

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1912

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER, 1912.

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

QUESTIONS.

LEASE OF COUNTESS STREET RAILWAY RESERVE.

Mr. FIELLY (*Paddington*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. What is the description of the railway reserve leased by the Tramways Company in Countess street?”

“2. What are the terms and conditions governing the lease?”

“3. Are there any other instances in Brisbane where city railway reserves have been similarly leased by the Commissioner to private individuals or corporations?”

“4. If so, what are the particulars of such lease or leases?”

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

“1. Part of railway reserve, with frontage to Countess street, proclaimed in *Government Gazette* 15th June, 1895, having an area of 1 acre 2 roods 5 perches (described in the lease by metes and bounds), also allotments 1 and 2 adjoining, area 27 perches; total, 1 acre 2 roods 32 perches.

“2. The lease of the larger area, executed on 26th April, 1896, is for a term of thirty years, and provides that the company shall pay an annual rental as follows, namely:—For the first ten years, £230 per annum; for the second ten years, £306 per annum; for the third ten years, £383 per annum, in addition to all rates, taxes, and assessments.

“The second lease was executed on 5th March, 1904, and is for a period of twenty-two years fifty days, at a rental of £40 per annum. The leases expire concurrently in April, 1926.

“3. Yes.

“4. *Roma street*.—Brown and Broad, Limited, timber-yard; Brydon, Jones, and Co., coal-shoot; W. R. Black, Limited, coal-shoot; Nobles, Limited, coal-shoot; W. R. Warmington, fuel depôt.

“*Normanby*.—J. Molloy, fuel depôt; Brisbane Tramways Company, Limited, coal storage.

“*Exhibition*.—Australian Estates and Mortgage Company, Limited, grain and wool store; New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Agency Company, Limited, grain and wool store; Fenwick and Co., store; National Association, part of grandstand, etc.

“*Central*.—Wilson and Co., store; Post and Telegraph Department, storage yard; City Council, public convenience.

“*Brunswick street*.—Virginia Brick Company, Limited, brick depôt; Mrs. Andrews, fuel depôt; City Council, public convenience.

“*South Brisbane*.—J. Briggs, business site; Baynes Bros., horse paddock; G. T. Smith, business site; Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board, storage pipes, etc.

"Woolloongabba.—Brandon and Co., fuel depôt; Barrett and Woodland, fuel depôt; C. Luxton, blacksmith's shop; Lahey's Limited, timber-yard.

"In addition to the above, Messrs G. Herbert and Co., Limited, have a lease of sixteen advertising hoarding sites at certain metropolitan stations. This lease expires at the end of the present month."

WATER CONSERVATION AND IRRIGATION.

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

"1. Is it not true that in all countries having an uncertain rainfall and enormous dry territories the questions of water conservation and irrigation are questions which engage the very serious attention of the Governments of these countries?"

"2. Is it not true that in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia the Governments are giving far more attention to those important subjects than is the Government of this State?"

"3. Will the Government, therefore, make an exhaustive inquiry as to the possibility of water conservation and irrigation on a large scale in Queensland?"

"4. Further, will the Government particularly inquire into the possibility of constructing dams in the valleys of the Fitzroy, Mackenzie, and Dawson Rivers, with the view of establishing State water trusts and irrigation settlements?"

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

"1. It is true of Egypt, India, and the United States of America.

"2. Everything considered, no.

"3. Investigations consequent on report of Hydraulic Engineer have been proceeding for past three years, for nature of which investigations see twenty-second annual report of Hydraulic Engineer.

"4. Special investigations in respect to the Dawson River have been made; but the conclusions are discouraging, and Dr. Elwood Mead, on page 7 of his report, states that water trusts and irrigation works in connection with rivers mentioned in question would be premature."

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR PORT ALMA

RAILWAY.

Mr. ADAMSON asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Referring to the report of the Commissioner for Railways, page 60, where is the land, comprising 3 roods 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ perches, situated, which was purchased in connection with the Bajool to Port Alma Railway?"

"2. Was the sum of £600 paid for this land, as stated in the Commissioner's report?"

