

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 24 JULY 1912

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 24 JULY, 1912.

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

QUESTIONS.

DREDGES "SAMSON" AND "REMORA."

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. Has the dredge 'Samson' been put out of commission, and, if so, for what reason?

"2. What was the actual cost of the dredge 'Samson'—(a) purchasing price; (b) cost in maintenance, etc., to the present date; (c) total cost?

"3. Who recommended the purchase of this dredge and passed her as fit to do the necessary dredging required?

"4. What is the price paid for the dredge 'Remora'—(a) the amount of import duty paid; (b) the total cost to date?

"5. Were tenders invited for the construction of this dredge in Australia or Great Britain?

"6. Has the dredge 'Remora' been taken over by the department, and, if so, on whose recommendation; also what trials or tests was the dredge submitted to?

"7. What guarantees has the Treasurer that the dredge 'Remora' will satisfactorily perform the work required of her?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"1. Yes, in 1902. It was not necessary to continue working her. The 'Hercules' can complete all the dredging in the Brisbane River for which this type of machine is suitable.

"2. (a) The 'Samson' and 'Hercules,' with pipes, lines, and three tugs, were purchased under one contract, amounting to £171,780; supervision cost £2,546; total, £174,326. The precise cost of the former cannot be stated; but it may be assumed to have been about £100,000. (b) Maintenance, £5,251 to date; (c) about £105,251.

"3. The portmaster, the late Captain T. M. Almond.

"4. The contract price was £46,000; 25 per cent. of this is held as retention money—(a) An undertaking has been given to pay duty if demanded by the Commonwealth Government; (b) £46,000, including amount held as retention money.

"5. Seven leading dredge-building firms in Europe were invited to tender on the department's specifications. Tenders were not invited in Australia.

"6. Not yet. The trial tests prescribed by the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers in the contract were carried out satisfactorily under the supervision of the acting executive engineer of the Agent-General's Office. The principal dredging capacity requirements were that the pumps would lift easy material at the rate of 1,500 tons per hour, that a complete cycle of each of the grab machines could be performed in one minute, that

the pumps could discharge a full load (27,000 cubic feet) of mud or silt in ten minutes. The speed requirement was 10 knots fully loaded over a measured mile.

"7. The performance of similar machines in other parts of the world. The Engineer for Harbours and Rivers was sent to Europe to ascertain the suitability of various machines in use for certain work in the Brisbane River. His recommendations are embodied in the 'Remora.'"

RAILWAY EXTENSION FROM PIALBA TO URANGAN.

LIEUT.-COL. RANKIN (*Burrum*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"When is it proposed to commence the construction of the railway extension from Pialba to Urangan?"

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

"Not until several of the lines now in progress have been completed."

NAMBOUR DRAIN.

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

"Has he any objection to lay on the table of this House all the correspondence which has passed between the Health Department and the Maroochy Shire Council in relation to the Nambour drain?"

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

"A copy of the correspondence will be laid on the table on Tuesday next."

HOLIDAYS BILL.

INITIATION.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, it was formally resolved—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to make provision for holidays and for other purposes connected therewith, and to repeal the Bank Holidays Acts, 1904-1905."

MINING FOR COAL AND MINERAL OIL BILL.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*), this Bill, initiated in Committee, was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*), this Bill, initiated in Committee, was read a first time, and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* Mr. HUXHAM (*Buranda*), who was received with Opposition "Hear, hears!" said: I think it is a very nice compliment which is generally paid to young members when upon the first occasion on which they stand up to address you, Sir, the older members of the Chamber congratulate them on the manner in which they take part in the proceedings of the House. Judging from the experience I have had before in this House, the young members who have spoken this session, members on both sides of the House, have acquitted themselves in a manner which must commend itself to older members who have been in many Parliaments. I know that when a man has to speak for the first time, he feels very nervous indeed. In fact, even if he has gone through the experience in several Parliaments it takes him a long time to shake off that nervousness—it is almost impossible to shake it off. It has been noted in days gone by that where men have had a small problem to deal with after facing big ones the same nervousness comes back to them. I feel very much that way myself this afternoon, and I hope that members on the other side will accord me that consideration which I know members of the party to which I belong will certainly grant me, and that, although I may have something very pointed to say, I shall have a fair show to make myself perfectly clear, and that after it is all over members will be able to shake hands with me in the good old-fashioned manner. (Hear, hear!) His Excellency's address is important as far as we are concerned in two particulars, or shall I say in one particular? And that is the matter over which a discussion took place yesterday—the Industrial Peace Bill. I was interested in the remarks made by members on this side of the House, because my feelings were with those members who took the strong stand they did in dealing with the question. The amendments brought forward by the leader and the deputy leader of the Opposition were absolutely essential. They were essential for the fact that we wanted to know what we had to answer. We had had indications that this measure was likely to be of such a character as to make it rather a burden to those who sent us into this House to represent them. The manner in which it was introduced, especially by the deputy leader of the Opposition in bringing matters so clearly before the House, and the objections which he raised, I think were pretty well justified, and I believe that before the Bill becomes an Act we shall have no reason to regret having voiced our opinions in the way we did yesterday.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: I am perfectly satisfied that if it is the intention of the Government to make this measure an absolutely repressive measure, then they have gone the right way to make it a failure. Our experience of matters of this nature shows us that in questions of repression or oppression there must always be a vent whereby the people can give expression to their feelings. Therefore a sufficient vent should be allowed for people to give expression to their opinions. We all know the amount of repression that was shown to the German socialists by a strong man—a much stronger man than ever the Hon. the Chief Secretary will be—that is,

Mr. Huxham.]

Bismarck. We know the history of the great socialist movement in Germany, and we know that in 1878 the Chancellor brought in a Bill which had for its object the suppression of the socialist movement in Germany. He brought in anti-socialistic measures that were likely to be very irksome to the people, but they did not stop the ambitions of the German people. It did not stop the trend of the measures which they were determined should be brought forward for the benefit of the whole of the German Empire. We find that the measures introduced were very oppressive, and although we regret one circumstance that brought it about, still we are perfectly satisfied of this, that the experience of the German people was such that they have gone on and become stronger in their political opinions, and in their industrial activity. We know that that measure remained the law in Germany for six years, and then it was renewed for two years. Two years after it was renewed for another term of two years. When it was brought up for the fourth time—which was twelve years after it was first introduced—it was introduced in even a more strenuous form than it was originally brought before the German Chamber. However, we find that it was so strongly resented, even by those who formerly approved of it, that they rejected it by a very substantial majority. (Hear, hear!) In the meantime what do we find in connection with that great German party. I refer to the Democratic Socialist party of Germany. We find from the time that this measure was introduced that the socialists grew from 400,000 to three and a half times the number in a very few years. Notwithstanding all the laws of oppression and repression that were introduced, these people went on from strength to strength, and it had the effect of binding the German industrial population more strongly together than ever they were bound before, and that would not have happened had not this measure been brought in. I sincerely hope that the Government will pay some consideration to that at the present time, because I maintain that, much as I admire the German people, much as I admire their intelligence and their sturdy independence, they do not, nevertheless, exceed the feelings that we Britishers have. It was Emerson who said that the Britisher is a man who of all others stands firm in his shoes. I take it that the people who have been fighting for political and industrial freedom for the past 700 years are not going to allow the Government at this time to take any action that will repress them in a matter of a Bill such as has been forecast—a Bill which I believe is going to hurt the people generally even more than we anticipate. The effect on the people generally will be that they will become strongly advised, and they will certainly become more strongly identified with the political and industrial movement, because they will recognise that it is a sheer impossibility to make any headway at all unless they do so by means of both political and industrial action. The hon. member for Rockhampton gave a little simile which accurately describes the situation. He said that when they only went in for the industrial movement they were like a bird with one wing, and they wanted the political wing to give the exact poise to make the bird progress. I am perfectly satisfied that before the Bill goes through this House there will be many stormy debates, if the Bill is as

[*Mr. Huxham.*

strong and as strenuous as we anticipate it will be. If such is the case the Government will find from this side of the House a most strenuous opposition.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: There is one thing that I notice here. There is very little mention of social reform in the Government programme. So far as the Bills to come before us I would have liked to see some containing some measure of social reform. These are matters I feel keenly interested in. My training, and, I suppose, my temperament, have brought me closely in touch with the people, and every movement that is going to benefit them makes me feel that it is worth while for Huxham to tackle. For instance, I would like to see our hospitals and charitable institutions dealt with in a different way from that they are dealt with now. From time to time we see appeals through the papers, and in other ways, asking for funds for our hospitals and charitable institutions, particularly the hospitals. Much as people want to help, and much as people feel they would like to help, there is something about it that does not appeal to them. They do not like this constant cadging that is going on, having a collecting box shoved under your nose on hospital Saturdays and other days. Some time ago a lady very much interested in hospitals and charitable institutions asked me if I would be in favour of putting a tax on amusements to provide for the upkeep of hospitals and charitable institutions. I said I thought it a splendid idea, and when she asked me if I would help such a movement I said I would, because I could see that there was something substantial about it, something that would provide a revenue for our hospitals. (Hear, hear!) We have hospital Saturdays and other occasions, and I strongly object to such cadging. Our women have to put up with most humiliating insults from men when they are collecting in the streets. A young girl goes up to a man with her box, and sometimes she meets a man full of liquor and he makes an insulting remark to her, for which he ought to be kicked from one end of Brisbane to the other. If we adopted some such scheme it would mean that the hospitals would get more money, which would enable them to be better equipped so far as their operating theatre is concerned. (Hear, hear!) I believe it would tend to make hospitals and other institutions have an enlarged staff. I believe, further, that it would give our nurses a far better share of leisure that they are entitled to. Although our nurses look healthy in our institutions the strain on the nurses is very considerable, and they should be relieved at least at the end of eight hours, so that they could go away and get that recreation that they require and return refreshed mentally and physically to enable them to carry on another day's work. I sincerely hope that the

[4 p.m.] matter will be considered by the Government, and that as soon as possible they will bring forward a measure to impose a tax on amusements, and I am sure it will bring in a very handsome amount. I am sure that people would be willing to pay a tax on their amusements for the benefit of the sick. I would suggest that on every ticket of the value of 3d. a tax of $\frac{1}{4}$ d. for each 3d. should be

imposed, and I believe it would bring in a tremendous sum—more than adequate for the requirements of all of our hospitals.

Mr. COYNE: What is wrong with the nationalisation of the hospitals?

Mr. HUXHAM: I believe that the hospitals should be taken over entirely by the Government, but meantime some means should be devised whereby they would be better cared for monetarily than they are at present. If a tax were introduced, such as this tax, until the Government can see their way to nationalise the institutions, it would be a good thing, and would be a money-making concern. The Treasurer might go into the details of the matter, and see if something in the direction I suggest cannot be done. I wish now to speak of the position occupied by this party in this House. The hon. member for Barcoo yesterday wanted to impress upon the Premier that, although the hon. gentleman was the head of the Government, we on this side are the Opposition; and I should like the Government to understand that we are here as a part of the Parliament, with important duties to perform.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: I would like him to understand that we are going to criticise the Government as keenly as we possibly can, and to commend their good measures, if they bring any forward.

Mr. COYNE: You will not have much time taken up in commending them.

Mr. HUXHAM: The remark of the hon. member for Warrego has just brought to my mind something I read in Winwood Read's "Martyrdom of Man." I do not subscribe to all his tenets, but something of what he wrote appealed to me very much indeed. It is his opinion that none of us is absolutely good, and he followed this up with a quotation from a French writer to the effect that the true choice is not between the good and the bad, but between the bad and the worse. Now, that does not give the Government a very wide scope. (Laughter.) It is merely carrying out the old Biblical truth that "There is none good, no, not one." That has been so frequently repeated that we have lost the point of the saying. Still we should recognise that none of us can be perfectly good, but that we are between the bad and the worse. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the Government will take heart of grace and endeavour to come a little nearer to our side of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is to the worse.

Mr. HUXHAM: Instead of being at the very antipodes, that they will make the difference between us less marked than it is at the present time. I feel that the very best we can do for the people is not enough. We ought to be very active in our social work, and should endeavour to recognise the kinship there is between all classes of society. If we only grasp that truth, I am sure we shall hear from the Premier a very different statement to that which he made in this House on a former occasion, when he said that it was not the prime function of the Government to secure the happiness of the people.

The PREMIER: I would like to know where that quotation is from.

Mr. HUXHAM: It is in *Hansard*.

The PREMIER: I should like to see the context.

Mr. HUXHAM: The context is just as convincing as what I have quoted. The hon. gentleman will find it in *Hansard*, vol. ciii., page 102. This is what he said—

"I do not allow that the prime function of any Government is to secure the happiness of the people."

I imagine that the prime function of any Government is to secure the happiness of the people.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUXHAM: If not, we shall find this discontent that is going about at the present time will become more acute. Hon. members should lay themselves out to make the people happy—I do not say to make them contented, because there are some people who will always be discontented. It is the duty of the Government, as far as in them lies, to endeavour to make the people happy and to remove causes of discontent. Not only in Queensland and in Australia, but in every civilised country, we find great activity on the part of the people in grasping for something better than they have had in the past, and something better than their forebears have had. That is a very commendable aspiration, and this party has so recognised the position that it is out for all time for something that is going to make for the uplifting of the people. If that were not so, we would be useless as a party. Here we have the big working class, representing fully 85 or 90 per cent. of the population. Are these people always to be subordinated to the other 10 or 15 per cent., and to be mere hewers of wood and drawers of water? The fact is you have gone the wrong way to work about the business. The schoolmaster has been abroad; you have made provision for primary and secondary schools, and Universities, to develop the mentality and morality of the people; and whilst that is going on you may rely upon it that these aspirations are not going to be quenched, but will become stronger and stronger. (Hear, hear!) I believe as the Government gives way in their antipathy to this great social movement, they will find even themselves to alter, because we cannot be in contact with good or bad without feeling that we are made good or bad in the same degree. Every influence for good operates on all lives, and I think we shall have a much better conception of ourselves and of our duties as between Government and Opposition if we recognise that it is not all bad on this side, even as I say it is not all bad on the Government side. We have had indications during this Parliament, when hon. members have said that they are willing to do this and that for the benefit of the people. For instance, the hon. member for Fassfern was very open, and it was gratifying to me to feel that he could recognise that the fairest thing had not been done for the people. (Hear, hear!) If we are like-minded in these matters on both sides, let us have a programme; you can bring it in now—in fact, I am open to offer on behalf of this side—although I am not authorised to do so—that if the Government adopt a plank of the Labour platform, the Labour party will help to carry it through.

Mr. Huxham.]

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Don't they say that they are the Labour party now?

The PREMIER: The true Labour party.

Mr. HUXHAM: There is the opportunity, and we will not take exception if the Government take any single plank of the Labour platform and put it into operation, because we want to see it through. It is not that we want to be on the Treasury benches merely to do it, because there is plenty for us to do after that is put into operation. There is no stagnation about us. We purpose, as far as we can, to lay ourselves out to make the happiness of the people more assured in the community in the future than it has been in the past, and we are very wise in doing it. (Hear, hear!) There is one thing that has interested me in this discussion—the matter which was brought forward by the hon. member for Ithaca with reference to abattoirs. I am not seized of the whole of the facts of the case as they existed at the time, but from what I gathered then, and from what I have learned since, I feel that this is absolutely essential for the welfare of the people. I am glad the Minister for Agriculture is here, because I believe he wants information on the matter I wish to bring forward. He might take it first-hand, and I shall be very pleased to give him certain omissions that are essential to him to make his inquiries complete. The question of abattoirs is one of great public concern, as it deals with the food supply of the people. The meat should be healthy in the first place; it should be slaughtered under good conditions, and the people should receive it in their homes in a fit condition for them to eat—absolutely sound meat. Although we are very strict in the Health Act Amendment Act which was brought in recently, there is something lacking in regard to the meat carts which are taken about the city. These meat carts generally supply meat to the poorer classes. They are loaded up early in the morning, simply jammed full of meat, and the ventilation is of a very indifferent sort. If you look at the tail end of the cart, it makes you feel that you will not eat an ounce of meat again, so repulsive is it. But these carts are allowed to go round, supplying meat not to the well-to-do people, but to the poorer people. The man who drives the cart has just been holding the reins, and his hands are full of grease; he will grab the meat and cut it up, and you can imagine what the state of the meat may be by the time that it has gone round the whole of the district and it comes to the last one to serve with meat.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No, the one who is going round must wash his hands.

Mr. HUXHAM: It is well that he should do so, or else he must carry something about to cleanse his hands. I am certain that the Minister would not be one to eat this carrion—I can call it nothing else. I think that this should come under the most strict supervision, because the health of the people is absolutely essential if we want to bring up a better class of people. Dr. Saleeby, in his work on "Parenthood and Race Culture," lays it down that it is essential that we should look after our people from the cradle to the grave. The health of the people is a matter which it is essential for the Government to take in hand and grapple with, notwithstanding any expense or trouble, in such a way that the people are going to be benefited by it.

[Mr. Huxham.

Mr. HARDACRE: In Sydney they are going to have wire gauze to keep away the flies; here they have nothing.

Mr. TROUT: The hon. member is talking about cash carts, and you are talking about shops.

Mr. HARDACRE: No, I am talking about meat. (Laughter.)

Mr. HUXHAM: I am talking about cash carts. I want to draw the attention of the Minister for Agriculture to the lack of supervision in the killing of pigs. I will read the following extract, so that there can be no mistake as to the facts—

"On Tuesday, 9th July instant, a cockie farmer drove from Teowong to South Brisbane and offered to J—B— four pigs ranging in weight from 75 lb. to 90 lb. They looked good on inspection, but the price asked, 1d. per lb., aroused suspicion, as the market price is from 3½d. to 4d. per lb. Inquiries elicited the man's anxiety to quit the pigs was due to his wanting to escape the inspector, as pig disease was known by the department to be in his neighbourhood.

"If this meat was not diseased why was the price so low, and why was it brought in so surreptitiously?"

Mr. TROUT: Because he had stolen it.

Mr. HUXHAM: No, I am simply stating facts. It is not a question of stealing, because the man was killing his own pigs, but they came from a district which had been declared to be infected. The testimony of the hon. member for Ithaca is sufficient for me. I think the hon. member for Enoggera is scrupulous in the way he carries out his business, and it is to protect that hon. member and other reputable butchers that I want to see more care shown in the slaughter of the cattle.

Mr. THEODORE interjected.

Mr. TROUT: The hon. member for Chillagoe gives nobody credit for being honest.

Mr. HUXHAM: I would not say that. I think the hon. member for Chillagoe rubs it in hard, and sometimes it is deserved.

Mr. TROUT: And very vindictive.

Mr. HUXHAM: I would not say that. He simply means business. He is straight from the shoulder, and I can scarcely say he is wrong in so doing. Temperamentally, I am entirely different to that; I suppose I have a little more of *suaviter in modo* in me. The extract goes on—

"The pigs were cleared out quickly, but there is every possibility of a less scrupulous butcher buying them, and selling them either as joints or put through the mincing-machine for small goods."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Let me tell you that we have killed in the last few weeks over 800 pigs within a 10-mile radius of Brisbane; we are killing 150 pigs to-day, and we are killing every pig within 10 miles of Brisbane.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am very glad to hear it. The very fact of my bringing this up has given the House information which it would probably not have had otherwise.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That information has been published in the Press

week after week for the last five or six weeks. The only two factories slaughtering pigs are the one at Oxley and the one at Zillmere; and we have men there all day and every day.

Mr. HUXHAM: That proves that the Minister has missed the point, namely, that this farmer killed his own pigs, brought them to town, and wanted to unload them at this place.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We cannot keep an inspector in every farmer's house.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am not blaming the Minister for lack of supervision. What I want to do is to so impress him with the importance of this question that not many months will elapse before public abattoirs are established and nobody will be allowed to slaughter a beast for human consumption save under proper inspection.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The only thing is that some informers get hold of—

Mr. HUXHAM: I will give the gentleman the name of the man to whom the pigs were offered.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is more than the leader of the Opposition would do.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would not give you the name of a man that you might persecute him.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have got the name, and if I speak I shall use it, too.

Mr. HUXHAM: I insisted on the name, so that I might give it to the Minister for Agriculture under the rose. He will then be able to make inquiries; and his inspector can get the information at first hand.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I will be pleased to get the name.

Mr. HUXHAM: In connection with the selling of meat at the South Brisbane municipal markets, I wish to say that for the last ten weeks, I am told, the meat has been sold on Saturday mornings without the Government stamp attached.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a matter for the Health Department.

Mr. HUXHAM: And I am told that calves under the regulation weight have been slaughtered.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We traced one man, and he cleared out of the State. That shows how keen we are in the matter.

Mr. HUXHAM: What I say is that the supervision is not sufficient, and it is up to the Minister to consider the necessity of having more inspectors. With respect to the question of immigration, the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon last night caused a great deal of amusement, but they were very edifying. I regard the matter of immigration not from the advantage to the immigrants coming here, but from their utility to the State. Some years ago in New South Wales, when the question of immigration was brought up, Mr. Joseph Carruthers, who had just resigned from the premiership, stated that it was very unwise for New South Wales to undertake immigra-

tion, because, he said, "They all drift here." And that has been the case ever since. It seems hard that we should put our hands into our pockets to bring out immigrants that others may get the benefit. And scientifically it has been proved to be of no effect. If you force immigration to a place it is always detrimental to the people.

The PREMIER: What do you mean by "forcing immigration?"

Mr. HUXHAM: Forcing them in the way we are doing—forcing and inducing them to come. The Chief Secretary will know that when immigration agents go home they tell specious stories.

The PREMIER: We are confining immigration to nominations now.

Mr. HUXHAM: At the present time. The un wisdom of immigration was shown by a man who made a very clear investigation into the matter—Mr. Francis Walker, of the United States of America, who conducted the census of 1870 and that of 1880. He has written works on statistics and economical immigration, and he stated in one of his works that in the United States from 1790 to 1880, a period of forty years, the American population increased from 4,600,000 to 13,000,000 by natural increase; but in the forty years after that, notwithstanding a big influx of immigrants, the increase was only about 10,000 more than if there had been no immigration.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The growth of the black population was bigger than that of the white population; and they are all counted.

