, it was on the distinct understanding that the armed forces of the Commonwealth would be at the service of any State threatened with domestic violence, and it is impossible to conceive of language plainer than that in which this understanding is expressed in the 119th section of the Constitution. That section allows the Commonwealth Government no option in the matter, and, in the most unequivocal terms, commands that Government to afford protection to any State which considers that its condition justifies it in asking for such assistance. The framers of the Constitution were justly of opinion that this privilege could safely be left to the States, for no Government would, without grave occasion, acknowledge its inability to discharge its primary function—the defence of the liberty and property of its citizens."

I think certain of our friends on the opposite side, who make, not unjustly, a considerable pretence to legal knowledge, will agree with me that in that statement the Premier entirely deceived himself, and also made an attempt to deceive the State Governor. According to the opinions of constitutional authorities in the Federal Parliament—opinions given since the date of this correspondence—the Premier draws entirely wrong conclusions. It is entirely optional for the Federal Government whether they render military assistance or not on the application of a State Government, and I intend to quote on that point some of the opinions expressed in the Federal Parliament by men who call themselves friends of the Liberal movement. The Premier says that the Commonwealth Government showed their contempt for the application. There was nothing in the nature of contempt; it was simply the exercise of common sense in their decision not to comply with the frantic request of the State Government for the military to shoot at defenceless people. For the edification of the Premier, who seems so ignorant on these questions, I am going to

Mr. Theodore]

bring before his notice the opinion of the Federal Attorney-General first, who, when speaking on the application for military aid, used the words I am going to quote. It appears that when application is made by a Government requiring military assistance to quell domestic violence it is necessary to comply with the obligation imposed by the Defence Act and the Constitution. It is necessary for a proclamation to be issued by the State Governor calling attention to the domestic violence which it is intended to quell, which was not done on this occasion. Mr. Hughes said—

“The Prime Minister was quite right not to send troops to Queensland, because the requirements under the Constitution and the Defence Act had not been fulfilled. There had been no proclamation, and the request was therefore improperly and illegally before him. In the second place, it was clear there was no domestic violence within the meaning of the judgment I have just cited.”

The judgment of a United States High Court Justice on a similar question which Mr. Hughes cited was this—

“The charge as made is really of nothing more than a conspiracy to commit a breach of the peace within a State. Certainly it should not be claimed that the United States have the power or are required to do merely police duty in the States. If a State cannot protect itself against domestic violence the United States may, upon the call of the Executive, when the Legislature cannot be convened, lend their assistance for that purpose. It is a guaranty of the Constitution, but it does not apply to a case like this.”

That judgment referred to an application by a State for troops to quell a disturbance which was nothing more than a conspiracy on the part of certain persons to create domestic violence, and that was the case here. There was no actual violence; even at most it was only some contemplated attempt at violence of which the hon. gentleman was afraid. Mr. Deakin, who belongs to the party of politicians supporting the same views as the Premier, gives this opinion on the question—

“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 think this is a case in point, and Mr. Deakin used very apt words which could be applied to the application made by the Government of this State. The Government lost its head, and made a frantic application for the military when there was no occasion to do so. Now, I intend to quote Mr. Groom, ex-Attorney-General, and one of the representatives for Queensland in the Federal Parliament, also a member of the Liberal party. And I may say for every one of those gentlemen, if one may judge by the opinions expressed by them in the House

[Mr. Theodore.

of Representatives, strained every point in favour of the application, and in favour of the contention laid down by Mr. Denham.

“When it comes to the exercise of a power, undoubtedly there must be with the Commonwealth some means of ascertaining whether the conditions exist which call for an exercise of the power. There must be that right in the Commonwealth in order to ascertain whether this duty ought to be fulfilled.”

There is the position maintained by Mr. Fisher and his colleagues—they had a right to ascertain the conditions and to refuse the request if they thought it was unreasonable. Sir John Quick, who is recognised as an eminent constitutional authority, also gave his opinion on the matter, going fully into the constitutional requirements of the Federal Government regarding the sending of the military. He arrived at this conclusion—

“If the facts as alleged in the statement by the Premier of Queensland were true, his appeal was justifiable, and the Prime Minister would have been justified in responding to the appeal.”

Not that it was obligatory on him to respond, but merely that he would have been justified. These opinions, which I think the Premier will take as being very incontrovertible opinions on the question, entirely shatter the opinion expressed by him to the Governor. And the hon. gentleman, setting himself up as a constitutional authority of some tonnage by saying that the Federal Government had no option in the matter, I think amply demonstrates his own ignorance of the position. It appears that they did not make sufficient investigation into the question as to what were their obligations in connection with their application for the services of the military. It is stated that they consulted the Attorney-General, and that they were satisfied they had followed the proper course of procedure. I can only say that if they did consult the Attorney-General, and acted upon his advice, his knowledge of constitutional law and his opinion on this particular question differ very much from the expressed opinions of the legal gentlemen I have quoted, and indicates the necessity for a new Attorney-General. The letters conveying the opinion of the Premier of this State regarding the obligation of the Commonwealth Government to send out the military in a general strike, were merely an attempt to make political capital against the men who were concerned in that movement.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: They were written for electioneering purposes.

MR. THEODORE: For purely electioneering purposes. I should like now to quote something which was said in the Federal Parliament last week regarding the statement of the Home Secretary, Mr. Appel, upon this question as to what the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth should have done, and I ask hon. members to follow this very closely. I am quoting from a speech made by Mr. Wise, member for Gippsland in the Federal Parliament—

“The Prime Minister told us that Mr. Appel, one of the Queensland State Ministers, speaking on the subject at a later date, said—‘The Prime Minister missed a good political point.’ Fancy

any person in the crisis that existed in Brisbane—at a time when, according to the State Premier, riot and bloodshed were imminent, thinking of political points! It violates one's sense of propriety altogether that a man in the position of a State Minister should regard such a condition of affairs from a political point of view. I do not wish to make any charge. I can only draw an inference. Inasmuch as Mr. Appel said that the Prime Minister had missed a good political point, that enables one to draw the inference that the Government of which Mr. Appel was a member were trying to make a good political point by putting the onus of settling the difficulty upon the Federal Government."

Mr. WHITE: Fisher's action was purely political, because he daren't do it.

Mr. THEODORE: I am going to call attention to another letter which the Premier addressed to the State Governor on the 19th February—over a fortnight after the refusal of the Commonwealth authorities to permit the soldiers to be sent up to Brisbane to shoot the workers, that is to say, after a lapse of time which should have enabled the hon. gentleman to have made sure of his facts and opinions regarding this matter. Here is what the hon. gentleman wrote—

"Sir,—Supplementing my letter of the 5th instant, with respect to the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to afford the State the protection guaranteed by the 119th article of the Constitution, I have the honour respectfully to inform Your Excellency that Ministers will seriously consider the question of calling on the Commonwealth to reimburse the State the expenditure that has been rendered necessary by the deliberate neglect of the Commonwealth Government to fulfil its obligation to the State."

I should like to inquire from the Treasurer, who should know what is being done in this direction, what steps are being taken or have been taken to bring the Federal Government to book for refusing to send soldiers to shoot down citizens in Brisbane? How much do the Government expect to be indemnified for that refusal? This lovely effusion addressed to the Governor goes on as follows:—

"As I have shown in my previous letter to Your Excellency on the subject, the Constitution, which has transferred from the State to the Commonwealth the military power that was indispensable to the security of the State in the strike of 1891, obliges the Commonwealth to place its armed forces at the service of the State when in a period of civil disorder it calls for such assistance. The Commonwealth cannot constitutionally decline the application."

There we have the opinion of the great constitutional authority, of a man who sets himself up against every constitutional authority in the Commonwealth, and says what shall be done and what should be done under such circumstances. Just follow this—

"I do not concur in the opinion that the Defence Act or any other Federal enactment absolves, or can absolve, the Commonwealth from any obligation imposed on it by the Constitution; nor am I aware that the Defence Act even

attempts to do so. Its 51st section lays down a procedure which may, or may not, be adopted to give effect to the 119th article of the Constitution, but does not and cannot render that article nugatory. It is quite possible that the 51st section, unlike the 119th article, is not mandatory, and that the Commonwealth is not bound to have recourse to it, even though it must be regarded as providing the simplest and readiest means of assisting a disturbed State that could be devised. But it is indisputable that, if the Commonwealth does not take that course, it must find some other way of protecting the State against domestic violence."

Here was a hint that the hon. gentleman was going to set up some other sort of authority, that he was going to make an attack on the Constitution. If the Constitution does not provide what he says it does provide, he is going to take some other means to call out the military to shoot workers. May I ask the Treasurer what other means the Premier was going to adopt? Here is a deliberate hint that the Premier is going to come out in open rebellion against the Australian Commonwealth. If he did so, we should then have the edifying spectacle of the necessity of the Commonwealth Government giving instructions to the military to restrain the hon. gentleman. A lot was said during the currency of the strike, and after the strike, about the absolute necessity of having soldiers on the spot. Mr. Deakin, in an interjection replying to Mr. Chanter, on the 4th July, said—

"I have shown elaborately that there was no need to send troops on the occasion referred to."

Let me now quote from the opinion of Lord Haldane, who was Secretary for War in the House of Commons, upon the question of quelling domestic violence. Lord Haldane, in his evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, says—

"I think the calling out of the military unnecessarily very often leads, or may lead, to a breach of the law, by making an unnecessary demonstration which incites and provokes the public, and that is a view on which the War Office, not only in my time, but always of late years, have acted consistently and strongly. We hold the military ought not to be called out except in the last resort. . . ."

"The military authorities say: 'We are here, and if we use our firearms it is to kill.' That is why we demur to being called out except in the last and most perilous necessity."

I desire also to quote what our Premier, Mr. Denham, said on the question of maintaining public order of applying for the use of soldiers. This extract is from the *Courier*, and refers to the time immediately after his application for the military—

"I can assure the citizens that ample protection is afforded by the enrolment of special constables, foot and horse, and I see no reason why early in the week normal conditions of trade should not obtain in the metropolitan area."

Mr. Theodore]

Here is another statement at complete variance with the letter which the Premier sent to His Excellency the Governor. I should like to hear his explanation of it. He goes on—

“The Premier (Hon. D. F. Denham), in an interview on Saturday, said that plans were maturing for such a measure of protection against molestation and intimidation as would allow of a resumption of business, with security to life and property, at an early date. Speaking again, yesterday, Mr. Denham said: ‘I have been in close conference with the Commissioner of Police to-day, and am pleased to be able to say that by reason of the large enrolment of civilians who have volunteered to assist in preserving peace and insuring the conduct of business without hindrance or insult to workers and others the approaches to the wharves and railway stations, in addition to all the main portions of the city of Brisbane, both north and south, will be so patrolled that by noon on Monday business and traffic can be resumed with security to all concerned.’”

That is at variance with the statement which he sent to the Governor, and I leave it for hon. members themselves to see that it is so. I should say that if these matters are brought before the Governor His Excellency will require an explanation from the Premier on the matter as to why His Excellency was deceived in such a way as to cause him on different occasions since the strike to make inflammatory speeches to the farmers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THEODORE: He would not have done so had it not been for the letter sent to him by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not continue in that strain. The hon. member is not in order in referring to His Excellency in the manner he is doing. The hon. member cannot be allowed to speak in those terms of His Excellency. I think the hon. member will see the propriety of what I say.

Mr. THEODORE: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker; but I think it was a grave misuse of his privileges for the Premier to communicate with the Governor as he did. He misused his privilege by attempting to deceive the Governor on this grave question. Upon this question I hope that the Premier and every hon. member of the Ministry will for ever refrain from making such egregious asses of themselves as they did on that occasion by setting themselves up as constitutional authorities.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE: It seems to me that it was nothing more or less than an attempt by the State Government to make capital out of the Federal Government for their own ignoble purposes, and I think that the rebukes which they got from their own friends in the Federal House will be a sufficient lesson to them in future. The Commissioner of Police, Mr. Cahill,

[Mr. Theodore.

was a person who assumed a position of very great importance during the strike.

Mr. LENNON: He was the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. THEODORE: It appears from the correspondence which I have read, especially in the communication from the Premier to Sir John Quick, that it was Mr. Cahill, Commissioner of Police, who suggested calling out the military. I think that this came about through the inaction of the Government and their inability to take the necessary steps.

Mr. HAMILTON: It was Dublin Castle over again.

Mr. THEODORE: That strike enabled Mr. Cahill to assume the position of a little despot in Brisbane.

The TREASURER: He did splendid work, let me say.

Mr. THEODORE: The Treasurer says that he did splendid work. If that is so, how is it that not a solitary Minister during the debate has said a single word in defence of him, in reply to the charges made by members of the Opposition against Mr. Cahill himself, his administration, against his motives, and against his control of the Police Force during that strike? These charges were made during the strike and on every public platform since the strike, and not a solitary Minister has undertaken the duty of defending the Commissioner in any way whatever. The Home Secretary never mentioned the Commissioner during his speech. Is there not something sinister in that? Is there some mysterious motive for silence? Are they ashamed of the Commissioner of Police?

Mr. HAMILTON: They are ashamed of each other. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. THEODORE: The Home Secretary made reference the other night to the finding of quantities of dynamite. The thing is too absurd altogether. Did the hon. member expect any hon. member in this House to believe that twenty separate and individual attempts were made by unionists, or somebody else, to blow up the trams or the tram property, or indulge in tram wrecking? I do not think anyone would believe such a preposterous story as that. There is something more than appears on the surface in this matter. The Home Secretary carefully refrained from giving the name of the person who drew up the report from which he quoted, although he was definitely asked by the deputy leader of the Opposition to do so. The hon. gentleman quoted from the document which was alleged to be the report on the finding of the explosives, but only one or two cases of the finding of explosives was recorded in the public Press of Queensland during the currency of the general strike. The first reports were in the *Courier* and *Daily Mail* in the early days of the strike. It was reported that a plug of gelignite had been found, and it went on to say that in the opinion of experts if that plug had exploded it would have shattered the car to fragments and killed all the people in the immediate vicinity. Now, I have some knowledge of the use of explosives and the effect of an explosion of gelignite; I have used a good many hundred-weights

of it during my career, and I know that an explosion of 50 lb. of gelignite would not cause the effect which it was stated by the daily Press would be caused by the explosion of that one plug. I noticed that after that the *Courier* did not record any further finding of gelignite. They were probably afraid that it would have a boomerang effect and would react upon themselves, or that the public would not ride in the tramcars, as they would be afraid of being killed, and in that way it would react on their friend, Mr. Badger. I think there are one or two editors of daily newspapers in this town who can tell us more about the planting of the gelignite plugs and the finding of the plugs than any other person in this State.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: They put them there themselves.

Mr. THEODORE: I do know that this Government is the direct lineal descendant of a Government of which Mr. Horace Tozer was Colonial Secretary, which, in the nineties, did not scruple to employ organised workers. In what is known as an *agent provocateur*, his duty was to help the Government in their enmity to the Labour organisations, and he was in the Government employ for three years.

Mr. BOWMAN: A spy.

Mr. THEODORE: He was employed to spy on the unions. He became a member of the various unions in Brisbane and belonged to the Workers' Political Organisations. During that three years he carried on his nefarious work of spying on his fellows, and he communicated to the Government what they were doing. He used to incite the men to do lawless acts in order that the Government might trump up cases against them. I believe this Government would resort to the same despicable things. I want to say that in spite of the denials that were given by hon. members of this Chamber, and by the men who were connected with the strike, that there was no attempt made to interfere with the supply of ice to the hospitals—in spite of all that, I say the Home Secretary is unscrupulous enough to repeat the miserable lie. It is not understandable in our present day, when there is supposed to be the ordinary civility even between political opponents, when members on the Government side cannot accept the denials given by hon. members. It was alleged against the strikers that they were interfering with the supplies for the hospitals, but I will quote from the *Courier* to show what was the actual position. We find in the *Courier* of the 29th January, one day before the strike, the following advertisement was inserted by the strike committee:—

"The committee desire the public to know that they are anxious, and will in every manner assist, to have hospitals, benevolent, and such institutions fully provided with stores and other requisites necessary to effectually carry on same during the tenure of this dispute, and carters, etc., supplying those may obtain permits on applying to the undersigned.

"We also desire it to be known that we will not, in any way, interfere with the measures usually taken to safeguard the public health of the community, such as sanitation, etc."

That announcement was published in the daily Press of Brisbane the day [4.30 p.m.] before the strike. Two days afterwards, on 1st February, the "Official Bulletin" of the strike committee contained this—

"A permit has been given for the manufacture of ice for the hospitals, providing only union labour is employed. There was no delay whatever in doing this on the strike committee's part, and we repudiate the lying and cowardly assertions of the Brisbane Press. Should there be any difficulty in getting ice, the committee will see that it is surmounted by arranging at once to supply it themselves. Will hospitals please note?"

Does that show any desire to interfere with the ice supply to the hospitals? Any person with a spark of manhood in his composition and who know all these facts should not hesitate to say that the strike committee did everything possible in order that the supply should not be interfered with; and any person knowing those facts who deliberately states what was said here by the Home Secretary the other night, well, I do not know what term can be used fittingly to describe him. I know that the term which I should like to use would not be parliamentary, and therefore I refrain from using it. (Opposition laughter.) While upon this question, I should like to say that the same sort of malicious lying has been going on regarding the stoppage of food supplies and the stoppage of milk supplies. I do not speak on this question as one who was on the strike committee, but as one who, not having been in Brisbane at the time the strike occurred, but as a person who made himself acquainted with events subsequently, could take an impartial and dispassionate view of what happened. It has come to my knowledge that there was an attempt to stop food supplies, but the attempt proceeded from the Employers' Federation. A member of the Employers' Federation told me that a meeting of the Federation was held on 2nd February, and at that meeting there attended representatives of the Chamber of Manufacturers, the Brisbane Traders' Association, the Master Bakers' Association, and the Master Butchers' Association, and at that meeting they carried a resolution that all places of business in the metropolitan area should be closed down for one month, and it was expressly stated that it was for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear upon the strikers. It has been admitted in unequivocal language that it was for the purpose of starving the workers into submission. I will tell hon. members what it was that broke down this little scheme. There is no doubt they would have carried out their intention if they had sufficient power, but this is what happened. The Queensland Co-operative Stores, which have premises in Queen street, decided to open if they could get supplies from the wholesale houses.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Why were they closed?

Mr. THEODORE: They were closed by contingencies and circumstances which usually happen when there is a dislocation of business of this sort. It is not worth explaining to the hon. gentleman. He is not so ignorant that he does not know why they closed.

Mr. Theodore]

When men, acting under the impulse of great excitement, knock off work and hold meetings for the purpose of considering certain questions, it is likely that ordinary business will be temporarily interfered with. So soon as they could restore the ordinary means of supplying the people with food, they did so.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: By permit.

Mr. THEODORE: It is a pity the hon. member should make such an insane interjection. The Co-operative Stores came to the determination that, so long as they could get supplies from the wholesale stores of the goods they required, they would open, and Messrs. Foggitt, Jones, and Co., wholesale suppliers in this city, decided to supply them, and they opened, and thus broke down the arrangement. And so soon as the Co-operative Stores opened, a number of other store-keepers broke away from the Employers' Federation, when they found their business was going from them, and the Employers' Federation found themselves in the position of a body not having its edicts carried out by its own members. I shall quote from the *Courier* again. I prefer to quote from the organ of the Liberal party, because I do not want it to be said that I am quoting from sources which might be said to be prejudiced in favour of my cause. The *Courier* of 1st February said—

“The majority of the retail business premises carried on business as usual. . . . The restaurants are all keeping their doors open and carrying on business. . . . The principal of one of the largest firms of retail grocers in the city, with branches throughout the suburbs, said that they were carrying on without any great measure of difficulty.”

I think I have now disposed of the malicious false statements that have been made by members on the other side regarding the stoppage of food supplies, and I think I may say that the strike committee challenge any hon. member on the other side, or anyone in Queensland, to cite one case where the milk supply of the city was interfered with.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE: As my time has almost expired, I will leave questions of detail; but I want to point out that the Government have evidently been unable to see anything in the recent movement except the insignificant local circumstances. They have been unable to detect what underlies this great movement which led to an upheaval in Brisbane a few months ago. They have not tried to discover the real cause, nor are they concerned about the possible consequences, of such an upheaval.

Mr. COYNE: Or the remedy either.

Mr. THEODORE: Apparently they do not realise that there is something radically wrong in the body politic when 20,000 or 30,000 men can take the action which was taken in February last. They do not see that there is industrial unrest in every country in the world, that men are no longer satisfied with the evil conditions under which they have been labouring. They do not see that working men are now looking for something better; that they are looking for a fair measure of the comforts and the good things

[*Mr. Theodore.*

of this life. No longer are they going to be satisfied with living in miserable hovels and existing on hard fare. They are going to have a say in so reorganising society that they will get a fair measure of the comforts and the intellectual enjoyments of civilised life. I know the Treasurer will not concede that they are entitled to that. He does not think that a navy or a man working in a sugar-mill for 4½d. an hour and keep should be a person that should have any higher ideals.