"3. Who was the former owner from whom the Government purchased this land?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1. In the city of Rockhampton, corner of Derby and George streets. Allotment 1 and subdivisions A and B of allotment 2 of section 70.

"2. Yes.

"3. Holyoake Woodd and Alfred Bernard Catt, devisees in trust, with power of sale. The construction of the Port Alma Railway necessitated a separate shed in Rockhampton for shipment traffic, and the only site available entailed the removal of the traffic manager's residence, which was taken down and re-erected on the land purchased at the corner of Derby and George streets."

LIGHTING OF THE COAST.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. What arrangements, if any, have been entered into with the Commonwealth in reference to the taking over of lighthouses and the lighting of the coast?"

"2. What are the intentions *re* the erection of new lighthouses, and by whom will they be constructed?"

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

"1. None.

"2. So far no information has been supplied to the Treasury by the Commonwealth Government; but it is noticed that an amount appears on their Estimates for 'Lighthouses—Construction and Alterations—towards cost, £15,000.'"

RAILWAY CHECKERS AND SHUNTERS.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What is the number of checkers in the Railway Department—(a) First-class; (b) second-class; (c) third-class?"

"2. What is the length of service required before promotion—(a) From third-class to second-class; (b) from second-class to first-class?"

"3. What is the number of shunters in the service—(a) Foremen (or first-class); (b) second-class; (c) third-class?"

"4. What is the length of service required before promotion from—(a) Third-class to second-class; (b) from second-class to foreman (or first-class)?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1. (a) Six warehousemen (or foremen) and two first-class checkers; (b) twenty-six second-class checkers; (c) ninety third-class checkers.

"2. No fixed period for promotion. As vacancies occur in the higher classes, they are filled by the promotion of the senior competent men.

"3. (a) There are twenty-four foremen shunters; (b) there are 179 shunters; but they are not divided into classes; (c) maximum pay is granted after one year's service as shunter.

"4. No fixed period for promotion. As vacancies occur for foremen shunters they are filled by the promotion of the senior competent shunters."

MAP OF PRICKLY-PEAR INFESTED AREAS.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands, without notice—

"If the map showing the prickly-pear infested areas in the State is complete,

and, if complete, will the hon. gentleman cause a copy of the said map to be hung up in the Chamber?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. E. H. Macartney, *Toowong*) replied—

"A map showing the approximate areas of land affected by prickly pear has, I think, been completed, and can be hung up in some convenient place in the Chamber for the inspection of hon. members."

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF FOR 1912-13.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Governor, transmitting the Estimates of the probable Ways and Means and Expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1913.

The TREASURER: I beg to move that the Estimates be printed and referred to Committee of Supply.

Question put and passed.

TREASURER'S FINANCIAL TABLES.

The TREASURER presented the tables relating to his Financial Statement, and moved that they be printed.

Question put and passed.

PETITION.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) presented a petition signed by 6,000 members of industrial unions and electors of Queensland praying for the withdrawal of the Industrial Peace Bill.

Petition read and received.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*), who was received with cheers, said: Mr. Stodart,—I have much pleasure in being permitted to again submit the annual review of the financial position of this State, and to express the satisfaction which I feel at being able to inform the Committee that the favourable anticipations of last year were amply realised. Last year I was able to report that Queensland had made great progress. This year I am in a position to say that the rate of progress has not only been maintained, but that marked improvement on the previous year has taken place. The revenue from most sources has increased considerably, and a record for the State has been established. Expenditure also increased, but, notwithstanding that fact, the year closed with a credit balance. There is cause for congratulation, however, that whilst necessary demands have been met during the last eight years, surpluses have been recorded. With the increasing number of demands which are being made on account of schools, and many other necessary requirements, an increase of expenditure was

[*Hon. W. H. Barnes.*

inevitable. I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to the transactions for last year, and I am sure that they will be interesting as comparisons are made. Last year's estimates and results were as follows:—

	Esti- mated.	Actual.	
Revenue ...	£ 5,773,588	£ 5,939,347	Over the estimate, £215,759
Expenditure	5,768,633	5,965,692	Over the estimate, £197,059
Surplus ...	4,955	23,655	