Mr. HUXHAM: Then we have our own experience. Notwithstanding the large number of people brought into the place from 1907 to the present time, there has been a gradual falling off in the natural increase. In 1907 the rate per 100 of births over deaths was 1.69; in 1908 it was the same; in 1909 it went up to 1.80; in 1910 the rate was the same; but in 1911 it fell to 1.74. I wish to point out to hon. members

how far we have gone in this [4.30 p.m.] matter, and to impress upon them the fact that the increase in our population in 1911 as compared with 1910 was only fifteen souls, notwithstanding the fact that we introduced 14,000 immigrants during that period. Such a condition of things ought to be grappled with. In the two previous years the increase in our population was between 300 and 400, while last year it was only 15 souls, according to the Commonwealth Statistician. Our own statist gives the figures as nineteen souls, but the difference between the two authorities is a mere bagatelle. My contention is that where people go into a country in large numbers and interfere with the employment and industry of the people already there, the natural increase in the population is diminished. As Mr. Walker has pointed out, if a man who is resident in a State is not up to the standard required in this commercial age, he is driven out in favour of the foreigner who comes to the country. I say that if we brought up our people from childhood to manhood with the greatest care, we should find that the natural increase in our population would be normal, and that would be a great benefit to the State. The people who are here are injured to the climate and the conditions of

Mr. Huxham.]

employment, they would grow up with a knowledge that everything was going well, and would lead decent lives, which they cannot do at the present time. Dr. Saleeby, in his volume on his work in the slums of London, says that 90 per cent. of the children in those slums are born healthy, and that it is simply their subsequent environment that is the unmaking of them. It is our duty to look after our children in such a way as will enable them to grow up to a healthy and useful manhood and womanhood, and for that reason I maintain that we should so care for our children that where a mother is left a widow, or in the case of a foster-mother, we should look after their children, and see that they are supplied with wholesome food, wholesome clothing, and wholesome surroundings. A £25 per annum grant to widows and to foster-mothers to support neglected or orphan children is one of the best investments we could enter upon as far as the State is concerned. Not only does it afford us a moral advantage, but it also affords us financial gain, because the £1 5s. that we receive from the Commonwealth is equivalent to 5 per cent. on the money invested. I am satisfied that young children require decent surroundings, and by spending money to give them those surroundings we bring them up a credit to the State, inasmuch as we improve their morality and mentality, as well as their physical well-being. I do not want in this matter to discriminate between mothers and foster-mothers. I had a very pleasurable experience the other day when visiting two orphan children who were in charge of a foster-mother. The older child rushed into the woman's arms, and it was evident that both had a great affection for their foster-mother. I afterwards found that both those children were illegitimate. I could not help feeling an interest in the youngsters, and feeling that they were worth caring for, notwithstanding the circumstances of their birth. (Hear, hear!) I am not going to advocate general immorality, but I say those children were born here, and they belong to us. I take exception to a remark which was made the other day at a public gathering in connection with the Salvation Army with regard to the £5 bonus being handed to mothers whose children were born out of wedlock. However, I shall not deal with that subject at any length, as there are several other matters I wish to mention. The point is that children born here belong to us, whether they are born in wedlock or out of wedlock, and the talk about morality in that connection does not appeal to me. No girl is going to suffer the trouble of carrying a child for that time and caring for it afterwards merely for the paltry £5 bonus she will receive from the Commonwealth.

Mr. COYNE: It is too ridiculous.

Mr. HUXHAM: It is too ridiculous to imagine such a thing. I was pleased to notice from the business paper that the hon. member for Windsor proposes to bring forward a private Bill for the protection of mothers, which is a measure that I will support. I am satisfied that every member on this side of the House will give his support to any measure which has for its object the care and protection of mothers, no matter from what quarter it may come. There is another matter I wish to refer to, and that is the strike. I am not going to touch upon this matter very much, because I think our case has been amply vindicated by the hon.

[Mr. Huxham.

member for Chillagoe and the hon. member for Barcoo in particular. They made out an admirable case. I took a part in that strike, and I do not know of any strike which I have taken part in that appealed to me so much as that one. My reason for saying that is that the strike was on a matter of principle rather than on a question of money. The money matter always grates on my nerves, though I know that our people need the money. But when men come out as strongly as those men did on a matter of principle, they well deserved the remark made by the leader of the Opposition when he said he was proud of the men for standing up for the principles they believed in. (Hear, hear!) The remarks which have been made towards members on this side of the House, especially the hon. member for Warrego and others who took part in that strike, were absolutely undeserved. We know that it was insinuated that the leader of the Opposition was a coward, that he tried to shirk his duties as leader of that movement, and we find others spoken of as having shielded themselves behind the women. They needed to do nothing of the sort. I never came across a class of men who looked at the matter so fair and square and who went into that strike as did the rank and file. The men who came out on strike came out on matters of principle, and, when I see men doing that, I am ready to defend them and stand shoulder to shoulder with them. The money question does not trouble me much. I hate strikes as I hate the devil. (Laughter.) There is no doubt about that. They not only bring trouble in the house, but they go a long way towards losing friendships and shattering them even after they have existed for a term of years. No one wants strikes. I had the same experience in the last strike. Because I stood by the men who went out on strike, there are men who were formerly friends of mine who have since given me the cold shoulder, and some of them have gone so far as to say that they will not do any more business with me. That does not concern me very much. Huxham is never concerned about people not doing business with him so long as he can make sufficient out of his business to keep his wife and children and live decently. (Hear, hear!) So long as I can pay my bills I am quite satisfied. So far as the strike is concerned, I am with everyone of my friends who took part in it, because they did nothing to intensify the trouble. Their motives were misunderstood. There was a great misconception about what they were doing. No man could have done more than the leader of the Opposition to allay the trouble. No man could have done more than Mr. Bowman did on that unfortunate Friday to keep the men quiet. (Hear, hear!) I was there and saw the whole thing. Although we have been challenged and flouted we have the proof of what the people thought about it, because in the very centre where the strike took place the people of Brisbane exercised their votes in such a way as to give us a marvellous increase in the number of votes recorded for the Labour party, with the result that we returned our man. That does not look as if we are such scoundrels in the eyes of the people of Brisbane. There is another matter of some importance which I wish to bring forward, and it is one that was mentioned by the hon. member for Murilla. He challenged us on the question of the women and children

being batoned, and I said that I saw it, and I presume the hon. member took my word for it. I would also like to refer to another matter, the point of which was missed by Mr. Finlayson in the House of Representatives, that is the question of the badge. In the first place I would like to read two letters bearing on this subject which I think should be absolutely convincing. They come from the strike "Bulletin," but they need not be any less convincing because of that. The names are appended to the letters, and they tell their own story. If they are wrong they should be prosecuted. I will read the first letter relating to the batoning of women and children.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. member propose to read a private letter?

Mr. HUXHAM: No.

Mr. COYNE: It is a published letter.

Mr. HUXHAM: This letter has been published.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must know that I have asked hon. members to refrain from reading private letters. The hon. gentleman may quote the contents of the letter and also the name of the writer. If it is an official letter, or a letter that has anything to do with the Administration, he may read it in full, but if it is a private letter the hon. member will be out of order in reading it.

Mr. MURPHY: Just give the name of the writer and quote the whole letter.

Mr. HUXHAM: This letter is signed by Sydney Cook, and refers to the fact that women and children were batoned while they were trying to get bread.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is quite at liberty to quote from the letter but not to read it.

Mr. HUXHAM: But hon. members will not get the benefit of the expressions in the letter unless I read it all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is quite in order to quote on the floor of the House any letter that he may have received, but he is not at liberty to read a private letter. If the letter is an official one, or relates to any act of administration, the hon. member would be entitled to read it. The leader of the Opposition, earlier in this debate, was allowed to read letters from associations, but it would be manifestly a prostitution of Parliamentary privileges to allow private letters or individual letters to be read in this House. I propose to disallow it.

Mr. HUXHAM: This letter is signed by "Sydney Cook," and he says that he witnessed the batoning of women and children when they were trying to get bread from Enever's bakery in Leichhardt street.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Were they hurt?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. KIRWAN: Ask Sergeant Casey.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Where were they taken to?

Mr. HUXHAM: They were taken home, I suppose, and I want to emphasise this fact.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member does not believe a word of it.

Mr. HUXHAM: The Home Secretary is absolutely wrong, as I do believe it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I don't think you do.

Mr. HUXHAM: One thing I was going to emphasise in connection with this matter is the fact that the wife of a police constable in the employ of the Government was assaulted, and she was willing to go and give evidence to that effect.

Mr. COYNE: Sworn evidence.

Mr. HUXHAM: Yes, sworn evidence. She was the wife of a constable.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a most extraordinary thing that he never made a statement about it to the Home Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Buranda has possession of the chair, and I hope the Home Secretary will allow him to proceed.

Mr. HUXHAM: I am satisfied that the Home Secretary did not want to embarrass me. We are very good friends, but, of course, he wants to protect his department. That was a fact all the same. These things did happen. The position was this: The Government gave carte blanche to the Commissioner of Police to do what he thought was best.

Mr. COYNE: And he told the police to do what they liked.

Mr. HUXHAM: Yes; and they came down on the people like a lot of Huns instead of like civilised people.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has occupied the time allowed him by the Standing Orders. Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member be granted an extension of time?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! No, no!

The SPEAKER: The "Noes" have it.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I should like to compliment some of the young members on their speeches, though at the same time I must say that I have never heard so weak an attack upon the Government policy from the other side before. Their criticism has been confined to the question of public abattoirs—which I understand is being dealt with at the present time—and their administration during the recent strike. Without going into the question of the strike just now, I think that any impartial mind will concede that the Government's conduct of affairs during that period compared more than favourably with what took place in Adelaide during the strike there in 1910. There has been a sort of pious opinion expressed that had it not been for the strike the Government would not now be in office. With that opinion I beg to differ. I consider that the legislation which they have passed fully justifies our position on the right of the Chair. Take some of the legislation passed last session. Take the Workers' Dwellings Act, and the Health Act, for the better securing of pure food for the people and for the checking of various abuses. Then take the Sugar Works Act, one provision in which has not been sufficiently enlarged upon. In that measure for the first time it has been laid down that it is within the rights of Parliament to check anything in the shape of exploitation on the part of private companies. I refer to that provision

Mr. Swayne.]

in the Act which prevents any company established under the Act from paying any dividend in excess of a certain amount. The Workers' Dwellings Act should specially appeal to those who object to the system of landlordism. Altogether, I think that many of the measures passed by the Government last session entitle them to a continuance of the people's confidence, leaving out of consideration such outside issues as the strike. Then again take their railway policy; and in a young country like this I think that must come even before industrial legislation. In a young country like this, the most important task in front of us is to open up our vast areas, and unless there is railway communication that is hopeless. The vigorous railway policy of this Government has placed us in the proud position of owning more railways per head than any other country in the world, and of building railways at a greater rate than any two of the more populous States of the Commonwealth. I think that our claim to be judged upon our policy alone was quite sufficient to entitle us to the confidence bestowed upon us by the people. Coming to our opponents, I do not think that any of them have so far during this debate justified their policy. I do not think we have heard any advocacy of their policy of nationalisation of all the means of production, exchange, and distribution, and I was waiting to hear some justification of it. I feel safe in saying that all they can offer in the way of policy is the penalisation and the discouragement of everything in the shape of enterprise and industry. I further ask what is likely to be the future of any country in which those qualities are discouraged? If they were to attain to office and carried out their policy of nationalising everything in the shape of industrial enterprise and discouraging everything in the shape of private endeavour in that direction, what would be the future of our young country? Coming back to our railways, I regret there is no reference in the Governor's Speech—as there was in the Speech of last session—to the building of some lines by private contracts. Many hon. members have urged that we should go slow in the matter of railway construction, but at the same time I do not think the Opposition have laid their finger upon any item that should be omitted. In my opinion every railway that has been projected is particularly desirable if we are to build up Queensland. At the same time, it behoves those who have the task of guarding the public purse to see that we get fair value for the money we spend in this direction. After travelling over some of the lines in progress, I am sorry to say that there appears to be something like a deliberate attempt to introduce the "cannery" system in connection with our railway construction, and this, if allowed to continue, will cost the taxpayers dear. On the North Coast Railway, for instance, farmers' sons, who have been brought up to do a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, when they went to work on the railway, proceeded to put this rule into practice, but they were warned—to use their own words—by leading lights in the Amalgamated Workers' Association that they were not to work like that, but were to go slow. If that is the case—and I had it on good authority—it is a most serious matter.

Mr. BERTRAM: You do not believe it, do you?

[Mr. Swayne.

Mr. SWAYNE: I have also been on the duplication of the line between here and Toowoomba, and I am sorry to say that I have reason to believe that very much the same state of affairs exists there. If such is the case, it means an addition of fully 25 per cent. to the cost of the railways we have in hand. That is to say, that for works for which we shall have to pay £10,000,000, we should only have to pay £7,500,000, and in the interests of the taxpayers, and more particularly in the interests of the primary producers, upon whose shoulders the bulk of the burden will fall, I enter my protest. Under the Railways Act of 1906, if there is a deficit on a line, 3 per cent. on the cost of construction is to be made good by the ratepayers in the benefited area, and on the North Coast, for instance, they are nearly altogether producers, and where that does not apply heavy freight rates on produce will be requisite to pay interest upon the extra expenditure so caused. In their interests I commend this point to the consideration of those in charge of the Railway Department. Possibly I shall give further details on the Railway Estimates, but in discussing the policy of the Government on the Address in Reply it is not desirable to go much into details, rather to deal with broad questions of policy. I should like to see a check instituted by building some of our lines by contract. The department can make an estimate of the probable cost of a line. They should call for tenders, and they themselves should tender. If they are successful, and it is found that their expenditure largely exceeds their estimate, then we can call them to account for it. We recognise that with our heavy financial responsibilities in connection with railway construction this is a point worthy of attention.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Do you believe in the contract system of railway construction?

Mr. SWAYNE: Under some conditions I do, and I am sorry to say that if what I have noticed in some cases is in any way general throughout the whole of our railway construction, we could not be worse off than what we are under our present system. At any rate, what I am proposing now is not a total revolution of our policy in that matter. What I ask for is simply a check contract to be let, in order that we may see how we are getting on. Let the two systems work together side by side, and then we can form an opinion as to which is best. Surely those who advocate day labour in season and out of season, no matter what the cost may be, are not afraid of comparisons?

Mr. KIRWAN: No, we are not.

Mr. SWAYNE: Will the hon. member support the letting of some lines, at any rate, by contract? The unfortunate part of the business is that some of the hon. members interjecting do not represent those who have to "pay the piper" if there is a loss. I happen to do so.

Mr. KIRWAN: You remember the Robb arbitration case; that is the contract system for you.

Mr. SWAYNE: If what I have seen is in any way general, the Robb arbitration case will be simply a flea-bite to the money which is being spent under the present system.

Mr. KIRWAN: Then you have the departmental officers.

Mr. SWAYNE: Coming to other matters, I intended to remark that the repressive policy that has been advocated by the other side, this constant harassing of those who are developing our primary industries, must have an ill-effect. I am afraid that already that has been shown to be the case. I noticed figures were quoted showing the excess of our imports over our exports. I think it was shown that during the first four months of this year the value of our imports has exceeded our exports by nearly £5,000,000, speaking for the whole of Australia. That discloses a serious state of things. It shows what through artificial conditions we have imposed upon ourselves to a large extent, and there is also the fear that more drastic conditions will be exercised in the future. There is an unwillingness to invest in the development of our resources.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Do you mean the sugar industry?

Mr. SWAYNE: Amongst other things. I notice that this year instead of an increase, there is a decrease in our acreage. I do not think the departmental report is yet available, but I understand that the figures this year are something like 130,000 acres under cane, as compared with 141,000 last year. There is something wrong about that.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Government won't build the mills.

Mr. SWAYNE: Quite apart from those mills. When we were dealing with the 141,000 acres there was no shortage of mill power then; therefore, there can be no shortage with 130,000. A good deal is owing to the fear of harassing conditions and labour troubles, and so on; such strikes, for instance, as the sugar strike. There is not the increase of land under the plough that we should have expected to see in Queensland, and I contend that it can be shown to be owing to the discouragement of everything in the shape of private enterprise that we see shown on the other side.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Drysdale does not think that when he is building a mill on the Lower Burdekin.

Mr. SWAYNE: He is under exceptionally favourable conditions. I am speaking more particularly about the small grower. A good deal has been said about the tactics pursued during the recent campaign. I have here a manifesto circulated by the Opposition during the recent campaign. I leave it to the House to say what justice there is in such paragraphs as this. It states—

"Not a single measure for the benefit of the workers and the vast majority of the people has been enacted by the Denham Government. It has struck no blow at a public evil; it has made the conditions of life no easier for any man whose labours have advantaged the community."

On the face of that they must know it is untrue. Hon. members have quoted measures which were passed last session which show that such a charge is false. Then take this paragraph—

"Millions raised by loan at heavy cost to the country are being squandered on railways that no one professes to believe will pay; that everybody knows will affect no genuine settlement; that are not, as a matter of plain truth, designed for any other purpose than that

of putting fortunes into the pockets of absentee sheep and cattle owners, and enhancing the value of securities held by loan and mortgage agencies."

In the face of that, our railways at the present time are returning something over £3 18s. per cent. on the money invested in them, and yet the other side has the effrontery to publish such a statement as this! Do you wonder, if that was what they were depending upon to secure the suffrages of the electors, that they were returned with such a small minority?

Mr. KIRWAN: An increase of 40,000 votes.

Mr. SWAYNE: Referring to the strike, what happened was simply a quarrel between a private tramway company and its employees. Yet, with the object of making political capital out of it, we find that a certain party fomented the trouble, although the matter in dispute was before the court. What did it matter if a few weeks or months elapsed? There was no justification for the loss and distress caused by their action. The men on these trams had been working under the conditions then prevailing for years.

Mr. BOWMAN: They had been tyrannised over for years.

Mr. SWAYNE: Would it have been any hardship for them if they had worked even months before the award was made? Would it not have been far better than imposing the loss that it did on the community, seeing that it was only over a badge.

Mr. HARDACRE: Men getting sacked all the time.

Mr. SWAYNE: Strictures have been made on the Government owing to the steps they took to preserve peace and order. When we had members on the other side using such expressions as the one made use of by Mr. Collins, urging the people to steal—

Mr. KIRWAN: Cardinal Manning said that.

Mr. SWAYNE: If that was said in Russia there might be some ground for it, but there is not the slightest excuse for anything of the kind in Australia. Again, we had the hon. member for Warrego boasting of having destroyed the trade of Brisbane. As an illustration, I need only refer to the coal shipments, which were only 500 odd tons in the February during the strike as against 421,000 tons in February, 1911. The whole thing was most unjustifiable.

Mr. HARDACRE: You ought to blame Badger for it.

Mr. SWAYNE: Because they happened to disagree about the badge, a question that would have been settled by the Arbitration Court in any case, that was no reason why large quantities of produce should be spoiled, as happened the Mourilyan shipment; it was no reason why forty-three unions should be called out, and large numbers of people not concerned in the dispute brought into the matter. An attempt has been made to compare the situation here with that which prevailed in Great Britain; but there is no analogy, because in Australia we have tribunals specially appointed to deal with such troubles, whereas in the old country they have nothing of the kind. I do not say that employers are always right, and I quite recognise that where no other means of redress exist people sometimes have to strike in

Mr. Swayne.]

order to get their rights; but where there are arbitration courts, wages boards, and so on, the unions have no more right to attempt to coerce others and resort to force than a private individual has to take the law into his own hands.

Mr. FOLEY: Do you deny the right of the tramway men to strike?

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes; seeing that their case was already set down for hearing before Mr. Justice Higgins. I was in Brisbane during the strike, and I could give plenty of details, but there is no need to do so. The Home Secretary mentioned the acts of violence; and I believe he was pretty correct; but some that came under my notice he did not give. For instance, when he told us about that lorry trying to get from Roma street to the brewery yard, he did not mention the way the police were pursued and stoned in the yard afterwards.

Mr. KIRWAN: Bunkum! I was there.

Mr. SWAYNE: So was I; and I know what I am talking about. The question of the strike has been worn threadbare; but before I sit down I wish to refer to another strike—one that was fully discussed last session. I refer to the sugar strike. Seeing that it was resurrected during this debate, I do not feel disposed to let the opportunity go by without doing my best to set right the misrepresentations that have again been made. I have been five years in this House, and I thought I was well aware of the lengths to which the imagination of hon. members opposite would lead them; but I think I must give first place to the hon. member for Cairns, a young member, for his soaring flights into the realms of fiction when he gave his account of the sugar strike. Briefly, the men in the sugar districts had no desire to strike. The object of the strike was simply to compel every worker in the sugar districts to contribute to the political funds of the unions, and make it impossible for any man who did not subscribe to their political doctrines to obtain employment in the industry. The Australian Workers' Union had been considered ineligible for registration as a trade society because of their socialistic objective, yet their object was to make it impossible for anyone to earn his living in the canefields unless he subscribed to their doctrines whether those doctrines were right or wrong.

Mr. BOWMAN: Was not that dispute last year in connection with wages and hours?

Mr. SWAYNE: There was a means of settling that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Was not that the basis? Why try to mislead the House?

Mr. SWAYNE: I am going to read at some length from the speech of the hon. member for Cairns. First of all he remarked that the men had no constitutional means of redressing their grievances. I say again that they had the wages board. Then the hon. member said—

“I know many of the farmers were not against the demands of the Australian Workers' Union. In support of that statement I say that every demand we made on the farmer has been granted to us to-day, in North Queensland at least.”

In regard to the attitude of the farmers, I

[Mr. Swayne.

have the report of a meeting of the farmers in the Mackay district—I suppose the largest in the State, numbering 1,500 or 1,600; and they placed on record their opinion in reference to the demand of the Amalgamated Workers' Union, as follows:—

“That, in reference to the demands of the Amalgamated Workers' Union, compliance with them will render it impossible to grow sugarcane with any profit to the producer; that the canegrowers are perfectly willing to meet their employees on a legally appointed wages board, and that pending the appointment of such, canegrowers are all requested to resist demands of such an extortionate character.”

That resolution was passed at a large meeting of farmers in one of our largest sugar districts.

Mr. LENNON: Were they not reasonable demands?

Mr. KIRWAN: He says they were extortionate.

Mr. SWAYNE: Certainly. I may as well say that these demands included an eight-hour day in the field, which men with full knowledge and experience in this matter—which is not possessed by members on the other side—consider to be perfectly impossible in the conditions of field work. I would like to say that the industry is under the control of the Commonwealth Government, and the Minister of Trade and Customs has power to substantially penalise any grower not according fair conditions of employment, and under the circumstances such an industry should have been exempt from troubles of this kind. The hon. member goes on to say—

“They were justified, and if that was so, why did the Government back up a powerful monopoly and force on this strike?”

The Government did not force on the strike in any way. Of course, the monopoly referred to is the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, but that company only came into the question very slightly. Their mills were more lightly affected than the other mills; but, of course, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company is the old gag, which is brought up every time, in season and out of season, entirely irrespective of the fact that it may have no application to the argument. Again, he says—

“For years the old sugar-workers' union attempted to get a wages board—the thing we hear so much about from the other side. It was not granted.”

I do not know that any attempt was made by them to get a wages board.

Mr. McCORMACK: That shows your ignorance.

Mr. SWAYNE: Can the hon. member give me any authenticated case in which they tried or attempted to get a wages board? I have not heard of any. Again—

“Why was it not granted? Because the Colonial Sugar Refining Company circularised the millers, advising them to have nothing to do with a wages board.”