The TREASURER: He is a better friend of the working man than you are. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. THEODORE: He is a better friend of the working man when he will allow his own employees in the sugar-mills to go out on strike for three months before he will give them 7½d. an hour, and when he will make them work twelve hours a day under these miserable conditions! In consequence of the dissemination of literature, even those who are labouring under the most adverse circumstances now look for something better. They look to lift themselves up from the environment to which they have been subjected, and they are asking why they should not share with traders, and rich lawyers, and the professional classes, and the retainers, and the idlers of society, why they should not enjoy with them some of the amenities of civilised life. Why should they not look with enjoyment upon the pictures painted by great masters, or why should they not enjoy the works of the great poets, and why not follow with attention and interest the discoveries and investigations of scientists in the realm of geology, biology, metaphysics, and all those sciences which are of so much interest? Does the hon. gentleman say the working classes should not take an interest in these things?

The TREASURER: I say that we are making provision for them to do so. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. THEODORE: Make provision! The hon. gentleman was making provision by compelling them to work twelve hours for 4½d. an hour and keep. There is no provision by which they can purchase even books, much less indulge in the luxuries of life. They have to live in hovels while the hon. gentleman and his friends live in suburban villas and palatial residences.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What about Fisher's palatial residence?

Mr. THEODORE: Mr. Fisher is trying to help the working class, and if the hon. gentleman were inspired by as pure motives it would be to his credit.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Why don't you explain about the Mount Morgan strike?

Mr. THEODORE: The Mount Morgan strike! If a body of workers in Queensland!—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has occupied the time allowed by the Standing Orders. I now put the question—“That the hon. member for Chillagoe be allowed further time to complete his speech.”

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 24.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Bowman	" Larcombe
" Breslin	" Lennon
" Coyne	" May
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" McCormack
" Gilday	" O'Sullivan
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. Land and Mr. Murphy.	

NOES, 25.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Macrossan
" Appel	" Morgan
" Barnes, G. P.	" Paget
" Barnes, W. H.	" Petrie
" Bebbington	" Rankin
" Booker	" Roberts
" Bridges	" Somersset
" Caine	" Stevens
" Corser, B. H.	" Swayne
" Corser, E. B. C.	" Tolmie
" Crawford	" Trout
" Denham	" Vowles
" Grant	" Walker
" Grayson	" Welsby
" Gunn	" White
" Macartney	" Wienholt
" Mackay	" Williams
" Mackintosh	
Tellers: Mr. Morgan and Mr. Wienholt.	

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): At the outset of my remarks I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply; likewise yourself, Sir, at having been re-elected to the honourable position of Speaker of this House. So far as the Governor's Speech is concerned, and the policy placed before the House, it appears to me that it meets with the unanimous approval of both parties. I have listened attentively to the addresses delivered by hon. members opposite, and the only thing they took objection to was the strike. They have endeavoured to talk away, as it were, the mistakes and blunders made by men connected with their party in fomenting that particular trouble. First one said that we suffered from a general strike, then another called it a lock-out. I think it was practically a rebellion. (Opposition laughter.) The leader of the Opposition dealt only with two subjects during a speech lasting something like an hour and a-half, and he failed altogether in criticising the policy of the Government. He thought, no doubt, from his point of view, or from his party's point of view, that it was more advisable to get certain explanations in *Hansard*. The deputy leader of the Opposition told us that had the Government taken certain steps no strike would have occurred at all; but I say that had men on that side taken certain steps no strike would have occurred. Were the Government responsible for those men wearing a badge on their watch chain?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. MORGAN: Were they responsible for that, especially after those men had accepted employment with the full understanding that they were not to wear any distinctive badge to show that they belonged to any particular union? No doubt those men were advised to go to work, believing they could act the same

game of bluff that was acted in Melbourne and some of the other States. Here in Queensland the game of bluff did not come off; the men responsible for the strike discovered, to their sorrow, that the gun was loaded. They presented a weapon at the head of Mr. Badger, and discovered that the gun was loaded, and it actually meant a strike. They were not men enough when they discovered that their bluff did not come off to say that they had made a mistake, or to call the strike off, but they went on and appealed to the Government to try and prevent the strike, and got them out of the blunder which they had made themselves. That is the whole position. Yet we are told that the Government could have prevented the strike. No doubt every strike can be prevented if you give the men exactly what they want. Only recently, a strike occurred in connection with some men who were engaged loading sleepers from a ship, in order to build a railway, in connection with the Federal Government. These men struck for 12s. a day. The strike was soon settled by the Federal Government, and how did they settle it? By giving the men what they asked for. Every strike can be settled quickly if they give them exactly what they want; and that is only for the time being. This is the worst of it: When they give way to men who are asking in many instances unreasonable requests, it is looked upon as a sign of weakness—they are told that they are not game to refuse the demand. Then they come again, and keep on coming again, until eventually something must occur, and that is what occurred in connection with the Brisbane strike. Personally, I am not sorry that the strike occurred. Something had to come sooner or later. The lessons taught by the strike no doubt have been severe, but they will be taken to heart by people on both sides. The agitators, or the strike leaders—call them what you like—have been taught a very severe lesson. What is the result of that important lesson? Here we have them in this House getting into *Hansard* stuff which they know is to be sent throughout the country—they are getting that information circulated for the purpose of bamboozling people in country districts. Speak to any hon. member opposite privately, and every one of them will tell you that the strike was a fatal blunder, and never should have occurred, but get them on the floor of the House, and they try to throw dust in the eyes of the people and the workers generally. They are not game to go on a public platform, or stand up here where they are being reported, and say what they would say outside—that the strike was a mistake. Why do they not own up to it manfully? They have made charges against this Government about the police batoning women and children. Is there a man on that side who will go before a judge, and swear that he saw with his own eyes women and children batoned by the police?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

Mr. MORGAN: Any amount of these men were in Brisbane during the whole period of the strike, in the different places where the crowds collected, and I think if any one of those men were asked to take an oath that they saw with their own eyes—

Mr. MAY: You only think so, you will not state it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: Not one of them would be game to substantiate there what they said on the floor of the House.

Mr. COYNE: I will take an oath on it any time.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not intend to proceed further with the strike; I have more important matter to deal with. The strike is a thing of the past, so far as I am concerned. The lesson has been taught; "Let the dead past bury its dead." (Opposition laughter.) I have certain grievances to ventilate in connection with the Electoral Act. I think we have one of the most imperfect Electoral Acts that exists in Australia. It has been more convincingly brought home to my mind by what occurred during the recent general election. That election goes to show that votes can be recorded improperly, that a man can vote two or three times, that a man can be on the rolls for at least six different electorates, and can vote in any one of those particular electorates, or, if he wishes to be dishonest, can vote for the whole of the six electorates.

Mr. FHELLY: It is the fault of the Home Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN: It also shows that big alterations are necessary, and I am pleased to find from the Governor's Speech that it is the intention of the Government to introduce an amendment of the Electoral Act. When the amending measure is introduced, I hope it will enable the Government to prosecute those who are discovered to have done something illegal, and not place the whole burden of prosecution on the candidate. I have a list sent to me by the returning officer, showing that no less than seventeen people had voted twice in my electorate.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Seventeen instances of double voting?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. Why should that list be sent to me as a candidate, and why should I be looked upon as the person who should institute proceedings? That should be the work of the department. We should have officers appointed who will prosecute, and have the men brought before the court. If we protect people from being robbed, why should we not protect our voting system, and see that it is made as clean as it possibly can be?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: This is one of the worst Governments we have had.

Mr. MORGAN: No matter what Government it may be, it should have officers appointed, so that after a general election matters can be gone into, and, when there is sufficient evidence of dishonesty, prosecution should take place. But generally after an election we say, "Let it rip; it does not matter." That means that the people who are dishonest in recording their votes go on being dishonest, and perhaps induce other people to be dishonest, because they know that no prosecution ever takes place. I do not wish to convey the idea that my remarks refer simply to those who voted

[5 p.m.] for the Labour-Socialist party; it is quite possible in a large community that these things exist on both sides. My remarks are made so that as far as possible we shall get a true vote from the people, and not a vote which has been proved to be one that cannot be relied on. I also hope that the Bill will include provision for voting by post.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

[Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORGAN: We know that the women now have a perfect right to vote; the old men also have a perfect right to vote, and I ask whether it is right that in electorates like my own out in the country people should be expected to travel 30 or 40 miles to a polling-booth to record their votes—women in a delicate state of health, and feeble old men. If we believe in every adult being allowed to vote, should we not make it as easy as possible for their votes to be recorded? In an election we should endeavour to get a true reflex of the opinion of the people, but we cannot do that if we debar certain people from voting; and unless provision is made for voting by post we do debar a large number of people from voting in country electorates, where people have to travel over bad roads, and cross creeks without bridges. I say that many people in these districts are practically disfranchised through not being able to vote by post, the provision for voting by post having been abolished because the people in the cities and towns did certain things which made it advisable, in the opinion of the Government, that it should be abolished. In the cities and towns there are polling-places right up against a person's door, and one can jump into a tram or a cab and record his vote in ten minutes. I see no reason why people in the country should be disfranchised on account of things that took place in the towns which did not reflect credit on the system of voting by post; and I think that if we are going to have voting by post it can be made clean.

Mr. MURPHY: It has been tried already and found wanting, you know.

Mr. MORGAN: There is one thing in particular that I want to emphasise, and that is the excessive rates charged on our railways for certain goods. I introduced a deputation last December to the Deputy Commissioner for Railways in connection with the freights on kerosene, oils, benzine, etc. The deputation was an influential one; and after some time I received word that a reduction would be made to the extent of 33½ per cent. on the carriage of those articles. It seemed a big reduction to make, but I showed that the freights on those articles in Queensland were from 200 per cent. to 300 per cent. higher than in any other State of Australia. This reduction is all very well; but it only applies to 4-ton lots, and does not benefit the small farmer, or even the average storekeeper, who cannot afford to get 4 tons of kerosene at a time. I say we should have a reduction that would apply to lots as small as three cases, if the little people are to have the benefit of reduced freights. It is said that there is a difficulty in the handling of kerosene; but when I was in Victoria and New South Wales some time ago I found that a case of kerosene could be sent by rail 200 miles for 1s., while in Queensland, to get a case sent from here to Miles, a distance of 230 miles, it costs 6s. 6d.

Mr. FHELLY: There is a Labour Government in New South Wales.

Mr. MORGAN: This was before the Labour Government got into power, and they never made any alteration of the railway freights since they have been in power. I notice that the Minister for Railways, speaking at Toowoomba in connection with the Drayton deviation, proudly remarked

that the Railway Department, after paying all working expenses and interest on cost, provided a credit balance of something like £75,000. No doubt that is very gratifying to the Minister and the Commissioner.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And very gratifying to the Treasurer.

Mr. MORGAN: Of course it is; but you must admit that that £75,000 has been got from the people in the country, and is nothing more or less than a tax drawn out of the country people, because it is the country people who have earned that money. In the big cities and towns you get everything at the price of the port; you do not pay the freight from here to country places or from country places back to Brisbane. If we send anything to Brisbane to be sold, we have to accept the price obtained less the cost of getting it to Brisbane, and if we buy anything in Brisbane we have to pay the Brisbane price with the amount of the freight added, so that we pay the freight both ways, and that £75,000 is nothing but a tax drawn from the country people and put into the Treasury to be used in some other direction. I say that if the railways are made to pay, they should not be expected to do anything else. They should not be expected to provide a surplus, which is nothing but a tax on a particular class. Another thing, though the Brisbane and suburban railways are run practically at a loss, the trains are provided with all sorts of comforts and luxuries. I travelled in a train from Corinda to Brisbane containing not more than six people, but in trains out West we are packed like herrings.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You want to travel by a suburban train in the morning.

Mr. MORGAN: I admit that for an hour or two in the morning they may be packed sometimes, and then we see letters in the *Courier*, and a big deputation from the Chamber of Commerce with complaints of having to stand up while travelling a few miles, and an alteration is made. I have seen people standing in the train all the way from Brisbane to Dalby, and we have had to complain time after time in order to get a lavatory carriage. (Hear, hear!) I am pleased to say, however, that we have got an improvement in the Western train.

Mr. POWMAN: And there is room for greater improvement.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister for Railways fulfilled his promise to put on the Western line a good sleeper, and the old fowlhouse we used to have has been done away with.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are too warm on the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: Not a bit. If you travelled in that carriage on a summer night you would find it a bit more warm than you imagine. At any rate, we now have a sleeper, and the train service is better than it used to be. Nevertheless, I say a big improvement can still be made in the trains which travel a long way into country districts. I wish also to mention some matters in connection with the Agricultural Department. So far as my experience of the department and my knowledge of Queensland go, I think the Agricultural Department has done fairly good work during the past two and a-half years. I admit that the

department is a much better department to-day than it was two and a-half years ago. When the present Minister for Agriculture was appointed, I expressed the hope that he would make it a real, live, up-to-date department, and I feel sure that the hon. gentleman is doing his level best in that direction. At the same time, although I may be wrong, I think that he is hampered in some way. The department is not what we may call a money-making department; it has to depend upon the money it gets from the Treasury, and has nothing coming in. And when a department has nothing coming in, the Treasurer naturally looks at every shilling spent by that department. I contend that the money spent by the Agricultural Department is the best spent money in Queensland, and I think it is a pity that the Minister has not got more to spend.

Mr. KIRWAN: To give away seed wheat?

Mr. MORGAN: No; we do not want anything in that way; if farmers want anything they are prepared to pay for it. We are not like the hon. member's crowd, who want to be spooned all the time, but we want this department to be made a live department, and I feel sure that if the present Minister is given a chance he will make in a live department. I therefore hope that he will be given a greater amount of money than he has hitherto received for his department. I would suggest that a demonstration farm should be established for the purpose of showing that wheat can be grown profitably. So far as the sugar and dairying industries are concerned, it is well known that under ordinary conditions they can be made a success. But what about the wheat-growing industry? We are not growing nearly enough wheat to feed our own people. We have to get wheat from other States in order to feed thousands of our own people. That is a shame to this State, as, instead of bringing in wheat from other States, we should have truck load upon truck load of wheat going to the ships for export; and if we had that, we should find ships coming here which do not now visit our ports, and their coming here would bring trade to Queensland. I should like to see the Agricultural Department take up a block of land, say, west of Chinchilla, and take it up under the same conditions as an ordinary selector, clear it, plough it, and put it under wheat cultivation. I suggest that, because there is an impression among old Queenslanders, and also among many new comers, that wheat cannot be grown successfully in Queensland. The consequence is that as soon as they take up a block of land they go in for dairying or some agricultural pursuit which it has been proved is profitable in this State, but they do not go in for wheat cultivation. They may put in a few acres of wheat, but they do not go in for its scientific cultivation on a large scale, and the result is that during the last four or five years we have not made any progress in the area put under wheat—we are not growing more wheat now than we did five years ago. I know perfectly well that wheat can be grown profitably in Queensland because I have proved it for myself. Wheat can be grown here as well as in any State in Australia. But the farmer is a peculiar person—he likes to follow. It is all very well to send up an expert to try to teach the farmer what to do, by showing him your methods on a platform or in a book,

Mr. Morgan.]

but that is no good to the farmer. I have lived among farmers all my life, and I can assure you that the man who goes into a district and cultivates 200 or 300 acres of land, and grows a large crop of wheat profitably, will do more to encourage the cultivation of wheat than any platform lectures. The farmer wants a practical demonstration, and this can be given him by the department taking up a block of land under ordinary conditions and growing wheat under a capable manager. Such a farm would prove a good financial investment, because when the wheat is grown it will be sent to the market and sold at the highest current prices. I do not want to see an experiment made with four or five acres, but should like to see 400 or 500 acres, or even 1,000 acres put under wheat, as that will do more to demonstrate to the farmer that wheat can be grown profitably than any isolated experiments in different parts of the State. A thousand pounds would be sufficient for the initial expense. Many a farmer has gone on to a block of land with not more than £200 or £300, and he has made agriculture a success. When it is proved that the demonstration farm is capable of growing wheat profitably, and the farm has outlived its usefulness, as many of our State farms have—and I am glad the Minister has recognised that fact—the department could sell the land, allowing the man who worked it the option of purchase. That would make him take more interest in the farm. The hon. member for Cunningham quoted figures the other night which show how the value of land increases in agricultural districts. Land on Westbrook was sold some years ago at £5 per acre, and to-day it is worth £30 per acre. That shows that the increased price which would be obtained for the land used as a wheat demonstration farm would more than recoup the department the expense incurred in its establishment, and in its operations the farm would be a money-making concern. I also wish to refer to the Agricultural Bank. I was one of those—and I think the present Minister for Agriculture was also one of those—who condemned the Agricultural Bank, as it were, up hill and down dale. We considered twelve months ago that the Agricultural Bank was not doing what was expected of it. I admit that there has been a certain amount of improvement. I admit that the bank is doing better work to-day than it was doing twelve months ago.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are getting rid of nearly £7,000 a week.

MR. MORGAN: It may be doing that, but still better work can be done.

MR. MURPHY: Can anyone get a draw on it? (Laughter.)

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Even if the Agricultural Bank is getting rid of £7,000 a week, I do not take much notice of that. I remember during the early days of the strike a manager of one of our financial institutions told me in Brisbane on the very day I was talking to him no less than fifty people came in to his place and borrowed sums of from £5 to £25 for a small term to carry them over the term of the strike. (Opposition laughter.)

MR. FHELLY: Too strong.

[Mr. Morgan.]

MR. MORGAN: It is an absolute fact. They recognised that the strike was going to last a certain time, and that they would not be earning any wages, and so they came to the financial institution for assistance, and during that day fifty people went to him to borrow money. But it does not say that because that man had fifty clients that day that he was going good work. The reason that the Agricultural Bank is being made so much use of is because the other banks have closed their doors to the farmers and they are being asked to reduce their overdrafts. And not only are the farmers being asked to reduce their overdrafts, but the business people too, and the business people have to say to the farmer that he must reduce his account, as the bank is squeezing him. The result is that hundreds of people have been driven to the Agricultural Bank to get money, people who would not have gone to it otherwise. It is not because the conditions are favourable that the people go to the Agricultural Bank, but because the other conditions are unfavourable. Then one-fourth of the people who go there are compelled to do so whether they like it or not, because the Government will not let them go to any other bank. They cannot mortgage their property or borrow money on it until after the lapse of a certain period, so they are compelled to go to the Agricultural Bank.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a good thing they have a bank to go to.

MR. MORGAN: It is certainly a good thing that they are able to do that. But we established an agricultural bank for that purpose. There is one important matter which I wish to touch upon in connection with this bank. I can safely say that not one member of this House thought when that amending Agricultural Bank Bill was going through the House last session that such regulations were going to be passed as we find since have been passed. No one thought that such a regulation as regulation 24 was going to be framed. We thought when we passed such a liberal clause that it was one of the most liberal pieces of legislation ever passed in Australia. I refer to section 17 of the Act, although it was clause 6 of the amending Bill. In that clause we provided that any person could borrow up to £200 for the purpose of effecting improvements, even although he had no improvements on his property. He would receive an advance of £200 at the rate of £1 for £1. I went through my electorate and during the election campaign I referred to this clause and pointed out what the Liberal Government had done for the farmers. I know I obtained scores of votes by the insertion of that clause in the amending Act, especially from young fellows who wanted to take advantage of it, and they all thought what a splendid Government it was which passed such a clause. But what do we find now? We find that a regulation has been issued. It was not my fault, nor the fault of any member of this House that such a regulation was passed, for it never came before the House for our approval or otherwise. We find a regulation has been issued which debars the unfortunate people who took up prickly-pear land from getting any advances under this clause. I have got the regulation here.

MR. MURPHY: Let us have it.

Mr. MORGAN: It is regulation 24, and it reads as follows:—

"In no case shall sub-section 1 of section 6 of the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Act of 1911, so far as it relates to advances made at the rate of £1 for £1, be deemed to refer to advances made upon the security of any prickly-pear selection, nor shall it be deemed to apply to any application that is not for a first advance."

Now we have to get the prickly pear here and we want to get rid of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Government don't.

Mr. MURPHY: Don't the prickly-pear selectors get special concessions?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes; but I will tell you all about them later on. As a matter of fact, I will show that the man who takes up a prickly-pear selection is really worse off than the man who takes up an agricultural farm, so that he really does not get any concession at all. At any rate, no one knew that there was going to be such a regulation as that to apply to the unfortunate man who took up prickly-pear selections. As a matter of fact, I thought that the clause was framed and included in the Bill for the benefit of the prickly-pear selector, because they are the men who want assistance. The rich man will not take up a prickly-pear block at all, because it is not worth bothering with. It is only the poor man who will graft on a prickly-pear selection and clear it. Yet under this regulation the man who takes up a prickly-pear selection cannot get an advance under this particular section of the Act.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who is responsible for the passing of that regulation?

Mr. MORGAN: That is exactly what I do not know. That regulation never came before the House.

Mr. BOWMAN: Ask the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: I think it is only right that a regulation of that sort should come before the House before it is passed.

Mr. FIDELLY: Move a vote of censure on the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: It is quite likely that the Liquor Bill will be brought forward this session and be passed. Well, would it be right for the Minister to issue a regulation saying that the operations of a certain clause of that Act would not apply to certain publicans? It is just the same as was done here.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That regulation was laid on the table of the House within seven days of the meeting of the House.