Hon. members will notice that an under-estimate of the revenue was made by an amount of £215,759, and that the expenditure was also under-estimated by an amount of £197,059, and that the year closed with a surplus of £23,655. The amount on the expenditure side was increased by the transfer from loan account to revenue account of an amount of £44,606 for the erection of wooden school buildings. The surplus for the year has been handed to the trustees of the public debt reduction fund, who have followed the usual practice in the purchase of a debenture, the proceeds of which have been placed to the credit of the loan account, and consequently become available for public works. The revenue received during the year is shown in a table below, under the usual heads, and reveals the increase or decrease as compared with the estimate:—

Head of Revenue.	Esti- mated.	Actual.	Increase.	De- crease
	£	£	£	£
Commonwealth	754,888	757,087	2,199	...
Taxation ...	688,000	787,577	99,577	...
Land ...	814,000	843,402	29,402	...
Mining ...	35,500	31,819	...	3,681
Railways ...	3,048,000	3,032,929	...	15,071
Miscellaneous ...	433,200	536,533	103,333	...
Totals ...	5,773,588	5,969,347	234,511	752
Net excess		£215,759		£215,759

It will be noticed that in all the services, with the exception of Railways and Mines, receipts have exceeded the estimate. Railways receipts fell short of the estimate by the comparatively small amount of £15,071, and Mines by an amount of £3,681. No doubt had it not been for the partial dislocation of the railway service during the general strike the revenue would have exceeded the amount estimated. There is cause, however, for intense gratification that we should have received from our railways the handsome sum of £3,032,929, and the management are to be congratulated thereon, especially when it is borne in mind that the receipts from railways in 1906-7 were £1,821,946, whilst in 1911-12 they had increased over the period mentioned by £1,210,983.

Mining, as in the case of the previous year, discloses a further shrinkage, but I think hon. members will agree with me that there are indications of a revival in mining, and it is decidedly pleasing to note

the spirit of hopefulness which prevails in many mining centres among those who are engaged in the calling, and who thus should be the best able to forecast the future of this industry.

One of the most pleasing phases of the period under review is the satisfactory amount received from our Crown lands last year, showing an increase of £29,402 over the estimate. What will the amount be from this source when the present railway policy now in progress and outlined, covering as it does so much of the State, is completed, and when many of our rich lands, as a result of such a policy, are brought within fairly easy reach of the markets?

The receipts from taxation exceeded the estimate by £99,577, and the miscellaneous services by £103,333. The estimated receipts from the Commonwealth were exceeded by £2,199. Hon. members will remember that last year their attention was drawn to the fact that interest payments from the Commonwealth Government of Australia on transferred properties had only been proposed at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum on the amount owing, and it was pointed out to them that I considered that even a payment at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum would not cover the interest cost of the money, and that the demand for payment at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum was fair and equitable. The Premier's Con-

ference, which was subsequently held in Melbourne, took the same view, and carried a resolution that payments at a less rate of interest from the Commonwealth Government could not be entertained. I am pleased to report that the Commonwealth Government, subsequent to the request of the Premiers' Conference, has seen the justice of our claims, and has made provision on their Estimates for a payment of interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. for the current year, and for arrears of interest of ½ per cent. from 1st July, 1910, to 30th June, 1912. An amount of £90,781 was received by the Treasury during the year, being interest at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum from 1st July, 1910, to 30th June, 1912, on the capital value of the transferred properties. The payment of this amount is mainly responsible for the large increase in receipts under the heading of "Miscellaneous."

It is interesting to note that our estimated population at 31st December last was 622,129 persons, being an increase of 22,998 during the year. It is gratifying to know that so many desirable persons have been added to the population. As previously stated, the revenue for the year amounted to £5,989,347, or equal to £9 12s. 6d. per head of our population.