That is rather too ludicrous. I shall read

an advertisement presently emanating from the hon. member's own organisation which entirely disproves that statement—

"For years we found no wages board was granted to those men. As the men could not get any redress that way, they formed one union which could fight for them, and did fight for them, and the Secretary for Works, as soon as he found out there was a possibility of a union being formed to fight against the millers—at the last moment he granted a wages board to one section of the industry, and not at the request of the employees either. On every other occasion the employees had requested the Minister for a wages board, but on this occasion the employers made the request, and it was immediately granted. That wages board was appointed for the Mackay district. It would have no jurisdiction except in the Mackay district, and could not possibly deal with the whole of the Queensland sugar industry."

That is not correct, because throughout the whole length and breadth of the sugar district the employers expressed their willingness to abide by any award made by the Mackay board—

"A special board was asked for in this House to deal with the industry. The men did not want to strike."

The men did not want to strike, but they were compelled to strike—

"They were prepared to go before a properly constituted court, but what did we find? A wages board for the Mackay district, and a man who had been auditor for the mills appointed as chairman of the board. A partisan; a man who was making his living out of the class who were engaged in this strike."

I think I may be permitted to say that it is cowardly on the part of members to take advantage of their privileges as members of this House to make such attacks on persons who have not the opportunity to reply to them.

Mr. McCORMACK: I said it outside, and I am prepared to say it again.

Mr. SWAYNE: Only the week before last the chairman of that board was unanimously chosen by the representatives of both employers and employees as chairman of the board for the carpentry and joinery trade. If his conduct had been so grossly open to censure as the hon. member alleges in connection with the sugar industry wages board, would the employees' representatives on the carpentry and joinery trade board have joined with the other side to choose him as chairman of that board?

Mr. McCORMACK: He doesn't get his living by joinery.

Mr. SWAYNE: The mere fact that he was appointed unanimously to that position disproves the allegation. The hon. member then referred to the question of wages, but I have not time to traverse the whole of the statements which I have marked in his speech. But I notice that he brings in the old gag that "men were working in the sugar industry for 4½d. and 5d. an hour," even men employed in the Government mills. I may say that I have got a list of rates paid in the mills before and after the wages board award, and it discloses the fact that the

average wage paid in the mills before the award was nearly 7d. an hour and found. What better refutation can be given to such a statement as that which I have quoted? What can we think of a case which is supported by misrepresentation of that kind? Of course, if you take a few exceptional cases, and base your argument on them, you may make the case look black, but take an impartial view of the matter and look at the average wage, and you will find that there is no agricultural industry in the world which pays better wages than the sugar industry of Queensland. The Treasurer showed that in the mills under his control before the strike the men were paid at the rate of time and a quarter for all time worked over eight hours. But I wish particularly to draw attention to the complaint made that the men could not get a wages board when they wanted one. When a wages board was about to be appointed, an advertisement was published by the sugar workers' organisation advising the men to keep away from the board. This is the advertisement which appeared in the *Daily Mercury*, of Mackay—

"Mackay Branch, A.W.A.

"Motion carried on March 11th, 1911—

"That we, as a branch of the Australian Workers' Union, do not recognise the wages board for the sugar industry in any of its branches."

"T. W. HOWLAND,

"Branch Secretary, A.W.A., Mackay."

The men had the opportunity of being represented on that board by whomsoever they chose to appoint, but they deliberately refrained from appointing representatives, in order, I suppose, to make out a good case for a strike. If they had been earnest in their expressed desire to preserve peace, they would have taken advantage of that opportunity and have appointed representatives on the board, but they did not do so, and it ill became them afterwards to make reflections on the board. Their neglect to appoint representatives shows how intent they were on bringing about a strike. They never communicated with the farmers asking for a conference. They say they asked for a conference. But they did nothing of the kind. They wrote to the Australian Sugar Producers' Association on the subject, and that association replied that they considered it a matter for local management rather than one for the association. In that reply the men were virtually referred to the farmers' organisations. When the general secretary of the Pioneer Farmers' Association in Mackay was asked whether he had received any communication requesting a conference, he said "No." He said he never heard of it. As a matter of fact, they were simply spoiling to bring this strike on.

Mr. MAY: You take a bad view of it.

Mr. SWAYNE: They only wanted to make political capital out of it. All through, their demands were made in such [5.30 p.m.] a way as was calculated to incite the farmers to resist them. The resistance did not come from the Colonial Sugar Refining Company or the Queensland Government, but from the farmers themselves. Can you wonder at it? For instance, here is an extract from one of the letters which was received by the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union at Mackay.

Mr. Swayne.]

It is dated "Chillagoe, 6th April, 1911," and is signed "W. McCormack, general secretary, Australian Workers' Union"—

"We have laid down the main point at issue, and have not introduced any detail matter into the fighting platform. All outsiders will thoroughly understand what we are after, and should we be successful in forcing the employers to a conference, we should be then able to introduce other matter."

There was no finality to their demands at all. It meant that if we gave them an inch they would take an ell. In spite of what the hon. member for Cairns said the other day, and in spite of all he told this House—that they did not get all they wanted—it was not due to the Australian Workers' Association that they did get as much as they did. I can say that it was largely owing to the Minister for Works and the Free Workers' Association. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: Too strong. What next?

Mr. McCORMACK: Are you a member of the Free Workers' Association?

Mr. SWAYNE: No. I am a member of the Farmers' Association. That is quite enough for me.

Mr. BERTRAM: They would not have got anything if they had not gone on strike.

Mr. SWAYNE: If anything is said in this House about the farmers it is always met by sneers and jeers from hon. members opposite, and yet they try to pose as the friends of the farmers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That statement is like a good many of your statements; it has no foundation in fact.

Mr. SWAYNE: It was the action of the Mackay Wages Board in giving the award that virtually settled the sugar strike. It will be remembered that last year I asked the Minister two questions on the matter of the Mackay Wages Board, and hon. members can find them on page 1729 of *Hansard*. I asked the Minister—

"1. On whose request was the Mackay Sugar Works Wages Board, whose reconsidered award formed the basis on which the recent strike in the sugar districts was settled, first appointed?"

He replied—

"1. Upon the application of the whole of the employers engaged in the business of sugar manufacture in the Mackay district."

Does that look as if we were averse to the formation of a board?

Mr. McCORMACK: You had got notice that there would probably be a strike.

Mr. SWAYNE: The wages board was appointed in November and the strike did not take place till June. The hon. gentleman says that it was the Australian Workers' Union that settled the strike, but it was virtually the Mackay Wages Board. This is the second question that I asked the Minister—

"2. At whose request did the Minister suggest to the board that they should sit again for the purpose of reconsidering their first award?"

[Mr. Swayne.

The Minister for Works replied to that—

"2. The Minister suggested to the chairman the advisability of calling the board together; this was done after conference with the chairman of the society of free workers and other interested parties."

No one disputed that it was virtually this second sitting of the wages board at Mackay that settled the dispute; assisted, of course, by the conference of which the Minister for Works was chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK: The Mackay Wages Board was not mentioned in the matter at all.

Mr. SWAYNE: I will give the causes which led up to the revision of the Wages Board's determination. I received this telegram at Parliament House in July of last year—

"Free workers have five hundred members and demand recognition. Have applied for revision of wages board determination. Moseley."

Mr. McCORMACK: Where are the free workers now?

Mr. SWAYNE: They are fairly strong, I am glad to say.

Mr. McCORMACK: Where is Moseley?

Mr. SWAYNE: He was in the House the other day, but I have not seen him since. It was the second sitting of the board which virtually settled the strike. Moseley appeared and asked for an eight-hour day at the mill.

Mr. McCORMACK: That was while the strike was on.

Mr. SWAYNE: That shows that Moseley, who is not liked by the political organiser, came and gave evidence on behalf of his organisation in favour of an eight-hour day in the mill. The settlement of the strike is due to the Minister for Works for the action he took in connection with the holding of the conference, and to the free workers for asking for a second sitting of the wages board so that they could reconsider the whole position.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And the unionists, too.

Mr. SWAYNE: No; they wanted to strike. Reflections have been made on the Government for the action they took in regard to the late Brisbane strike; but from what took place during the sugar strike up North—I was there at the time—I can say that the Government's action in the Brisbane strike was quite justified. If any warning was necessary as to the lengths to which strikers would go unless they were checked by a firm hand, it was given up North. Unfortunately, the protective steps that were taken in Brisbane were not taken up North, and what took place there was quite sufficient to justify the precautions against disorder the Government took. I have a diary here simply stating the facts and giving the occurrences which took place during the sugar strike. This foreshadowed what was likely to take place in Brisbane. It shows conclusively that the Government were justified in doing what they did.

Mr. McCORMACK: Is that the *Worker* you are quoting from?

Mr. SWAYNE: No; this is the *Australian Sugar Journal*. These are the verdicts given in the court, and if there is any misstatement it can easily be refuted. These

are statements of fact, and not merely expressions of opinion. I dare say that the newspapers published in the interests of the Opposition would give these same facts that I am now giving. We find that in Cairns on the 14th August they wrecked a train.

Mr. McCORMACK: That is not true.

Mr. MAY: Was it one of your free workers?

Mr. SWAYNE: This is an extract from a newspaper giving an account of the occurrence—

"A few mornings ago, at an early hour, Driver William Francis, of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company's Hambleton locomotive, when about three miles from the Hambleton junction, on the Green Hills tramline, found that a large log of wood and two blocks of firewood had been placed across the line and covered with tall bushes so as to prevent the obstruction being seen until the train was right on it. He also discovered that the points at the junction of the line with the brickyard siding had been opened and left as if to derail and probably cause a serious accident to any train passing over the points."

Mr. KIRWAN: Wasn't there a red flag on it?

Mr. SWAYNE: Here is another—

"As the outcome of an assault by a number of men upon one of the workers at Plane Creek, a man was fined £5 for obscene language."

Then, again, we have this—

"Organiser Martyn, speaking at Mossman, declared that the Amalgamated Workers' Association was demanding an eight-hour day this season; next year they would be asking, and getting, a six-hour day."

Is that sort of statement likely to bring about industrial peace? It means that if you give way to what they ask for, then next year you will be confronted with another demand.

Mr. MAY: Naturally.

Mr. SWAYNE: Will the hon. member disown a man who says that when they get an eight-hour day they will want a six-hour day? Then again—

"July 24.—Several instances of violence reported in the Bundaberg district.

"July 25.—Train with free labourers attacked at Huxley, Childers district; fireman struck, and glass on train broken with stones. Maryborough mill closed down. Four strikers at Cairns fined for endeavouring stop vehicle containing a number of free workers.

"July 28.— . . . The State Minister for Works has written to the chairman of the Mackay Wages Board, suggesting that the board should be called together to obtain any fresh information that may have a bearing on the strike. . . .

"July 30.—[At Bundaberg]. Several hundreds of strikers had assembled at the railway station to meet visiting members Ferricks and Allen. One of their number, accused of taking part in the disturbance at Childers Mill, was arrested by the police, and his comrades

endeavoured to effect a rescue. Stones were thrown, and one of the police received a nasty cut on the head."

And so on. There is the spirit. And now in face of that sort of thing—when we even have threats from a member of Parliament and expressions of regret that men were not "brained," can it be contended that the Government were not justified in doing what they did in Brisbane?

Mr. MAY: Extreme measures were not required.

Mr. SWAYNE: Not required when you talk of braining men? I think there was ample justification for whatever steps were taken here. With regard to the military, judging by what had taken place in the North, I hold that the Premier was amply justified in asking for the military at the hands of the Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. KIRWAN: He said afterwards he did not want them.

Mr. SWAYNE: At the same time, I am very pleased they were not sent, because the refusal of the Prime Minister afforded such a splendid opportunity of showing that the people round Brisbane were behind the Government in the matter. Had the military been granted, those special constables would never have been called out, and they would not have had the opportunity of making the response they did, and the fact that so many of them were wage-earners shows that the Premier had the people of Brisbane behind him. For that reason alone I am glad that the request of the Premier was refused. It also gives us the opportunity of showing, if the referendum ever comes along again, that we are quite capable of managing our own affairs without any assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SWAYNE: Coming back to violence in the North during the sugar strike, we felt in the North rather sore that some steps were not taken there to protect us such as were afterwards taken in Brisbane. I suppose, however, that, being so far away, the facts were not so plainly brought under the notice of the authorities. Here are more extracts from the diary of the sugar strike—

"August 1.—Renewed disturbances Isis district; firearms much in evidence; free labourers forcibly removed from farms. Man fined at Bundaberg for forcibly detaining cab on the road to Quanba. . . .

"August 3.—Bingera and other Bundaberg mills doing good work. Seventeen men arrested for riot at Childers mill; eleven sentenced to three months' imprisonment each."

And so on. There are many other cases which are not quoted here. One came under my own notice of an old man working on one of the Pleystowe cane fields who was severely knocked about. He and four others were cutting cane at what they considered a good price, and they did not see why, at the behest of politicians, they should be prevented from earning a living. They were complying with the law of the land, and they decided to carry on their work, and this old man was knocked about most severely with sticks of sugarcane, and for some time his condition was a matter of solicitude to his friends. Of course you ask why he did

Mr. Swayne.]

not prosecute. He was asked to prosecute, but these organisations had managed to stir up such a fear that it was almost useless endeavouring to get men to prosecute. Fortunately some men had the pluck to stand up against them and give evidence, and, as I have shown, there were quite a number of convictions recorded during the strike. The point is that there was so much violence manifested during that strike as amply to justify the Government in doing what they did in Brisbane. I do not feel disposed to close my remarks without paying a tribute to the farmers who stuck to their work so manfully on that occasion, especially in view of the "big guns" who came into the field against them. We had Mr. Hughes, the Federal Attorney-General, telling us that, unless we gave way to the demands of the workers, the protection upon which the sugar industry of Queensland depends for its existence would be withdrawn. We had Mr. Bamford telling us that, if we did not yield every point, we should have sugar mills established in New Guinea. The stand taken on the other side is that, the moment men strike, the employer has to concede every demand that they make. If he does not, he is an outlaw, his property is to have no protection, he is beyond the pale of the law, and the Government have the right to step in and compel him to accede to the demands of the men. Under such conditions it is obvious that the prosecution of any industry by individuals would be impossible. Of course I quite understand that hon. members opposite are perfectly consistent. It is part of their policy for the nationalisation of the means of production, exchange, and distribution. I must say that I admired the good tempered, mild way in which the hon. member for Cairns put his case here. The hon. member is—I hope he will take it figuratively—"as mild a mannered pirate as ever scuttled ship or cut a throat." I thought of that when the hon. member was making his speech, and when he disavowed any connection with syndicalism my thoughts flew back to the objective of the association of which he was secretary—the nationalisation of all the means of production, exchange, and distribution. I do not interrupt other hon. members when they are speaking, or I would have felt inclined to ask him how he proposes to bring about that objective. Does he propose to compensate the people who invest in an industry the savings of a lifetime, or does he propose to annex their property, and to render their existence impossible by strikes or by adverse legislation? I should like to pursue this topic further, simply because it has been dragged into this Parliament again. I thought it was finally closed down in the last Parliament, but my time is expiring, and many questions I should have liked to touch on I must leave for another opportunity. I cannot but feel amused when I hear hon. members on the other side speaking about their friendship to the farmers, and when I hear them urging their being compulsorily brought within the scope of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Are we to take that as a sample of their friendship? We have heard that Act praised already to-day, but I notice that hon. members who are so loud in their praise of the Act quite ignore that section which imposes a penalty of £1,000 upon any body which takes part in a strike or lockout. Yet we had the spectacle of the Federal Attorney-

[*Mr. Swayne.*

General, who is charged with the administration of the Act, taking part in the sugar strike. Before I sit down, I should like to point out that by our inclusion within the scope of the Act we are in this position, that we have either to submit to the most exorbitant demands—demands which we know will render the carrying on of our industry impossible—or we shall have to defend most expensive actions in a court many hundreds of miles away. We know what it cost the Pastoralists' Association and the Shearers' Union. I think it was £18,000 on the one side, and £4,000 on the other. Now, the farmer is exposed to such a risk as that through his inclusion in that Act. Up to 1910 he was outside its jurisdiction, and he was brought in without his request. When an election comes round again, I hope the farmers will remember that their inclusion in the Arbitration and Conciliation Court is one of the reasons why they should vote against hon. members on the other side.

Mr. WELSBY (*Merthyr*): In accordance with a time-honoured practice, I believe it is customary on the part of every speaker on such a debate as this to give hearty congratulations to the new members who proposed and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. To-night I give my quota of admiration to those hon. members who performed that task; but I go further than that; I offer my hearty congratulations to those new members on the Opposition benches who have spoken so far. I have a dim recollection, while a member of this House last session of hearing the eloquence displayed by certain members on the other side, and I have to regret the loss of some of those members, especially the late hon. member for Gympie, who, having failed ignominiously in the State election, has been raised to a high position in the Northern Territory.

Mr. BOWMAN: And well fitted for it. (Government laughter.)

Mr. WELSBY: I was under the impression that the person receiving high appointment should be a man of high qualifications, of long experience, and of good business ability.

Mr. MAY: He has long experience.

Mr. WELSBY: But when I last saw our friend, I shook hands with him with the most hearty feeling of sorrow that he was going away North from the scene of his victories and from us.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He is a good pioneer.

Mr. WELSBY: Unfortunately, my constituency is not one where you might use the parish pump, as it is called. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, I believe, is in the same position as I am myself in that respect. If we had grievances, if we wanted wharves or railways built by the Government, I believe we could talk in this House night after night, and, in due course, get by agitation all that we required. (Laughter.) But, unfortunately, the hon. member and myself talk on general subjects, on general topics; I am like him, and he is like me. (Renewed laughter.) I believe that in the whole of Queensland there is no name more honoured and revered than that of the leader of the Opposition, and I believe in his neighbourhood receiving the same reverence as he has. (Laughter.) Unfortunately, I do not hope to predict the same fate for him that has followed the leaders of his party time after time. I am just afraid that there is a little

intrigue going on in the ranks, and that some day David Bowman will not be in the same position that he occupies at the present time.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: That is quite true.

Mr. WELSBY: He will have my sympathy. I think that with all the desire to criticise the present Government which he and the hon. member for Barcoo also had, when he made his speech on the various anticipated clauses of the Industrial Peace Bill—and knowing nothing at all about it—that in any difficulty he will not be left in the lurch. I was exceedingly pleased to hear the other night the manly, straightforward, and intelligent speech of the hon. member for Mount Morgan. One could not but be struck with the cemetery-like quiet that prevailed on the Opposition benches when the hon. member spoke. I was exceedingly sorry, when the hon. member spoke, to see the leader of the Opposition retire from his seat.

Mr. BOWMAN: On business.

Mr. WELSBY: He left the House very quietly indeed, but during the time of his absence a deathly silence prevailed that to me was most painful in every respect. I say that the scathing remarks made by the hon. member for Mount Morgan were most deservedly received and most deservedly given. He knew too much of the inner workings of the Labour party and the Trades Hall. During that silence they remained in fear of what the hon. member was going to say. The caucus meeting which they had between 6 and 7 o'clock proved conclusively that the hon. member for Mount Morgan had come to his senses, and was sitting on the proper side of the House. (Laughter.) I have also to congratulate the Labour Opposition on the accession to their ranks of an eminent junior member of finance. I am pleased indeed to know that the hon. member for Paddington some time may become, if he goes on, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the old country—(laughter)—judging from the remarks he passed regarding our worthy Treasurer, and the knowledge he had of the loan going forward in the old country, in which the Hon. Robert Philp was having a good say; and no man in our Parliament for years past has known as much of finance as that gentleman. But when the hon. member for Paddington in the height of his eloquence told the Treasurer the value of £100 at 96, or £100 at 92½, I felt exceedingly sorry for him. When he spoke of the £1,000,000 loan, the £14,000,000 loan, and about making provision for the redemption of debts as they fell due, I felt that with all his counting-house knowledge he had got a mighty lot to learn. When I heard these remarks of the hon. member for Paddington, and the way he twitted the hon. member for Murrumba, I felt I would like to be in the House to hear the scathing remarks which would come from the hon. member for Murrumba. I heard the leader of the Opposition speak on this debate; I never had the pleasure of hearing him speak in the House before, although I had heard him speak at public meetings, and I must say that I never heard in this House a weaker speech than that of the hon. member. When he got on to the strike he knew that, to a very large extent, he was on dangerous ground, and in ten minutes' time the question of abattoirs suddenly cropped up, and the hon. member then spoke about abattoirs and about bad and good meat. I

really think that when he spoke that evening his heart was not in his cause. He might not have been in the best of health, but during the time he was holding forth he knew he was on dangerous ground, and on the first opportunity dodged the question at issue.

Mr. BOWMAN: You give us the issue.

Mr. WELSBY: When I come to the question of the strike, I think the same remarks I make now apply also to his late colleague, Mr. McLachlan. These two gentlemen left the Trades Hall, and came down Queen street. They came down with solemnity fit for a night owl. In my opinion, that procession should have been led by a band playing the Dead March in "Saul." They walked down Queen street, knowing in their own mind that they were in the wrong, and the silence that prevailed told me that in their heart they thought they were not in the right path to victory. (Laughter.) In accordance with time-honoured custom, it is moved by a new member on the Government side and seconded by another new member on the same side; after which members on both sides of the House take part in a debate, extending over three or four weeks. In my business career I have always heard that "brevity is the soul of business," as well as of wit; and I think it would be a good thing when our Standing Orders are altered not to allow all members on both sides to speak on the Address in Reply, but to choose the mover and seconder, the Chief Secretary and the leader of the Opposition, and a few other members to debate the question.

Mr. THEODORE: Who is to choose?

Mr. WELSBY: It could easily be done by the Chief Secretary and the leader of the Opposition. If what I suggest were done, we could get to work much sooner in the session, and it would be all the better for our constituents. Just before we adjourned for tea I was about to use the term "holy day" in connection with the strike; and I say that when members of certain unions were gathered together and their claims were advocated by certain members of Parliament on a holy day, it shows that they had an exceedingly weak cause.

Mr. BOWMAN: Better than going down the bay fishing.

Mr. WELSBY: That is my recreation, just as some men go out in their motor-cars or buggies. What was the hon. member for Warrego at that time? The president of the strike committee. I repeat that when men gather together in that way on a Sunday they have an exceedingly weak cause.

Mr. BOWMAN: "The better the day the better the deed."

Mr. WELSBY: There were forty-three unions accounted for at the gathering on that Sunday; and I have been told that out of the forty-three delegates there were twenty-three to twenty-one.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are wrong.

Mr. KIRWAN: Absolutely wrong.

Mr. WELSBY: Well, I will take the hon. member's word.

Mr. RYAN: Twenty-three and twenty-one make forty-four.

Mr. Welsby.]

Mr. WELSBY: Well, twenty-two to twenty-one. What I have been told is that if the voting had been by ballot there would have been no general strike; and I am convinced of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: How do you know?