Mr. MORGAN: This regulation never came before Parliament at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I laid it on the table of the House within seven days of meeting.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, during the present Parliament, but when the amending Bill was being passed last year we passed it in such a way that anyone who took up an area of land would be able to get an advance up to £200 for the purpose of carrying out improvements. Since then, however, a regulation has been issued which debars the holders of prickly-pear selections from getting an advance under that clause. I will

show the difference in the conditions of the prickly-pear selection and agricultural farm selection. A man can take up an agricultural farm of 1,280 acres at 10s. an acre, which means a total cost of £640. He has to pay one-fifth of the cost of the survey fee down, and he is allowed twenty-one years to pay the balance for the farm, and in addition he gets ten years in which to clear his land of pear. The man taking up a prickly-pear selection gets 1,280 acres at 10s. an acre—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Or perhaps nothing.

Mr. MORGAN: If it is given to him for nothing, I am sorry for the man who takes it up. He takes up a prickly-pear selection at 10s. an acre which, for 1,280 acres, amounts to £640. He has to pay the full amount of the survey fee down, and he has to pay the full purchasing price within fifteen years, and in that time he has also to clear his land of all the pear. So that the man who takes up an agricultural farm is far better off for terms than the man with the prickly-pear selection, and yet under this regulation the man with the prickly-pear selection is debarred from getting an advance for the purpose of making improvements. The man with the agricultural farm, on the other hand, not only has better terms but he can get an advance up to £200 under this section. That is an injustice. I say that is wrong. I admit

that the bank will not lend money [5.30 p.m.] on pear land to any great extent, as it does not consider it good security. But in Western Australia, where they lend up to £400 on land without any improvements, there is land in certain parts of the State which is not looked upon as good security owing to the existence of some poisonous weeds, but the Government guarantee the bank.

Mr. FIDELLY: A Labour Government.

Mr. MORGAN: That was before a Labour Government ever came into power there. I admit that the manager of the bank is within his right when he says that he cannot advance £200 on a prickly-pear selection as the security is not good, because I know what the prickly pear is. But is it not the duty of the Government to get round that? Are they prepared to say to the bank, "Lend the prickly-pear selector the £200 the same as the agricultural farm selector, and we will guarantee the advance"? This question has to be looked at from a national standpoint, and I am sorry to say that the pet has never yet been looked upon as a national one. The Lands Department have come to the conclusion that there are 13,000,000 acres in Queensland which are unclearable because of the pear. The figures which have been prepared by the department show that there are 13,000,000 acres of good land in the State which would be better if sunk at the bottom of the sea, because the pear has got hold of it. We find that the pear is not even being kept in check, but that it is increasing. I think I might say that there is two-thirds more land every year coming under pear than is being cleared of the pest. Yet under these particular clauses we are doing all we possibly can to stop men going on to prickly-pear land. We are told that selectors of prickly-pear land receive special consideration in the matter of price, but I contend that it is not right to place any value on it at all. Instead of regarding such land as an asset, we should say that we want it settled

Mr. Morgan.

and that we shall look for a return from the selector not to the price of the land but to railway receipts and other taxes. This land is getting of less value every year. The thing is to try and stop the spread of the pear, if possible. In the Lands Department they look upon the department as a money-making concern. They want to exact the last penny. They say that land is worth 10s. an acre. If it is not taken up after two years at that price, they reduce the price to 7s. 6d. an acre, and every two years or so they reduce the price by 2s. 6d. But in the meantime the cost of clearing the pear is increasing by 10s. or 12s. every year. The department should be prepared to let people take up pear land for nothing. They cannot afford to bargain over the price. So long as there is good land in other parts of Queensland where there is no pear, so long will the pear land remain unselected. If land which is free from pear is not taken up it does not matter, as the land will not deteriorate; but the pear land is deteriorating every year, and eventually it will be worth nothing at all, so that the department and the State are losing through insisting on the last penny being got out of the selector. Then, owing to the increased rates of pay to surveyors, the survey fees have been raised by 50 per cent., and now they are the highest of any State in Australia, and three or four times as high as in Canada, where they are putting people on the land in thousands. Where we paid £21 before, we now have to pay 50 per cent. more, and in the case of prickly-pear land the selector has to pay the whole amount in a lump as soon as he selects the land. The department is not dealing fairly by the man who takes up prickly-pear land, and it should be more liberal. They should not trouble their heads about a paltry shilling or two. So long as the pear is being destroyed, they should be prepared to give the land for nothing.

Mr. FIDELLY: You had better come over here.

Mr. MORGAN: I am one of those who believe in a good strong Government, and I believe in a strong Opposition as well; but the people have sent such a weak, miserable Opposition to this House that some of the Government supporters find it necessary to criticise the actions of the Government, because the Opposition have shown themselves so far incapable of dealing with anything but strikes.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are the candid friend of the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: It is better to be the candid friend of the Government than to be a friend who hides himself when he is attacking anybody. What I say here I am prepared to say outside. I do not say things here under the protection of the privilege which a member possesses with regard to anything he may say on the floor of this House. If I make any remarks here, I am prepared to make them outside, and that is what some hon. members on the other side are not prepared to do.

Mr. RYAN: I do not think you are justified in calling this a "miserable Opposition." (Laughter.) Do you think that is a fair thing? (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: I certainly think my remarks are justified, because hon. members opposite have absolutely proved during the last two or three days that they are capable

of nothing else but talking of strike matters. In setting forth the conditions which are imposed on selectors of prickly-pear land, the Government should insist upon each selector clearing a chain right round his land during the first year. At the present time the selector has to clear a certain portion, but it is not stipulated where it is to be cleared, and the result is that one man clears one portion and another clears another portion. If it were specified that during the first year every selector should clear a chain right round his selection, the selector of 1,280 acres would only be asked to clear 48 acres, but it would mean that there would be a clearing two chains wide between every two selections, and that would assist materially in keeping the pear in check. We have seen a good deal in the papers lately about the Government grant of 10s. in the £1 not being claimed by different local authorities for pear-clearing. I find that in shires where it would cost £100 to clear all the roads and reserves of pear the Government are prepared to grant an endowment to the extent of £33. Where the cost of clearing the roads and reserves in a shire would amount to £300, the Government are prepared to give 15s. in the £1, and in shires where the cost would exceed £300 per annum they are prepared to grant £1 for £1. But where the pear is the worst they will not give any more. We do not want to "grease the fat pig," to use a common expression, but we should try to assist the shires in which, through no fault of their own, it would cost thousands of pounds to clear the pear. I suggest that instead of this condition prevailing, the Government should set apart a certain amount of money and allow every shire a bonus—allow so much in the £1 to every shire, no matter what shire it may be. If a shire is prepared to spend £100 or £200 or £300 in clearing pear, then they should get at least 10s. or 15s. in the £1 assistance. That should apply to every shire, and not to only a few shires where the pear hardly exists. At the present time the Government are only assisting the fortunate shires, and the unfortunate shires, which spend a certain amount of money in clearing pear, get no help at all. A shire in my electorate which spends £200 a year in clearing pear—a bit here and a bit there—does not get any help at all, but to another shire that has only £100 worth of pear, the Government is prepared to give £33 in order to help them clear that pear. Where roads are cleared of pear the owners of the land on either side should be compelled to keep those particular roads clear. In Victoria the landowner has to keep the roads clear of thistles and rabbits, and I am quite satisfied in Queensland, after a man cleans his block of land, if the council or Government once cleared the road, the selector would be only too pleased to keep it clean. That should be a regulation, or the municipal councils should have the power to pass by-laws compelling the landowners, once the roads have been cleared, to keep them clear of pear. I also wish to refer to another important matter, and that is the necessity for an amendment of the Careless Use of Fire Act. We find in Queensland that things have changed—they are not the same now as they were some years ago. Districts that at one time were looked upon as squatting districts are now agricultural districts, and it is time some of the old Acts on the statute-book were revised. We have passed legislation year

[*Mn. Morgan.*]

after year, perhaps many years ago, and now those Acts are obsolete. They are out of date, and we want some alteration. We want some alteration in the Careless Use of Fire Act. At the present time a traveller might light a fire on a public road or reserve to boil his billy, and afterwards takes up his packs and goes on, leaving that fire burning. It may, perhaps, be safe for a time, but eventually it burns along the grass and perhaps some poor unfortunate settler is burnt out of house and home. It is quite true that the Careless Use of Fire Act is only applicable to certain districts and does not apply to the whole of Queensland. We can make application to have it extended, but we know that in some localities it is a very hard matter to get the councils to take advantage of that particular Act. It is time something was done in this matter. If the police or others were informed that a fire had been left burning on a road or reserve by a traveller, the man who was responsible should be brought before the police court and fined. It is time we protected the people who settle on small holdings. I also wish to refer to the recent appointments to the Upper House. I have nothing whatever to say against the *personnel* of those particular appointments. The gentlemen who have been appointed are no doubt eminently capable of fulfilling the duties of the position, but I do say that until that Chamber becomes an elective Chamber—I am one of those who believes in an elective Upper House and will do my level best to get that brought about—until that Chamber is made elective, I think the different industries should be represented in that Chamber. We have linen drapers, we have lawyers, we have breweries and hotel-keepers represented in that Chamber, but I doubt if there is one representative in the Upper House who can say he is a true representative of the small farmer. Perhaps when these matters are taken into consideration the farmer is overlooked. We have amongst our farmers men who are capable of holding their own in debate, men who read and think and who would be an honour to that Chamber; but simply because they do not happen to live in Brisbane or some other big town where they can make themselves heard, they have been overlooked. I say the farmers have a right to be represented in every representative House or Chamber that may exist in Queensland. He is the backbone of the country—he is the backbone whenever it comes to taxation. Perhaps they think the backbone can carry it best, but when it comes to representation, it is thought the backbone does not require support. I hope if any other appointments are to be made to that Chamber before it becomes an elective Chamber that the farmers will be taken into consideration; that they will be given representation, and that the Upper House will not consist of members representing the big industries that exist in and around Brisbane.

Mr. FIDELLY: Got a farmer in the Ministry first.

Mr. MORGAN: I also wish to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Ithaca in connection with the establishment of meatworks in Brisbane. He stated he was sorry to see we were going to have meatworks established here. I do not know what the people whom he represents, or the union he was secretary for some few months ago, will

think when he gets up in the House and says he is sorry meatworks are to be established here that will give employment to hundreds of men. I think it is to be regretted that a man who is supposed to represent the working class should get up here and say he regrets certain works are to be established that will give employment to 300 or 400 men.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: He did not object to the establishment of the works.

Mr. MORGAN: He did not qualify his remarks. He went so far as to say there were sufficient meatworks in Queensland to treat all the stock available. That is not so, because for meat there is a season and the off season. It has to be treated at a certain season, and if we cannot sell our stock at that particular period we have to keep them a considerably longer period, simply because we are told the meatworks are full up, and that they cannot send out a buyer to inspect for three or four months. So far as the Brisbane market is concerned, it is absolutely nothing as regards the sale of cattle. Anybody who has had experience knows what it is to send in stock to Brisbane. We find to-day that beef is selling at 17s. to 18s. per 100 lb. in Brisbane yards, and in New South Wales the price is £1 5s. to £1 7s. 6d. per 100 lb., and in Victoria £1 10s. per 100 lb. So that, although not more than 1000 miles separates us, we get 17s. or 18s. per 100 lb. for beef while in Victoria they are paying £1 10s.

Mr. RYAN: And we pay just as much for our meat.

Mr. MORGAN: Yet we are told there are sufficient works in Brisbane and in Queensland to meet all requirements. I say that they are not. We have only got a certain season to get off our crop—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I beg your pardon. Do not put the question, Mr. Speaker, I do not want further time.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassfern*): I do not intend to keep the House so very long tonight, nor do I intend to say very much on the question of the late strike. I suppose it is only natural that hon. members who were more intimately connected with it than I was want to blow off steam, so to speak, during the Address in Reply. I believe after this is over we will hear very little of it. I have listened very attentively to the remarks made by hon. members, who, as I say, are well acquainted with the inner side of this matter, but some of the remarks are very hard to understand. Some hon. members describe the police as having used batons, and all that sort of thing; and yet one hon. member, who perhaps knows as much as anyone else about it, and who, at least, had a speaking part in the whole thing described them as worthy of comic-opera. Whether there is anything of the nature of comic-opera about it, I do not know; but it struck me that we were all rather hysterical about it, and I say that in the broadest sense. There is one feature which the leader of the Opposition mentioned which is important, and which may be remembered when other features of the strike have long been forgotten—and that is the very interesting question of the military being asked for and refused by Mr. Fisher. I feel it only right to say, in fairness to the Prime Minister for

Mr. Wienholt.]

any criticism I may make later on, that my own private opinion is this: I was sorry to see the Government and the Premier ask for the military. I will also say that I think if I had been Prime Minister of the Commonwealth myself, I would have refused the troops too.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr WIENHOLT: But though I say that, I must remember this: That it is a different thing if you have the responsibility of making such a request on your shoulders. If any grievous accident had happened by injudicious attempts at arrest, or something of that sort, would not hon. members opposite be the very first to blame the Premier for never having asked for the troops? I can imagine how the deputy leader of the Opposition would be getting up and blaming the Premier for not having asked for the military. He would have explained why the Government did not ask—and that was because there was a Labour Government in power in the Commonwealth. (Opposition laughter.) I will say this: That I never withheld my admiration for the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth for having risen to the high position that he has. I think that any man who can, so to speak, rise to that position off his own bat, is worthy of admiration.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: I will say that quite sincerely, but I think that when the Prime Minister made the remark that he did when he knew the result of the election—that the finances of Queensland were in a bad way—I think he did something that was unworthy and disloyal.

Mr. COYNE: He had been attacked before—did he not speak the truth?

Mr. WIENHOLT: He had been attacked, and we will make allowances for a man who has fought a political campaign. Let him by all means attack the Denham Government—the Liberal party—but he should not have let himself be drawn into saying anything disloyal and unfair to the State. The leader of the Opposition and many other members perhaps have influence with the Prime Minister, and as Queenslanders may be able to give him some friendly hint that we will not see that sort of spectacle again.

Mr. RYAN: This Government is always crying stinking fish to the Commonwealth.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I have no sympathy with anyone who tries to run down the Commonwealth. I believe it is best to be, first of all, an Australian, and, secondly, a Queenslanders.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: But "two wrongs do not make a right," and it is just as wrong for any of us here to be drawn into running down Australia because we do not believe in the present Commonwealth Government, as it is for the Prime Minister to come up here and confuse the Liberal Government with Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. WIENHOLT: He said the finances are in a bad way. I do not think that that is true. When you consider what our debt has been spent on, and that we still own 90 odd per cent. of our land, when you think of the vast possibilities of the State—and

[Mr. Wienholt.

perhaps better than that, that we have a growing Australian spirit right throughout the Commonwealth, and beyond that again we have all the power of the British Empire behind us—I do not think there is any country in the world that has its finances in a sounder position than Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: I would like to say a word about the railways. The hon. member for Murilla drew attention to the question of freight. I know that hon. member did very good work last session in respect to one or two anomalies—and I imagine that in a big department of that sort there will always be some anomalies that will need alteration; but I say this—and I say it carefully, because I represent a farming constituency, and I know how popular it is to speak about reduced freights—I hope the Minister for Railways will be very careful about reducing freights.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He will be.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I am very glad to hear that. It is a difficult thing to raise them again. I look upon our railways as one of our best assets. There is another thing about our railways—I think if we can show they are paying railways it will have a good effect on the borrowing and rearrangement of our loans which are coming in the future. That is why I think it is highly desirable that the railways should show high returns during the next few years. I was surprised to hear one of the points mentioned by the hon. member for Brisbane in his exceedingly interesting speech on railway matters. He declared that there was still some victimisation going on in the Railway Department.

Mr. KIRWAN: I know it.

Mr. WIENHOLT: The hon. member knows more about this, I will admit, than I do, but I cannot imagine two men less likely to do anything in the shape of victimisation than the present Minister and the Commissioner.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is perfectly true—I can prove it.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I suppose when men are discharged others come in and take their places, and the hon. member will have to suggest what cure is possible. But I am sure if there are railway men in Brisbane who have been in the past good servants to the department, as the hon. member said, walking the streets, I think it is time that by-gones should be by-gones. (Hear, hear!) I would like to see the department, if possible, heal any wound that may be left.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Did I not say there are only forty-two not taken back.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I admit that it is victimisation if you refuse to take a man back for any cause that is now settled; but is it not just as much victimisation when you have preference to unionists, and refuse to employ men at all because of their political opinions? I say that that is victimisation of the worst kind. I do not believe there is anyone in the House who says he does not believe in unionism. The only argument I can see against unionism is in this preference. I hope hon. members will explain that. I have always understood that one volunteer is worth two pressed men, and why a union should wish to press men into a union, I cannot understand.

Mr. HARDACRE: Because they are co-operating with the law—the arbitration and conciliation law. (Government laughter.)

Mr. WIENHOLT: Then there is this Industrial Peace Bill which has to come before us. We do not know the [7 p.m.] details of it, and I feel doubtful of these industrial Bills. I hope the Bill will be treated as little as possible on party lines. It would be a pity if a Bill with such a title was subject to a particularly acrimonious and bitter debate. A Bill of that sort, above all measures, should receive fair consideration and the help of all members. The hon. member for Ithaca the other night suggested that it would be a good thing if the secretaries of unions could also be made inspectors under the wages boards. I do not know whether he was really sincere, or whether there was a certain amount of dry humour in what he said; but I am afraid that sort of amendment would hardly work. Personally I think that nothing but really good common sense and good feeling between employers and employees will bring matters into a satisfactory state. In this House many of us are experts in different matters and have what may be called technical knowledge. Members like the hon. member for Brisbane, the hon. member for Ithaca, the hon. member for Enoggera, and many of the farming representatives have such knowledge; and I think that if the whole House of seventy-two members act in a fair spirit, without party bias, and bring our best efforts to bear on the subject, we may possibly produce something that will be of help in settling industrial questions. I notice that there is a Public Servants Superannuation Bill to come before us. I found in my box a paper containing the regulations for the admission of candidates into the classified and unclassified divisions of the service; and, as this party stands for no class legislation, it is somewhat mystifying to me that there should be these class divisions. I think that any lad entering any department of the Public Service in any capacity whatever should not be restricted in any way from attaining to the highest position in the service, whether classified or not. Like Napoleon's soldier, he should carry a marshal's baton in his knapsack. Now, I would like to say a word or two on land matters. We have had eight good years in the pastoral industry, and I notice that there is a keen and eager demand for grazing farms. With another good year the demand will probably be keener. Probably hon. members opposite will tell us of the great number of applicants who cannot get land, but in many cases those applications are for picked spots. All the same, there is a very keen demand.

Mr. HAMILTON: The demand exceeds the supply.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I believe it does. But that proves the attractiveness of Queensland to people outside as well as to our own people, and shows they are satisfied that we have good lands administration, with a fair and just Minister at the head. Large resumptions are taking place; and I hope the Minister will be able to push on those resumptions and have them open as soon as possible. The State is now getting a justified increase in pastoral rents; and it is only a fair thing, after a number of good seasons, that when many of the holdings become due for reappraisal of the rents, to arrange that the reappraisal

should be made in time to get the benefit of these good years. Another matter is the settlement of the land in small areas. I am not one who believes in too wild an immigration policy. I believe that first of all we want to be sure that our own young men are getting land.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: The hon. member for Burnett spoke particularly well, I thought, on this matter; and in his district there is perhaps the largest area of good Crown land which can be made available for really close settlement and which is handy. I believe there is an area of 300,000 or 400,000 acres. There are many young farmers in my district and other districts who want land to settle on, and I hope the Minister for Railways and the Minister for Lands will this session bring forward a railway that will open up this country for settlement. I know there is a battle of the routes; but I hope the railway will be passed, and special consideration given to the young farmers of the Fassifern, Rosewood, and other districts. They are really the best settlers we can have—(hear, hear!)—because they understand the falling of scrub and other matters connected with settlement in this country. Another matter is the prickly pear problem; and in connection with that matter I would make a suggestion I made before—namely, that if practicable the Government should try and use prison labour in the eradication of the pear. When I made the suggestion before I was assailed with "Chain gangs," "Russia," "Cheap labour!" and so on. That, however, is not my idea. I believe that prison labour could be used in this way, not only effectively in clearing pear country, but as a means of considerable reform in our prison administration. So that nobody could say that a prisoner was treated harshly, I would leave it optional whether he worked in a pear camp or not; and I would make it a privilege. I would give the greatest reduction in sentence to those working in prison pear camps—if necessary, four-fifths, or even more, of the sentence. I never believed in long sentences. Let us imagine some unfortunate has five or six years in prison ahead of him. By good conduct he may perhaps get out in four and a-half years. If that prisoner had a certain amount of pear land given to him to clear and he knew that by working hard he could clear it in a year, would it not be good for him to have a chance of tackling the work? And would not the moral effect of having won his own freedom by his own work enable him to come out a better citizen than after simply putting in four or five years in an ordinary prison? Another objection is that we should be interfering with outside labour. That might be a reasonable objection if it were a fact, but if you visit St. Helena or any of our prisons you will see prisoners working at saddlery and the making of pint pots, and so on. Surely that is interfering with outside labour. I hold that if there is one occupation in which they will not interfere with outside labour it would be in clearing prickly pear. I should like to say a word or two with reference to the mining industry. That industry, I own, I know very little about, but it is peculiarly gratifying to find that we have on this side of the House representatives of the mining industry. I have frequently heard mining members on the other side speaking on mining matters, and, to do them justice, they are

Mr. Wienholt.]

always advocates of good hours, healthy conditions, and good wages for miners, and I say "good luck to them" in advocating those things. I believe that members on this side of the House who represent mining constituencies will not be less keen in their advocacy of those things for miners. At the same time I am of opinion that members opposite have been too narrow in their views. It is no use getting good conditions for the men if you do not allow the industry to exist. Members opposite seem to be hostile to the mining syndicate, or mining company, and yet I know that when I was living near Gympie, many stockmen invested their savings in the Gympie mines, and it appears to me that these men and other small investors should be given equal consideration with the miners. The hon. member for Charters Towers spoke extremely nicely about the farmers' representatives when he gave us examples of how money had been spent on State farms, and I can assure him that he will find that I for one will be ready to help mining members in anything which will promote the prosperity of the mining industry. Farming members know what help the mining industry has been and can be to the persons they represent, but there are other and greater reasons why one wishes to see the mining industry flourish, and one is that mining brings and keeps in the State a bigger population than almost any other industry, and we know the need we have for population. If the country has ever to fight for its existence we can depend upon the miners, who are as fine and as staunch a body of men as we have in the State, and who will be the backbone of the country. I remember that Macaulay in one of his poems—perhaps the hon. member for Rockhampton could quote it better than I can, says—

"The rugged miners poured to war
from Mendip's sunless caves."