The details of the expenditure, compared with the appropriations, are as follow:—

	Appropriation for 1911-12.	Expended, 1911-12.	Saving.	Excess.
	£	£	£	£
Schedules	129,985	125,727	4,258	...
Interest on public debt	1,751,588	1,724,304	27,284	...
Executive and Legislative Chief Secretary	17,603	20,420	...	2,817
Home Secretary	133,496	195,590	...	62,094
Public Works	669,132	680,133	...	11,001
Justice	177,291	191,170	...	13,879
Treasurer	80,675	87,170	...	6,495
Public Lands	217,756	249,264	...	31,478
Agriculture and Stock Public Instruction	231,718	214,787	16,931	...
Mines	70,250	71,394	...	1,144
Railways	442,555	436,672	5,683	...
	55,036	54,815	1,221	...
	1,791,718	1,915,243	...	123,528
Total	5,768,633	5,965,692	55,377	252,436
Net excess		£197,059	£197,059	

Last year, when reviewing the expenditure for the previous year, I pointed out that the estimate for that year had been exceeded by £276,214. It will be seen that for the year now under review the expenditure exceeded the estimate by £197,059. Hon. members will notice that several departments—namely, Lands, Instruction, and Mines—were under the estimate, whilst other departments, such as the Chief Secretary's, Home Secretary's, Works, Treasury, and Railways, exceeded the estimate. In view, however, of the development which took place in different parts of the State, it will be admitted, I think, that a firm hand was kept upon expenditure, and when the appropriation was exceeded the money was well spent. Last year opportunity was taken, when delivering my Statement, to compare the year 1902-3

with 1910-11, and it was shown in doing so that the increase of revenue for the period named was 50 per cent., and the increase of expenditure for the periods named 42 per cent., the revenue in 1902-3 being £3,526,465 and the expenditure £3,717,806. Comparing that period with the year 1911-12, it will be found that for the latter the revenue was £5,989,347, and the expenditure £5,965,692, showing an increase of revenue between the periods compared of almost 70 per cent., and an increase of expenditure of 60 per cent. In showing a surplus for the eighth year in succession, it is gratifying to note that a record for Queensland in this respect has been established, and I sincerely trust that each succeeding year a similar result may follow the year's operations.

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

LOAN FUND.

The loan transactions during the year were as follow:—

	Cash at Call or Short Notice.	Extended Deposits.	Total Credit.
	£	£	£
Cash balance at credit, 1st July, 1911	Dr. 115,387	Cr. £504,118	388,731
Repayments by local authorities, sugar-mills, railways, etc., etc.	326,885		
Receipts under the Land Sales Proceeds Act of 1906	31,354		
Balance proceeds of £2,000,000 loan issued 1911	1,809,755		
Proceeds of sale of debentures under 1902 loan	134,370		
Proceeds of sale of debentures under 1908 loan	295,680		
Repayments of extended deposits by banks	90,432	90,432	
Loan from Commonwealth of Australia	1,000,000		
	Cr. 3,573,040	413,686	
EXPENDITURE—	£		
Buildings	40,591		
Water supply	2,465		
Loans to local bodies	396,184		
Loans in aid of co-operative agricultural pro- duction	706		
Loans under Mining Machinery Advances Act	70		
Advances to sugar-mills	5,837		
Wire netting, Rabbit Boards Act	23,835		
Railways	2,854,560		
	£3,324,248		
Unclaimed matured debentures, transferred to loan account in 1909, presented and paid 1911	500	3,324,748	
Cash balance at credit, 30th June, 1912	248,292	413,686	661,978

The credit balance of the loan fund on 1st July, 1911, was £388,731. To this was added amounts received during the year from various sources as shown in above table, making in all £3,986,726. The principal items of expenditure during the year were—On account of buildings, £40,591; loans to local bodies, £396,184; wire netting, Rabbit Boards Act, £23,835; railways, £2,854,560, leaving a balance at the end of June of £661,978. During the year additional loan money was obtained, the Commonwealth Government offering £1,000,000 at $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and the acceptance of the offer made it unnecessary to go on the London market during the period under review, although opportunity was taken to do so early in the present financial year. The vigorous railway policy now being carried out will make it necessary to replenish loan funds from time to time. It is well known to all who have followed the conditions of the money market, the world over, that there has been a big demand for money, and a general hardening of the market. It is probable, therefore, that we shall, in order to carry on the policy of development, have to pay more for the money necessary to complete the railway policy embarked upon, and which has proved so successful, not only in opening up the lands of the country, but in giving such an excellent return for the money spent. It will be admitted that it is clearly our duty to develop Queensland, and to do so by opening up the country by means of railways.