Mr. WELSBY: Men I know who took part in it have informed me. I know it in the same manner as members of the Opposition gather information from our side of the House. I am in touch with the working men of Brisbane quite as well as members on the other side, not in their home life, but in their business life. I can give a case in point where a man went out on strike and did not dare to go back to work though I got him a job. At the Queensland Brewery our men were called out, and they had to go out. One man came to me and asked for a job, and I got him a job, but I found the following morning he was missing. I was telephoned for, and I went to his residence, but he was not at home. The wife and seven children were there starving, while the husband, with a job at £3 a week, had gone down the river fishing, because he was called a scab the day he went back to honest work. After that, can you wonder that men do not return to work? Even in the schools the children of men who returned to work were called scabs by the children of men who were on strike. The word "scab" is a word I do not like.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Chief Secretary used it.

Mr. WELSBY: I am not here to defend the Chief Secretary. I would like the word "scab" taken from the vocabulary of both sides. When the trouble of war is on, before you can get the best soldiers you have to get the best leaders. In the history of Great Britain, take Wellington and Nelson, for instance; and in France take Napoleon. In the Trades Hall strike committee there were two glorious leaders who failed to fight after five weeks' deliberation. In the days of Queen Anne there was a famous general who became Duke of Marlborough. That is the name I give to the hon. member for Warrego. He had an excellent lieutenant—a man not in Parliament—who was knocked out of the Labour plebiscite at Woolongabba—

Mr. BOWMAN: That is not true.

Mr. KIRWAN: He withdrew.

Mr. WELSBY: He was knocked out at Paddington; and that man was Mr. Joseph Silver Collings. The Duke of Marlborough, as I designate the hon. member for Warrego, had for his lieutenant a man called Bill Adams. (Government laughter.) The hon. member for Barcoo, in his speech, was talking about certain matters regarding the arbitration case in Melbourne; and he mentioned Mr. Justice Higgins. I called out, "A most partial man." I reverence any man in a high position; and I am not here to decry or bring down the name of any judge in Australia; but I say he is a most partial judge. The hon. member for Barcoo said he was nothing of the kind, and that he had no Labour tendencies whatever.

Mr. RYAN: I did not say that.

Mr. BERTRAM: The fairest man in Australia.

Mr. WELSBY: If the hon. member for Barcoo will turn to page 122 of "Pugh's [Mr. Welsby.

Almanac" for 1912, he will find that the Watson Ministry lasted from the 27th April, 1904, to the 17th August of the same year; and he had in the Cabinet as Attorney-General Mr. Higgins. The same Mr. Watson who appointed Mr. Justice Higgins could not have his own way because Mr. Higgins was doing exceedingly well at the bar. And he prevailed upon the whole of the members of the Ministry to hold their Cabinet meetings at night so that he might make money at the bar during the day. If that does not show that he had Labour tendencies, I do not know what it does show. If a man like Mr. Justice Higgins had no Labour tendencies, how could he have had power to work Mr. Watson as Premier in a Labour Government?

Mr. BOWMAN: Who put him there?

Mr. WELSBY: There is one thing in connection with the hon. gentleman who represents Brisbane in the Federal House of Representatives, Mr. Finlayson, that I should like to mention. Mr. Finlayson, in the heat of the argument which he addressed to the public during the strike, said many things for which he was sorry afterwards. One thing he said was that the badge question was not in the plaint submitted to the Arbitration Court. Afterwards he wrote to the *Courier* admitting that he was wrong in making that statement. But later on, when he went to Melbourne, he once more denied that the badge question was in the plaint, and he said he had seen the plaint.

Mr. THEODORE: He did not deny it.

Mr. WELSBY: He denied that his statement was true in a letter he wrote to the *Brisbane Courier*. Another thing he said in the ardour of his argument was that at the next election Dave Bowman would be Premier of Queensland, and that he was then Premier by right if not in fact. I should like to see Dave Bowman Premier of this State, but he will have to wait for three years.

Mr. RYAN: That is an admission.

Mr. WELSBY: Another statement made by a member of the Labour party was that they caused the closing of the hotels. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who did?

Mr. WELSBY: I will tell you. The very first afternoon I came into this House with my hand on the arm of the hon. member for Maryborough—when I came, as I thought, among gentlemen—the name "Bung, Bung!" was called to me by members opposite. And those men say they were the cause of closing the hotels during the strike. Nothing of the kind; the closing of the hotels was brought about purely and simply by the Licensed Victuallers' Association.

The HOME SECRETARY: They requested it.

Mr. WELSBY: Yes; they requested it. In the morning they canvassed the hotel proprietors in the city, and they went to see the Premier in the afternoon, but were told that he was at a Cabinet meeting. When the Cabinet meeting was over, Mr. Denis O'Connor and another hotelkeeper went and saw the Government, and made a request that the hotels should be closed.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear! That is correct.

Mr. WELSBY: And I say that one of the best things which occurred during the

strike was the closing of the hotels—(hear, hear!)—not alone for the protection of property, but because if the class of men who were out of work and had no money in their pockets had had access to the hotels and got drunk they would have acted like demons. Members opposite may deny as they like that the closing of the hotels was brought about by the Licensed Victuallers' Association of Queensland, but it is a fact nevertheless. Again, when Mr. Finlayson saw that after all that had been done it was impossible to keep the strike going, what did he do? He wrote to the Brisbane newspapers, saying that the business men of the city ought to intervene and settle the dispute. Was he not a business man? Was he not in business in the Brisbane Markets before he went down South? Yet, after doing all that he could to continue the strike between employers and employees, he wrote in that manner to the papers. Why did not he as a business man do all he possibly could to settle the dispute, and not try to keep the strike going? Another matter I should like to refer to is a remark made by the hon. member for Warrego. I am not like the hon. member for Warrego or the hon. member for Mount Morgan. I have engaged in various games, I have played cards, I have played euchre, and I have played poker. (Laughter.) I remember that when the hon. member for Warrego was hysterically shouting that the strikers had victory all along the line, he said, "I have two jokers in my pack." If I played cards with a man who had two jokers in his pack, out he would go through the window—(Government laughter)—and that is exactly what happened to the hon. member for Warrego. After saying that they had victory all along the line, and that he had two jokers in his pack, he was passed through the window. (Hear, hear!) It is an exceedingly strange thing that when the trouble first started nearly every man on the opposite side of the House was in Brisbane helping, aiding, and abetting the strike. They were at the Trades Hall, in the Market Square, and at various places in the city, urging the men to stand firm, but towards the end of the strike they dwindled away. Even the hon. member for Barcoo retreated. The only two men they had then were the Duke of Marlborough and Bill Adams of Waterloo. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: You know that is not true.

Mr. WELSBY: The leader of the Opposition and I, as most members know, have been friendly as neighbours at New Farm for many long years. However much we may have differed in politics, our friendship has continued. One afternoon going home I met the then hon. member for Bowen, Mr. Ferricks, and I said, "Ferricks, old boy, where are you going?" He replied that he was going to the railway station, and I drove him in my cab to the station. As he was getting out I asked how Mr. Bowman was, and whether I could see him under present circumstances. Mr. Ferricks said there was no harm at all in my seeing Mr. Bowman any time I liked. On the following morning I went to Mr. Bowman's house, and had a few hours' conversation with him, his wife being present, and during the whole of that time not a single word was spoken about politics. I was sorry to hear one of the members of the Ministry, in speaking of the derelictions of hon. members opposite, mention the leader of the Opposi-

tion. I can vouch for the cause of the absence of the hon. member from the strike meetings at that time, and I say that if Mr. Bowman had taken an active part in that strike at that time, as he usually does when he is in good health, he would not be here to-night. At the same time I blame him for sitting back quietly and not bringing the strike to an end earlier. The two most sincere members of the Labour party are the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Maranoa. They are the most sincere Labour men on that side of the House, and they took a part in the strike; even John May was prevailed upon to take the chair at one meeting, but he never took it again.

Mr. MURPHY: Oh, yes; that is not right.

Mr. WELSBY: Now I come to the matter of special constables. I was a special constable, No. 8 on the list, and I am proud of it. (Hear, hear!) I was proud to uphold the honour of the State and to assist in preserving law and order. I worked throughout the whole of the strike—worked harder than some people imagine—and I admired the boys who came from Beaudesert, and rode into town in order to keep the peace in Brisbane. And they kept the peace. (Hear, hear!) If you will pardon me for using a vulgarism or sporting expression, those boys were looking for scrap. If that scrap had taken place then there would have been bloodshed. An hon. gentleman on the other side said that the streets were flowing with blood. I would be willing to make a wager that all the blood spilled during the whole of the strike would not have filled a teacup.

Mr. BOWMAN: It would have filled one of your barrels. (Laughter.)

Mr. WELSBY: I would like to say a word or two in praise of the special constables who have been treated with disrespect by members on the other side of the House, but who came forward and assisted in maintaining order right through the strike. If hon. members had seen all the specials lined up in the Market Square on the day that there was going to be another procession then they would have seen bankers, solicitors, barristers, and commercial men, and I am sure that they would not have applied the names to them that they subsequently did. On one occasion the hon. member for Bowen, Mr. Ferricks, made use of certain words regarding the special constables, and he called them bludgers. One day when Mr. Ferricks was walking up Queen street, just as he got opposite the Bank of New South Wales, he was stopped by a special constable and asked if he made use of that expression, but the man ran away. Here was an actual case where Mr. Ferricks, the late member for Bowen, made use of a certain expression and when asked by a special constable if he did use it he ran away. He dared not use the same expression to the man's face.

Mr. THEODORE: I dare you to use it to Mr. Ferricks's face.

Mr. WELSBY: It was in the public print.

Mr. THEODORE: It was not in public print that he ran away.

Mr. WELSBY: I am here to speak what are my own ideas. One ugly word which they used against Mr. Badger was that he

Mr. Welsby.]

was an "alien." If anyone knows the history of America he will know that the original white population of America came from Great Britain. They went there in the days long before the American revolution. We have read of the Pilgrim Fathers sailing in the "Mayflower" from Great Britain and settling down in America. These were the men who started the white population in America, and they are our brothers in every respect. So when anyone refers to an American as an "alien" he is wronging the cause of British liberty and justice. America is the same as John Bull. With all his faults, Mr. Badger has done more than any man in Brisbane as a commercial business man to make Brisbane what it is to-day.

Mr. BOWMAN: No man ever tyrannised more over human beings than he has.

Mr. WELSBY: There is another man who was connected with that strike whom I desire to give credit to. He has received enough blame on his shoulders from members opposite, but I give all credit to Major Cahill.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WELSBY: Some few months ago the merchants of Brisbane held a meeting at the Commercial Travellers' Club and made a presentation to Major Cahill. I never saw a finer gathering of representatives of commercial men than I saw there that day. If he was not entitled to his C.M.G.-ship before the strike he certainly was after the strike.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was very cheap, at that rate.

Mr. WELSBY: Another man who came in for some abuse was Mr. Cumming, the Government Printer. I only wish we had more men like Mr. Badger, Major Cahill, and Mr. Cumming.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WELSBY: It was frequently asked during the strike "Where are Forrest and Welsby?" That was used on more than one occasion on the public platform. There was no open-air concert when Labour members spoke, but I was not going on to a platform in the open air. I would have gone if they had guaranteed to give me a fair hearing, but after my experience last year on the public platform and my experience during the election, I was not going to go on any public platform and have stones and other things hurled at my head. I would go if it was quiet, but I would not go to address a lot of rabid rebels. I did not intend to speak on the strike, but after the speech of the hon. member for Mount Morgan I thought I had better add a few words. I see we are to have a Public Service Superannuation Bill. I am not a lawyer or barrister, and I do not remember the terms of the last Public Service Superannuation Act, but I think it is time that we had such an Act in force in Queensland to-day. It does not matter which branch of the service wants it first, we should bring it into force, and in a few years' time the Government could look into it and see if it requires any alteration. I did not know that the Industrial Peace Bill was coming on so soon, and I shall reserve what remarks I have to make on that Bill till we get to the Committee stage. I could not help thinking when members were speaking on that Bill yesterday that a good many of them seemed to know more about what was in the Bill than the leader of the Go-

[Mr. Welsby.

vernment himself. The Premier and his Cabinet have a chance of making a name for themselves in connection with this Bill. He has the opportunity of framing such a Bill that it will be copied by other States, and I hope it will do good to both sides. We are to have a District Courts Bill. I suppose it relates to the taking of the evidence in shorthand. I know that shorthand writers are allowed in the Southern courts. It might do away with the accumulation of fees for barristers and solicitors, but I think it is time that our law cases were shortened by the evidence being taken down in shorthand. A Trade and Commerce Statistics Bill is to be introduced. I think this is being done at the instigation of the Chamber of Commerce. I am a member of the Chamber of Commerce, and I know that that question has been brought before the Chamber on several occasions, and we had a deputation to the Premier on the matter. The crux of the Bill is that it will enable a record to be kept of goods exported from Queensland through the other States of which no record is kept at present. With regard to Savings Banks, I am sorry that the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher should come into our State and interfere with our Savings Bank business. I understand that they are going to pay interest on current accounts in the Commonwealth Bank. In Scotland and part of England they pay interest on current accounts, but I do not think they do it anywhere else. The private banks in Australia charge 5s. per half-year for keeping accounts, but the Commonwealth Bank is going to pay interest on current accounts.

Mr. LENNON: What makes you think they are going to do that?

Mr. WELSBY: It is spoken of already. I would like to say a few words in praise of our Agent-General, Sir Thomas Robinson. I say honestly that he is an exceedingly good Agent-General for Queensland. I found him a man of sound commercial knowledge, and I believe the leader of the Opposition will also speak of him in the same terms. He is the right man for the position, and I hope that while Mr. Philp is in England they will both be able to do a lot of good for Queensland. I am glad that the Government is pushing ahead with the dredging of the river. I am pleased that the cutting at Luggage Point and the Pile Light are being attended to. There is a vast amount of shipping coming to Brisbane compared with what it was ten or fifteen years ago, and we have to depend on the deep sea ships to take away our produce. With regard to education, I hold that our teachers should be recognised in the same way as the police. The police are entitled to the increased pay [7.30 p.m.] they are to get shortly; and, if we borrow money at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 per cent. for reproductive works, if we gave the whole of our teachers an increase in pay proportionate to that which is to be given to the police, the money would be well spent, for no work could be more reproductive than that of our teachers. Their work is to turn out good scholars, and they earn their salaries well. There are only two more topics upon which I wish to touch before I conclude, and one of them is the Liquor Bill. I do not know in what respects the Bill which is to be introduced differs from the Bill of last session, but I speak with a certain amount of knowledge

of the trade, and I have spoken with people outside the trade, and the general opinion is that if the present Liquor Act were enforced a little more strictly it would do far more good than the Bill which is to be introduced. Had I my way, I would take the whole of the seventy-two members of this House down in the "Lucinda" and have a caucus, and I would gently and carefully tie a millstone round the neck of the Liquor Bill and drop it to the bottom of Moreton Bay. (Laughter.) I know the Opposition desire to see the nationalisation of the liquor trade; but, if they knew what I know regarding the opinion of certain men in the trade, they would say that the present Act, properly administered, would be far better than the Bill coming before us. I am not here to give advice to the Cabinet on matters of finance, but I would repeat the advice given them on a former occasion by the hon. member for Murrumba, and tell them to "Go slow." I hold that members of Parliament should conduct the business of the State in precisely the same manner as they conduct their own business. They should carefully look ahead and not be too extravagant. I know there are times when seasons fail and the endeavours of Ministers are thwarted, but my advice is to go slow about finance.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): This debate is now in its fourth week, and I know that the Premier is anxious that it should be disposed of this week. Nevertheless, I desire to make a few remarks about certain matters. It has been noticeable during the discussion that very few members on the other side have addressed themselves very closely to the proposals contained in the Governor's Speech. I presume the reason is that the matters there alluded to are of little interest to the House generally, with one or two exceptions. I refer especially to the Drainage of Mines Bill and the other Bills relating to the same industry; but, if we eliminate them from the Speech, and one or two others, there seems to be very little of interest in the legislation foreshadowed in the Speech. Of course, there is our old friend, the Police Jurisdiction and Summary Offences Bill, which has been in process of incubation for the last three years, and is now a fair-sized infant with long curly hair.

Mr. MURPHY: It is to be hoped it stops at that stage.

Mr. BARBER: I am inclined to think it will meet with the same fate that it has met with in the two preceding sessions. From my reading of the Bill of last session, I must candidly admit that it proposes to give to the police powers which are altogether too large. Whatever may be our views regarding the tyranny which exists in some European countries, my opinion is that if we pass that Bill, especially if the Police Force is under the control of Major Cahill, the only country to which to attach Queensland will be Siberia, and I know that there are some members on this side of the House who would soon find themselves exiled to cold Siberia. Then there is the Liquor Bill, to which the hon. member for Merthyr has referred. I was somewhat amused at the pathetic manner in which he pleaded with the Government to go slow. The Bill passed this House during

last session, and when the House adjourned last year it was on the understanding that we should meet again shortly after and deal with the question. But the Premier considered that, owing to the industrial upheaval that took place in Brisbane, members of the Opposition were no longer worthy of a place in this august Assembly, and he distinctly told his supporters and the country generally that he refused to sit any longer with a body of men who had practically been traitors to their country. He made that the plea for precipitating the general election. My candid opinion is, and was at the time, that the hon. gentleman was looking for some excuse. He and the other members of the Government knew very well that the licensed victuallers, not only in the metropolitan area, but throughout the State, had convened a number of meetings and had decided to fight the Government tooth and nail if they passed the Liquor Bill, and practically to annihilate, at any rate, the Cabinet, if they did not annihilate the whole party sitting on the other side. As a matter of fact, they threatened to drown the whole Government in sour beer, and I can imagine that it would have been a very painful fate to overtake anybody to be drowned in sour swipes. (Laughter.)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Imagine the Treasurer.

Mr. BARBER: The Government therefore decided to look for some means of escape from the ire of the licensed victuallers and the brewers and distillers, and they made the general strike the excuse for precipitating the elections. I may say that the Liquor Bill of last year was very drastic to some of our friends, yet it was not sufficiently drastic for me. I knew that had there been a referendum when the election was taking place, I should have been found among the more militant temperance section of the State in trying to defeat the Bill, because it was not sufficiently drastic. The forces associated with the Licensed Victuallers' Association and the great booze traffic would have been fighting the Bill because it was too drastic. I can imagine that the fate of the Bill and the Government generally would have been a very sad one. Whatever alteration or modification may have been made in the features of the Bill that is to be introduced this session, I hope, at any rate, that the Government are not going back at all, and have not modified it in the direction of making it easier for the traffic to get more control.

Mr. LENNON: You may depend upon it they have.

Mr. BARBER: I am inclined to think so, but I can only express the hope—it is a somewhat faint hope. I must admit—that it has not been made in any way easier for the traffic to gain a bigger control of the interests of Queensland. Before I touch on strike matters, I have one or two local matters to refer to. One is a railway matter. Now, I have listened during the time I have been in the House, and I think this is the twelfth—may it be twelve more, say my electors, by the way. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: May it be twelve more, says yourself. (Laughter.)

Mr. BARBER: I have noticed that probably one of the strongest features of the speeches made by practically every member on both sides has been that in favour of the construction of railways into their districts,

Mr. Barber.]

or into districts in the immediate vicinity of their electorates. Over and over again, I myself—and I may say the hon. member for Musgrave—have placed before the House the claims of Bundaberg and district for a railway into the Upper Burnett. I do not intend to quote the reams of figures that I have quoted before, I do not intend to recapitulate all the statements I have made regarding this matter during previous sessions; but there is one thing I wish to point out. In looking over the Commissioner for Railways' report up to the end of June, 1910, I find that the total expenditure for railway construction in Queensland—that is, Government railways—was £25,677,890. During last year—from 1st July, 1910, to the end of June, 1911—there was a further sum of £1,610,304 odd, which made the total expenditure on railway construction in Queensland £27,288,194. The only railway that has been built in the Bundaberg district since Bundaberg was founded is a line going from Bundaberg to Mount Perry. That was built so far back in the remote past, or dark ages, that there are only an infinitesimal number of people in Bundaberg who can remember the line being opened. There are, of course, some ancient mariners, belonging to the old generation, who can just remember the opening of the railway. It is true that some years ago the line was extended right through to Bundaberg from Maryborough, and then from Bundaberg on to Rosedale, and finally to Rockhampton; but the assertion of Ministers—the Premier, the Home Secretary, and the Minister for Railways—during their visit to the district some years ago, and especially of the Home Secretary during his frequent visits to Bundaberg, Gin Gin, and Mount Perry, has been that this Government would see that every port received its full or proper share of the hinterland trade, and the people in that district have taken these gentlemen at their word. They have believed in these assertions. As a matter of fact, I think the last few elections have practically been fought on the question—at any rate, the star feature of the election has been the Wolca to Dalgangal Railway. The argument used by my friend the hon. member for Musgrave why the Bundaberg electors should support my opponent was that if they returned a supporter of the Government the railway was a certainty. That was the theme in 1908 and 1909, and it was the main argument used against my return for Bundaberg at the last election—that if the electors of that district returned me, they would probably not get the railway; but if they returned my opponent then the railway was absolutely sure. That was the assertion which was made, and the three Ministers I have referred to expressed themselves in favour of the railway.

MR. COYNE: Was not that bribery?

MR. BARBER: No, they do not call it bribery. I know that the Speaker will consider any remarks I would like to make, which would give full expression to my views, as unparliamentary.

MR. COYNE: That is a very corrupt practice, anyhow.

MR. BARBER: Of course it is. It depends on which party you are supporting in determining what is bribery and corruption. The cost of the Mount Perry line up to the end of last year was £364,816. If we take what we consider a fair area from Bundaberg, 30 miles north and 30 miles south of Bundaberg

[Mr. Barber.