And I think we shall find the miners a great asset to the State in our hour of need. I do not wish to say anything further, except upon one point, and that is that hon. members opposite are continually accusing us of not being sincere. I cannot quite see how they can be sincere themselves. For years now they have been fighting on their platform of socialism. That, they say, is practically the whole object of their desire. Lately they have had control of the Federal Parliament, and they have also had absolute control of the Northern Territory, which after all only consists of a few cattle stations, and about 1,100 or 1,200 white people and a few Chinamen. I believe that every one of those stations could have been bought at a comparatively reasonable price, and if members opposite and their party are sincere in their professions of socialism, they had a splendid opportunity there to put it in force. Is there any territory which is so open and so well adapted for an experiment in socialism as the Northern Territory? Hon. members opposite laugh. That is exactly what I expected they would do when I made this suggestion; they are not game to try socialism on a big scale. Experiments in socialism are somewhat difficult where there are vested interests, and yet members talk about making them in such places. But in the Northern Territory we have a vast area of land, it is virgin country and has only a small population, and one would have thought that socialists,

[Mr. Wienholt.

even if it was only out of curiosity, and even if it cost a few millions, would have made a trial of socialism in that territory. But they have not made the attempt.

Mr. HAMILTON: They have taken over a territory that is tied up with leases for twenty, thirty, forty, and fifty years.

Mr. WIENHOLT: I believe there is not one of those leases that could not be bought to-day. I am pleased that the Liberal party have been returned by the country, not so much for what they have done as for what it is hoped they will do. I believe it is not the man who putteth on the armour, but the man who takes it off, who should boast, and I hope this House will—with the help of the Opposition if possible, if not without them—do good work for Queensland. I hope also that at the end of this Parliament we shall leave the State more prosperous than we found it. By "prosperity" I mean general prosperity, not the prosperity of one class. I like to see prosperity spread throughout the State, from the big man—if you like to call him by that name—down to the humblest worker, and especially clerks in offices, who do not, I think, get too fair a share of things at present. If we do that this Parliament will not have been elected in vain.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FIDELLY (*Paddington*): It is very refreshing indeed to find that we have one Australian on the other side of the House who can get away from party shackles, and give us an outline of what should be an Australian ideal. (Hear, hear!) I cannot go all the way with him in his strictures with regard to the Northern Territory. I do not think he is fully conversant with the facts of the matter. However, on his general ideas he is to be complimented. Certainly they are in marked contrast with the peevish, parish pumpism of the hon. member for Murilla, and also with the smug, shallow hypocrisy of the Treasurer. The hon. member for Fassifern said that the appeal to the Commonwealth for a military force was an hysterical one. I do not think there can be two opinions about that. But I do not know that Major Cahill, the Commissioner of Police, will care about hearing that condemnation from a member on the Government side of the House. We know about the hysterical appeal of the Premier, and we are glad that the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth kept his head sufficiently well to reply that he would not countenance the use of the military in a matter of purely domestic polity. The Prime Minister suggested that the Premier of Queensland was affected in some way by the moon, and the remarks of the hon. member for Fassifern bear out that surmise. The man who advised His Excellency seems to have been the most hysterical of all those who were concerned in the affair. I propose now to deal with the Treasurer's remarks regarding the strike. The hon. gentleman posed as a peacemaker.

The TREASURER: Hear, hear!

Mr. FIDELLY: I do not think the hon. gentleman has convinced himself that he is a peacemaker. There is not an atom of sincerity in his professions. If he were a peacemaker, is it not probable that he would have consulted his colleague, the Minister for Lands, who is solicitor for the man who plunged Brisbane and Queensland into industrial distress? We have circumstances

existing in the Government circle where one Cabinet Minister is adviser of the Crown and taking money from the public purse for his advice, and at the same time his firm are taking moneys as advisers to the tramway proprietary.

Mr. HUNTER: Disgraceful.

Mr. FIEHELLY: I do not know if the Hon. the Treasurer saw that aspect of the case when he was addressing the House last night.

The TREASURER: It is an aspect of the case that did not exist.

Mr. FIEHELLY: It is a fact. (Hear, hear!) We come along to the Treasurer's arguments, which summed up amount to saying to the other side, "You don't like it." He also read us several letters, and also fell back on the Press cuttings which seem to be the main policy of the present Ministry. Certainly this Ministry will go down to posterity as "the Ministry of Press cuttings." (Opposition laughter.) Nothing original has emanated from that side—nothing original whatever. The Treasurer gave the House a little lecture last night, but I would remind him that at one time he accused a certain man named William Kidston of having been drummed out of Falkirk.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FIEHELLY: He accused him of that, and yet afterwards he sat in the same Ministry with him. Whether the Treasurer knew it was a lie at the time he said that we do not know, but we know that it was afterwards distinctly proved to be a lie, and I do not know that that statement by the Treasurer was ever publicly retracted. Consequently, when we find the Treasurer and Minister for Works sitting in this House what can we think so far as his remarks and opinions are concerned. Can we take them as being honest? I don't hesitate to answer, we cannot do so.

Mr. BRESLIN: He has gone out to get some advice from the Premier. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FIEHELLY: There was one matter which the Treasurer refrained from touching on when he was wiping the floor with the hon. member for Cairns and other members the other night.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He thought he was wiping the floor with them.

Mr. FIEHELLY: Yes; he thought he was. The Treasurer did not say a word about a certain carters' wages board in Rockhampton. I have a very vivid recollection that the hon. member for Keppel charged the Treasurer with suspending the award of the carters' wages board in Rockhampton, and subsequently making an Order in Council abolishing the board altogether. The Treasurer finds that he has a very convenient appointment outside just at this particular time. (Laughter.) At any rate, that is one little matter which he did not dwell upon at all. He was very good in giving the details of a confidential document, which I understood he made confidential himself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FIEHELLY: I think the Treasurer suggested that it should be made confidential. (Hear, hear!) What was it he quoted? Just the usual felicitations to the chairman from members of a board at the close of its sitting.

Mr. THEODORE: The usual amenities.

Mr. FIEHELLY: Yes; the usual hypocrisies. (Laughter.) Just in the same way that hon. members congratulate new members here on the way they made their first speeches. As a matter of fact, we all do that sort of thing. While referring to the new members I wish to compliment the mover of the Address in Reply—(laughter)—and also the seconder of that motion. (Renewed laughter.) I think they are both an acquisition to the House. (Laughter.) I mean that. (Renewed laughter.) The Treasurer in quoting from this document forgot to mention that they were the ordinary common-place felicitations—the garden variety of felicitations, to get down to the language of the hon. member for Murilla. (Laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: You seem to like the member for Murilla.

Mr. FIEHELLY: We like him very well; but in his speech he could not get away from his poddy calves. (Laughter.) I intended to deal with matters contained in the Address in Reply when I first got up, but the sensible remarks of the hon. member for Fassifern coming on top of the inanities of the hon. member for Murilla rather put me off the Address in Reply. However, it will be generally admitted that it is a colourless document. The hon. member for Port Curtis remarked last night that a lot of the things were dead and were being resurrected, and some of them ought to be buried. The Trade Disputes Bill is not found in the Governor's Speech. So far as I can see the only contentious matter is the Liquor Bill. The Industrial Peace Bill is hardly a contentious matter, because, personally, I am inclined to agree with it. Whether it deals with the prevention of strikes or not I do not know, but a man cannot give away his freedom altogether. When all else fails the men must have their right to strike. You will find advisers of the Crown, like the Treasurer, who simply incites class war, and yet he comes along to the floor of this House and poses as an angel of peace. The same hon. member will abolish the awards of wages boards and yet say that you should not strike because you have a wages board to deal with your case. In fact, one member on this side said the Government were more like moonlighters than men who had the welfare of the country at heart.

Mr. HAMILTON: They suspended the Factories and Shops Act during the strike.

Mr. FIEHELLY: Dealing with the general strike, I think the country is tired of it—full up of it. I think that members on both sides have simply wearied the House with yards of quotations about the strike—the strike—the strike. The strike is dead.

Mr. BOOKER: You are wearying us now.

Mr. FIEHELLY: The hon. member will be wearied more before I have finished. We are fairly tired of the details of the strike, but the thing we have taken no notice of is the moral of the strike, and what is to be deduced from it. All I know is that the employees lost, the employers lost, and the country has to foot the bill to the extent of £25,000. Hon. members on the other side do not seem to realise that in 1910 the Government put the first match to that little fire. After that they fanned that match with considerable vigour, and it culminated in this appeal for the military, then the flour, and subsequently the newspaper cuttings, and, amongst other things, a little victimisation. (Laughter.) I will not deal with the

Mr. Fiehellly.]

details of the strike, but I want to lay stress on the blundering stupidity of the Government, which neglected, first of all by Order in Council, to deal with the wearing of the badge. That regulation was not passed in a legal way. Mr. Justice Higgins pointed out at the very outset that that simple regulation saying that these tram people should not wear the badge was not legalised. To legalise it, it should have been passed by an Order in Council. The Secretary for

Lands, the solicitor of the Tramways Company, probably advised that it was not necessary, and the same hon. gentleman, in consultation probably with the Attorney-General, advised the Government that it was unnecessary to issue a proclamation regarding the military. The Government blundered right through. Nothing they touched seemed to go right, and from a legal aspect or a common-sense aspect nothing at all was done in correct order. Now, when some more political capital is going to be made out of the strike—because all the political capital has not yet been made out of it, although the present Government has been returned with a blank cheque—the Liberal party in the Federal Parliament want to keep it going until their misrepresentations can get amongst the people during the next general election. And yet all of this great strike business, upon which our destinies seem to rest for the next six or ten years, is due to an inept and stupid Government—a Government that has not even an atom of common sense, and has not done one thing in a regular and authorised way. The Premier gave an exhibition of Billingsgate. As a young member, I expected some policy from him, some passing reference to what he might do in the future. I do not mind a gentle cock-a-doodle-doo over their victory—for it was a real victory—although not so real as hon. members opposite imagine; but the hon. gentleman had a portfolio of Press cuttings, worn-out efforts of some penny-a-liner that we had read, and stuff that hon. members had given their constituents by the yard, and that some hon. members opposite had learned by heart. The hon. gentleman insulted our intelligence by offering this in reply to the fine speech of the leader of the Opposition. Amongst other things, the hon. gentleman spoke of people who were a disgrace to this great Queensland. It does not rankle very much with me, but I think that if there is any individual, whether in Parliament or out of it, who has abused the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth of Australia with the same freedom as the hon. gentleman, he should be ashamed in his little anti-national and State-fright way, to talk about disgrace. If there is one individual I hold in contempt, it is the reactionary anti-Australian, the man who has come to Australia and prospered, and who cries “stinking fish” about our great country. I am very pleased that the hon. member for Fassifern gave the hon. gentleman indirectly such a splendid lecture on what patriotism should be. In the Premier’s argument the affair of the pawnshop had to appear. Well, I want to give some more “pawnshop.” The Premier found it necessary to quote the *Bulletin*, which is always right. It does not matter what it says, it is always right. It can be quoted for itself and against itself for the next thirty years, but it is always right because it is the *Bulletin*. Perhaps it would not be out of place

[*Mr. Fihelly.*

to give the hon. gentleman some of the *Bulletin* back. I do not go in much for quotations, and I do not feel too happy when other members are reading yards of them; but this is what the *Bulletin* had to say about pawnshops, amongst other things, in its last issue—

“Queensland has been going the whole hog. This shows how the Northern State’s loan expenditure has been shaping:—1905, £225,466; 1906, £297,624; 1907, £683,570; 1908, £1,033,676; 1909, £1,247,821; 1910, £1,486,216; 1911, £1,995,301; 1912, £3,324,248. The money has, of course, been spent in ‘opening up the country’—the same old operation on which £44,750,000 had allegedly been spent before last year started.”

I think that is meant as sarcasm, because the words “opening up of the country” are quoted—

“Yet, though £79 13s. had been spent to open up the country for every man, woman, and child in it, the job had either been done so badly, or the country takes such a vast amount of opening up, that another £5 8s. per head had to be poured into the same sink last year; and apparently still more must be poured in before the country can hold any additional people. When will this farce end?”

This is the Bible of hon. members opposite that I am quoting—

“Or, frankly, does the Denham Government believe that the £48,000,000 already spent has only developed the country enough to hold 610,000 people?”

Rather a fair argument for those who believe in the eternal loan policy, and who, like the hon. member for Murrumba, would like to borrow £5,000,000 and spend it in one year—

“If it can hold more people with the present development, then this seems a proper time to keep out of the pawnshop.”

That is what I told the Premier the other day—that this was the proper time to keep out of the pawnshop, as we have had seven or eight surpluses. The Treasurer boasted about his surpluses, which are mostly due to rain and other lumps of luck. But, notwithstanding those surpluses, our credit is still pretty bad, or at least not good—I will put it that way. I shall now quote more of the *Bulletin*—

“During the next twelve months the State has about £3,000,000 worth of IOU’s falling due; and, since it hasn’t any cash in hand wherewith to buy up those IOU’s, it must borrow £3,000,000, even though it doesn’t spend a cent on public works during the next twelve months.”

Of course we know that, but the fact that we were aware of it does not get away from another fact—that we are going to have a little trouble in borrowing the money.

Mr. GRAYSON: Don’t you believe in borrowing?

Mr. FIHELLEY: I will give you my policy upon borrowing in time, but I will say that I do not believe in going mad on borrowing.

Mr. GRAYSON: They do not want railways in your electorate.

Mr. FIEHELLY: The hon. member thinks there is nothing in the world except a little tinpot railway running from one backyard to another. The hon. member wants a railway running from a sandy-bedded creek into every yard of corn in the Cunningham. There are bigger issues than provincial railways—

“And in 1915 a beautiful little lot of £11,728,000 will have to be argued in one piece.”

Well, that is a fair argument even for those who believe in a big loan policy.

“If Denham had to climb Bellenden Ker to save his life, it *might* be a sensible thing to prepare for it by doing a 5-mile sprint; but that plan would be much more liable to leave a corpse on the track.”

That is all the *Bulletin*. I would not have bothered quoting the *Bulletin* at all, only hon. members on the other side say it is gospel. Members, like the hon. member for Murilla, who cannot think consecutively, rush to the *Bulletin*. (Laughter.)

Mr. WHITE: We don't want the *Bulletin* shut over here.

Mr. FIEHELLY: The Premier insisted that we should have it. We go a little further with the Premier in his authorities. He quoted the Federal Attorney-General on the strike matter.

Mr. MORGAN: Use your own brains, if you possess any.

Mr. FIEHELLY: My friend, the hon. member for Murilla is talking about a subject to which he is an absolute stranger—brains. (Opposition laughter.) The Premier quoted the Federal Attorney-General on the matter of the strike. He agreed with the attitude of the Federal Attorney-General, and I want to ask him: Does he agree with the referendum now? Does he go the whole animal with the Federal Attorney-General? As he also agreed with the Federal Minister for External Affairs, is he also going to accept the Commonwealth Bank? Or is he going to pick out a little bit here and a little bit there to show that the Labour party can think independently, and that we are not bound and shackled to the extent of other people? Our members have absolute freedom of thought, and we can explain to the public what our opinions are on the strike, what we are upon every other question affecting the public; but apparently our friends on the other side pick out one or two items from us and call them inconsistencies, or use them to flay us with. Mr. Hughes and Mr. O'Malley have both been fighting side by side with us at the last general elections, and I hope they will give us a little bit of assistance at the next State elections. Before I leave the strike altogether I want to draw attention to the Tramway Company and its operations. That such a monopoly should be allowed to exist in Brisbane is a scandal. We know it has the passive and active support of the Government, but such a badly conducted affair, from the point of view of the public convenience, should not be tolerated here, and it should certainly not be allowed to go outside the Act and make contracts with local authorities whereby it gets rid of certain of its responsibilities. As matters now stand, before one can get a tram to a suburb within a decent distance of the city, the threat is “You must pay

for the upkeep of the road or you cannot get a tram,” and that, to my mind, is responsible for the fact that rents are high, because new suburbs are seldom opened up. The trams only go there after they are opened up. It is quite different in Sydney with the system of nationally-owned trams. They go in for pioneering, like railways constructed into the district of the hon. member for Cunningham—they go there and pioneer and help the people to open up new suburbs. Also as regards electric light, this company seems to be able to distribute electric light everywhere and anywhere. A short time ago, I recollect, the South Brisbane Municipal Council could not get a Bill through this House to allow them to manufacture electric light. A municipality whose profits go for the benefit of the people who reside in that city, could not get permission to make electric light for their own benefit, yet the Tramways Company are allowed surreptitiously to supply light all over the city of Brisbane, in competition with the people who are supposed to have the real monopoly, which is just as bad.

Mr. WHITE: You ought to be glad.

Mr. FIEHELLY: I am not glad of any scheme whereby such a company as the Tramway Company can make money. This victory we heard so much about a short time ago—I admit it is rather substantial in this House, but at the same time, in justice to us, it must also be admitted that we had no say in framing the electorates. Hon. members on the other side say they had no say, in the redistribution, but I think it panned out admirably for them.

Mr. WHITE: By Jove, it did.

Mr. FIEHELLY: However, they certainly have a preponderance of members in this House, but when you analyse the votes it is found that there were 110,817 votes cast in favour of Government candidates, and 105,215 votes cast against them. Why, after all the magnificent strike, members on the Treasury bench have only increased their vote by nearly 30,000, whereas we have increased our vote by 40,000. The difference between the two, when all is said and done, is only 5,602 votes, and on that ratio, out of the sixty-seven seats contested, there would have been thirty-four and one-third on the Government side—and I put the member for Murilla down as the one-third—(laughter)—and on the Opposition side there would be thirty-two and two-thirds. (Renewed laughter.) I would remind members opposite of the state of affairs prior to the last Federal elections. At that time we were about 35,000 behind in the total number of votes—or, at any rate, we were not less than 20,000 behind. This time we were only 5,000 behind, and I fancy that, notwithstanding the blood party in the Federal House, who have been howling for blood all the month, and who have hung up public business because they could not get blood—notwithstanding that party, I fancy we are going to capture the Senate and the House of Representatives, and I do not think Mr. Fisher need be a bit troubled, although a certain member scored votes where Mr. Fisher happened to go and also where Mr. Fisher did not happen to go. I think members on the opposite side should feel rather ashamed of the Ministerial exhibition that has been made during the last few weeks. There is our friend, the Home Secretary. His voice, apparently,

Mr. Fiehellly.]

is the biggest asset at the present time on the Treasury bench. He certainly has no reason or logic, and the hon. gentleman need not think that by merely singing out at the top of his voice that he can win any argument. Certainly a loud voice is very effective, but I think we could all detect something in the speech similar to that advertisement of the puppy outside the gramophone—we could detect the master's voice. I think we were listening to the master's voice through the Home Secretary, and whether he gloried in the exploits of special constables, or Major Cahill, or not, or whether he gloried in those brutalities which were perpetrated during the strike time or not, certainly he did not appear very sincere, and if *Hansard* were illustrated, I fancy the hon. gentleman would be seen with his tongue in his cheek. A caricature of him would be there, and he would not be looking at all in earnest on these matters. He gave us a long list of dynamite and soft soap—Cahill's soft soap. The dynamite has been proved to be soft soap. But the hon. member had a walk-over in his electorate, and had no use for the soft soap. There is a probability that that may be the cause. However, it was a peculiar coincidence that all the soft soap was possibly discovered by those who put it there. In the old world, where dynamite is apt to be used in a gentle sort of way, the first discovery is made by the fact that something is blown up. Here the long arm of coincidence went so far that every man in the town could find dynamite. Even when a few school urchins put a couple of pebbles on the tram rails, they were turned into huge boulders. We know the Home Secretary controls a very efficient force. One would think that with all that dynamite about he would be able to sheet home the crime to at least one or two—and it was a crime if dynamite was put on the tram rails. (Hear, hear!) You would think with all those specials roving about the hotels and street corners, that they could develop some Sherlock Holmes instincts, and get on the trail of the dynamiters.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It was not there long enough.