—that is 60 miles—we find the amount expended on that area of 60 miles is in round figures £360,000. When we add to that the amount expended on the Mount Perry line, it shows a total expenditure of about £725,000. Our people have been going into this matter very carefully. They have spent a considerable sum of money in collecting evidence, and securing data and statistics, to show the possibility of that line paying if it was constructed. They have also demonstrated that in the area to which I refer there is practically one-sixth of the population of Queensland located. We claim that if each centre is to have a fair share of expenditure, as this Government have asserted should be the case, the one-sixth of the population there are, at any rate, entitled to have one-sixth of the total expenditure on railways in the State spent there. Instead of that, we are a long way short of the one-sixth expenditure in that district. The Home Secretary in 1909 visited Bundaberg, and when speaking in support of my opponent, Mr. Charles Stumm, said the Government were in favour of the construction of this line. But they have so often told the people of that district they need not fear the wolf—you remember Æsop's fable—that even their most loyal supporters are beginning to lose faith in their promises. We want Bundaberg and district to get a square deal and not suffer by the encroachment of other districts on our preserves. Recently some fresh developments have taken place in Mount Perry, and I sincerely hope that with the price of copper now obtaining the district will have a long run of success. Recently there has also been a movement in Bundaberg for the construction of a line from the Mount Perry line between Goondoon and Gin Gin, via central sugar mill, Walla station, Goodnight Scrub, Kalliwa, and connecting with the Gayndah line at Dappil. A considerable amount of interest has been taken in the movement by the Bundaberg District Railway League, who engaged a surveyor, Mr. Wearne, to go through that part of the country and furnish a report. I have the report here, but I will not read the whole of it; I will merely point out that Mr. Wearne states here that there are 76,000 acres suitable for cultivation, and tens of thousands of acres suitable for grazing and dairying. I wish to emphasise the fact that Bundaberg and district have been treated very shabbily as far as railway construction is concerned. Even the hon. member for Musgrave assured the Bundaberg District Railway League that they would get their railway if they would give their support to my opponent; but the electors of the district considered that their interests were safer in my hands than in the hands of my opponent. When the hon. member was called upon to give some reason why the Government had not carried out their promises, he felt in somewhat of a fix. He admitted that he had always been opposed to the Port Alma Railway; yet owing to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the then Premier, Mr. Kidston, he voted for the railway on the understanding that the Government would see that the railway in his district was constructed. That is a miserable position. He did not believe in the Port Alma Railway; and from all accounts that Port Alma business will pan out what members on this side predicted—a rather miserable affair.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:
That is not true.

Mr. BARBER: I know it has had the blessing of the Governor and the benediction of a large number of the people of Rockhampton; but if Press reports are to be relied on, it seems that the Rockhampton Harbour Board are already engineering a scheme which would practically repudiate any responsibility as far as payment in connection with any loss on the Port Alma business is concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:
Not the slightest intention.

Mr. BARBER: I saw an extract purporting to have been taken from a Rockhampton paper; and I make the assertion on the strength of what I saw reported there. Despite the bad manner in which the Bundaberg district has been treated in regard to railway construction, I hope the claims of that important district will receive some little consideration from the Minister in future. Bundaberg is practically the sixth station in the State as far as revenue is concerned; and considering the large amount of settlement that has taken place since we sent our coloured brother back home, and the general prosperity of the district, I think the Government ought to give us a fair deal. It is a long time since the Bundaberg people asked for an improvement in connection with the station yard; and the year before last a certain sum was placed on the Estimates to carry out necessary improvements. Last

[8 p.m.] year a further sum, sufficient to cover the whole cost of the work, was put on the Estimates. The work was started very well, a large body of men being put on, but they have now been at the work for about eight months, and there is no sign of it approaching completion. The gang are there for two days or a week or two, and are then taken away altogether, with the result that it is taking half a generation to do a £7,000 job. I am sorry the Home Secretary is not present, because I just want to remind him that last year I brought forward a motion in this House affirming the desirableness of abolishing the iniquitous toll that the people of the Bundaberg district have to pay to cross the Burnett.

Mr. COYNE: Shame!

Mr. BARBER: When the hon. gentleman visited Bundaberg during the last election campaign he was waited upon by two deputations in regard to this matter, and he promised to see that something was done. I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget that promise when we get to the solid business of the session. The hon. member for Maryborough last night put forward very strong claims on behalf of the Maryborough foundry, and rightly so. I should like to say that we have a thorough up-to-date foundry in Bundaberg. Though it is not on so large a scale as that at Maryborough, and does not go in for building railway engines, yet it can handle pretty well anything else, and I hope that it will get a fair share of Government work.

Mr. E. B. C. CONSER: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: There is another matter that I should like to refer to, and that is the steamers provided for the pilot service. In response to an interjection or question by me as to why better steamer accommodation was not provided for the pilots, the

Treasurer replied that he was advised by experts that the present steamers were able to do all that was required. A few weeks ago we had some very ugly weather on our coast, and the pilots found it practically impossible to get out and do the work they are required to do. I pointed out in this House last year that even the steamer which the Government bought was totally inadequate for the requirements of the pilots. The vessel, though fairly well found, is absolutely unsuitable for that particular work. I noticed in a report of a Press interview with the hon. gentleman some weeks ago that reference was made to a case in which a pilot was unable to board a vessel, and the Treasurer told the reporter that he had given instructions that if the weather was too bad the pilots were not to take the risk of going out. If the hon. gentleman knew anything at all about seafaring life and the class of men from which pilots are selected, he would know that those men, who are bred to a hardy life and live a hardy life, do not know what danger or risk is when duty calls. They refuse to recognise danger, and if you put those men down at the heads for the express purpose of bringing ships safely into the river, the only just and humane thing the Government can do is not to express a sentimental opinion about their work, but to provide them with a ship that is safe and which gives them every desirable comfort. Who is to be the judge of the amount of risk in this business? There are times when we have such heavy weather on our coast that vessels break down. Supposing a vessel with 500 or 600 immigrants on board, or an ordinary mail steamer, breaks down, and the pilots take the risk of going out and something happens, is the Treasurer to be the judge as to whether he took unnecessary risks or not? There would be a fine howl throughout Queensland if any disaster overtook any mail or other steamer because pilots were not well enough equipped to go out and bring that steamer into port. It is a perfect scandal that pilots, who are away from their homes the best part of their life, and who have to submit to the hardest conditions imaginable, should be boxed up in a kind of dog box when on duty. And yet the Treasurer says he is advised by experts that the accommodation is sufficient! The pilots should be provided with the kind of craft they need, regardless of expense, because so much is involved in the question as to whether they can get out to vessels needing their assistance. I notice another old friend in the Governor's Speech, a Bill to amend the Elections Act. It is about time that that Act was amended in various directions. Probably I shall have something more to say on this subject when the Estimates for the Home Secretary's Department come before us, but I wish to say now that during the twenty years I have been in the Bundaberg electorate, and the eighteen years I have taken an active part in politics, the Bundaberg roll has never been in such a scandalous condition as it was at the last election. I do not know who is responsible, but scores of electors filled in their claims, handed them to police officers, and took it for granted that their names would be put on the roll, but when the election took place they found that they were not enrolled. I went into the matter as carefully as I could, and found that in the eastern section of Bundaberg and also the northern

Mr. Barber.]

section the work of enrolling electors was done splendidly, but that in other parts of Bundaberg, especially in connection with boarding-houses in the main street, where a large number of sugar-workers reside, there were dozens of men whose names were not on the roll. I hope that some drastic alteration will be made in our Elections Act. Personally I think that the best Elections Act operating in the southern hemisphere is the one in operation in New Zealand. If the Government will study the provisions of that Act, they will find that New Zealand is far in advance of anything we have here or in any of the other States. There is a matter connected with the Education Department that I wish to refer to, and that is the matter of the cleaning of the schools. I hope the Minister for Education will take this question into serious consideration. There is no doubt that the women who clean our schools receive very inadequate payment. There is a school attended by a large number of girls in Bundaberg, and the cleaner is paid 12s. 6d. a week for cleaning it. Out of this princely sum she has to find eight towels and soap for washing purposes and ten blackboard dusters. She requires a new broom practically every three weeks. There is no appliance such as a step-ladder for use in cleaning the windows or sweeping the cobwebs off the walls or ceiling, and the woman has to stack one table on another to do her work.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Where is the Minister for Education?

Mr. BARBER: He is out just now. For cleaning the boys' school the lady who does the cleaning gets 7s. 6d. a week. I do not know whether the girls' faces get dirtier than the boys', but she has to provide two towels and eight blackboard dusters for the boys. There is no accommodation or appliance for cleaning the windows, and if she wants a step-ladder she has to borrow one. At one of the other large schools in the Bundaberg district the pay received for cleaning the school is £36 a year. When one considers the great amount of work which these women have to do, it is evident that they should get a greater remuneration than they do at the present time, especially as they are a body of workers who are unable to speak for themselves. There is very great need for improvement in the conditions under which they have to work. The other night the Hon. the Treasurer gave a return showing the amount of wages paid to men working in the central sugar-mills, but he avoided giving what the members on this side wanted and what the House wanted to know, which was what wages were paid to the labourers employed in those mills. It will be found from a return tabled some years ago that the labourers in the central mills receive something less than 5d. an hour.

Mr. HARDACRE: 4½d. an hour.

Mr. BARBER: That speaks bad for the Government as an employer. The men in the mills deserve a far greater rate of pay than what they receive at the present time. There is no mention made in the Governor's Speech of any increase being paid to the teachers. This party brought the matter of increased pay to teachers before the House last year, as the teachers deserve greater recognition of their services than is being given at the present time. They are the worst paid class of people in the Government service at the present time, and, with

[Mr. Barber.

the exception of Tasmania, there is no State that pays its teachers such a low, miserable, sweating rate of wages as the present Government pays our teachers.

Mr. BERTRAM: It applies to the whole of the public service.

Mr. BARBER: There are other matters I wish to deal with, but I will refer to them as opportunities arise. I wish to say a word or two about the industrial upheaval that took place in Queensland some months ago, but before doing so I have a few observations to make regarding the remarks of the hon. member for Mount Morgan the other night. There is no doubt that the recital and rendition of the traitor's creed by that hon. gentleman was done remarkably well. (Opposition laughter.) And the applause that was given him by the Government generally and the benediction pronounced on him by those sitting in his immediate vicinity—

Mr. WIENHOLT: You kept very quiet.

Mr. BARBER: When a man is going to hang himself it is best to let him do it as quietly as possible. (Laughter.) There is a line in one of Tom Hood's poems—

"Only another unfortunate going to his death."

That is what I thought the other night when the hon. member for Mount Morgan was talking of the Trades Hall and the people. The words "The People" were repeated ad nauseam. And yet in 1910 the very argument that the hon. member used the other night was used by him on the motion for the adjournment of the House to protest against the action of the Kidston Government dipping their hands into the public Treasury to assist Mr. Badger to crush a young budding union. The hon. member said on that occasion—and *Hansard* will verify what I say—that, no doubt, an effort was being made to crush unionism. And that was what was tried a few weeks ago—to crush the unionists of Queensland. This is not a new matter. We have seen it growing for a considerable time. It goes farther back than the sugar strike of last year. We have recognised that the attitude of the Government, not only in connection with the sugar strike, but on every other occasion, has been in distinct sympathy with the large employer. And Mr. Badger, who seemed to rule Brisbane and the Government in January and part of February last, was sagacious enough to recognise two years ago that the action the Government then took, that of assisting him in preventing the registration of the Tramway Employees' Association of Brisbane, meant that later on he would receive the full support and backing of the Government. The *Courier* said that the speech of the hon. member for Mount Morgan was the greatest trouncing that the leaders of this party and the Trades Hall ever received. Hon. members who have been here for some years listening to the hon. member could practically anticipate word for word what the hon. member was going to say. It was the old traitor's creed. No doubt the hon. member did it very well, but he lacked the pomposity of the last traitor who recited that creed in this Chamber—I refer to the Hon. William Kidston, who became the saviour of the party sitting opposite, and who was at the same time the greatest traitor to the party sitting on this side.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: It is a great combination—"Saviour to one party, traitor to the other." No doubt the hon. member for Mount Morgan tried the other night to spread himself over the Hon. W. Kidston, but, if I am any judge at all, all the fulminations of the hon. member against this party did not matter one iota. It reminded me of the time, long ago, when I was a little boy with long curly hair. I had a Sunday School teacher who was rather irreverent, and he told us a story of Noah and the Ark. He said that when the animals were brought into the Ark two by two two elephants went in, and they were followed by two fleas. (Opposition laughter.) The flea happened to touch the elephant's leg, and the elephant turned round and said, "Who are you pushing?" (Opposition laughter.) After the tirade of the hon. member for Mount Morgan the other night, after all the brooding and prediction that he expressed, this party can hold its head erect, and can say to the hon. member, "Who are you pushing?" (Renewed Opposition laughter.) It had just as much effect on us as had the flea pushing the elephant.

Mr. WIENHOLT: You did not say anything the other night.

Mr. BARBER: I say we are always willing to let a man hang himself as quietly and decently as possible. We do not want to disturb a man who is going to his political death; the torture of the death is enough for him. After he had received the applause of the Government, who rushed round and shook hands with him, and after the benediction given by the members on the front Treasury bench, the hon. member looked up the *Courier* to see the points he had scored. I have no doubt the hon. member also scored several "pints"—(Opposition laughter)—considering the general exodus from the Chamber by the worshippers of Bacchus on the other side when the hon. member finished his speech, I have no doubt that various "pints" were scored. (Renewed Opposition laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member should couch his remarks in parliamentary language.

Mr. BARBER: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I shall leave the hon. member to his fate. I said a few minutes ago that the hon. member said that probably if we read his speech of 1910 we would learn more about unionism than ever we knew before. The hon. member seems to have missed the fundamental principle of unionism which binds the workers together. The hon. member and other hon. members who have spoken this session have said they do not understand why these men went out on strike. There is something more in unionism than even an increase in wages or a reduction in hours. There is that spirit that binds men one to another. The unionists of Brisbane recognised that Mr. Badger was trying to crush that spirit in January last. It was that that brought them together, and it was that that took the thousands of people in Brisbane up and down the streets in procession. I can quite understand why hon. members opposite did not understand why those men went out. It is because they are not in touch with the workers. They claim to represent the worker, but they have never grasped the principle that binds the workers together. It was when Mr Badger and the Employers' Federation attempted to crush and break the true spirit

of comradeship that the forty-three unions in Brisbane said, "We are going to stand firmly by these men through thick and thin," and, although capital has claimed a victory, although it has claimed to have broken up that unionistic spirit that existed in Brisbane, the unionists went back to work 4,000 stronger than they came out. I say that instead of loss there has been considerable gain. Never was there a strike yet that was lost. We recognise in the time of stress and trouble where our real friends are.

[8.30 p.m.] The hon. member says the workers are learning. They are learning; they learnt a lesson during the strike. They saw that right from His Excellency down they practically had the whole of society against them. They saw arrayed on one side all that goes to make up the whole of the present boasted civilisation of society; they saw enrolled in the ranks against them the whole of organised capital. I referred to one last night—the Employers' Federation, when I said that the men knew where the money was coming from. I said hundreds of thousands of pounds, and hon. members on the other side laughed. I have a copy here of what was supposed to have been a private and confidential circular, issued by the South Australian branch of the Employers' Federation, in which they set out the necessity to organise to crush labour, and these are one or two of the reasons they give for their existence—

"(a) Testing the constitutionality of Acts of Parliament which may be deemed to trespass on the rights of employers. (b) The defence of the members against the attacks of organised labour. (c) Compensating and indemnifying members against loss arising from industrial troubles."

They levied a charge upon employers in the following ratio:—

"The rate of subscription shall be 6d. per head for every employee in receipt of less than £2 per week, and 1s. per head for employees receiving £2 or more per week. These rates to apply up to 500 employees receiving £2 or over per week, and 1,000 employees receiving under £2 per week. Half rates shall be paid on all employees over 500 and up to 1,000 receiving £2 and over per week; and over 1,000 and up to 2,000 receiving under £2 per week. Quarter rates shall be paid on all employees over these numbers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has occupied the time allowed by the Standing Orders, and I shall put the question that the hon. member be further heard.

Mr. BARBER: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): I was glad that the hon. member who has just sat down did not take up the whole time of his speech in connection with the strike. I am inclined to think that a great deal too much time has been taken up in connection with the strike. Personally, I would have much preferred that two or three of the prominent members on the Government side, Ministers, and two or three prominent members on the Opposition side should have discussed the question, and that other hon. members should have afterwards discussed the questions really before the Chamber. It has been

Mr. Forsyth.]

stated that strikes are bad things for all sides. I have had experience of the late strike, and I should like to see it buried in oblivion, and all the ill-feeling pass away, and that amity should exist between employer and employee throughout the length and breadth of Queensland.

Mr. RYAN: This Bill which has been introduced won't do that, from what I have seen of it.

Mr. FORSYTH: I hope it will be a long time before the trade of Queensland is hung up and paralysed as it was a few months ago, and I do not think any right-minded people in the State want such to happen again. The idea is prevalent—and it has been spoken of almost by every member—that members on this side are against trade unionists. That is absolutely false. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: This Bill is the strongest evidence of it.

Mr. FORSYTH: I think that every honest, right-thinking man believes in the genuine principle of trade unionism. Anyone who looks back and studies this question from the very beginning must believe that the conditions and hours of labour that the people, more especially in the old country, had to suffer were absolutely a disgrace to civilisation. That was my idea, and it is my idea now. When trade unions were formed in the first instance they could not even combine; they dared not meet together until the combination laws were repealed. When they were repealed, the men who wanted to combine for their own benefit, to try and improve the conditions under which they worked, not only as far as wages were concerned, but also as regards hours of labour, were allowed that freedom and liberty. The greatest advocates of trade unions will tell you that. But there is one thing I will say, that while the men fought for that principle of freedom to combine, it was never intended that when they got the freedom they wanted, there should be liberty for them to compel. That is a very different question. Trade unionism should be voluntary, under all conditions, and anyone who seeks to compel, violates the very first principles of trade unionism. There can be no get-away from that fact; these are statements made by the best men.

Mr. COYNE: Hear, hear! I wish you had told that to Mr. Badger.

Mr. FORSYTH: I will deal with Mr. Badger later on. There are some men who do not appear to understand the difference between right and freedom, coercion and compulsion, but there is a great difference. We all want every man to have the right to carry on his business under the laws of the land, and have freedom to combine as much as he chooses. Trade unionism was formed for breaking down these combination laws, so that men should be able to carry on their avocations and meet for the purpose of redressing their wrongs, and no doubt there were wrongs in those days.

Mr. LAND: They exist to-day.

Mr. FORSYTH: Every possible credit should be given to the men who formed the unions in the first instance, because they had reason to meet and try to better their conditions. There are some members of this

[Mr. Forsyth.

House—the hon. member for Rockhampton has lived in a mining centre, and I myself was brought up in a mining centre, and the conditions that these men had to live under were a disgrace to civilisation. They had low wages and long hours, and practically nothing to look forward to. I am pleased to think that the combination of trade unionists has done something for the uplifting of these men. There conditions were pitiable and miserable—

Mr. COYNE: They are to-day.

Mr. FORSYTH: In some case they may be to-day, but we cannot deny that the conditions are very much improved, and while there is room for improvement, let us be thankful for the conditions which prevail to-day. The hon. member for Rockhampton, the other night, mentioned the fact that the King, and others, were sympathetic in connection with the coal strike; and I say that any man who knows the conditions under which the miners work in the old country must be satisfied that the miserable pittance of a minimum wage of 5s. a day for an honest day's work is certainly not in accordance with the civilisation of Great Britain. (Hear, hear!) I say there is no combination of men working in Queensland with whom I have greater sympathy than the men who have to go into the bowels of the earth and work under conditions which generally shorten life. We are told that "those whom the gods love die young"; and if that is so, the miner must be very much loved by the gods, because in my time very few miners lived to be old men. The conditions of the strike in Brisbane and the conditions of the strike in Great Britain were two distinct things. Here there was no question of wages or conditions of living or hours; it was because the men were not allowed to wear a little badge.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It was an attempt to down unionism.

Mr. FORSYTH: Nobody could stop them from having a union—any man has freedom to combine with others if he wishes. The hon. member for Barcoo said that trade unionism was used for the purpose of fighting capital. I am sorry he made that statement.

Mr. RYAN: I said "capitalism."

Mr. FORSYTH: I have no desire to misquote any hon. member. On page 111 of *Hansard* of this session the hon. member stated—"Using it for the purpose of fighting capital," not "capitalism." I say it is a bad principle; and what every right-thinking man should do is not to try to make labour fight capital, but try to get labour and capital to work amicably together. To state that unionism is for the purpose of fighting capital is not the right way to ameliorate conditions.

Mr. RYAN: Do you think capital should have its own way?

Mr. FORSYTH: No; I do not think so. I think the working man has as much right to be considered as the capitalist. The hon. member said it was for the principle of unionism that they were fighting, that it was not so much a question of the badge. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that that was correct, what was the result? Did not Mr. Justice Higgins state distinctly that he had no power to stop the strike? I will go

further and say that even if he had the power he was not likely to do it. What did Mr. Justice Higgins say?—

“As to the question of reinstatement of the men who were dismissed in Brisbane—I included it in the dispute which was referred to the court as it was raised at the conference, but I feel still, as I felt then, that I can do nothing. In the first place, the dispute as to the dismissal or reinstatement is confined to one State. It does not seem necessarily incidental to or part of the interstate dispute as to the badge. I seem to have no power over the matter under the Constitution. In the second place, no evidence has been tendered to show me facts on which I could make an order that would not make confusion worse confounded. Mr. Badger has, no doubt, appointed other men to a considerable number, and incurred obligations to them, and I should be very loth to thrust upon him a number of angry men to take the places of the new employees. Even if I had jurisdiction, I should hesitate to make an order under the circumstances.”

What was to be gained by the strike? If it was for the purpose of stopping Badger from discharging men, it had no effect. As a matter of fact it was badly planned, and was a ghastly failure. The hon. member for Barcoo also made the statement that it was his duty to try to stir up the great mass of the people to a consciousness of the fact that the Government were their enemies.

Mr. BOWMAN and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: So they are.

Mr. FORSYTH: Why should the Government be their enemies? We are all Queenslanders, either born here or here because this is our adopted country; and why should any man try to introduce into the minds of the people the idea that this or any other Government are their enemies; and I am sorry the hon. gentleman used such terms.

Mr. RYAN: I not only used those terms, but will try to do it.

Mr. FORSYTH: He also made the statement that the Government come down with proposals for settling industrial disputes, raising wages, and so on, but all those measures are useless if we cannot control prices. If the hon. member knows anything about economics and the conditions which control wages or prices, he must know that the large primary products of Queensland under no circumstances can be protected. I can understand the bootmaker, the butcher, or the baker being protected by a heavy duty. You can control prices as far as they are concerned, but I would like to ask the hon. member for Barcoo how he can control the prices of wheat, frozen meat, butter, tallow, and those things. Surely his common sense will know that we want to have our exports infinitely larger than our imports so as to be financially sound. About 80 per cent. or 90 per cent. of our primary products leave the Australian shores, and neither State Government nor Commonwealth Government can protect them to the extent of one brass farthing. How then can you control prices?

Mr. HARDACRE: Can you reduce prices?

Mr. FORSYTH: When the goods go from Australia to London or anywhere else, the man who buys our goods does not ask the man who sells the goods what it cost to

produce them; he simply says it has to take its place in competition with the world, and get the price of the day, no matter what was the cost of production.

Mr. HARDACRE: Can't you reduce prices? Do you say you can't? You daren't.

Mr. FORSYTH: What does the hon. member mean by reducing prices?

Mr. HARDACRE: Can you reduce prices?

Mr. FORSYTH: We can neither increase nor reduce the prices of the articles we export. What nonsense!

Mr. RYAN: I mean the things that we consume here.

Mr. FORSYTH: The things that we consume here we may perhaps deal with, but it must be borne in mind that we cannot control the prices of the things we send out of the country. I was reading a book the other night—a book which I often read and take a great delight in, that is the “Letters of Junius,” written 150 years ago. He says—

“The submission of a free people to the executive authority of government is no more than the compliance with laws which they themselves have enacted.”

I think hon. members will agree with that. But “Junius” goes further, and says—

“A general nation is grateful even for the preservation of its rights.

“Loyalty in the heart of the British is a rational attachment to the guardians of the law.”

Now we are going to try to preserve the rights of the people of Queensland, no matter what may happen. We talk a great deal about liberty; we talk a great deal about freedom, and I want now to read a facsimile of a document which was signed by Mr. Coyne, and sent to different people in Brisbane and other places. It is as follows:—

“Affiliated with the A.L.F.

“Trades Hall,

“Brisbane, 6th February, 1912.

“Combined Unions’ Committee.

“Dear Sirs,—We have been informed that you are conveying supplies from your stores to various establishments in this city.

“This committee wishes to intimate to you that the only conditions under which work can be sanctioned by this committee is by permit and according to the conditions as per enclosed slip.

“We remain,

“Dear sirs,

“For the Combined Unions’ Committee.

“J. HARRY COYNE,

“President.”

Here is a copy of the permit—

“Combined Unions’ Lock-out Committee.

“Brisbane, 1-2-1912.

“No 55 PERMIT.

“This is to certify that

.....
has permission to

.....
provided that such work or goods supplied is carried out solely by unionists.

“J. HARRY COYNE.

“President.”

Mr. Forsyth.]

"Combined Unions' Committee.

"Trades Hall, Brisbane,
"30th January, 1912.

"Sir.—The provisions governing the enclosed permit are as follow:—

"(1.) All work to be carried out solely by unionists.

"(2.) The said unionists not to receive any remuneration direct from you, but such remuneration to be forwarded to the Strike Committee, who will pay strike allowance to such employees on application, providing they produce fidelity voucher signed by you.

"Any infringement of the above provisions will render the permit liable to forfeiture.

"The committee hold the right for the withdrawal at any time of this permit.

"J. A. MOIR, Sec."

We talk about liberty! Does any man think that any man in business would so far forget his manhood as to go to the Trades Hall for a permit to deliver his goods in Brisbane?

Mr. WHITE: Certainly not.

Mr. FORSYTH: No sane person would dream that business people would do such a thing. We talk about liberty and freedom! What hypocrisy—

"Oh, freedom, how many crimes are committed in thy name!"

We want every man in the State to have freedom, and we want to protect every man and woman in Queensland, so that they may have liberty to go about their avocations without let or hindrance. No Government, whether it be a Labour Government or any other Government, could do otherwise. We cannot get away from the fact that the Government must protect the people. That is a constitutional doctrine. I say the present Government did that during the late strike. They were determined to do it, and they did it, and any Government which would not do it would not deserve the confidence of the country for twenty-four hours. There are one or two things that I want to speak about, as though they may have been hinted at by previous speakers, they have not been discussed with any fulness. I want to speak of a gentleman and an officer of the Government who, with his sound common sense and tenderness of heart, gave the railway men at Ipswich the best advice they ever got in their lives. He told those men to "think, think, think," before they went on strike, and the way he handled those men was a credit to him, and had a great deal to do with their going back to work. (Hear, hear!) I say all honour to him. I hope the Government will specially recognise his services. The Commissioner of Police is also entitled to special recognition.

Mr. BOWMAN: He has got it.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes, I know, but not from this State. It is the duty of the Commissioner of Police not to take sides in any dispute which may arise, but to see that order prevails in the city, and he did it during the late strike, and I admire him for his patience, his perseverance, his pluck, and his tact. (Hear, hear!) He had nothing to do with whether the strike was right or wrong. His duty was to protect life and

[Mr. Forsyth.

property, and to see that law and order were maintained, and he did it; and I say he should receive that recognition which his services deserve. We have been told by members opposite how much they are the friends of the farmers. They want to persuade the farmers of Queensland that they are the best friends the farmers have got.

Mr. BOWMAN: My word, we are.

Mr. FORSYTH: Let me refer to what has been done by the Trades Hall in Melbourne in their efforts to get a log for the farmers of Queensland. I do not say that farmers should not pay a fair wage to their employees, but I say that by insisting upon a certain log like that which is suggested you might interfere with the farming industry in a way that may almost bring it to ruin. Let farmers pay a fair wage, but is it a fair thing to insist that a boy under eighteen years shall be paid £1 2s. 6d. per week of forty-eight hours, with bed and board, and so much for overtime? If that log is introduced and adopted, and the farmers are forced to pay the wages laid down, my impression is that there are any number of farmers in Queensland who would very much rather be employees than employers. I do not think they should not pay a fair wage for a fair day's work. There are many men who are worth 10s. or 12s. a day, but to insist that men who are doing so much for the development of the State shall submit to the proposed conditions is something the people of Queensland will not stand. Even the children of a farmer are not to be allowed to work on the farm. Any member who lives in a farming community, whether that member be on this side of the House or the other side, knows the struggles that farmers have had in the past, and are having now, in trying to get homes for themselves—how they have to clear their land, build a house, raise crops, and bring up their families. Yet it is proposed in this log that a boy or girl under fifteen years of age, that is, a boy or girl who has become of some use, shall not milk a cow or pick fruit before he or she goes to school. They must be over fifteen years of age before they are allowed to go to work on the farm. Children are of great use to their parents long before

[9 p.m.] that age, but under this log they must not work on the farm till they are fifteen, and then they must be paid at the rate of £1 2s. 6d. per week, and bed and board found for them as well. Can the farmers afford that? I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, can they afford that? I say "Give them good wages, by all means," but, can they afford that? If we put on wages like that we will only trammel an industry which is one of the best that we have got in Queensland to-day. (Hear, hear!) We have about 24,000 men and women employed in the dairying industry in Queensland to-day. Are we going to ruin that industry? Do we want to ruin it? I believe that hon. members opposite are honestly endeavouring, in their own way, to try to do what they can to further develop Queensland, but to do a thing like this would be a great mistake. Last year the butter industry was worth £1,700,000 to Queensland. When that great export of butter was started—and we are only on the fringe of that industry—(hear, hear!)—the whole of the industry was revolutionised owing to the

fact that we are able to export that amount of butter to the old country from this State. (Hear, hear!) We talk of our increase in agriculture. I doubt very much if in the £70,000 which we are spending on our Department of Agriculture the people of Queensland are getting full value for their money. When we look at the exports of wheat from Australia—there is no export of wheat from Queensland—when we look at the exports of wheat from Australia and see the millions of money that it represents we see that out of 95,000,000 bushels of wheat grown in Australia only 1,000,000 bushels were grown in Queensland. Every year we have got to send £1,000,000 to bring into Queensland wheat, grain, flour, vegetables, and fruit, which I should like to see grown in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) That £1,000,000 should remain in the pockets of the people of Queensland. I hope the time is not far distant when that may be so. In the great farming industry, which I suppose includes the dairying industry, there are 33,000 people employed in Queensland. This is a big industry and wants every possible encouragement to increase the cultivation of crops on our land. The cultivation is too small altogether. We talk about the quantity of land that is taken up. We talk about the 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 acres of land that is taken up every year. Yet in 1901 we had 483,000 acres under crop, and in 1910 we had only 667,000 acres under crop. During the last ten years we have had taken up in Queensland as agricultural farms and homesteads no less than 4,500,000 acres of land, and they averaged about 265 acres each so far as the agricultural farms were concerned; yet the 32,000 people engaged in the farming industry, who took up all that land, only show the miserable return of 660,000 odd acres under crops. I trust that the Agricultural Department will do something to assist this great industry and push it along. Even if you include paspalum and the artificial grasses, it will not bring up the total much, as there are only 140,000 acres of land under artificial grasses. Instead of having only 600,000 acres under cultivation, we should have at least 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 acres. Look at what the wealth production would be if you had that area of land under crops! We hope that something will be done to help it along in that direction. Our railways are being extended in every direction. We talk about our railway development, and we even “blow” about it, because it means so much more railway for the farmers to have facilities to bring their produce to market. Yet with the 667,000 acres of cultivation produced last year we only got £192,000 in freight out of a total of £2,730,000. I should like to see much more cultivation than we have at present. We get money from London or anywhere we can to try to develop this great State in every way possible. That reminds me of something that was said by the hon. member for Paddington the other night. The hon. member thinks that he has only got to open his mouth in this House and everybody will believe his words.

Mr. LENNON: Don't you believe the same—that every time you open your mouth the people will believe your words?

Mr. FORSYTH: When I get up to speak I am quite serious, and I give facts. (Hear, hear!) I do not speak or use words just to

tickle the fancy of members of this House. The hon. gentleman harped on the fact that I said that I believed in spending five or even ten millions of money every year, whereas, as a matter of fact, every member of this House knows that I have done my best to try to get the Government not to spend so much money. (Hear, hear!) If the hon. gentleman read my speech he would know what I said. I said that the expenditure of loan money ought to be kept down, as we will want £3,000,000 to meet the Treasury bills and the Commonwealth loan falling due. The hon. gentleman was talking on a subject on which he was absolutely ignorant, and he has no right to speak on any business in this House unless he is thoroughly conversant with the subject. (Laughter.) If the hon. gentleman is determined to quote me he should quote me as I gave it. If the hon. gentleman continues to talk in that strain then he is not likely to gain the respect of this House. I am sorry that I have not got much more time, but there is one matter I want to refer to in the little time at my disposal. The Federal Government are coming into competition with the State savings banks. There is one statement which I wish to quote cursorily. Mr. Miller said recently—

“The object will not be to attract deposits from other institutions, but to give depositors facilities for depositing their savings, which will earn a reasonable rate of interest, and be available when required within a reasonable time.”

Does not the Queensland Savings Bank do the same? They give the same rate of interest, and the money is payable on demand. I very much doubt if a great many hon. members have given this subject the attention it deserves. The Savings Bank of Queensland is one of the strongest bulwarks that any Government could possibly have. At the end of June the deposits amounted to about £7,200,000, put there by 140,000 depositors. All honour and credit to that noble army of men and women who by their thrift and energy and industry have given to the Government of Queensland this colossal sum for the development of this State. The amount in the bank is steadily increasing. Since 1907 the deposits have increased by £3,000,000, and the increase last year was £1,000,000. Now what do we do with that money? Everyone who has studied the Savings Bank Act knows that two-thirds of the money must go into Government securities, and at the present time the Government have £5,000,000 of it invested in Government securities. It is placed to the credit of the loan fund account for the purpose of building railways and other public works. Could the people who have saved that money put it to a better use than that? Surely it is only right and equitable that the people who by their thrift and industry have made money in the State should put it in the Savings Bank of the State to be used for such purposes! Two-thirds of that money is now invested in Government works.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, but the Government tried to make out that it was specially earmarked for advances from the Agricultural Bank and under the Workers' Dwellings Act.

Mr. FORSYTH: Nothing of the sort. £5,000,000 of the money is invested in Government debentures for the building of railways and other public works. The Treasurer

Mr. Forsyth.]

has power, no doubt after consulting the manager and trustees of the bank, to spend more than that proportion in connection with the development of the State. Do our friends opposite realise what this means to Queensland? If any hon. member will turn up page 15 of the Treasurer's tables, he will see that nearly one-fifth of the total cost of our railways is represented by moneys placed in the Savings Bank. Then there is about £2,400,000 to the credit of current account. Now what do we do with that balance? We have here the items. I believe there is about £300,000 owing to the Agricultural Bank, and will any man tell me that the savings of the people could be put to any better use than in making advances to settlers on the land who are improving the public estate? That money comes from the Savings Bank. There was an Act passed some years ago called the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, and I do not think a more democratic measure was ever placed on the statute-book. That Act has done an enormous amount of good. Land that was formerly used merely for sheep walks is now the home of thousands of farmers, and the amount to the debit of the trust fund at present is £660,000. That money came from the Savings Bank. We have spent about £250,000 of Savings Bank money in dredging our rivers. Then we all know that the public estate improvement fund has done a great deal of good, and that it has found employment for thousands of men. Well, all the money spent for that purpose has come from the Savings Bank. Last of all, there is the money spent in connection with the Workers' Dwellings Act. That is surely an Act which is doing good to the working men of Queensland who want to get homes for themselves and their families, and the Government advance them money from the Savings Bank funds at a low rate of interest and on easy conditions. I ask could the moneys placed in the Savings Bank be better spent than in developing this great State, and in assisting the working classes of Queensland?

Mr. LENNON: Nobody disputed the argument.

Mr. FORSYTH: Seeing the money is earned in the State, I ask if hon. members opposite will do their level best with their friends to see that the depositors of Queensland put their money in the Queensland Savings Bank.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: It is the working classes' own bank, and it is their money that is doing this great work. Why should not their money be spent in our own State instead of being spent somewhere else? We want all the money we can get to develop this great State. This fund is like a glorious river of usefulness, spreading all over the land, and leaving behind it a quickening and fructifying influence, the benefits of which no one can estimate. (Hear, hear!) I think it unwise for the Federal Government to interfere in this matter; they think otherwise. It is the States that must develop Australia. They have the lands and the railways, and the Commonwealth have neither lands nor railways. They have other business to attend to, I grant, and important business. They are making a great deal of money out of Queensland. According to "A.B.C.," the

[Mr. Forsyth.

gross revenue the Commonwealth Government derived from Queensland in 1910 was about £2,200,000, and their total expenditure in the State, including old-age pensions, and cost of Commonwealth departments, was about £1,150,000, leaving a credit of over £1,000,000. They return £1 5s. per head, amounting to about £680,000 per annum, but that still leaves them about £400,000 to the good. Why cannot they leave the States alone? They are making plenty of money out of them. They have a princely revenue. They had a surplus of over £2,000,000 last year, and surely they might leave the States to work out their own salvation so far as the Savings Bank is concerned.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUNTER: Are you including the sugar bonus in that money?

Mr. FORSYTH: No, that is quite distinct. The excise received by them from Queensland not only pays for the bounty, but leaves them a surplus of some hundreds of thousands in addition. I hope that every man in Queensland who wants to be loyal and patriotic, and who wants to support the State in which he lives and in which he believes, will do his level best to get his friends to deposit their money in our own Savings Bank. Do you not see that if hundreds of thousands of pounds are taken away from Queensland and put into other Savings Banks, it must retard the progress of this great State? We are all anxious to see the country develop, and we are simply standing on the edge of development now. I do not wish to use any opprobrious terms, but I think the Commonwealth Government did a wrong thing in coming to interfere with this great Savings Bank of Queensland. I say, all honour and credit to that big body of men, women, and children who have put their money into the Savings Bank, and which is of such enormous advantage for the development of this great State. We have a magnificent heritage, and the potentialities of Queensland are enormous, and we can never develop it as we should until we spend millions and millions more on it, and the more money we can spend on it in a right way, the better it will be for the people of Queensland. We are all Queenslanders, and we believe in our State. We talk about the great State we live in, and we want to do everything we can so as not to retard the progress of Queensland, and I sincerely trust that everyone will do their best to try and get the people of Queensland to leave their money in the Savings Bank. It is the working classes' bank to a very large extent, and I trust the working classes will be loyal and patriotic enough to Queensland to recognise that fact.

Mr. LENNON: Probably they made a blunder of that.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the Federal Government give you no better terms, why should people go to them.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: They will do so.

Mr. FORSYTH: I hope so, and that the Labour party will help them to do so. We cannot estimate the wonderful benefit of our Savings Bank to Queensland. Very often we are £100,000 or £200,000 short for public works, and we can go for half a million to the Savings Bank, and carry on for the time being. The money we are spending on railways goes to pay wages, and the men, to a

certain extent, place them to the credit of the Government in the Savings Bank. Is it not just and equitable that the very men who are enabled to earn and save money should leave it in their own Savings Bank? I am sure that these statements cannot be repudiated.

Mr. HAMILTON: You must acknowledge that the Commonwealth Government forced this Government to extend its operations and made it more useful than what it was.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not know whether they did. A bank which has money on deposit does not take it for less than twelve months. On current account the depositors get nothing; but in the Savings Bank, on current account they get interest all the time. That is an important thing. The more we open up the Savings Bank, it will be like a snowball, increasing in usefulness all the time. I sincerely trust that every one in our day and generation will do what they can to forward the best interests of this State, and that, in my estimation, is the highest ideal of citizenship. We are only here for a short time, after all. Later on we have to "shuffle off this mortal coil," and it must be a satisfaction to people, even in a humble way, if they feel that they have done their level best to assist in the development of this great State, which I believe will ultimately become the greatest in Australia. We have the land, and we want more people to develop it, so as to get the wealth from the soil, and the more people we have working here, the more money shall we have coming into the Savings Bank. We have a good asset. Everybody knows that the Savings Bank is the strongest asset you can have. You have the whole of the assets of Queensland behind it—our railways, lands, and buildings. What better security can there be, and what better bank could people put their money in than our Savings Bank? It is the people's bank. I am proud of the working people of Queensland, because through their thrift and energy they have been able to save between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000, and place it in the Savings Bank against a rainy day. We should all do our best to induce our people to leave their money in their own Savings Bank, and by doing that, not only will they be doing a good thing for themselves, but they will be seeking in their own small way to develop this great State.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GILLIES (*Eacham*): I shall endeavour to confine my few remarks to those questions which have not been dealt with in detail from either side of the House. I regret, and I am sure every member on this side regrets, that the previous speakers, especially those hon. members representing sugar districts, have not given some indication of what the attitude of the Government is going to be with regard to the burning question in the North—the establishment of new central mills. The attitude of the Government, and of the Treasurer, so far as their conduct applies to the planters in the North, has been dealt with at public meetings, meetings of the shire councils, chambers of commerce, and of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association. Every one of these meetings condemned the action of the Government in their repudiation and failure to carry out the contract implied in their promise to the farmers in the North. I refer to this in my opening remarks because I regard it as a

national question. I regard the settlement and development of the Northern areas as a question not only affecting Queensland, but Australia as a whole. It has been recognised by men who are competent to give an opinion that one of the greatest questions affecting this country to-day is the question of defence, and in that question of defence is wrapped up the question of land settlement. As a Northern man, I do not represent a sugar growing constituency; but I feel that Queensland's greatest industry is being threatened by the conduct of the Treasurer with regard to the promise of these new State mills.

The HOME SECRETARY: The action of the Commonwealth Premier, you mean.

Mr. GILLIES: That has absolutely nothing to do with it. It might be just as well for me to call the attention of members to the fact that the Royal Commission now sitting was not mooted by a Labour Government; as a matter of fact, the first Federal Sugar Commission was appointed by Mr. Deakin, at the request of the sugar growers. The sugar growers of Australia, through Mr. Archer, the late Federal member for Capricornia, presented a largely-signed petition praying for a Commission to be appointed to inquire into the sugar industry.

Mr. WHITE: Why didn't the Commission go on?

Mr. GILLIES: Because Judge Cohen, the chairman of the commission, refused to carry out the position of chairman, or could not do it. Now there is a [9.30 p.m.] change of Government, and the Fisher Government are carrying out the request of the producers by appointing a commission to inquire into this industry. It has been said by some people that the Federal Government have no right to indicate how much the grower should receive for his cane; and it appears to me to be a matter of great concern with members opposite whether the Commonwealth commission will bring in a recommendation that the grower shall receive a certain price for his cane.

Mr. E. B. C. CORSER: Not at all.

Mr. GILLIES: It is a very hard thing to serve two masters; and it is hard for the Government to serve the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—or the buyers of sugar and buyers of cane—and at the same time serve the sellers of cane and sellers of sugar. I for one, as a sugar-grower most of my lifetime, have looked forward, ever since the protective duty of £6 a ton was imposed, to the Federal Government going further and prescribing not only that certain wages shall be paid to the sugar worker and the cane worker, but that the grower shall receive a fair price for his cane. It appears to me that the Treasurer is concerned as to whether the Sugar Commission will bring in a recommendation that the farmer should receive 15s. a ton or something like that for his cane.

The HOME SECRETARY: Nonsense! He only desires to safeguard the interests of the State.

Mr. GILLIES: I know it has been the practice of certain Governments in the past to give Royal Commissions instructions as to how to bring in their recommendations. The Federal Government appointed a commission not composed of Labour men.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillies.]

Mr. GILLIES: Will anyone dare to say that Mr. Crawford is a Labour man?

Mr. WHITE: He is the only one who is not.

Mr. GILLIES: What about Mr. Anderson, of Sydney? Is he a Labour man?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

Mr. GILLIES: Well, if he is, he is a good man. (Laughter.) The Federal Government appointed a commission with a free hand.

Mr. WHITE: What about the secret letters?

Mr. GILLIES: I never heard about the secret letters, my friend. I say that Mr. Fisher appointed a commission to bring in recommendations for the preservation of the industry; and I am prepared to believe that the great octopus known as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company are afraid the recommendations will reduce their dividends, which, on the authority of the Federal Attorney-General, are somewhere in the vicinity of 20 per cent. per annum.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Nonsense!

Mr. GILLIES: The men in the North who are the strongest in their condemnation of the action of the Government in this matter are Government supporters; and I am going to quote the remarks of some of them. Mr. Draper is known as a strong supporter of the present Government. I met him on the boat coming down here. I am not going to say what he said to me; but he can see through this thin gauze—that the Government are afraid the interests of the State will not be conserved by the Federal Government. I recognise it as a similar dodge to asking Mr. Fisher to send up the military—to discredit the Federal Government at the forthcoming Federal election. First of all I was inclined to believe—and I still believe—that they have not too much cash; but I believe it is their object to discredit the Federal Government by trying to convince the farmers that the Federal Government are responsible for hanging up the construction of these State mills.

THE HOME SECRETARY: So they are.

Mr. GILLIES: I am sorry the hon. member for Mirani left this question severely alone. The party opposite are generally supposed to be the friends of the farmers, whereas the Labour party are always pointed at as being the enemies of the farmer; but the farmers in the North are beginning to realise that the Government are not the friends of the farmer at all. Now this is what Mr. Draper said at a meeting of the Cairns Chamber of Commerce—

“Considering that millions of Queensland money had been sunk in the sugar industry which was subject to the same Federal laws and regulations; seeing that men had put their all upon the word of the Queensland Government, it was manifestly unjust if not deliberately dishonourable for the Government to turn round at the last moment and under what could only be regarded as a subterfuge refuse to proceed with the Babinda Mill.”