Mr. FIDELLY: I am afraid it was found in each case by the individuals who put it there; otherwise I would say that Major Cahill's force is a very clever and efficient one, only for the one point that is lacking—to prove their efficiency they should have discovered one of the perpetrators. (Hear, hear!) Out of that noise—I think some hon. member called it stage thunder—out of that noise on the part of the Home Secretary, I would like to see him show his sincerity and test the strike in one direction. Why does he not prosecute the strike committee? If the strike was such a vicious outbreak, and all the strikers were guilty of sedition, there is a good chance of prosecuting the strike committee. They can be found; their address is well known to the police, and it will be quite as interesting in the police court as the game of two-up. With regard to loan expenditure—

Mr. WELSBY: Now we are going to get it.

Mr. FIDELLY: The hon. member wished to know my policy about loan. I think the first part of that policy would be a rational way of dealing with any loan that we require, and I think it is time that we realised that the Commonwealth is the right party

[*Mr. Fidelity.*]

to raise loans for the State. They will get the money on better terms than we could ever hope to get it. Their credit is better, and if our Ministry would recover from its periodical attack of State-frightism, and attempt to get on better terms with the Commonwealth Government, they would find that they would save several hundred thousand pounds a year—that is, of course, if the Commonwealth would tolerate their mad extravagance. In the Loan Bill put through a few days ago we saw the death of a poor little apparition that had been standing a couple of years. We had such a thing as a redemption of the debt, or a sinking fund, and it was wiped out in one stroke of the pen. Would it not have been wise for members who are so set on loan, and like £3,000,000 or £5,000,000 a year, and who probably later on will go up to £10,000,000—

Mr. FORSYTH: I will deal with you later on. I will give you a slating when it comes to the loan fund. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FIDELLY: I really feel very sorry. I am quite afraid. In connection with loan, would it not be a good idea to try and grapple with the sinking fund, try and put it on a safe financial basis, on an actuarial basis, so that it can be redeemed in proper time. We cannot go on borrowing for ever. A good deal of our money has been spent upon works that are not reproductive, and they at least should be covered by a sinking fund.

Mr. HAMILTON: Western Australia has one.

Mr. FIDELLY: I do not think they are unheard of. I will now touch for a moment upon immigration. The hon. member for Burnett last night said we should look after our immigrants when they arrived here. I think the immigrants should not be dumped in the town, and allowed to struggle around the wharves and the trams, for the common every-day sort of employment. They are brought here for a purpose, and mainly that they should be drafted towards the country districts. Just now, the immigrants happen to be reproductive work—each one is worth £1 5s. per head per annum, and I think they should be looked after in accordance with their value. In Sydney a while ago I had occasion to go into our tourist bureau agency. I remember a couple of years back, during the sugar strike, it was used as a recruiting establishment for free labourers.

Mr. HAMILTON: An agency for them.

Mr. FIDELLY: And since then I know for a positive fact that the office of the director was used by the representative of Young Bros., and the director himself was evicted—evicted with his own consent. It may have been with his own consent; at any rate, he handed the office over entirely to the representative of Messrs. Young Bros. who was recruiting free labour. The result is very obvious. During the late general strike the tourist agency in Sydney, was picketed every day by unionist people. They thought it was going to be another agency for free labourers. However, the policy of the tourist bureau is not mainly what I wanted to deal with; it is its utter unsuitability. It is a satire on Queensland, and yet it is supposed to represent our resources, to give an idea to the passing wayfarer that Queensland is a good place to go into, but it fails completely.

Mr. COYNE: Haven't they the "Sacred Ibis" there?

Mr. THEODORE: They have boomerangs there.

Mr. FIELLY: Yes, they have boomerangs there. But inside the inner sanctum, or sanctum sanctorum, all I could see was the photograph of a pugilist like Bill Squires, shaping up across two or three samples of Queensland wood, at an individual who looked quite pugnacious on the other side. That is one of our tourist agencies. A few daily papers are strewn around the table, and there are some more samples of Queensland wood in the outer compartment. They have a window into which a dray seems to have been backed and emptied. Yet the Premier, a while ago, was down in that office, and he is back here perfectly satisfied that we can rival New Zealand and New South Wales. But just at the present I can assure him it is more like a dust bin than anything else. Now, I would like the Minister for Works to listen while I make a few suggestions. The Commonwealth Government are con-

[8 p.m.] tinually having public works constructed all over the State; and the State Government carries out those works for the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government have a minimum wage; but the labourers on Commonwealth work done by the State Government cannot get that minimum wage, because the Minister for Works—and I suppose his colleagues endorse his action—will not pay that minimum. It would be no loss to Queensland; in fact, it would be a gain, because the more money that is spent on Commonwealth work the more commission the State Government is paid by the Commonwealth Government. In every other part of Australia labourers on Commonwealth work are paid the minimum wage, and it is a disgrace that in Queensland they should be penalised. It is time the matter should be inquired into and rectified. I have a few words to say now in regard to the Education Department and imported labour. Our teachers are the most sweated of our public servants considering their responsibilities. They are supposed to "teach the young idea how to shoot," and they should be paid fairly well, and their promotion should not be interfered with. The Minister for Education paid the passages of certain individuals from England and gave them a month's salary in advance. He put some of them on at £162 per annum, while his own teachers, who have proved their worth, remained at £142 per annum—where they will remain all their lives, unless they are willing to pass an examination which those other teachers were not asked to pass.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Those teachers have a higher qualification.

Mr. FIELLY: One imported man had no qualification to speak of.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not correct.

Mr. FIELLY: It is correct. If it is not correct, I will show a gross inconsistency in what the hon. gentleman says, because a short time ago a man of similar qualification was appointed at £142. One man who is in Brisbane at the present time was appointed at £162, but was not asked to pass the same test as our local teachers who stop at £142.

Mr. THEODORE: It is scandalous treatment.

Mr. FIELLY: Of course it is scandalous treatment. We have heard a great deal about the mining industry and about the

expenditure on deep sinking. I am of opinion that the Government should cease expenditure on deep sinking unless they are going to try new ground. The hon. member for Gympie talked about gold below the present depth and only wanting perseverance. That is all nonsense. The same ground was tried fifteen years ago and the money put into deep sinking was simply wasted. The experts on Gympie will admit that. Therefore I say that if any money is spent on deep sinking, it should be on entirely new ground to the north or to the south. With regard to the Justice Department, I cannot help referring to the little game of two-up they are playing—a game which is infinitely more vicious than the other game of two-up—in the way they are distributing briefs to partisan candidates. If the Government wish to reward defeated candidates who stood in their interest they should find some other way of doing so. I do not think it is a good thing to put rejected candidates into another place either. If rejected candidates on the Government side are to be rewarded with seats in the Upper House—

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: God help the other House.

Mr. FIELLY: If that is to be done, I do not see what is to become of representative government. The hon. member for Murilla said the Upper House should be elective, but I know that hon. member has a personal grudge to work off against a certain man who has been appointed.

Mr. MORCAN: Absolutely false.

Mr. FIELLY: It is a purely electoral affair; but the principle enunciated by the hon. gentleman is fairly correct, which is surprising, coming, as it does, from him. In the Railway Department I think there are any amount of abuses which could well be dealt with by some of the big Government majority; and I am glad the hon. member for Murilla complained and grumbled all round. I think it is about time the railway experts realised that the suburban railway service should be improved. Whether the improvement is to take the form of electrification or not I don't know—though Victoria is trying that system—but the tramways should not be allowed to compete with our railways as they do at the present time. The Railway Department is altogether behind in that respect. The Minister should also make inquiries into the commercial use of the monorail. If the single rail is feasible at all it is criminal to go on with the Western extensions without inquiry into the use to which the monorail may be put. I do not think it would cost much to make inquiry into the matter, and I am of opinion that the department should take up the matter and make a report available to this House at an early date. With regard to the Department of Agriculture, we have not had much of its work put before the House. Most members will recollect the cape gooseberries which were sent home sour, and the pineapples which were sent home rotten.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: During the strike.

Mr. FIELLY: No, long before the strike, when the present Premier was Minister for Agriculture. The question of abattoirs is one which the Government ought certainly to deal with, without appointing a Royal Commission to report on it. There is no necessity for a Royal Commission on that subject: the Commonwealth meat inspector could give in

Mr. Fihelly.]

an hour a report showing all that is required and how it should be done. I notice that there are several matters of importance absent from the Governor's Speech. One of these is a measure for water conservation. What are the Government going to do in that respect? Have the Government any intention of making provision for irrigation, or are they simply confining themselves to small abstract theories, which are dropped in between the elections? One member on the opposite side of the House remarked that he hoped to see a farmers' Ministry in Queensland. I should like to know if the Government are going to do any real work in irrigating our back lands and conserving water? There is plenty of scope for irrigation in places which are served by railways at the present time, and it is a pitiable fact that this matter has been lost sight of in the Governor's Speech. Then, there is no mention of any method for cheapening food.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Can it be done?

Mr. FIDELLY: Certainly it can be done, but it cannot be done any longer farmers' representatives support middlemen like the Premier and the Treasurer. Again, the housing of the people is a vital question, but that is not touched upon in the Governor's Speech. We have a Workers' Dwellings Act, but why have we not in conjunction with that a State sawmill and State brickworks? Even under the Workers' Dwellings Act a man requires some capital before he can get a home for himself. I hold that any individual in the State, with or without capital, should be assisted to build his own home, provided he is willing to pay interest and redemption on the money borrowed. In Sydney the Chief Secretary is trying to arrange for a public dispensary where medicines can be procured free of cost. Have the Government of Queensland ever thought of medicines being distributed free of cost to the people.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Our people are healthy.

Mr. FIDELLY: The hon. member's majority is about the only thing that is healthy on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Drayton in talking about food prices forgot altogether that there is such a thing as co-partnership, or co-operation, and it is hardly likely that he will be reminded of it by the Treasurer.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I have had a good deal to do with co-operation, and know more about it than you do.

Mr. FIDELLY: The Treasurer, when replying to a printing establishment deputation, a little while ago, made several of his casuistic remarks. The leader of the deputation, a former member of this Assembly, became rather nettled by the free and easy way in which he was treated, and said if a public produce department was started that would not suit the Treasurer. The Treasurer admitted that it would not suit him. It does not matter what suits the people or the State, everything is subordinated to what suits the Treasurer or his colleagues in their private, not in their public, capacity. Where do the people of the State come in? Referring again to the establishment of public abattoirs, I ask would it not be a reasonable thing for the Government to make such provision as would ensure a supply of good meat instead of lumpy meat? In the North a few weeks ago a mule went straight into a meatworks, and it never came out alive, (Laughter.) Whatever way the mule came out, it did not come out alive.

[Mr. Fidelity.]

Mr. BOOKER (*Wide Bay*): Before addressing myself to the question before the Chamber, I should like to make reference to the late Mr. John Norman, who for many years represented the city of Maryborough, who served his constituency and his country well, and who, I am in a position to say, endeared himself to every member of the Parliament he sat in. (Hear, hear!) With those few remarks I shall proceed to the question before the House, referring in passing to the divisions which have taken place during the last two days on the question of observing the Standing Orders. On reading the *Courier* this morning I was very pleased to see that the Federal Government have passed Standing Orders identical, or nearly identical, with our own, and that Mr. Fisher, the personal and intimate friend of hon. members opposite, went out of his way to emphasise the fact that the Standing Orders which have lately been accepted by the House of Representatives have worked well in Queensland.

Mr. HAMILTON: Not passed yet.

Mr. BOOKER: I therefore hope that hon. members opposite will be consistent, and maintain our Standing Orders. The first paragraph of the Governor's Speech appeals to every patriotic Queenslander. I feel that His Excellency has a very wide knowledge of Queensland and its great resources, and that he showed it when he penned that paragraph. There is a ring of wide knowledge of the country in it, and it is to be regretted that men of Sir William MacGregor's type are not in our Chamber. Their ripe experience and breadth of view would be a very big asset to the State, and would level up the tone of debate on questions like that we are now dealing with. I could not help but feel after listening to the hon. member for Paddington that the traditions of debate in the Queensland Assembly are not rising, but there is a tendency in the other direction. Referring to the first paragraph of the Speech, it clearly indicates that to carry out the great work of the moment—His Excellency mentions that we are just on the fringe of it, and so we are—it is necessary to find the means to carry out great Government works and develop our resources, and that can only be done with money, and the Loan Bill that was dealt with last week was in that direction. In passing, I may say also that the men who have the greatest faith in Queensland are the men who pioneered it and who put in all their energy and brains into it, so that they are in a position to-day to come to the Government with large sums of money—aye, and trust money, too—in exchange for Government scrip. Only this morning, when I was at my breakfast, one of the old pioneers of Queensland came over to me and asked me whether the Treasurer would issue any scrip of any kind so that he could place a large sum of trust money. That is the best and most practicable way of indicating, not only to our own people but to the financiers at home who have lent us large sums of money in the past and who will lend us large sums of money in the future when we want it, and at a reasonable rate of interest. It is not a question of 3 per cent. or 4 per cent. when we want the money for judicious expenditure. We have to employ a large number of people, and if we want that money we must get it, and it is not a matter of an extra $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. or 1 per cent. If we spend

that money properly, we will not only get back the interest and redemption from it, but we will also make a profit on our workings. Take our railways—where is there a finer example of Government administration than our railways? Dealing with railways just now I may say that the Loan Bill was largely in the direction of acquiring the necessary means to carry out our railway policy. I heard—and I understand authentically—that one of the biggest railway constructors in the world is at present in Queensland, and he has made representations to the authorities. If the authorities take heed of what he says, and, in a business way, deal with such a proposal as this gentleman has offered, that will be the best way for the State to spend the loan funds and bring about better conditions. It has been the practice for many years back to build our railways by day labour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: We have given day labour a fair show, and at the particular time the State decided to build their railways by day labour I was with them. I am with them still so far as it is, but the time has arrived—and I say it distinctly—the time has arrived for the Commissioner of Railways to take a check contract, and to see whether we, as a State, are getting the best results for our expenditure.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: If we are, then I say, "Let us build our railways by day labour." If we are not, then I say, "Let the Railway Commissioner and let the Minister for Railways build railways in the most economical and at the same time in the most effective way." (Hear, hear.) Put it this way: I am led to understand that the gentleman I am referring to is prepared to do certain things. Now we are pledged to a railway policy costing eight or nine millions of money, and if we can save one-ninth of that it means a saving of £1,000,000. Look how many miles of railway we can lay down and how many more square miles of rich country we can open with that money. Is that not the proper way to deal with the great business we are here to control? After all, the business of the Government is just the same as running a private concern, only that it is a much bigger thing. We have great responsibilities as trustees in spending the people's money in the proper and correct way. I say this with some knowledge of the subject—that there are railway construction works going on that the best results are not coming out of through the employment of day labour. I have had it from one responsible officer—I am not going to mention his name, but I say it in all sincerity—that there are cases where men have been getting 9s. a day, and the work after its completion showed that they were not worth one-half of that sum.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: That shows the necessity of taking a check contract to prove to this House and to the country that we are building these lines in the most effective way. There is one point I would like to emphasise with regard to railways, and that is that it is no use building railways if you do not provide them with sufficient rolling-stock for the people who find the produce—the produce that will pay interest and redemption. That is the question that is

paramount, in my opinion. I will deal with the Royal Commission into the meat industry later on, but in passing I might say that the dearth of rolling-stock is bringing this about. My contention is that the meat trade is responsible for our enormous export which brings back gold into our country, and yet every meatworks in Queensland for weeks back have had difficulty in securing trucks inside of a month to carry their stock from the pasture to the meat companies' works. I quite appreciate the fact that the Government have spent a large sum of money in rolling-stock. I appreciate the effort and endeavour of the department to do this, but in all sincerity I say that it is just as essential to provide rolling-stock on the present existing lines as it is to build fresh lines. At the same time we are involved up to perhaps £9,000,000 to build new railways, and we have not taken into account the necessity of providing new rolling-stock for existing lines and also for the new lines when they are built.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, yes; we have.

Mr. BOOKER: That is growing to be one of the greatest factors on our railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We spent £600,000 last year.

Mr. BOOKER: I quite appreciate what the department is doing and what the Commissioner is endeavouring to do, but it is a matter to take into consideration that when new railways are being built provision should also be made for new rolling-stock. Dealing with railways, I take it that the Western extensions were an appealing circumstance when the Bill was going through last Parliament. If one circumstance did not appeal to hon. members when they cast their vote to have these extensions built to link up our Western railways, the necessity has arisen since that Bill was passed. We have New South Wales negotiating with the Premier of Queensland to link up Bourke with our Western Railway, while the Premier also intends to link up our Western Railway to make the transcontinental railway to Port Darwin. The greatest circumstance that will appeal to us is this: That it will not only open up our resources, but it will secure to us the transcontinental railway through the greater part of Queensland. Speaking of railways, there is one thing that concerns myself very much, and it is this: For some years it was recognised that there was a great district close to ports, close to the metropolis, close to the Northern ports, and a great territory all round it. The necessity was to open up these lands by railway, and for a very considerable time it was undecided as to which route the railway should go through that district to give the district the best port. I am not personally concerned about either part. But I say that the time has arrived when, in the interests of the district [8.30 p.m.] and the settlers who are there and the settlers who will come there, that decision should be come to by the Government. At the earliest possible moment the Government should come to a decision as to how that country is to be opened up—not in the interests of the people of any one port or in the interests of any section of the people, but in the interests of the State and of the people who are going into that district. I may illustrate

Mr. Booker.]

what I mean by referring to what is going on in the South Burnett. During the last week a Darling Downs company has acquired 20,000 acres on the famous Baramba Estate, close to Murgon. It is only a week since that purchase was made, but I know for a fact that within that week there are sixty settlers in the district at the present time who are rushing those people to get certain blocks on that estate. That fairly indicates that the settlers who have gone to the South Burnett are more than satisfied with the conditions they have found there, and are anxious to get land, and their friends who are coming in are falling over each other to get land there. Those lands are private lands, therefore, it behoves the Government to come to a decision as to how those Upper Burnett lands are to be opened up. I know there are other districts in which you have fine land, but they are more distant from centres of population. If the Government do that, there will be a field for settlement and enterprise. In the electorate of Nanango seven years ago there were only 700 people, and possibly at the present time there are 12,000 there. That just indicates what it means in a matter of this sort. I now desire to refer to immigration. Anything that I may say I say in all sincerity, and in no capping spirit. It was a source of regret to me when I read in the Press that the Administration had decided to curtail their immigration policy. I explained from the various platforms when addressing the Wide Bay electors that I have the profoundest recognition of one thing in connection with the development of this country, and that is that we must bring people into it; and we had arrived at that stage that we were acquiring the very best class of people—that is, the nominated immigrants. No man or woman in Queensland is going to nominate friends in other lands to come to this country unless they are satisfied with the conditions that prevail here. If they are not satisfied, they are not likely to nominate their friends. If, when their friends arrive here, they cannot place them, there is a moral responsibility on them to maintain them until they are placed. Therefore I say that when people nominate their friends they are absolutely satisfied with the conditions here. Now, I take the view that an immigration policy must have continuity. You cannot check a flow of people if there is a shower of rain or if there is a three months' drought. We know the recovery that took place after the drought of nine years ago, and even if we were to suffer from another drought, the recovery would be just as quick. In fact, Queensland is now in a better position to withstand a drought than ever before. An immigration policy should be carried on in a businesslike way. Let people of the right class come here. It has taken a large sum of money, and it has taken many years, to influence that flow of people to the State; and if we as a State, or if Australia as a federation, check that flow now, there are other countries waiting for the overflow of the good people of Europe. They will take them, and we shall lose them, and that would be a grave loss to Queensland. There is no better asset to this State than people, and people of the class who have been coming to these shores for the last five or seven years. I am very sorry that the Government have seen fit in any sense to curtail their immigration policy, and I do hope that, now that bounteous rains have fallen and we have

[Mr. Booker.

entered upon a splendid season, they will not only get back to the generous policy of the last three years, but that they will expand still further. If we are going to build railways, if we are going to settle our lands, we want the people to work, produce, help the people who have taken up our lands, take up land themselves, and find freight for the railways. At present we are pledged to build 2,500 miles of railway within the next five or seven years. If we do not pledge ourselves to build another mile, it will give us 6,500 miles of railway. And how are 600,000 or 700,000 people going to find freight for those railways? They are being built on the guaranteed system, and if we do not find people to cultivate our lands and find freight for those railways the railways will not pay, and the settlers who gave a guarantee will have to bear the burden, and probably at the time when they are least able to bear it. Is that the kind of business that we are here to carry on? I say "No." What we should do is to look ahead and make provision to find freight for the great railway policy we passed in the last Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: But is not all the berthing accommodation taken up until the beginning of next year?

Mr. BOOKER: I am glad the hon. gentleman has raised that question. Only a month ago I had the pleasure of meeting a very eminent shipowner from Liverpool, and he assured me that, if it was recognised at the other end that there would be a continuity of the policy in regard to immigration to Australia, whether Federal or State—he did not mind which—there were men who were prepared to put down the keels and equip ships to bring, not hundreds, but thousands of immigrants here. If we show our determination to make our policy a continuous one, there will be no question about the bottoms to bring the people here, and as to the freight that will regulate itself. If the people are coming out, there will be a reasonable rate; but, even if we had to pay £3 more per head, that would be a small matter compared with the advantage of having the people coming here. In one sense I appreciate the appointments that were made to the Legislative Council at the opening of this session. In the Hon. Arthur Whittingham we have the representative of the great pastoral industry. The Upper House is rather deficient in members who practically understand and recognise the importance of our great primary industry. Mr. Whittingham is a man who takes a very prominent interest in public affairs; he is a generous man and a good citizen, and I say that his elevation to the Upper House is right. But I also say that among the nominations there should have been a representative of the other great section of the land industry—the grazing farmers, and farmers down to the man who owns 60 acres of land. There are many men in the public life of Queensland who would be eminently fitted to occupy a seat in the Council—men who thoroughly understand the conditions of the smaller men on the land, and when legislation went from this House to the other Chamber dealing with the land, the ripe experience of such a man would largely help to finish that legislation. The same thing applies to the secondary industries. Very few members of the other House are identified with the great secondary industries of the State. We are passing

industrial legislation through this Chamber, and it is very necessary to have men in the other Chamber who are qualified, from their connection with the industrial life of the State, to make that legislation a finished article. I want to finish up by saying that the nominations to the Upper House should be absolutely away from politics. It does not follow that men who have contested electorates, whether it is in the interests of the Government or any other party—our friends opposite might occupy these benches some day—God forbid that they ever should. (Laughter.) That is by the way. I say that nominations to the Upper House—if they were on the personal merit and capacity of the men who are sent there, it would give greater confidence to the great body of people. That is all I have to say about it. The leader of the Opposition in his speech only referred to two big questions. I regret I was not present to hear the hon. member, but I have read his speech very carefully, and one question I am going to refer to is the question of abattoirs. It is a very pleasant circumstance to us here and to the general community outside, that the Premier and his Ministers have seen fit to appoint a Royal Commission to deal with the great question of the meat industry of Queensland—that is, the production of stock, the transit of stock by road and by train to the various centres of population, for local consumption, and for export, and that will necessarily take in the question of abattoirs. Further, the wider the scope of that inquiry, so will the result be the more valuable, and also so will it give the greater confidence to the people. That is the view I take of it. Personally I am in absolute accord—I know something about it, too—I am in absolute accord with the necessity of abattoirs in every centre of population, say down to 10,000 inhabitants; and as time goes on I am satisfied that abattoirs, managed by the Government—not municipal, I have a great objection to municipal abattoirs—when the larger cities are equipped and the management is good—and no doubt it will be, as there are able men available to carry on the work—when the results are good, it will prove quite clearly to the people in the smaller towns that it is desirable and necessary to have abattoirs in all towns, even down to 5,000 inhabitants. This is a grave question. If we have public abattoirs in a city like Brisbane, they will naturally have to be very well equipped, which will take a large sum of money, and that is where the responsibility comes in. It is all very well for hon. members to speak from their place in the Chamber and say that this should be done and that that should be done. It is a question of money, and when a Loan Bill comes along, some of us object. Some of us object to going too fast, and some object to paying too great an interest. If we are going to have abattoirs we have to find the money, and that is where the responsibility rests on my friends opposite.

Mr. BOWMAN: We will welcome that.

Mr. BOOKER: I quite understand that, but there is the point where we are anxious to bring about the very best conditions with regard to pure food and sound food for the people. I am glad that the Cabinet have decided to get down to bedrock and find out where the weaknesses are and to guard against them, and to lay down a system

which will be creditable to the Administration who carry it on and satisfactory to the people. We hear a lot of discussion about our export trade. It is disastrous to think that this great country of Queensland is only exporting to a city like London about 5 per cent. of the imports to that city. These are things which naturally the commission will inquire into. This is in the interests, not of the big man any more than it is in the interests of the small farmer. That is one reason why I am anxious to see public abattoirs—so that the small man who has twenty head of cattle or fifty head of sheep can get his stock treated as in South Australia, and have his small consignment shipped and get the best possible price for it. That is our trouble under present conditions. The meat companies under present conditions will not deal with the small man who has less than 100 bullocks or 500 sheep. We realise that the Government are anxious to fall into line and make provision for the small man just as the meat companies have made provision for the larger people. Dealing with the question of a Royal Commission, unfortunately it has got abroad to some extent, that the Stock Owners' Association raise objections to the meat companies—the exporters. That is not so. There is nothing of that in the movement at all. It is a warm desire to get the business of our local consumption and export put upon the best possible footing, and that was the reason of the original endeavour to bring about what the Cabinet have appreciated, and I am, moreover, very pleased to find that the Government have done what they are doing. Speaking of electoral reform, I quite realise that this is a very important subject, and when it is being dealt with there should be no party considerations at all. What applies to my friends opposite applies to ourselves. What we want is a fair deal. We do not ask for anything more, and what I do hope is that when that Electoral Reform Bill comes before this Chamber and has been discussed, that every member of the House will realise one fact, that it is for a fair deal, and there should be no trickery about the franchise at all. It has struck me for some time back, as a matter of fact ever since I have been in public life—I have contested three elections—that on election morning both sides find a great number of their friends are not on the roll. That suggested to me that there should be in the different districts of the State permanent officers to carry on electoral work. There are ten Federal areas in Queensland and inside those Federal areas are several State electorates. Of course some of the State electorates overlap into other electorates, but that could be adjusted when the officer was appointed. I make this suggestion: That there should be a permanent officer—and there are many capable men in the public service—men who carried on the last election—appoint a public officer for each electoral area to deal with State elections in that area and whose duty it would be to carry on election work from election to election, and then to carry on the machinery of the election at any particular time. If that was done, it would relieve the Home Department of a good deal of stress and rush of work. The electoral machinery would go on smoothly from election to election, and where the officer was a local man, it would be his business to watch every State electorate, and keep the rolls up to date. Then, no matter what your political opinion was,

Mr. Booker.]

you would feel at once that everybody was on the roll, and the machinery of the elections went on smoothly, and the results were fair and square. Something like that I am certain would bring about infinitely better conditions. Whether our friends opposite, or we on this side, benefited in connection with that electoral reform, we should have something simple and effective. In connection with the Lands Department I desire to make special reference to the appointment of a very able man in charge of the Forestry Department. There is no better asset to the State than our timber, and we have unfortunately sacrificed a great deal of that splendid asset, and we are doing so still. I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that in every timber district—in ironbark timber districts especially—through which a railway is passing, some of the most beautiful young trees are felled to give a few sleepers. To me it seems an iniquitous thing that any State department should be sacrificing these young trees for the passing circumstance; for, after all, the young sappy timber never is as permanent as the matured timber, and those trees are being used which should be available in the future for better work. I would ask the Minister for Railways to confer with his officers, who in turn might confer with the Director of Forests, and come to some clear understanding. The forests of Queensland should be controlled for the time being by one officer, who should be the Director of Forests. To me it is a most important matter, and something of that nature should be done. It is disastrous that this great timber asset should be in a sense divided; the Railway Department can go into a hardwood forest and take what they like, and the Director of Forests has no control, or, if he has, it is a passive control. That is a matter which I hope the Minister for Railways will endeavour to look into. Last Parliament we heard a great deal about the Liquor Bill, and I say, without hesitation, that if this House had accepted that Bill as it came into this Chamber, without cutting and slashing it about, the Bill would have been infinitely more just than as we received it from the Council. If the Bill comes into the Chamber in anything like the form in which it was placed before us last year, I am going to cast my vote for it. Many of the amendments that were passed spoilt the Bill—the Bill should have been accepted in globo. There is another matter I desire to go into, and that is in connection with wages boards. That there are defects in the Wages Boards Act we all agree. I am closely identified with the industrial life of the State, and I find that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction amongst the workers as to the personnel of the chairmen of the boards. (Hear, hear!) Not in a sense altogether personal to the individual—it might be Mr. Denham or it might be Mr. Bowman—but the wages boards are formed by an equal number of representatives of the employees and of employers. Then after, perhaps, a disagreement, the Crown, represented by the Minister for Works, appoints a chairman.

Mr. BOWMAN: If they cannot appoint one.

Mr. BOOKER: I say that that is only going halfway. If the wages boards are going to do their work, and bring about the closest confidence as between employer and employee, the chairman should be the judge

[Mr. Booker.

when big questions are at issue. Say, for instance, in a large district and in a complicated case; but in districts where it would be costly to send a judge, then a police magistrate should be sent, because after all the chairman is there to sift evidence—and then his decision gives confidence to both sides. I reluctantly say that in many cases the trouble with wages boards is the lack of confidence in the chairman. Then there are certain men who are sitting on wages boards, and I take it that these men to some extent are becoming professional chairmen of wages boards. Some of them have been politicians. I say with all due respect to the gentlemen I am referring to, that it is not good for them to have the suspicion cast upon them. To get away from that, and bring about that supreme confidence in the effectiveness of the boards, there should be a judge to preside, say, on large questions; and in smaller questions, in the case of the country, a police magistrate. The results would then I am certain be infinitely better than they have been up to the present time. I have heard from my friends opposite that they do not agree with wages boards, but would sooner have the arbitration court. I take this view of it: That "prevention is infinitely better than the cure." Arbitration is to settle disputes, wages boards were established to prevent disputes. Of course, it does not suit some of our friends opposite—they do not want any industrial amity and brotherly love between the men who are working and those who are employers.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are wrong.

Mr. BOOKER: The trouble is this: That many men—and some of my friends opposite are living upon the country, and the discord and lack of amity in the industrial life of the country, and do not like the words I am passing across to them.

Mr. RYAN: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. BOOKER: Take the smiling countenance of my friend opposite, who is largely responsible for the sugar strike—he never cut a cane in his life and knows nothing about it. That is what irritates and annoys a man who is earnest in his public life. Men come here and treat with levity the most serious questions that the country has to deal with—and what more serious question has this country to deal with than to bring about industrial peace? It does not suit my friend—the sardonic smile indicates the class of men who are representing, or misrepresenting, the workers of this country, and the sooner the Government pass an Industrial Peace Bill the better it will be for the worker—better for the worker than the employer; because all the industrial legislation passed through this Chamber has been in the interests of the worker. Many of the workers realise that fact, and hundreds of them voted for me. Speaking of the Industrial Peace Bill, I appreciate the title of the Bill. It indicates a great deal of what the Bill might mean. I will just read a little dissertation showing how necessary it is that we should have an Industrial Peace Bill. I should say that one of my friends had written to the Sydney *Bulletin* shortly after the Brisbane strike, and this was the reply of the *Bulletin*. We have heard a great deal about the *Bulletin* to-night. "Mallet" is the anonymous title of

the writer. Probably he has been riling at industrial life and doing all he can to shatter industrial peace. The reply of the *Bulletin* is this—

“Mallet”: Observe that, while you do not say ‘To hell with all agreements’! you ‘do condemn unions for signing industrial agreements which provide for service in a future that may be full of changing conditions.’ Cordially disagree with you. This country wants big industries built up on sound lines, and big industries cannot be built up if the men who run them cannot figure ahead as to costs for more than twenty-four hours. It is very pleasant, no doubt, for the worker to be in a position to drop in on the boss at any moment, regardless of agreements, and demand another ‘bob’ a day; but the boss’s uncertainty about the future may cost the worker more than he gains in the long run. And it certainly costs the country a heap more.”

That points to the necessity for an Industrial Peace Bill as much as anything I have ever seen. It is this everlasting

[9 p.m.] turmoil fostered by some of my friends opposite—not by all of them. Some of them live on the marrow of strikes; and if we were to pass an Industrial Peace Bill, their calling would cease to exist. That is why the Bill will receive the bitter antagonism of some of my friends opposite. So much has been said about the strike that a friend of mine said the next man who talks strike in this House should get three months without the option; but so much has been said reflecting on this side that I would like to say a few words. The deputy leader of the Opposition said this—

“But I do not intend to go into every detail of the strike. There is a broad line of demarcation between the party represented by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (the Premier) and the party led by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley.”

There is a great demarcation, and the demarcation is this: The distinction is that Liberalism implies freedom for every citizen to pursue his lawful avocation without interference. Every true unionist at heart is a Liberal. He also said—

“Now, I say the Government were the cause of the general strike. I said that during the campaign.”

He said a lot of other things just as unscrupulous as his charge against this side that our endeavour is to injure unionism. Fortunately for the country there are some industrial centres in Queensland that have another opinion; and the men engaged in industrial life are better judges as to whether the party led by the Premier are trying to down unionism, or whether our friends opposite, by their conduct, brought about the greatest disaster that ever struck this country. The leader of the Opposition smiles.

Mr. BOWMAN: You make me smile.

Mr. BOOKER: That is the worst feature about it—for the reason that it was the gravest blunder ever committed by a body of public men, bringing disaster on the community and on the people they represent. The hon. member for Warrego stated that they could have stopped the richest man from

buying a loaf. They did not stop the rich man from buying a loaf; they did not stop members of Parliament from coming every day for lunch to this House, where the best that could be provided was provided. I was here on several occasions when the strike was at its worst; and I found my friends opposite enjoying the best meal that could be got in Brisbane. The half-crown meal to be got at my hotel during the strike was not in it with the meal that could be got here for a shilling. Then they treat the matter with a certain amount of levity, which to me is the gravest attitude our friends could take up. I am only sorry I could not snapshot them at their dinner, and at the next election, or at the next Federal election screen them on the stage—and gramophone their utterances—because then there would be no necessity for any speaker on this side of the House to open his lips—the screens and the gramophones would be quite enough to wipe the majority of our friends opposite out of public life. In conclusion, I will make a short quotation from an article in “The Round Table” on the Brisbane general strike. There is always a fairness about the articles appearing in this publication; and this is what the writer says, referring particularly to co-operation and arbitration—

“The leader, of whatever party, who succeeds in drawing public interest back to these two principles will do well. And last, and most important of all, the great need of the age is that the coming generation, of every class and creed, should receive a real education, both intellectual and moral, in the things which belong to a true civil and national life. Intellectual, that they may discern and avoid the half-truths, the misconceptions, and the follies which in this instance have led the world of labour so far astray; moral, that they may understand that others beside themselves have rights, equally worthy of recognition and respect with their own; that the highest of ends can never justify the use of unjust means; and that even the industrial kingdom of heaven can never be gained by violence alone. If the experience through which we have just passed has helped us, if ever so little, to a better realisation of these truths, if it has brought this ideal one step nearer, then we may say without fear, that for all its loss and suffering that experience has not been in vain.”

It is the half-truths and unscrupulous statements that keep this thing going; and that has been my regret listening to the speeches by my friends opposite on the Address in Reply, because, if anyone could be responsible, they were responsible for what took place.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: You are wrong! Not true! Absolutely untrue!

Mr. BOOKER: They came here and grinned about the damage they did to the people and the damage they did to the State.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is not true.

Mr. BOOKER: It is true.

Mr. ADAMSON: I say it is not.

Mr. BOOKER: I say it is true; and the denial clearly shows that I have hit the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMSON: No, you have not.

Mr. Booker.]

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to support the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened the 15th Parliament, which was so ably moved by the hon. member for Gympie, and so ably seconded by the hon. member for Bowen. I desire also to congratulate you on your accession to the dignified position of Speaker of this Assembly. During last session I had the opportunity of observing the dignified and capable way in which you carried out your functions as Speaker; and I trust that you will long live to carry out the duties of Speaker of this House. The Address in Reply starts with these words—

“We, His Majesty’s loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign.”

I think that at no time in the history of the Parliament of Queensland has it been more necessary than it is at the present time for us to assure His Excellency of the loyalty of members of this Assembly, the reason being the affairs which have taken place recently in Brisbane, and the part which some hon. members of the House took in connection with those affairs. I am not going to labour the subject of the strike. I was not in Brisbane during the time the strike was in progress, though I did come down, more out of curiosity than anything else, towards the finish of the strike to see how it was going on. But I saw the effects of the strike in the country, and how the innocent there suffered for the guilty, whoever were the guilty. I know that the producers in my own district and on the Downs lost considerably, because there were no trains running to bring their produce to market, owing to the strike.

Mr. COYNE: Not through the strike.

Mr. VOWLES: Yes; through the strike. I know, too, that workmen of all classes suffered very considerably in the country. At some places in my own electorate work had to be suspended because material which was required for it was in Brisbane and could not be brought to Dalby because the men at the railway sheds would not load it on the railway trucks. The result was that a large number of workmen were thrown out of employment, and I heard the remarks which they made with reference to the strike. The strike touched them on the raw, it touched their pockets, and they were not very sympathetic with those who brought about the strike. The strike committee also hit the people in the country very hard, in this way—that supplies in country towns are very limited, and when there are no trains running those supplies cannot be renewed, with the result that the prices of the necessities of life are increased.

Mr. COYNE: Were they increased in Roma?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know whether that occurred at Roma and some other towns along the railway, but I know that prices were increased at Chinchilla, Miles, Dalby, Warra, and Jondowale, and in some cases the cost of the ordinary necessities of life was increased by 33 per cent. If the prices at Roma were increased, then one of the members of the Opposition participated in the profits. If he did not, it is a remarkable thing, because it would be very much against

[Mr. Vowles.

his principles not to make a profit when the opportunity offered. I have listened to the explanations, excuses, and apologies which have been given by leading members of the Opposition and by the prominent members of the strike committee.

Mr. COYNE: There is no need for apology.

Mr. VOWLES: Apologies have been made, and by no one more than by the hon. member himself, trying to prove that black is white, and so on. The hon. member for Paddington, in dealing with this matter, said that the elections were a real victory for the Liberal party, and that is a very candid admission to come from a member of the Opposition. We have been told that the Government gained that victory because on account of the gross misrepresentation of the metropolitan Press the Opposition side of the strike story was not given proper ventilation in the country, with the result that the Opposition suffered at their hands.

Mr. RYAN: So they did.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know whether they did or not, but I shall give you my experience in my electorate, and members can then judge whether it is true that the electors there got the true story of the strike or not. The whole of my electorate was simply flooded with strike literature supplied by the Opposition.

Mr. RYAN: I do not think they got the true story or you would not be here.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member can come up there, and try what his chances would be with the electors if he has any doubt on the subject. One could not go along the railway platform without tumbling over bundles of *Workers* giving a “true history of the strike,” as it was called. We had Senator Stewart and Mr. James Page, M.P., up there, and a special edition of the *Dalby Democrat* was issued. We had all those organs and all classes of agitators and representatives of the party I was opposed to in the electorate. They flooded the district with literature, and spoke in every quarter. They spoke night after night at every centre, and the result of all this was that those people who had suffered directly by the strike—people who were innocent of anything in connection with the strike, and who had nothing to do with the wearing of badges and all that tomfoolery which was going on in Brisbane, doubled my majority. Members opposite say that the true story of the strike was not ventilated in the country. I say it would be impossible to give more ventilation to anything than was given to the strike in the Dalby electorate. So much ventilation was given to it, that when Senator Stewart and Mr. Page went round and found how hopeless it was to fight the election on that matter, they dropped it and turned to Federal politics. There is one thing I am very anxious to see, and that is the Industrial Peace Bill. I have my own views of what it is absolutely necessary it should contain. We should have some legislation which will deal with strikes, and if possible prevent their recurrence in the future. I believe that members on both sides of the House will agree that a strike is a barbarous means of settling an industrial dispute. When I first came into this House, more than twelve months ago, we had a sugar strike, and when Parliament opened this session we were on the same hopeless subject, and I contend that it would be a good thing to have legislation which would prevent a

recurrence of strikes as a means of settling industrial disputes. I also think that legislation should be introduced to prevent members of this Chamber, whichever side they sit, taking an active part in creating dissensions in the community and causing strikes.

Mr. COYNE: How would the Treasurer get on?

Mr. VOWLES: Such legislation should apply to all members. The speeches of many members now sitting on the Opposition benches, and of one who is now out of the House, were absolutely seditious, and were not fit utterances for public men or for publication.

Mr. COYNE: Why didn't the Government prosecute them?

Mr. VOWLES: Why didn't the Government prosecute you? You wanted to be made a martyr of; that is all you wanted. You wanted to be dragged through the streets so that you might have something to whine about in the future, but the Government were too wise to gratify your wish.

Mr. COYNE: Why did they threaten me?

Mr. VOWLES: I say legislation ought to be introduced providing that any member of this House who is guilty of inciting people to strike shall be incapable of sitting in this House.

Mr. RYAN: Are you accusing any member of this House of sedition?

Mr. VOWLES: I am accusing them of inciting men to strike.

Mr. RYAN: You used the word "sedition."

Mr. VOWLES: I said that certain members of this House incited men to do things that they were not game to do themselves.

Mr. RYAN: Who did?

Mr. VOWLES: Some of the members. This is what I think should be contained in the Industrial Peace Bill. If we could prevent politicians from going out and inciting people in times of industrial trouble we would be able to protect unions against political influence. (Opposition laughter.) I am a strong believer in unionism.