That is not the only supporter of the Government who made use of just as strong words. Indignation meetings have been held practically all over the North protesting against the conduct of the Government in not carrying out their promises. The farmers who, on the word of the Government, started clearing operations and planted cane will be

[Mr. Gillies.

practically ruined if the Government do not carry out their obligations with regard to the establishment of mills at Babinda and Darradgee. This is a question of national importance, because it is recognised by competent men that the North of Australia is the backdoor of Australia, and it is necessary in order to hold this country for men and women of our own colour and ideals, to fill our empty spaces and develop our tropical industries. It is a burning question in the North, and it affects the whole of Queensland, and I hope the Treasurer will reconsider his decision and not try to deceive the people by making out that he is afraid to do anything on account of anything the Federal Government may do to injure the sugar industry. I quite believe that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company have something to do with this matter. One hon. member opposite stated that there are quite enough mills to crush all the cane that was grown last season. It is a fact well known to any man who knows anything about sugar at all, that it is impossible to have just sufficient mill power to crush the maximum or minimum crop—you must have a margin of power to provide for emergencies. During the last ten years Australia has imported 40,000 tons of sugar every year. Why cannot we in the North, where we have some of the best sugar land in the world, manufacture all the sugar that is required for use in Australia? Some hon. member on the other side spoke about the necessity of having a great export trade, but I am one of those who believe that we should first of all produce all that is consumed in Australia, and then export. We should first of all produce those commodities which are profitable, and in the production of which good wages are paid. The sugar industry if properly handled—and I believe it will be properly handled after the Sugar Commission send in their recommendations—should be the best wage-paying industry in Australia. An industry which is protected to the extent of £6 per ton ought to be the best wage-paying industry in the Commonwealth, and if the money for that protection is provided by the people of Australia they are justified in demanding that the money shall go into the pockets of the people who are doing the work in that industry, and not into the coffers of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to pay dividends. It has been said that the company could import all the sugar they require, and I agree with that statement, but that fact does not justify their making dividends out of the protection offered for the encouragement of the industry. All they care about is to pay dividends to their shareholders; they have “no body to be kicked or soul to be damned,” and they do not care whether their profits are made by white or black labour. The Sugar Commission, if they do any good at all, will certainly make some recommendations which, if adopted, will clip the wings of that monopoly. I hope that the speakers who follow me will have something to say on this great question, which is not a party question, but a great national question. Now, I desire to touch on another matter which I think concerns the whole of Queensland. I do not think anything has been said with regard to local government. I had the honour to represent the newest shire in Queensland at the last Local Authorities' Conference, and I must admit that the Home Secretary treated the delegates very well. Another conference is

to be held very soon, and I presume we shall hear the same speeches from the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and the same speeches from the Minister for Lands and the Premier.

The HOME SECRETARY: I expect we shall hear the same from you, without doubt.

Mr. GILLIES: The Home Secretary gave a promise at the last conference, which I shall quote, but before doing so, I may mention that 300 delegates were present at that conference, representing nine cities, twenty-four towns, and 125 shires. The Premier said on that occasion that there were present no less than five administrators, who were members of local authorities. I believe there are many members in this Chamber who, like myself, have graduated in the school of the local authorities, and it is a very good school to graduate in, but when members reach this House they should not forget the disabilities under which local authorities labour. I wanted to quote from the speech of the Home Secretary, but I cannot lay my hands on it just at the moment, so I shall content myself with saying that he said he had great sympathy with local authorities, and I believe he has—and promised to give very favourable consideration to any request they might make. Certain resolutions were passed at that conference which I am going to quote in order to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, because I notice that no reference is made in the Governor's Speech to any amendment of the Local Authorities Act or the Lands Act with a view to carrying out the recommendations of the conference—recommendations made by the representatives of a body of men whom the hon. gentleman said constituted the greatest Parliament in Queensland. I agree with that remark—the local authorities are the greatest of all Parliaments, greater than the State or the Federal Parliament, because they are nearer to the people, and they are doing a work which deserves more consideration than it is receiving from the present Government. The next conference will take place next month, and I am sure we shall have the same trip down to St. Helena—(laughter)—and if the ex-deputy leader of the Opposition makes use of the phrase "old fossils" again, I hope the delegates will not take any exception to it, but will begin to realise that he was correct in stating that they might expect some consideration from a Labour Government. Here are some of the resolutions which were passed at the conference—

"1. That the Government be asked to place a sum of money at the disposal of local authorities for the construction of roads through Crown lands cut up and sold by the Government.

"2. That the ownership and proceeds of sales of timber on roads and reserves be vested in local authorities.

"3. That the attention of the Government be drawn to the justice of granting local authorities portion of royalty derived from sale of timber, for making roads over which such timber is hauled.

"4. That where rates are due on land which is afterwards surrendered to the Crown or forfeited, and where the deposit or part thereof is retained by the Lands Department, that department should pay rates due.

"5. (a) That greater care should be taken by Lands Department surveyors as to positions and grades of surveyed roads.

"(b) That where a deviation of a sur-

veyed road is obviously necessary before construction is commenced, that the survey of such and cost of resumptions, if any, should be borne by the Lands Department.

"That local authorities should have full control of waterfalls within their area, and that no individual or company should be given a right to water power without the consent of such local authority."

These resolutions were all carried by a very large majority. I take it that as a great number of those delegates are slavish followers of the Government they were quite convinced when they passed these resolutions, together with the assurance given by the Home Secretary, that they would get sympathetic treatment from the present Government. With regard to the last resolution, I wish to say that I am associated with a party who believe that such assets as waterfalls and water power should not be given into private hands, but should be worked by the State itself.

The HOME SECRETARY: If you had followed the course of events you would know that that is covered by the Water Act we passed last year.

Mr. GILLIES: A request was made to the Premier by the local authorities in the Cairns district that the local authorities should take over the Barron Falls and harness them for the purpose of providing water power. The Premier refused to grant the request, and he had a perfect right to do so if the Government are going to harness the Falls. But if the Government do not intend to do anything in that direction, they should allow the local authorities to do so. I would like to know the intentions of the Government in that matter later on. No private company should be allowed to control waterfalls or anything of that kind. These are some of the resolutions passed at the last Local Authorities' Conference—"the great unpaid Parliament of Queensland"—and I regret that effect has not been given to them, although I am pleased to hear from the Home Secretary that effect has been given to one of them. With regard to the Land Act, as a selector and a man who has been a farmer and selector all my life, I think there is great room for amendments in our present Land Act. I am somewhat disappointed that there is not an amending Land Bill brought down this session.

Mr. MURPHY: There will be one before the end of the year.

Mr. GILLIES: The rents charged for land in North Queensland are far too high, especially in places so far away from the great centres of population. Provision should be made, as is the case in New South Wales, whereby a man can acquire a living area irrespective of the quantity of land he takes up. It does not matter if it is 10 or 10,000 acres so long as he has a living area. It is desirable that every man who is settled on the land should be contented. It is one of the greatest questions that affects the government of a country to settle men on the land so that they will become permanent settlers and wealth producers in this State. It is no satisfaction to a government to compel a man to go into a scrub area and put in five years counting the time when he will be able to sell out for a few hundred pounds

Mr. Gillies.]

and get away. The desire should be to make him a permanent settler.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Give him the freehold.

Mr. GILLIES: Never mind the old gag about the freehold. When we have an opportunity we will give a man a lease, and make conditions so attractive that men will succeed on the land. We will not take rent from him as soon as he goes on the land, but will give him time to pay it. When a man pays £6 an acre for land, as he has to do in the Atherton Scrub, he is not able to pay rent straight away; in fact, no man is able to pay rent for five years if he takes up a scrub selection, and no Government is justified in taking the rent out of his pocket and leaving him stranded on the land. It would be a better policy to give him the land for nothing. Another thing which works very well in New South Wales is the system of reappraisal. If a man takes up land at £5 or £6 an acre, and he thinks he has given too much for it, he should be able to go to some tribunal and have his rent reassessed. It is not right to make him forfeit the land if he finds out his rent is too much. If he had the opportunity to go to some court, he might be able to make out a good case to get a reduction in the price.

Mr. HAMILTON: Suppose the court thinks he should pay more.

Mr. GILLIES: Then he should pay more. I would like to see some provision introduced for establishing working men's blocks. A great deal has been said about the labour problem—and it is a problem—those who desire to employ labour—casual labour—should make some provision to settle this labour near by. A man could be employed in the sugar districts for six months of the year, and the Government would be well advised to provide working men's blocks for these men on the Atherton tableland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you know that we are doing that?

Mr. GILLIES: I am aware it has been talked of, but I learn from the Lands Department that it will require fresh legislation.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is done in the sugar districts.

Mr. GILLIES: I know it is in operation in the sugar districts, but I would like to see it done in the Atherton district. We have an ideal climate there; it is the sanatorium for the whole of Australia. It is 2,500 feet above the level of the sea, and it would be an ideal place for the establishment of working men's blocks. A man could live there with his wife and family, and when the sugar crushing season came on he could go to the coastal districts in the sugar districts and work till it was over, leaving his wife and family on the small working man's block of land which he has taken up. He will not want much land, just sufficient to enable him to keep a cow and grow his own vegetables and fruit, so long as he was in readiness to go to the sugar farm when he was wanted. I am a farmer myself, and I know that there is a great difficulty that the farmer has to contend with, and that is, that he cannot afford to pay for labour all the year round. With regard to the railway policy of the Government, I am not going to condemn it. We have the great curse of centralisation in New South Wales, and we do not want it in Queensland, although it

[Mr. Gillies.

is beginning to show itself here. Fortunately, we are naturally favoured for decentralisation, as we have ports every few hundred miles along our coast, and we only want railways from those ports to connect with the hinterland behind them, in order to open them up. We would like to see all these ports linked up with the hinterland by means of railways. I desire to see an alternative route to the coast from the Atherton Tableland. I am not committed to any particular route, but the time is not far distant when

the produce of that great district [10 p.m.] behind Cairns cannot be taken to port on one pair of rails. A

great deal has been said about the contract system of building railways, and a great deal of money has been spent in making good the results of the contract system on the Cairns railway. During the last twelve months the Government have spent £60,000 in repairing that railway owing to Mr. Robb's work having been so faulty. I am not going to say that the work that has been done there now is not permanent, but I believe that one pair of rails will not for many years carry all the produce of the Cairns hinterland, and the Government would be wise to take steps to cause a survey to be made from Millaa Millaa to Mourilyan, and to Cooktown or Port Douglas. I do not care to which port it goes, so long as it will open up good country. I was much disappointed at the reply the Secretary for Railways gave me the other day with regard to the Millaa Millaa and Cedar Creek Railway extension. I want to impress on hon. members on both sides the importance of carrying out in the near future the railway from Malanda to Millaa Millaa. There are 400 or 500 settlers who have gone out beyond the present terminus of the line on the definite promise of the Government that this line would be constructed, and it involves great hardship on those settlers. If the Government are really in sympathy with the poor man on the land, they will certainly make an effort to carry out their promise to those selectors, and not only give them the necessary connection with their holdings, but enable them to become permanent settlers. At present the packing charges involve a tax on every selector of from £15 to £20 per annum for the necessities of life alone, to say nothing of ordinary comforts. Why should the Government hesitate about making this very necessary extension? It will open up one of the richest parts of Queensland, and it is settled by people who are the very best class of settlers I have come in contact with in any part of Australia. I hope the Government will see the wisdom, not only of carrying out their obligations in connection with this line, but they will also go on with the line from Tumoulin to Cedar Creek, which is of equal importance and urgency. I now want to say a few words about the betterment system. I am not one of those who believe in that system. I believe that the Government should appoint, the same as they have done in other States, a Public Works Standing Committee to inquire into the merits and demerits of any railway which is asked for by the people. The evidence should be laid before Parliament, and if the line is considered a payable one and it will develop country, it should be carried out without any guarantee from the people at all. I am associated with a party who say

that the whole of the railways of the State should be financed and controlled by the State as one great system. The betterment system is unfair in this way, that it gives the local people who are called upon to guarantee the line no say whatever as to where the line shall go, how it shall be constructed, or how it is to be managed after it is built. There should be no taxation without representation.

Mr. HAMILTON: They are allowed to say whether they will have the line or not.

Mr. GILLIES: I know that, but I believe in giving them some voice in the matter of the construction and management of the railway. I will say no more with regard to railways, except to express the hope that the Secretary for Railways will push on with the two railways that have been promised in my district. Every Minister who has visited the Atherton Tableland has told the people that they recognised the great work they are undertaking in settling the country so far away from the centres of civilisation, and they have led the people there to expect sympathetic treatment from the Government. I hope they will keep their promises. The Premier has been there himself, and he knows the conditions. As Secretary for Lands he made available more land on the Atherton Tableland than any other Secretary for Lands, and I am sure that he is fully seized with the importance of not only making land available, but of enabling the settlers to become permanent wealth producers. The Secretary for Agriculture is regarded in that district as the white-haired boy of the Cabinet, because he certainly has done something for the district. He has given us an experimental farm. Every supporter of the Government, when he starts to tell you what the Government have done for Atherton, says, "First of all, they gave us the experimental farm," and then he pauses for a while and says, "And they promised us the Millaa Millaa railway." The Secretary for Agriculture carried out his promise in regard to the experimental farm, and I believe he intends to fulfil the promise he made me that he will carry out experiments in sugar culture. As a practical sugar grower, I am quite convinced that sugar will grow on the tableland. When that part of the country is devoted to dairying and sugar growing we shall get rid of one of the curses of the North—the Chinaman. It will not be my fault if sugar is not grown there, and I hope the hon. gentleman will carry out his promise in such a way as to demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that sugar can be commercially grown there. I do not say that the Government would be justified in putting a mill there before they find out whether sugar can be grown at a profit.

Mr. LENNON: You need not be alarmed about that. (Laughter.)

Mr. GILLIES: This experiment can only be carried out by putting in from 5 to 10 acres of approved varieties on the State farm and sending the cane to the Mulgrave Mill or some other mill to have it crushed so that the actual sugar content can be ascertained. Now, the Minister for Education, I hope, will carry out his duty to the children of the pioneers of the Atherton Tableland—that is, to establish State schools at all the centres of population. I have several requests to make for the establishment of schools—one at Malanda, and at various other places where settlement is springing

up, and where large towns will come into existence in the near future. I hope the Minister will anticipate some of the progress that is going to be made there, and that he will not stint the expenditure of public money in a district like the Atherton Tableland.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You have only been there lately.

Mr. GILLIES: I have been there long enough to find out the possibilities of that district—to find out that the North of Queensland is going to be the greatest part of Australia. The actual extent of the scrub areas on the Atherton Tableland is yet unknown, but I have it on the word of the Minister for Railways that it is 30 miles wide by 100 miles long. That area is equal to carrying a population as large as the total population of Queensland at the present time, and the Government should not hesitate to spend money to encourage those people who have gone out into the wilderness to develop that country. I hope the advice of the hon. member for Bundaberg will be followed by the Minister for Education with regard to his treatment of the teachers. State school teachers are engaged in the greatest work—in the work of moulding the characters of the future citizens of this country—and too much consideration cannot be given to those who are prepared to enter the Education Department, in order that we may secure the very best men and women in the State for that work. I was very much disappointed as an Australian to hear that the Queensland Government quite recently felt called upon to import ten teachers from the old country, while we have in Queensland men and women capable and willing to enter this branch of the service if the conditions are only made attractive to them. I hope the Minister will not stint the expenditure in this matter. Education is the most important of all questions, because ignorance is the root of all evil. The Labour party are great believers in free, compulsory, and secular education. They realise that as soon as the people become educated they will all be found supporting the Labour party. (Government laughter.) I do not think I need take up much more time.

Mr. PETRIE: I do not think so.

Mr. GILLIES: I hope I have not hurt the hon. member's feelings in anything I have said, because it is my desire to go through life, while voicing my own opinions, without treading on the corns of people who have different political opinions to myself. Amongst some of my personal friends are to be found some of my bitterest political opponents. It is very important that we should have difference of opinion in political matters; only by difference of opinion can we make any progress. I shall always speak straight while I am here, but I shall always endeavour to do so in a way which will not hurt any man's feelings. One hon. member opposite had a good deal to say about the claims of the Rural Workers' Union, and he insinuated that the Labour party were responsible for the claims.

Mr. PETRIE: So they are.

Mr. GILLIES: So they are; and the Labour party are responsible for the strikes too, are they not? If there was no Labour party at all, not only would we have strikes, but we would have rural workers' unions also. Let me remind hon. members who

Mr. Gillies.]

endeavour to gull the people that the claim has not become law, and the employers have the right to make out a case before an impartial tribunal. If they make out a good case, the rural workers' claims will not become law; but if the rural workers make out a good case, the rural workers' claim will become law.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How would you get on in Atherton?

Mr. GILLIES: The farmers in Atherton are intelligent enough to know that good wages are necessary for the expansion of their industries.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Could they pay them?

Mr. GILLIES: Take the butter industry. Some of the speakers have said that the butter industry depends for its future development on the London market. In England to-day there are 13,000,000 on the verge of starvation. If these people were getting decent wages, would they not be able to use good Australian butter. The dairy farmer will realise that without good wages his industry must go to the wall. It does not matter what industry a man is engaged in, if he is a producer he must be a believer in fair conditions. It appears to me that the men who condemn the Labour party, and say they are advocates of big wages, the policy of the other party being a policy of negatives, they must be advocates of low wages. The Labour party's objective is the securing of the full results of their industry to all producers—not to a certain section, but to all sections. Is not the farmer a producer?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member for Leichhardt to-night was advocating a reduction in the cost of food.

Mr. GILLIES: While the Labour party stand for decent conditions, they also stand for cheap land; and I take it that the party opposite—who by inference admit that they stand for low wages—also stand for dear land. We believe in making the land cheap and accessible to the people who desire to use it—not to make it dear in order to fill the pocket of the land speculator—and any law which will give the land user the full result of his labour and also cheap land, will not suit the land speculator. The interests of these two individuals are diametrically opposed. It is a difficult thing to serve two masters. If the party opposite believe in keeping up the price of land in order that the land speculator may get his "pound of flesh," then they certainly cannot give us a condition of things that will give the bona fide land user access to the land on the easiest possible conditions. I am not going to take up the time of the House by making long reference to the strike. We had strike for breakfast, strike for dinner, and strike for tea during the elections; and we have had practically nothing but strike since we met in this Chamber; and we shall have strike again when the Bill is under consideration; so I am going to reserve practically all I have to say on the matter until the Bill is before us. I just want to say, however, that nobody deprecates strikes more than I do. The party I am associated with have the principle of conciliation and compulsory arbitration on their platform; and the party advocating that principle cannot be advocates of strikes. It has been said, and it

[Mr. Gillies.

has been believed by many worthy people, that Labour in politics is responsible for strikes. I just want to ask those gentlemen who take up that attitude how it is that the greatest strike that ever took place in Australia was before there was a single Labour man in Parliament. Even if it were possible to annihilate every Labour man in politics in one day, instead of strikes being reduced, there would be greater industrial trouble than ever, because the party that stands for vested interests, trusts, and combines would run riot, and there would be something like civil war. I think the Labour party's proposal for conciliation and compulsory arbitration is the only method of bringing employer and employee together and reducing industrial trouble to a minimum. I do not think I need say any more on this question to-night. I will have something to say regarding the great mining industry when the Bills are being considered, and I will conclude with the hope that the Treasurer will reconsider his decision with regard to central mills in the North, and give the House an assurance before many hours that he will yield to the pressure and the logic brought to bear on him and carry out the promises made by responsible Ministers to the people in the North of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. LUKE (*Aubigny*): It gives me great pleasure to compliment the hon. member for Gympie and the hon. member for Bowen on the able manner in which they moved and seconded the Address in Reply. I think the new members on the other side have shown that there are many able speakers there; and I hope that when Bills are being discussed, the party feeling, which is very high over this industrial trouble, will be sunk, so that we may get on with the business of the country, and pass legislation that will be useful to the rising generation. With regard to the railway administration, I think the Government are doing their best towards developing this vast State; and I was surprised at the way in which members of the Opposition opposed the proposal to increase the rate of interest on loans to be raised, because we must have money to carry out railways that have been passed. And if loans are not raised, many of the wage-earners will not have the employment that can be given when loan money is available for public works. I have to compliment the Minister for Agriculture on the able way in which he administers his department. I think he has shown that he intends to run it on business lines. He has done away with the experimental farms which were not paying, and which have not attained the object for which they were established. I feel confident that the Minister's new idea of having lecturers is going to do a great deal more good than the experimental farms. I think the Gatton College is too elaborate, because the people there have the Treasury behind them, and very few farmers have the capital to invest in the latest improved implements. The Minister sees that; and his idea is to get a principal for the college who will conduct it on sound business lines. It is not a question of salary; but we should get the best possible man to run the college. Our education system stands quite as high as almost any education system in Australia, and is carried out in a very high-class manner. The hon. member for Eacham talked about teachers being brought out and put above the

heads of our own teachers. My idea is that in many States education has been neglected to a certain extent because it does not return a direct revenue; but we should not look at it in that light; we should consider that it is of the greatest value to our children. (Hear, hear!) I agree with the hon. member for Eacham that many of the teachers in outside districts do not get the salary we would like to pay them. In many cases the reason for the salary not being sufficient is the increased cost of living. The increased cost of production brought about by industrial legislation is the cause of many of those teachers not being able to live on the salaries which would keep them comfortable in the past. The Labour party have abandoned one plank; and it is one to which members on this side agree—namely, equal opportunities for all. Members opposite have told us repeatedly that they advocate preference to unionists; therefore they are prepared to legislate for only one class. I say that if there is to be any preference it should be preference to industry, and not to any particular class or union or body of men. I started as a wage-earner, and my sympathies are with the wage-earners; but I have always held the political views I hold now; and I will continue to hold those views. I have accumulated a certain amount by my own industry; and I do not see why I should be asked to divide it with the first loafer that comes along. I want it for myself and for my wife and children. As a local authority delegate, I wish to compliment the Home Secretary on the very nice way in which he entertained the delegates at St. Helena; but I cannot say, like the hon. member for Eacham, that I would like to go there again. I visited the place as a guest; but I have no wish, as he has, to go there again. I belong to the rural producers.

I am a farmer and dairyman— [10.30 p.m.] one of the class whom supporters of the Opposition call “teat-pullers”—(laughter)—and I am proud to belong to that class. They are honest and industrious men, and treat their children in a better way than the rural workers say they do. The rural workers tell us that we are not to employ our children until they are fifteen years of age. I would invite members of the Opposition to come with me next Wednesday to Crow’s Nest, and I will show them children who work in the dairy, and I do not think they will find a healthier, better lot of children anywhere in the State. The Minister for Agriculture can endorse what I say, because he knows the district well. I think Aubigny holds the record for children, or if not it is very close to it. There is one family of twenty-five, all of the same name, who are on the Aubigny roll.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do they vote Labour?

MR. LUKK: Yes; they all vote Labour. If hon. members opposite paid a visit to that district they would find ample proof that we dairymen do not sweat our children, and I would suggest to those hon. members that if they gave up pulling the legs of the workers of this State, and took to “teat pulling” it would be better for Queensland. (Laughter.)