Mr. COYNE: You are.

Mr. VOWLES: I am a member of a union myself, and a good one, too. My friend, the deputy leader of the Opposition, also belongs to it.

Mr. RYAN: Quite right. I want that extended, too.

Mr. VOWLES: I believe in unionism where it is for the benefit of the individuals themselves, but I do not believe in unionism which only exists for the purpose of fattening political parasites.

Mr. HUXHAM: Do you believe in free labour in your union?

Mr. VOWLES: If we do away with the professional politician in connection with unionism, we will be able to bring about what the men desire themselves. They do not believe in the professional politician element that is there. You have only got to look at the report of the Railway Board inquiry to see the answers the men gave when they were asked if they would go back. They admitted that they were coerced into leaving their work, and they went out against their own wish, and they said they went out because they were afraid to do otherwise. Keep out the professional politician, the man who is feathering his

own nest, and looking after his own interests. If he was not allowed to be a member of these concerns the members would be free to exercise their will as they pleased. We were told in the country that the strike was brought about by Denham and Barnes. That was the story going about out there. We were told that they were making some imaginary profits when they brought about the strike. We were told it was a middleman's strike. How on earth they were able to make a profit when no business was transacted I am unable to see.

Mr. COYNE: Who sold the flour?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not know who sold the flour, but I know you did not have your meals here and you did not have them down the street, so you must have eaten most of the flour. We have heard a lot about victimisation, but I can give you an example on the other side. In my electorate there is a shearer's cook, whom I suppose is known to the hon. member for Warrego. His name is Jack Young. During the by-election that took place there I had a shearer as my secretary, and this shearer's cook had the temerity to come out into the open and openly support me, with the result that he got punched one night. That was nothing, as Jack is a Britisher. He did not mind that. When the election was over he went out to the shed where he had been cooking for years and he was told that he was not wanted.

Mr. COYNE: All honour to those men.

Mr. VOWLES: He went to Cecil Plains, and there was told that he was not wanted there. He went to another station out West where he had also cooked for some years, and he was told he was not wanted there.

Mr. COYNE: How would you treat a scab in your union?

Mr. VOWLES: That man was victimised because he went out and voted as he pleased.

Mr. COYNE: No one prevented him.

Mr. VOWLES: No; but you victimised him afterwards. Even a shearer's cook cannot vote as he likes.

Mr. PAYNE: Was he a member of a union?

Mr. VOWLES: Yes, and had his ticket. The hon. member for Murilla referred to the Agricultural Bank Amending Act of 1911 and to a certain regulation which has been issued dealing with section 6 of the Act. That regulation was not in the Act when it was passed in this House, and to my mind it supersedes the Act altogether. If that regulation had been contained in the Bill when it was before the House, I, for one, would not have voted for it. I have a number of farmers in my electorate, and I know something about the conditions of prickly-pear selections, and I, for one, would certainly have opposed such an amendment as that.

Mr. RYAN: Do you say the regulation is *ultra vires*?

Mr. VOWLES: No; but I say that it supersedes the intention of the Act. The section that is dealt with by the regulation reads as follows:—

"Advances for any of the following purposes, namely, buildings not exceeding £40, ringbarking, clearing, fencing, draining or water conservation may be

*Mr. Vowles.*¹

made of an amount not exceeding £200 to the full value of the improvements proposed to be made: Provided that in the case of an advance being for the purpose of freeing land from prickly pear, the managing director shall retain such portion of the advance as he thinks proper, not exceeding one-half part thereof, etc., etc."

I have not got the regulation, but it was quoted by the hon. member for Murilla. It says in substance that that section shall not apply to prickly-pear selections. The point is this: I do not see why any prickly-pear selector should be excluded.

Mr. RYAN: Who is responsible for excluding him? Your Government.

Mr. VOWLES: I am criticising the Executive authority and the regulation that they prepared.

Mr. COYNE: Why not blame the strike committee?

Mr. VOWLES: It is an injustice to the prickly-pear men. I went round the electorate during the election and told the prickly-pear selectors of the liberal treatment they were getting from the Government in this Act, and I want them to see that I was right and that I was misled. (Hear, hear!) The man who takes up a prickly-pear selection is entering on a big undertaking. He is the man we want. We want him to help us reclaim the land that has fallen under pear. They are the best assets for the State, as they clear off the pear and afterwards become farmers themselves. Such a man as that should be nursed and encouraged in every direction. The prickly-pear selector has to pay the full survey fee down. It was £20 under the old scale, and there is another 50 per cent. under the new scale. He remains for five years without any payment except as to clearing the pear off the land. If he wants to clear his land quicker, he can do so and get his certificate. Yet this man is excluded for ever from the operations of this Act so long as it remains a prickly-pear selection. There is a good deal of pear on many of the agricultural farm selections, but they have only to pay one-fifth of the survey fee, and they can get the advantage of this particular section. I know cases in my own electorate where men have gone out and built a humpy costing £40 on the prickly-pear selection and started to clean the pear off, and I think they should be allowed to get advances under this section. Then they have started to cultivate and to conserve water. Under this regulation the man who is going to do that will not be able to borrow on the same terms as the agricultural farmer. Now, I

[9.30 p.m.] consider that is wrong, and I do not consider it was the intention

of this House when the Bill was going through. On the subject of railways I have the same complaint to make as the hon. member for Murilla. We live in the West, and we know that the Western Railway system is the biggest revenue producer in Queensland. Last year the railway receipts were more than 50 per cent. of the total revenue of the State, and the railways as a whole paid something like £3 16s. per cent. profit on the cost of construction. We know that the bulk of that money comes from the West, but we in the West do not get the consideration that we should get from the Railway Department in facilities for travel-

[Mr. Vowles.

ling. (Hear, hear!) Take our ordinary mail train, which leaves Brisbane on Tuesday and Friday afternoon at a quarter to 2 o'clock. It is nearly always packed from here to Toowoomba, and it picks up fresh passengers there for the West. We leave Brisbane at a quarter to 2, and when we get to Ipswich we are hung up for twenty minutes. Why, nobody knows. We might leave Brisbane twenty minutes later, but instead, we are hung up there. It cannot be that they do not want us to go into the refreshment-room, because the refreshment-room there is enough to paralyse anybody, and nobody goes there who can help it. The musty smell of the place is enough to make one ill. Then we go on to Helidon.

At 9.41 p.m.,

The SPEAKER left the chair, which was taken by Mr. STODART as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. VOWLES: The appointments at Helidon are altogether inadequate, and in that crowded train it is almost impossible to get into the refreshment-room, or, if one is travelling with ladies, to get a cup of tea with the limited space and the large number of travellers. We stay there till the schedule time, and then we leave for Murphy's Creek, where we are hung up for forty-five minutes waiting for the two divisions of the Sydney mail train to pass, and they are nearly always late. Then we get on to Toowoomba, and from there I have frequently travelled in the summer time with nineteen in one carriage. We are packed like sardines, and even women cannot get seating accommodation. That is a regular occurrence, and it is a sort of joke at Toowoomba to see the Dalby and Western people getting packed into their train. And our trains never run up to schedule time. You never know how long you will have to wait for a train. Then again you will not find one lavatory carriage on a train. I am pleased to know that quite recently the department had got rid of what used to be called the "hen coop." (Laughter.) That was the sleeping car, and there was good reasons for calling it the "hen coop," because it was full of lice and other vermin, and nobody would travel in it. A lot of the railway carriages on the Western line are no better. We are not getting what we should get in the way of accommodation, and I think it is up to us who live in the West to barrack for all we are worth. Another question that is causing a great deal of trouble in my district in connection with the Railway Department is the question of rebates on stock. It was the custom of the department for some time—a custom sanctioned by the late Commissioner, Mr. Thallon—to give a rebate of 25 per cent. on all stock from the West that was brought into the Dalby district and afterwards railed to Brisbane. The selectors in the Dalby district, which is recognised as the fattening district, draw upon the stock in the West. That continued until last Christmas, and then suddenly the regulation—I understand it is only a departmental regulation—was altered without notice, and people in my district are seriously out of pocket in consequence. I know one man who brought in four train loads of stock from the West, on which he had paid £1,600 freight. Under the old arrangement, he would have been entitled to a rebate of £400, and he suddenly discovered that the rebate was abolished, and, as he had purchased the stock on the basis of that rebate, he is

now "in the soup." There should be no such thing as rebates at all on our railways. Everybody should be on an equal footing, and, if the department want to make any concessions they should do it by a reduction in freights, and there should be no intricacies of bookkeeping to find out whether stock which came from the West eventually get down to the Brisbane market. The Commissioner has decided quite recently to carry on this system of rebates on a sliding scale ranging from 15 per cent. on stock railed for 200 miles and increasing with increasing distance up to 25 per cent. The minimum distance is 200 miles. It is 133 miles from Dalby to Roma, and it will actually pay people in my electorate to make the Railway Department carry stock trucked from Roma on to Jondaryan, 25 miles beyond Dalby, and drive them back to Dalby, so as to get them carried the 200 miles. That is a subterfuge that will have to be adopted to get this rebate, and it shows the absurdity of having a rebate at all. Another subject on which I wish to speak is that of the Jimbour lands. The Jimbour Estate was repurchased and cut up under the Closer Settlement Act. The first selectors have had rather a bad time having struck off seasons. Under the Act, the term of payment for the land is twenty-five years. The first payment is one-tenth of the purchase money, and the next four years are exempt from payment, and then the payments begin, the interest being capitalised and extended over the balance of the payments. The people who have taken up large areas in many instances paid a very high price—up to £7 an acre. I regret to say that they have been unfortunate in the seasons. The first two years they spent in getting their places in order, and the next two years in breaking up the land and putting in seed wheat, and they have got no return. Their payments come on them now, and in nearly every instance they find that they will not be able to meet their engagements to the Lands Department. They are going to ask this House to reconsider their position and to reconsider the position generally under the Closer Settlement Act, and ask if it would not be wiser to extend the number of years for payment so as to make the annual payments less heavy. If a man buys 1,000 acres at £5 an acre, it represents a capital of £5,000, of which he has to pay £500 down. He is paying interest on £4,500 at 5 per cent., and in addition to that they have this particular year to make a payment of one-twentieth of the capital value. That makes about £500 this year in addition to rates and taxes and all other outgoings. These men, in many cases, after spending what money they had on the land, have gone to the Agricultural Department for loans. They are in this position: They are paying 5 per cent. on the capital value of the land, they are paying interest on the money borrowed from the Agricultural Department, and if they are unable to meet their engagements to the Treasury and allow their engagements to run on for sixty days, they have to pay 10 per cent. penalty on the amount of money owing, which means they have to pay 20 per cent. on some of it, 10 per cent. on another portion, and 5 per cent. on another, and it is a very good business that can afford to do that. If you are going to encourage these people to go on the land, if you are going to encourage them to take up high-priced

land and cultivate it, you will have to make the terms more liberal and not be so exacting in regard to the penalty imposed.

MR. LENNON: Why not put them on the perpetual lease system?

MR. VOWLES: They do not care about it. They prefer to get their freehold.

MR. RYAN: Why, a Labour Government would do better than that.

MR. VOWLES: I hope they will never have an opportunity of trying.

MR. HUNTER: What are you grumbling about then?

MR. RYAN: It could not be much worse than you say.

MR. VOWLES: There is another subject in connection with the Railway Department. Now, the Cattle Creek line has been a very successful one, as far as the settlers are concerned. It paid last year £5 3s. 10d. per cent. on the money that was borrowed. That shows that the railway is making about £2 per cent. profit for the State of Queensland, with the result that it has gone out of the hands of the people in the benefited area and is now the property of the State. All the time the public had to pay for the upkeep of that line if there was any deficiency things went along quite smoothly, but I regret very much to say that as soon as it has got into the hands of the State a cheese-paring policy is being carried out.

MR. BOWMAN: Is that not a reflection on the State?

MR. VOWLES: I do not know whether it is a reflection on the State, on the Administration, or on the department. It is a remarkable thing that at one railway station, quite recently, two telephones have been installed for the use of the public, and the department employed a station mistress at the magnificent remuneration of 9s. a week. When she left the district they had to put a man on, and as his wages were too much the station was closed. This is the first station from Dalby, and it is right in the middle of a settled district. There is a good population there, there is stock all round about it, and it is a trucking station. I say this place should have remained a station the same as it was all the time the taxpayers had to keep up the betterment when there was any deficiency. It was a receiving place for goods, it was a booking office, and two telephones were installed there for the use of the public. If those things are altogether unnecessary, it is a remarkable thing that the Post and Telegraph Department would instal telephones, because I have tried very hard to get them installed in other places where they were required, and the department said the surroundings did not warrant their installation. On the subject of betterment railway lines, there is another thing I would like to point out in connection with the Tara line. That is another betterment line in my district.

MR. RYAN: Is that paying?

MR. VOWLES: We do not know anything about that. I do not think it is going to pay for a while. (Laughter.) At any rate, Dalby is in the betterment area, and Dalby is quite prepared to meet its share of any deficiency, but that line never will pay until it is carried 40 or 50 miles beyond Tara to

Mr. Vowles.]

the good country. In that particular case, the people at a place called Weranga have been agitating and asking the department to put up a siding and trucking-yard. Every person in the district who would have to pay the interest on the cost of that trucking-yard has asked for it to be erected, and yet they cannot get the department to move in the matter, with the result that they are very seriously inconvenienced. They have stock to bring out and stock to take in and they have no trucking yard and no facilities, and in addition to that I may tell you that they suffer a double injustice. Not only do they suffer through not having facilities for trucking, but they have to drive their stock from their own place to Dalby and elsewhere and are thereby losing the freight which would be earned on the railway and which would go towards paying its upkeep.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Why don't you go to the department?

Mr. VOWLES: That is all very well, but when you go to the department they tell you they want to protect your friends and constituents against their own improvidence. (Laughter.) If there is any shortage these men have to pay, and why should they not have what they want? I submit that it is only common sense that they should get it. I do not wish to take up any further time.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the Dalby-Jandowae Railway?

Mr. VOWLES: They are asking me every day when this line is going to be started. I know £10,000 was voted for it last year, and I hope it will be one of the very first railways to be started. The House evidently realised that it was very badly needed, otherwise they would not have passed it. Now we have had a lot of talk about abattoirs and all sorts of things from the leader of the Opposition and responsible members on the other side. One hon. member spoke about pulling the parish pump when the hon. member for Murilla was speaking, but I think it is the duty of the country members to pull the parish pump as far as their districts are concerned. It seems to me to have been pulled in Brisbane as far as these abattoirs are concerned.

Mr. BOWMAN: They are for the benefit of the public.

Mr. VOWLES: So are all these things for the benefit of the public. Brisbane would be a very poor place if it was not for the prosperity in the country. (Hear, hear!) Brisbane is practically dependent on the man on the land and the men on the mining fields. I am very pleased to note that it is the intention of the Mines Department to assist people on mining fields so that they will be able to exploit them and see if they cannot produce the same results as we had in previous years. It is rather lamentable to think that after all the years our goldmines have stuck to Queensland they are going down at last, and I think it would be a good thing for Queensland to spend a large sum of money in trying to find other fields. We are dependent on the mining fields just as much as we are on the man on the land. The gold that has come from those places kept Queensland for many years, and now they are going off I am very pleased to see that we are getting it in other directions, and,

[Mr. Vowles.

as I consider, from the ground itself, and there has been a large influx of population into the agricultural districts.

At 10 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. VOWLES (continuing): I commend the immigration scheme of the Government. I have had an opportunity of seeing the practical side of it in my electorate—not only the immigrants from overseas, but I have had an opportunity of seeing the class of men introduced during the administration of the late Minister for Lands, the late Hon. J. T. Bell. The best class of selector we have in our district is the man who was brought over from New South Wales and Victoria. We have some estimable immigrants from overseas, too. We have men on the land who are producing all the natural products of the land that can be got, helping to develop the State, and if they are doing as well in other districts as they are doing in my own, I say we have a great future ahead of us. I sincerely trust that these good seasons will continue; there is no doubt they are very bountiful at present. If they do, then we ought to have a very fine year in this House, and the Treasurer ought to have the most successful year on record as far as the Treasury is concerned. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): It is very refreshing indeed to hear even Government supporters criticising the Government. The hon. member for Dalby and the hon. member for Wide Bay did not hesitate to criticise the Government.

Mr. RYAN: And the hon. member for Fassifern.

Mr. PAYNE: The hon. member for Fassifern always makes a reasonable and sensible speech, but I say it is pleasant to see Government supporters having backbone enough to tell the Government where they think they are wrong. The mover and seconder of the Address in Reply have been congratulated from both sides of the House. I think they did very well according to their own political way of thinking, but I am safe in saying that the new members of the Labour party did equally as well. The hon. member for Keppel's speech was full of fight, the hon. member for Brisbane made a sensible speech, and the hon. member for Cairns made some sound remarks. We lost some good men from this side at the last election, but I think from the start the new Labour members have made, they will go a long way to fill the gap. The first few days of the session gave undoubted proof that the government of Queensland is not carried out according to the voice of the electors. We find that some weeks before the House met to transact the business of the session, seven representatives of this Chamber, together with two representatives of another place, met and framed two Bills, and dispatched them to England, with the result that when the House met to do the business of the session, those Bills were presented, with a very strong reminder that they could not be altered in one word or letter.

The TREASURER: Do not forget that Parliament supported them in their action, whatever was done.

Mr. PAYNE: Is not that a peculiar way of transacting the business of the State? An amendment suggested by the hon. member for Fasiferu was not entertained. I claim that the Denham Government have deliberately gagged sixty-five representatives in the House on this matter. It appears to me that if the Government can treat important legislation in this way, why can they not treat all legislation in the same way? The two Bills I have referred to were very important; one of them had for its object the raising of the interest on our loans from 3½ to 4 per cent.; the other provided that the Government could raise money by debentures. To my mind the procedure of the Government was unconstitutional. If it was constitutional, then the idea of Queensland being governed by the voice of the electors is only a farce. I think the Denham Government have shown no ability or generalship in managing the affairs of this State. I will quote one or two little instances of how they are managing things even in a small way. I may say that before I ever bring a complaint before the House I always thought it was a fair thing to see if I could not get that grievance settled in the department concerned. I did that in this case, and found I could get no satisfaction. I will quote the instance of a young lad in my own electorate, who had been recommended by the local doctor, by the State school teacher, and also by Dr. Bourne, who went out to examine the children's teeth and eyes, to come down South to have his eyes treated, as nothing could be done for him in the local hospital. He eventually found a place in the Church of England shelter in Mary street. I got a telephone ring from the Roma-street police station, saying that there was a lad from my electorate stranded in Brisbane. I came in immediately, and found that it was this lad I had met before. I saw him at the home in Mary street, and had a conversation with him and the lady in charge, and I discovered that the lad had been lodged there by a policeman. I went to the Home Department, stated the case, and I believe the lad was taken from there to a home at Nundah. He had a father and mother, but he came here to have his eyes treated. I am pointing out how this progressive Government conduct the affairs of the country even in simple matters. The boy

[10 p.m.] was sent to the Nundah Orphanage. I believe it is run by the Church of England people, and I have every admiration for the way in which it is conducted. I went and saw the lad after he had been there two or three months; and I must say he looked very much better than he did when he came from Longreach. I had a letter from his mother asking that his fare be given him from Nundah to the Brisbane Hospital to have his eyes treated. The letter is dated the 21st March, and it says—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member may quote from the letter, but he must not read it.

Mr. PAYNE: Very well, Mr. Speaker; but it will perhaps take me longer to do so. The lad's name is O'Farrell; and I had a letter from his mother, Mrs. O'Farrell. She asked me if I would be kind enough to get the lad a pass from the Nundah Orphanage to the Brisbane Hospital, to have his eyes treated. I wrote to the Railway Department

and received a reply, saying that if I would call in I would get the lad's pass. I called; and to my surprise they wanted to give me a pass for the one trip. Just imagine a man going to the Railway Department for a pass that would cost about 2d. or 3d.! I am not a moneyed man; but I would never trouble the department when it was a matter of pence or shillings. I said that was not what I wanted; that I wanted a pass to enable him to attend the Brisbane Hospital for three months, but they said they could not do it. Then I went to the Home Department, and saw the Assistant Under Secretary, who referred me to the head of the Orphanage Branch, with the reminder that if I could not succeed in getting a pass there I was to approach him again. At the Orphanage Branch I was given to understand that it was not an orphanage for boys at all—that it was a girls' orphanage, but boys were there. I wrote to the Education Department, and they replied regretting that they could not see their way clear to give a pass to the lad. We have heard a good deal from the Government side about all the Government are doing for the eyes of children in the West, and it seems to me a shabby thing, when a railway passes the place, and there are seventy or eighty trains a day, not to give that lad a pass. The Government would have been at no loss in giving the pass. And when I am appealing for a pass for this lad, I want a pass for every child in the institution that has to go to Brisbane to have eyes treated. This lady said it took her all her time to pay the weekly allowance, and I think it was miserable and shabby treatment on the part of the Government. There is another matter I want to mention. The member for Brisbane, Mr. Kirwan, said the other evening that the place where the women carriage-cleaners worked was filthy and insanitary. I can tell the Minister another filthy and insanitary place in connection with the Railway Department—namely, in the second-class carriages between Rockhampton and Longreach.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: I have mentioned this matter time and again, year after year; and to my personal knowledge, ever since I have been a member of this House, they have had second-class carriages running from Rockhampton to Longreach, a distance of 424 miles, carrying women and children, and no lavatory carriage.