MR. LAND (*Balonne*): I have carefully perused the Governor’s Speech, but I cannot say that I am disappointed with it, because I did not expect much. I do not intend to wade through the whole of the

Speech, but I should like to refer to one or two matters mentioned in it and to some of the Bills enumerated. In the first paragraph I find these words—

“In consequence of the recent beneficent rains it is highly probable that the State will be favoured with a continuance of the remarkable prosperity it has enjoyed for many successive years.”

I never remember, in the history of Queensland, rain coming at a more opportune time to avert a very great disaster. I have travelled a good deal in the country, and to give hon. members some idea of the state in which it was before the recent rains, I may mention that in my district there were only two drinking places for a distance of 113 miles along the main road, one at 10 miles and the other at 33 miles, and the remainder of the journey was without any water. The reason I refer particularly to this question is that I consider it is the duty of the Government to go in for a system of water conservation. Now is the time to initiate such a scheme, as we have had splendid rains, and I suppose every waterhole in Queensland is full to-day. I do not, at this juncture, advocate water conservation for irrigation purposes. I hold that in view of the large amount of money we are spending on the construction of railways to open up the country, it is absolutely necessary to provide roads to those railways, because if we do not provide roads and water for the public we cannot expect the lines to pay. I do not think there is any great chance of getting an improvement in our methods of water conservation in Queensland while our hide-bound hydraulic department exists as it is. We must first do something to alter the management of that department. The Government have plenty of opportunities to conserve water, because we have creeks and rivers, and any quantity of country in which artesian water is easily obtained; and it would be a great boon to the State if the Treasurer and Minister for Lands would take steps to institute immediately a system of water conservation for the benefit of Queensland. With regard to the Bills enumerated in the Governor’s Speech, I wish to say a word or two about the Industrial Peace Bill. I should have liked to have seen this measure framed somewhat on the lines which its title indicates, but I must say that now that I have seen the Bill I am disappointed with its provisions. I am certain from my own experience that the people of Queensland do not desire strikes. I dread strikes, and would do anything in my power to avoid a strike. I have never met a man or woman who wished to go on strike. Every one with whom I am acquainted who has engaged in a strike has done so because the strike was forced upon him. A good way to avoid strikes is to adopt compulsory conciliation and arbitration, and I had hoped that the Government would have taken action in that direction with a view of securing industrial peace. At any rate, I thought they would have introduced a better measure than that which has been placed before the House. Another measure I wish to refer to briefly is the Bill to amend the Elections Act. In travelling through the length and breadth of Queensland I find that many persons who are qualified for enrolment are not on the roll. It is very important that the Govern-

Mr. Land.]

ment should introduce legislation to provide that everyone who is qualified shall have his name on the electoral roll. I find, also, that many people who have been on the electoral roll and who have never become disqualified have had their names omitted from the roll. Matters of that kind should be looked into. I hope when the Elections Bill comes before the House that it will be a liberal and up-to-date measure. I would like to make reference to the Liquor Bill. Before the old Liquor Bill was introduced last year the Premier promised the Church, he promised the temperance people, he promised the licensed victuallers—in fact, he promised everyone in Queensland that he would introduce and pass an up-to-date Liquor Reform Bill. I never saw a greater failure of a Bill than that Bill which was introduced and passed through this House last year. I think that that Liquor Bill was a good deal the cause of the election being brought on when it was. I do not think the Premier had any right to get a dissolution when he did. It was not a fair thing, in the first place, to members of this House, and it was not a fair thing to the people of Queensland either. Within the last eight years we have had no less than five general elections. Some of those elections were brought about by treachery on the part of some of the leaders. It is a very wrong thing that the Premier should have brought about an election when he did. The Police Offences and Summary Jurisdiction Bill is an old friend of ours—we have seen it before. If it is the same Bill, I hope that we will get an opportunity of knocking it into shape. The Bill that was introduced last year was a disgrace to any country. I was anxious to see a Trade Disputes Bill placed on the programme for this session, as we want such a Bill passed to enable the unionists throughout this State to carry on their business without any friction. With regard to our immigration system, I do not agree with the method adopted by the Government for bringing people here. In the country districts you can find many men who are natives of this country—fairly aged men, as well as young men—knocking about looking for something to do and unable to get it. You will also find newchums taking their places at a lower rate of wages. It is a wrong thing to bring working men and women into this country at the taxpayers' expense—at the expense of the working men here—to compete against them in the manner in which they are doing. Not only that, but due consideration is not given in the selection of these men as to their character and health. We find after they land here that many of them are suffering from consumption and other diseases. We find men in our charitable institutions who have not been in the country twelve months. That is a mistake. With regard to our railway system, although there is a good deal of talk about our railways and the way they pay, and how they are managed, sufficient consideration is not given to the country districts. A lot of people who live in Brisbane have railways at their doors, and have the best cars and the very best conveniences, and they have a greater advantage than the people in the country have. The people who live long distances from the coast have to pay high rates for freights and fares and not sufficient consideration is given to them. I would like to say a word or two about

[*Mr. Land.*

the proposed railway to St. George. (Hear, hear!) This railway has been agitated for for a number of years, and it can now be connected with the Southern line with a railway 38 miles in length. There is good land there, and it is high and dry, and the people of St. George have been advocating for this railway for years. I have been endeavouring to get a start made, but the Minister for Railways will not promise to have a survey made. He says he is not able to get surveyors to do the work. That is a poor excuse to make in connection with a small branch railway. There is no doubt that it would be a good paying line. It is a disgrace to any man in the position of Minister for Railways to say that he cannot get a man to survey a line 38 miles in length. It would be much better if he said straight out that he would not build the line. I have also advocated the building of a line from Cunnamulla to Bourke. I noticed during the recent dry spell that there were stock in great numbers in that portion of the district. They were cut off from the Brisbane market, as the Brisbane market was flooded. There was no chance of getting rid of them, and it was too dry to travel overland to Bourke. Consequently many of them got poor and died owing to the scarcity of grass and water. If the Government connected Cunnamulla with Bourke it would be a good thing not only for that district, but for everyone in the Western part of Queensland.

Mr. FHELLY: Good for the Commonwealth.

Mr. LAND: It would be good for the Commonwealth, too. Although there has been a dry spell there has been a great demand for land out there in both the St. George and Cunnamulla land agents' districts. Notwithstanding the drought people have been unable to get land. I notice that when land is thrown open the lessee of the run is allowed to use the grass and water on the land. I do not see why the successful applicants for land should have to wait so long for their occupation license, and while they are waiting the old lessee is allowed to hold the grass in that country. I have not approached the Minister on the subject lately, but from correspondence I have had with the department it seems to me that the fault lies in giving an occupation license that extends beyond the time that the land is selected. When we went into recess at Christmas time we quite understood that we were coming back early in January, and on that occasion we were assured by the Premier that we would be called together as early as possible after 9th April to consider the Liquor Bill. We were assured there would be a session before the dissolution of Parliament. In place of that, we had to go to the country. I do not think that what happened with regard to the strike had anything to do with Parliament not meeting. The Premier should have kept the promise he made not only to this House but to the people of Queensland. Before I refer to the strike I would like to say a few words with reference to my friend and colleague the hon. member for Warrego. Some persons have maligned the hon. member in an untruthful and cowardly manner.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now, is it possible?

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, quite.

Mr. LAND: I have known the hon. member for over twenty years, and have always

known him to be a hard-working man and a man highly respected by all with whom he was associated.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why he said he has been on strike all his life.

Mr. LAND: The hon. member has always taken a very prominent part in union matters. Even before he was an honorary delegate he was organiser to the Australian Workers' Union, and I have been at sheds with him where there has been trouble, and I have always known him do his utmost to avoid strikes. In his endeavour to keep his family I have known him boycotted by Western pastoralists. He has been victimised and blacklisted. I speak as I do with reference to my colleague because I have heard so many things said against him that I know to be untrue. His acquaintances in the West are proud of him for the fearless manner in which he acted throughout the Brisbane strike. During my election campaign I had occasion to say, as I have always said, that I dread strikes, and that I have done all I could to prevent strikes, but I would never vote to deprive unionists of the right to strike. I believe it is our duty to get conciliation and arbitration, and to get an up-to-date Act by which unionists can get a square deal, but you cannot avoid strikes. A great number of the people of Queensland are very strong unionists. What has been said with reference to the Labour party in connection with strikes is only intended to throw dust in the eyes of the electors and to get support for the Government side. The Premier should never have advised the Government to apply for the military. If you can get a better behaved lot of people than the people of Brisbane I have never been able to see them. The Government have made a great fuss over the Commissioner of Police—a man who has been hoisted up by the ears. And what was it done for? Only for political purposes. There are people in Queensland who hold the opinion that the Commissioner should not hold the position he does, and my opinion is that he ought to be "doing time."

The TREASURER: You ought to take your hat off to him.

Mr. LAND: I ought to do nothing of the sort. I realise that, if there was a strike among the shearers, and the Commissioner of Police, backed up by the Government, took the action he took in Brisbane, you would not have been able to prevent bloodshed. The people's representatives make the laws, and the people should obey them, and I would assist the Government to maintain law and order; but I believe that in this instance the Government incited the people to do whatever little harm may have been done in Brisbane, and that they exceeded their duty altogether. In 1891, the permanent police throughout Queensland were considered to be quite competent to keep order during that strike, but owing to the misrepresentations of the Press and agitations which were got up, they brought out the military. That was not considered sufficient, and special constables were enrolled, without due consideration for their character or ability to fill the position. I consider the same thing happened the other day. There were special constables enrolled in the Commissioner's office without any consideration as to character. It was stated in the district I represent that some of the worst classes of men on the face of the earth were enrolled as special constables.

The HOME SECRETARY: You do not believe that.

Mr. LAND: I moved a resolution the other day that the names, addresses, and occupations of the special constables should be given to the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not likely we are going to give you that.

Mr. LAND: I do not believe you can get it.

The HOME SECRETARY: You would submit them to "moral suasion"—"peaceful picketing."

Mr. LAND: It may have been a very good thing that you enrolled some of them as special constables, as otherwise they might have been doing damage out in the streets, for which the unionists would have been blamed. I have a list of names here of men who I have been told were amongst the special constables enrolled in the Commissioner's office, of which the Home Secretary is the head. I was told there were convicts, wife beaters, wife deserters, seducers, pimps, and spies of all descriptions.

The HOME SECRETARY: I thought you claimed them all on your side. (Laughter.)

Mr. LAND: It is the duty of the Government to look after the lives and limbs and property of the people of this State, and it has been said that this class of people were being enrolled.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They behaved themselves, didn't they?

The HOME SECRETARY: Any murderers amongst them?

Mr. LAND: Would the hon. member, if he was leaving home, and wanted protection for his wife and family, would he pick this class of people? Would he not make sure of the characters of the people that he left in charge of his family? Is it not just as much the duty of the Home Secretary to look after the interests of the people of Queensland, and see that those who are placed in that position are people of good character?

The HOME SECRETARY: Does the hon. member bonâ fide allege that those were the characters of the special constables?

Mr. LAND: No, I am not going to answer that—I am going to leave you to answer that.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are not game to stigmatise them bonâ fide as being of that character, and you know it.

Mr. LAND: The Home Secretary asks me if I allege that this is the class of men that he enrolled. I told him that amongst them were that class of men. I know that the men enrolled were not all of the class stated here. I wanted to know the names, addresses, and occupations, not for myself, but for the people who asked me in the district that I represent. It is the duty of the Home Secretary to prove that this class of men were not enrolled.

The HOME SECRETARY: You prove that they were.

Mr. LAND: If you take up the position that you are prepared to enrol a class of men I have mentioned here as special constables, to look after the welfare of the people of Queensland, that is your responsibility, not mine; I would not do that.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say we did not.

Mr. LAND: I challenge the Home Secretary to prove that. He cannot prove that some of these names are not correct.

Mr. Land.]

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you allege that they deserted your party, and came over to us as spies?

Mr. LAND: It is all very well for the Home Secretary to try and evade the question. I have charged the hon. gentleman with being the head of a department which enrolled special constables amongst whom were included some in the list I have read out.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*): I have had a great deal of patience, but my turn has come at last. I am very pleased with the way in which the new members have acted this session. We have heard some remarkably good speeches, and I hope as time goes on they will continue in that strain. We have had a very fine programme of work put before us this session, and one similar to what we have had on previous occasions from this Government, and I have no hesitation in saying that in three years' time the people will appreciate our efforts in putting through this legislation in the same manner that they have done in the past, by returning us with a large majority. (Hear, hear!) I was very much interested in the speech of the hon. member for Eacham. After listening to him and hearing his criticism of the Treasury benches from one end to the other, you could only come to one conclusion—that Queensland was not altogether a fit place for a man to come to.

Mr. GILLIES: The place is all right; it's the men who are in it.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member must admit that the place is a good place to come to, when you take into consideration that he has only been here some twelve months, and is now a member of Parliament.

Mr. GILLIES: I never said a word against the State.

Mr. WALKER: He also spoke about the lack of administration in the various departments, and the want of railway facilities, more particularly in the Atherton Scrub, which he said was the best place in Queensland.

Mr. GILLIES: So it is.

Mr. WALKER: We have many places in Queensland just as good as the Atherton Scrub.

Mr. GILLIES: Where are they?

Mr. WALKER: The Blackall Range is equally good. Fortunately for Queensland, we have many good districts; and the trouble in regard to railway construction is where to put railways and how to find the money to build them. The hon. member also spoke of the large areas of land locked up and not settled; and a little while afterwards he said we should have 10-acre blocks for workmen. The hon. member put me in mind of a farmer who saw three strong men doing such excellent work on a road that he congratulated them and said, "May you work on the road all your lives." Evidently he wants men to work on the cane-field all their lives, and he would let them have these 10-acre blocks to work as well.

Mr. GILLIES: I did not say that.

Mr. WALKER: I rose principally to deal with two items, namely, the mining and dairying industries. I consider that in our programme of work we should have a Bill to control the dairying industry. A great deal has been said during the debate about the late strike; and it is regrettable that

[*Mr. Land.*

we shall have two more occasions on which to re-echo the strike trouble. Mining has gone down during the last few years. Last year's work gave an output of minerals to the value of £3,661,063, being a decrease of £49,000 as compared with the previous year. The value of the gold was £1,640,000 odd, or a decrease of £234,000—distinctly showing that we must pay more attention to the mining industry, more particularly to the gold-mining branch, which has been going down of late. The question is how it can be done for the benefit of the State. The hon. member for Gympie and myself went to an enormous amount of trouble to devise a scheme as far as Gympie is concerned, but in my opinion it is a failure. The idea was to get mine-owners together and formulate a scheme, advising the Minister where the money should be spent; but the trouble would be that so many people would want to put Government money into their own mines. I have a suggestion, however, which I think could be followed for a time to see if it would work. It is to have the warden, the inspector of mines, and some other responsible officer—three good men controlled by the Government solely—and for them to sit and take evidence not only of the mine-owners, but also of the miners.

Mr. FOLEY: Don't you think they would have a price, too?

Mr. WALKER: I do not think so. With regard to Gympie, it is a very easy field to work. In former days it was a very good poor miner's field, but now it wants more capital; and the question is whether to go down 2,000 or 3,000 feet so as to tap the bed of slate on the eastern side or whether it would pay better to work the big reefs of low-grade ores and go in for better machinery which would treat it at a cheaper rate. At present there are 164 batteries in Queensland, of which 7 are working full time, 64 part time, and 93 are idle. On Gympie we have seven batteries, only one of which is working full time. We have one of the finest batteries in the world at the Scottish Gympie, where they are working something like 2,000 feet from the surface, and last year they made a profit of £16,000 on stone that went 5 dwts. 5 grains to the ton. That shows the advantage of treating these big reefs, which, up to the present, have been considered not worth treating on account of the low-grade ore they contain. All the vexed problems in connection with these matters should be considered by three responsible officers in order to see where public money should be spent for the benefit of Queensland. We do not want an enormous amount placed on the Estimates for mining; what we want is what the industry deserves, and not a penny more, so that every penny can be well spent, and the amount expended may be returned to the Treasury with interest. The hon. member for Cairns spoke the other night in reference to mining; and the thing I took exception to was his statement that miners were well paid. In the old days that might be the case; but since the cost of living has gone up I often wonder how a man can keep a wife and family on £2 10s. a week. As some hon. members are aware, I have taken a great interest in dairying for the last eight years; and I have been chairman of a factory for the last five years.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Co-operative?

Mr. WALKER: Yes; co-operative. Having a certain amount of responsibility on account of being chairman, I have made a study of the business and tried to work out the best way of receiving cream and selling butter. What we want at the present time is a Bill to regulate the whole of the factories, whether they are proprietary or co-operative. The result of the existing condition of things is that cream passes several factories and goes to a place 100 miles away for some imaginary benefit offered by that factory. I do not say the whole of the factories are doing that, but one or two are doing it, and their action is causing great discontent among the farmers who supply the cream. While they may not be doing the farmers an injury, they are creating discontent, and causing them to send their cream long distances when there is no need to do so. It may be that an inducement is offered to them by lowering the test from, say, 40 to 38, and giving in return a higher price for butter, the result being a large "overrun" of butter. This factory really makes more butter than the farmers are paid for. I have taken a very active interest in this matter, and called a conference of factory representatives at Maryborough. We agreed to certain proposals, and they were broken. We also proposed the amalgamation of factories on the North Coast line, but a solicitor came along and said the assets of one company were not good enough, so the scheme fell through. What we want is a measure which shall provide that every manager of a factory shall be a certified tester, that he shall sign his name to his test report, and that if he gives a wrong report of his test he shall have his certificate cancelled. It might also be provided that if a manager is guilty of such conduct he should be liable to a fine, as well as having his certificate cancelled. I have taken a keen interest in comparing the balance-sheets of one factory in particular with others—I shall not mention any names—and I found that in one half-year it had an "overrun" of 10 tons of butter. The value of that butter was distributed in the form of higher prices for cream, and that created discontent among farmers and rival factories. I also know one firm who pay a higher price to farmers than the price of butter in the old country. I hope, therefore, that the Government will bring forward a measure for the protection of the dairying industry on the lines I have indicated. As hon. members are aware, the old country controls the price of butter in Queensland, and what we want is to have someone appointed in the old country to look after the butter industry of Queensland.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: More socialism.

Mr. WALKER: There are many matters which it is right the Government should take up, and this is one of them, but if the Government attempted to take over the manufacture of butter, it would be a terrible failure. The farmers cannot send a man home to look after their interests there, but they would willingly pay the salary of a man in the old country to protect their interests, provided he had the Government behind him. We do not want our butter dealt with in the same way as it is at the present time. The first thing that an agent who comes along says is that the butter is to be sold on consignment, and that it is not a speculative sale. It may be said that they are

taking the risk, but there is really no risk, as they are in the "know," and it is quite possible that our butter which was sent home a month or so previously has to compete with butter sent at a later date. There are several other Bills mentioned, one of which is a Bill to amend the Mines Regulation Act. I sincerely hope that that Act will be amended in such a way as will make it more workable than it is at the present time. I quite understand that the Act was put through the House very hurriedly.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: With the "gag."

Mr. WALKER: That was the fault of hon. members opposite, as they were offered a day for the consideration of the measure, and they refused to accept it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Why should we be tied down to a day?

Mr. WALKER: Members could have had a day, but they would not take it, and consequently the measure was hurried through. The Mining Commission made a very exhaustive inquiry into the subject of miner's phthisis, and the information contained in their report will, no doubt, be of great value to us later on, but I should like to see their recommendations on the subject embodied in the amending Bill. One recommendation they made was, if men are thrown out of employment on account of some unsoundness in the chest other work should be provided for them, and I trust that that recommendation will be acted upon, as it would be a deplorable thing to see men thrown out of employment for the benefit of those who are healthy, and not provided with a means of livelihood. The Inspector of Mines, Mr. Hunter, has issued a very good report, in which he makes many suggestions which I hope will receive the attention of the Government. There is another Bill to which I wish to make some reference, and that is the Bill on which the hon. member for Gympie spoke, dealing with miners' homesteads. I do not intend to repeat what he said, but I sincerely hope that the measure will provide that land within a radius of 1 mile from Gympie shall be handed over to the Lands Department, so that the commissioner shall have power to say whether an applicant can have 1 acre or 80 acres. I believe the Act is more at fault in this particular matter than the administration.

The HOME SECRETARY: All those matters are dealt with in the Bill.

Mr. WALKER: I would like to see the whole of the mineral areas placed under the control of the Lands Department, and they would be administered much [11.30 p.m.] better than they have been in the past. We have an Elections Act coming on, and it is one of great importance. I would like to see some alteration made with regard to the system of receiving forms for enrolment. People are struck off the roll and they do not know why they have been struck off. (Hear, hear!) We should have one man appointed to be responsible for the whole of the forms for one electorate, and not, as at present, two or three officers responsible for different divisions in the electorate. If one man was responsible, then when an elector was knocked off he would be

Mr. Walker.]

able to find out from him why it was done, whether it was because of "dead, left, or disqualified," or whatever reason it was. I have heard a lot of remarks made about the necessity of doing away with the absentee vote, and I quite agree with it. We have had the highest man in Australia abusing that privilege. It distinctly states that a man must not vote as an absentee unless he has been in the electorate for one month during the previous seven months, yet during the late elections Mr. Fisher recorded an absent vote at Warwick for the Gympie electorate, when he had not been one day in his electorate. We had the Prime Minister going through the electorate speaking at different places—and I was sorry to notice that he also addressed meetings on Sundays.

Mr. RYAN: Your candidates also addressed meetings on Sundays.

Mr. FIDELLY: It is a pity that the Prime Minister could not vote when he represents the electorate.

Mr. WALKER: The question is that he violated the oath that he took. If the Prime Minister does that, then you cannot say anything when ordinary people do the same thing.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Would you disfranchise him?

Mr. WALKER: We should treat him just the same as an ordinary individual. We have a right to prosecute him just the same as an ordinary man would be prosecuted. I noticed some complaints were made about the railways, especially with reference to little irregularities, and they came mostly from members on our own side. I know that it would be much better for members to make their complaints to the Railway Department, and they would get those matters attended to much better than by bringing them up in this House. If it is a matter of putting on an extra carriage or a special train or anything like that, it can be fixed up much better by the department than by speaking here, as the railway officers have not got time to read *Hansard*. One other matter I would like to draw attention to. Sometimes I have to travel in the cattle trains or luggage trains, and I was surprised to see drawings on the walls of the carriage which the person who made them should be ashamed of. The drawings are something deplorable and horrible, and could be seen by school children travelling in the train. I hope the Minister's attention will be called to it, so that the carriages can be painted a leaden colour, to cover up such drawings, so that they would not be seen.

Mr. HAMILTON: Is this the result of the Bible in State schools? (Laughter.)

Mr. WALKER: I did not wish to detain the House so long, but I emphasise the necessity of bringing in a Dairy Bill. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at twenty-four minutes to 12 o'clock.

[*Mr. Walker.*