Mr. HARDACRE: Scandalous!

Mr. PAYNE: Is there anything more filthy than that? I have seen it for myself. In that distance of 424 miles the only stoppages to speak of are three—places where people can get refreshments. There are other places where the train stops a few minutes. Just fancy a woman trying to get two or three sleepy children out of a second-class carriage and get them back again in five minutes! I have told them on several occasions to tell the guard they were getting out, and not to go until they returned; and I said, "If he goes and leaves you, I think you can get some recompense." I have seen most filthy scenes on those second-class carriages; and it has been going on for years. A good deal has been said about the late election being a great win for the Government. What was the great win they had? The Labour party got 41,555 more votes in 1912 than they got in 1909. Was that a

[Mr. Payne.]

defeat for the Labour party? We practically did better as far as voting power is concerned than we ever did before. The party had a lot to fight at the last general election. In the first place, there was the redistribution of seats and alteration of the boundaries of the electorates. They cut out four sure Labour seats, if not six. There was Bulloo, Clermont, Burke, and Carpentaria—sure Labour seats that nobody could shake. Then the leader of this party, Mr. Bowman, got more than enough of a majority to have returned his friend, Mr. McLachlan. The same remark applies to Charters Towers. Again, we lost a lot of Labour votes at the last general election because many Labour voters did not know exactly what electorate they were in. Though I knew the boundaries of my own electorate, I could not tell the boundaries of other electorates I visited. The trouble was that people did not know where to go to vote, and the consequence was that Labour lost a lot of votes. Then, we had the capitalistic Press against us. I suppose that under the existing state of affairs we shall always have the capitalistic Press writing on its own side, and no doubt the Labour Press has to write on its own side, but during last election the Brisbane dailies were simply rotten. One does not expect an opponent to praise one when engaged in a fight, but there is such a thing as honesty, and in that respect the Brisbane daily Press was absolutely rotten. In a paragraph sent to me by my wife when I was fighting the campaign, it was stated that I made a statement on a public platform to the effect that if I had had a revolver during the strike I should have had no hesitation in using it. I did not use those words. What I said was that if any man stood where I stood and saw what I saw, and he had had a loaded revolver, he would have been tempted to use it; and I say that now. But every kind of lie and misrepresentation was hurled at the members of the Labour party during the last election.

Mr. HAYDADE: If they hadn't any facts, they concocted some.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, they concocted some. I shall give you an idea of the raving of some of the Government candidates, more particularly hon. gentlemen on the Treasury bench. I am going to quote from a speech by the Home Secretary, as reported in the *Maryborough Chronicle* of Friday, 12th April last. I shall not quote the whole of the speech, but only such parts as seem to me absolutely unfair. I cannot understand how any man could say such things on a public platform.

"The unionists who came out had no complaint whatever against their employers. Their unions were recognised, and in some cases even preference to unionists was recognised."

Fancy a public man making a statement of that kind. Do we know of preference to unionists being recognised in any part of Queensland? The hon. gentleman said—

"As Home Secretary he gave permission to have processions through the streets on the first two days of the strike, but on the second day such acts of lawlessness and violence were committed by many who took part in the procession, evidently in accordance with the orders issued by some one in authority over them."

That is the dirty point I object to. Say, for

[*Mr. Payne.*]

argument's sake, that something unlawful was done, what a contemptible thing it is for a man in a public position to stand on a public platform and say that the men leading the unionists gave them permission or told them to do it. No greater falsehood was ever uttered by any man. The hon. gentleman further said—

"He realised it was his duty, in the public interest, to instruct the Commissioner of Police that law and order must prevail."

He went on to say—

"The unions had been converted into mere political fighting machines for the benefit, not of the individual members, but of certain men who had mostly never done a day's work in their lives. Mr. Harry Coyne, better known as "Flash Harry," boasted that he had been on strike all his life, and never saved a "quid."

Fancy utterances such as those coming from a man like the Home Secretary. With all due respect to him, I do not believe he ever did one week's work in his life. Fancy a briefless solicitor talking about men who had done more reproductive work in six months than he has done during the whole period of his life, and then saying that the members on this side who took part in the strike were only getting the unionists to do what they did for political jobbery! That is the kind of thing the electors had to listen to, and, unfortunately, the Labour party had no Press to give their views to the general public. The hon. gentleman made another statement, which I think, is worth quoting. He said—

"When the order went forth that the women and little children, and that meant the poorest in the city, were to be starved, he decided, as an administrator of a Liberal democracy, that they should not be starved, and he carried out arrangements by which the local authorities around Brisbane were supplied with 60 or 70 tons of flour during that period, to meet the urgent requirements of the people."

We know that is incorrect. The hon. gentleman further said—

"The Government flour contractor was at first afraid to supply the flour, as he had been threatened that his mill would be burnt down, and he had to assure him of ample protection."

That is altogether incorrect, and that is the kind of stuff that was given to the electors. I could quote a great deal more, but I do not think it is worth the while of honest people to listen to it. It is a parcel of lies. I read a great deal of trash which was published during that election, and I can say that if I never got into Parliament I would never get so low down as some of the members sitting on the Treasury benches did on that occasion. I am glad the Minister for Public Instruction has come into the House, because I can join with the hon. member for Keppel, Mr. Larcambe, in congratulating the hon. gentleman on coming into my electorate. I do so because it is a peculiar coincidence that wherever the hon. gentleman spoke in my electorate I got bigger majorities than ever I got in my life. (Laughter.) That is true, and it can be proved by figures and facts. But one of the most amusing things which happened there was a statement made at a meeting which was held in the very

fine shire hall at Longreach, and addressed by the Minister for Public Instruction and my opponent, Mr. J. M. Cross, a former Labour representative for Clermont.

MR. BOWMAN: A Labour rat.

MR. PAYNE: I suppose you would call him a Labour rat. The Minister, in criticising my action as a public man, thought he was doing a great deal when he told that gathering that Mr. Payne lived in one of the most aristocratic places in Brisbane. (Laughter.) Well, I was pleased in a way that he did mention that, because when he did so there was a round of applause, even from my political opponents, who have known me for over twenty years. In fact, some of them openly said that there was no house too good for Jack Payne and his wife and children to live in.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PAYNE: That is the miserable stuff they tried to gull the electors with. They tried to make out that I was becoming a capitalist and was living in one of the most aristocratic spots in and around Brisbane. The only thing I regret about it is that I cannot afford to live in a better house. (Laughter.) I am one of those who honestly thinks that no house in moderation is too good for my wife and little ones. (Hear, hear!) There is no doubt about that. I suppose if I liked to be nasty I could turn round and say to the Minister for Public Instruction that it appears to me that he is a parliamentary lodger. (Opposition laughter.) He stays here and the people of Queensland are paying for his lodgings.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No.

MR. PAYNE: Wherever I live I pay for myself.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I only have the same right as the leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAYNE: I join with the hon. member for Keppel in congratulating the hon. member for Fitzroy, Mr. Grant, on the fact that he came and spoke for my opponent, and I hope that on every occasion that I am opposed that he will come and speak against me again. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) I am very pleased to see that the Government have given a promise to the president and vice-president of the Pastoralists' Association that they are not going to interfere with the artesian bores in Central Queensland. Those of us who were in this House during the debate on that Bill dealing with the conservation of water know very well that the Western members, who had some practical knowledge of artesian bores, pointed out to the Government the mad-headedness of the legislation that they were bringing in when they wanted to shut those bores down straight away. We know very well that when that Bill came into this House the proposal was to come along at once and shut the bore off. If there was an accident and the water disappeared, or broke out somewhere else, the man who sunk that bore at a cost of perhaps £1,500 to £2,500, would get no recompense. That would be hard on the small selector—the 20,000-acre selector in Central Queensland. At that time the hon. members for Warrego

and Gregory, and also the late member for Bulloo, Mr. Allen, who represented Western constituents, all pointed out how mad the Government would be if they attempted to pass legislation of that character. We succeeded in staying their hands for ten years, as the Government accepted an amendment to that effect. Since then I see that the Denham Government—the Liberal Government—have come along, because the president and vice-president of the Pastoralists' Association met the Treasurer and Premier, and, with one stroke of the pen they said, "No; we are not going to shut them down at all." The Ministry would not listen to the advice given by the practical men on this side when that Bill was going through the House. If anyone will look up my remarks on that occasion they will see that I spoke in a plain, blunt way, and I said that if the Government went on with the proposal that it would interfere with the people engaged in that industry in that portion of the State. As far as the Treasurer is concerned, let me say that while I am a member of this House I will never take his word for a snap of the fingers. "Once bit, twice shy." I would not take the Treasurer's word for a snap of the fingers. I would have to get it in black and white. The present Treasurer, Mr. Barnes, placed me in a very miserable position by making certain statements to me in reference to the regulations in connection with that Water Conservation Bill, with the result that I wrote to several people in my own electorate, but when the regulations came out the thing was practically worse than it was before.

MR. HUNTER: Worse than the Bill?

MR. PAYNE: Yes; worse than the Bill. It placed me in this position: Mr. Ferguson, of Westbourne, and Mr. Bligh, of Aramac, wrote to me and I quoted the Treasurer's exact words to them. I said that the thing would be all right when the regulations came out. I got a letter from these gentlemen, and they said to me, "I do not know if you know what you are talking about. Have you seen the regulations?" I admitted that I had not, but I took the word of the Treasurer, but never again. (Laughter.) While I am a member of this House and have any dealings with the Treasurer, they will always have to be in black and white. With regard to the other Ministers, I always find that although we may differ politically, if they tell me certain things I always find that they are pretty accurate. (Hear, hear!) I can always rely on other Ministers, but not on the Treasurer. It is not a fair thing for a Minister of the Crown to make a statement to the representative of an electorate and convey a wrong impression to him, which he repeats to other people in his electorate, because it only makes a man look foolish. We have had something about the strike, and as I took an active part in that strike I want to have something to say about it. If I did not say something about the strike, hon. members opposite would say that I was afraid to mention it. Let me say at once that any part I took in the late Brisbane strike I am not ashamed of, and not afraid to refer to.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PAYNE: I heard a good deal of discussion on this, and I have heard some of

Mr. Payne.]

the most diabolical falsehoods that have ever fallen from the lips of human beings come from members on that side of the House. I feel that in an upheaval of the kind that took place during the Brisbane strike that unionists sometimes do things that are not right, but I quite agree with what has been said on this side, and I say it again—that the Denham Government were responsible for the strike.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. PAYNE: There is no doubt whatever. I asked a question a few days ago of the Home Secretary, and one of the questions was to this effect: I asked how many special constables that were sworn in were under the age of twenty-one years. The Minister side-stepped the whole thing by saying that where the magistrate saw that the applicant did not appear to be twenty-one years of age he was not sworn in. That is no answer at all.

Mr. COYNE: They took their knickerbockers off them and supplied them with trousers. (Laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: I can bring lads of nineteen years of age to-morrow who will say that they were sworn in as special constables.

Mr. COYNE: Some of their parents supplied them with revolvers.

Mr. PAYNE: I can bring boys of nineteen years and under. To my mind it was done with a purpose. Once the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr. Fisher, refused the military the Denham Government did all they could to have blood shed in Brisbane.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: They knew very well that those lads were better suited for their purpose than men of mature years and common sense.

Mr. GUNN: Were not some of the vigilance officers under nineteen too?

Mr. HUNTER: Where were you at the time?

Mr. GUNN: In Brisbane.

Mr. COYNE: Then you ought to know that none of them were under nineteen.

Mr. PAYNE: They were all mature members of unions. I could take you to Clayfield and show you some of the [10.30 p.m.] greatest larrikins in this city who were sworn in as specials, and they deliberately insulted men and women going along the street. I am not saying that every lad who was sworn in was a larrikin or low down, but a good many of them were. I am fair-minded, but I say that some of the scum of the city were sworn in, and it was done for a purpose. I was grossly insulted by four lads at the Customs House when in the company of the late hon. member for Bowen, and but for the generosity of two of the members of the permanent police I am satisfied I would not have allowed those lads to do what they wanted to do with me. The hon. member and I stood for a couple of minutes opposite the Custom-house. The street was practically clear for fifty yards on either side of us, and four of these impudent lads

[Mr. Payne.

came up to us. They did not ask you to move on, but they went to shove you. The first thing I thought of doing was to haul off and hit one of them, and but for a member of the permanent police I would have done it, or would have tried to do it. I said to them, "Why, hang it all, there is no rush here. We are doing no harm." And they gave us all the impudence and slang in the world. They did all they could to incite decent honest people, and I claim that the Denham Government swore them in for that purpose. When Fisher refused to send the military to Brisbane, they made up their minds they were going to act in such a way that the military would have to come, but they failed.

Mr. HARDACRE: Some of them had batons loaded with lead.

Mr. PAYNE: I was one of those who thought that it would have been the finest thing in the world if Fisher had come here with the military. Once he landed here with the military, we know that the trade unionists of Queensland would do more for Andrew Fisher than for any other man in Australia. We know very well that Andrew Fisher was a unionist himself, and that he has been victimised all over Queensland, that he has been starved on Gympie for holding union principles, and he would only have had to get up and make a speech to those 20,000 men, and I feel satisfied they would have done anything reasonable. Once Fisher came here—some of the lawyers and constitutional authorities on the other side will know whether I am correct or not—once Fisher came here, he would have been the supreme power. He could have ordered the specials off the street. He could have ordered the police off the street. (Laughter.) He could have deported Badger; he could have deported Cahill—(laughter)—or even my friend Harry Coyne, if he liked. (Renewed laughter.) Once he answered the call of the Premier of Queensland and stepped in here with his military, he could have told every one of them—even the Ministers—to sit down and mind their own business; that he was going to settle the dispute. (Laughter.)

Mr. HUNTER: Do you think he could have deported the Government? (Laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: He could have deported anyone. (Laughter.)

Mr. HUNTER: Then why didn't he come? (Laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: Under the Constitution he could have deported anybody who stood in the way of peace being brought about. He could have gone further. He could have told Badger, according to the Act he was working under, to start his trams in twenty-four hours or else he would run them himself. (Laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: You may laugh, but I know a great deal about constitutional law and order. (Renewed laughter.) He could have taken those trams, and he could have called the tramway men together and put them on the trams, and could even have told them to wear their badges if he liked. (Laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: I thought at the time it would have been a good thing if he had

come. But I expect he has his own way of thinking, but it struck me at the time that he had a golden opportunity to prove that he was the man who could settle disputes.

Mr. HARDACRE: He would not have come for the purpose for which the Government wanted him to come.

Mr. PAYNE: No; but I fancy he would have done good work if he had come. I was rather amused at hearing the Home Secretary read that list of outrages that were committed during the strike. I may say this is not the first industrial upheaval I have been connected with. I am dead opposed to strikes, whether general strikes or ordinary strikes, but you will never get me to vote for legislation to stop men striking unless you give them a fair deal otherwise. Any practical man, no matter which side of the House he sits on, going through that list of outrages would know at once that the man who compiled the list was closely connected with Dublin Castle. I have worked in mines for years, and I know the use of dynamite and all explosives, and the thing is ridiculous. Just fancy a man in the position of the Home Secretary bringing in as an outrage the throwing of rotten eggs into a tram! (Laughter.) I admit it is not a nice thing, but how could you call it an outrage? The most peculiar thing about these outrages is that not one of those combustibles went off. They were all found; and I find that three or four of them were found by the one man. To any practical mind the Home Secretary only showed his ignorance in attempting to get an opinion from the Government Analyst about the result of a charge of dynamite going off. Why, Great Scott! don't we all know that if a charge of dynamite or any combustible went off, it would probably do some damage? He says that the Government Analyst asserted that, if this supposed charge had gone off, the wheels of the tramcar would have been blown up and fragments would have been spread through the air. (Laughter.) Why, to a man of the world and a practical man, the whole thing is moonshine, and any man who has read anything of the history of other parts of the world can see at a glance where the thing came from. It is not the first time in my life that I have heard such charges levelled against unionists. I am not going to read the list. I notice there is a James Hooper who found four packets of dynamite. A most peculiar thing, a tram sweeper found nine dynamite caps and a small quantity of dynamite. Surely if these people meant to do any damage that is not the way they would have laid those things. The whole thing is too thin. In 1891 the unionists were charged with exactly the same thing. When they arrested the first five men in that strike at Barcardine, I was one of five others who saw it to the finish. I thought I saw contemptible miserable things done then, but the Denham Government can cap them. We had then a Conservative Government in power, and you will hear people say they were bad enough to do anything. But there was a good deal of honesty about some things they did. They were bitter fighters, but they never got real low down. The most they did was to ride with the military through the camps, but the Government of the day did not arm a lot of men with sticks to knock women and children on the head. For instance, a man who was in the office with me at Barcardine

on his way to lunch was charged with poisoning a swaddy, as we termed them up there—that was one of the men sent up to keep law and order. He was charged with poisoning that man by giving him an apple, and it was ascertained afterwards that that man was in the habit of taking fits and that he took one of those periodical fits and fell down in the street. The Press at that time came out with great headlines about the bloodthirsty unionists attempting to take that man's life. Another man was arrested for attempting to cut a bridge. I would ask the Secretary for Lands to hunt up the remarks of the present Judge Real on that particular case. Judge Real went out and inspected that bridge, and said it was a practical man who cut that bridge. It was discovered that the man who had been arrested did not know how to sharpen a saw. As a matter of fact, it was also proved that as the piles of the bridge were cut in a V shape, it was just as strong after being cut and had dropped the thickness of the saw as it was before. The first sheds that were burnt in Queensland in 1891 were not burned by unionists. The first sheds that were burned down three years afterwards were not burned down by unionists. I am not going to say who burned them down. It is past and gone, but if necessary I could bring papers to prove that they were burnt down for the purpose of belittling the unionists in the eyes of the general public. They did the same in connection with the Brisbane strike. The Press was full of a lot of misstatements about some windows being broken in the Valley. I traced the whole thing, and there was not a unionist among them. The owner of that shop will tell you that his plate-glass windows were broken by a lot of hooligans—a lot of lads under twenty-one years of age. I traced the whole thing out myself, so as to be certain of where I was in the matter. I saw nothing of this potato band and this beer band. Members on the opposite side have tried to make the public believe that members on this side of the House tried to make the unionists create war. If it had not been for members of the Labour party telling the strikers not to break the law and thus force Fisher to send the military here, the hon. gentleman would have had bloodshed. They were looking for it, and they would have had it. As regards Cahill and his satellites, I saw that man, and as an Australian native I never thought I would have lived to see the cowardly low-down work of riding helpless women and children down when they had neither a stick nor a stone in their hands. And those miserable men talk about their bravery! No man admires a brave man more than I do, but a cur I hate. I believe there are brave men opposite. I could put my hand on one or two who would not stoop to that dirty low-down work that was done in the late strike. The history of that strike has been given, and I do not care about repeating what has already been said, but a good thing cannot be said too often. We have been told we did nothing to stop it. Did we not go to the Premier, did we not go to the Minister for Railways, and did we not go to the Home Secretary? We did everything possible before that general strike came about. What did members of the Government do? They slunk into their lofts like curs. Did they take a similar attitude to that taken by the Government of England? Why, even

Mr. Payne.]

the King of England went out of his way to try and make peace, and yet these miserable people said, "Let them stew in their own soup!" I feel warm in speaking on this matter because I stood and saw a good deal of what happened, and I know I was credited with saying something I never did say. Anything I said I am not ashamed of, and anything I did I am not ashamed of. I was honest in my intention of trying to stop the strike, but the Government were trying to fan the flame, and when I saw there was no hope of stopping the strike, I said, "Let them go." I did all I could to maintain law and order. Every man on every public platform when they saw they had to fight, while they appealed to the unionists to stick to their guns as unionists, they also appealed to them to keep within the four corners of the law, and one of the greatest reasons why I did that was because I did not want Labour turned on Labour. I did not want the unionists to do some deeds that would necessitate Fisher sending the military here to stop them. I have a pretty clear conscience of not having done wrong to anybody, and I am not one of those who would deliberately push a fight on. What was the position of the Hon. the Premier, sticking in his own house with a guard of police round it to protect him? I would sooner to-morrow die a thousand times—and I am not the youngest man in the House—than have fifty or sixty or a hundred policemen around my house to protect me. The Premier had the opportunity of his life in making himself the Scddon of Queensland, and he need not have taken one side or the other. He could have taken an honest stand if he had had backbone. I venture to say that if Bill Kidston was here he would have done it. Bad and all as he is, he has a backbone. If he had been here that strike would not have lasted twenty-four hours, and the Liberal party would not have suffered anything from it either. I am not prepared to say whether the strike was a godsend, because a strike of that kind cannot be a godsend to any community.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was a godsend to the Government.

Mr. PAYNE: As far as that is concerned, I have been given to understand that it assisted them in certain directions; but, after all, I fail to see it. It would have been more honest, if they had not the money to pay men on construction works, to discharge them for the time being, and I think the country would have been better—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: It is all right, Mr. Speaker. I don't want an extension.

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I 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.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

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

[*Mr. Payne.*]