In connection with the public debt of Queensland, I pointed out last year that the percentage charge to the revenue fund for interest was smaller than for any previous period, being 6.16 per cent. It is pleasing to report that this record was again lowered during the year just ended, the charge to revenue being only 5.85 per cent. This is truly a most noteworthy achievement when it is remembered that in the year 1902-3 the

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

interest charge was a burden upon the revenue to the extent of 27.24 per cent. (See Budget Table K.)

Last year Sir Thomas Robinson visited Queensland, and opportunity was taken of his presence to discuss financial matters with him. While here he had the advantage of traversing a large portion of our extensive territory, and acquired such an up-to-date knowledge of our conditions and requirements that I am sure his visit will prove of immense service to this State. I repeat what was said last year, that Queensland is fortunate in having as its representative in London one so competent to undertake the duties of Agent-General, and to assist us in our financial problems.

Treasury bills amounting to £530,000, issued under the Treasury Bills Act of 1901, to provide for revenue deficits, matured on 1st January, 1912, and in many cases the holders of these invested in fresh securities issued under the Treasury Bills Act passed last session. Further Treasury bills under the Act of 1902, amounting to £600,000, will mature on 1st January next. We have already authority for a new issue of this amount with interest at £3 15s. per cent., but, as money has since increased in price, action will shortly be taken to obtain parliamentary sanction to increase the rate of interest to £4 per cent., whereby it is hoped that many present holders will renew their investments. All holders who desire redemption will, on presentation of their securities, of course be paid in cash to the full amount of their holdings. Applications from some present holders for a renewal of their investment have already been received.

TRUST FUNDS.

Hon. members will notice that the expenditures from trust funds continue to increase, two of our Acts being largely re-

sponsible for the increase—namely, the Workers' Dwellings Act and the Agricultural Bank Act. Applications for loans under the Workers' Dwellings Act have been very numerous. The popularity of this Act increases, and it has proved a boon to the man of small means, who has been able through its liberal provisions to obtain a home for himself and family under conditions most favourable when this Act was first passed, and made more so by the amendment of last year. Provision was also made last year for enlarging the scope of the Agricultural Bank Act, and the large increase, both in the number of applicants and the amounts loaned, shows how much it is appreciated by those entitled to obtain assistance under it. The principal items of expenditure are as follow:—Agricultural Bank advances and expenses, £134,798; for the working expenses of the Government central sugar-mills, £152,120; Workers' Dwellings Act advances, £141,722; payments and other charges under the Closer Settlement Act, £140,157; on harbour improvements, £156,088; immigration passage money, £70,000; and from the public estate improvement fund, £30,598. The receipts under the trust funds during the year totalled £622,600, the principal items being proceeds of sale of sugar manufactured at the Government central sugar-mills, £134,420; payments for land under the Closer Settlement Act, £116,811; harbour funds receipts, £94,300; interest, fees, etc., on, and repayments of, loans under the Agricultural Bank Acts, £39,154; and interest, fees, etc., on, and repayments of, loans under the Workers' Dwellings Act, £16,089. Full details are furnished in Budget Tables D to D8.

It is with much pleasure that I report that the amounts on deposit in the Government Savings Bank totalled £7,342,811 at the close of the financial year, being marked evidence of the progress of the State and the confidence of the people in their own institution. The following return reveals its progress since 1902-3:—

Year.	Excess of Withdrawals over Deposits.	Excess of Deposits over Withdrawals.	Number of Depositors.	Total Amount to Credit.
	£	£		£
1902-3	452,250	...	80,043	3,772,686
1903-4	131,005	...	80,959	3,741,967
1904-5	...	30,140	84,165	3,875,197
1905-6	...	1,209,999	83,023	4,112,791
1906-7	...	286,329	92,912	4,541,104
1907-8	...	252,501	100,321	4,921,581
1908-9	...	163,693	106,327	5,158,219
1909-10	...	323,603	114,720	5,622,986
1910-11	...	597,153	127,219	6,376,969
1911-12	...	782,758	139,091	7,342,811

Hon. gentlemen and the public generally will be delighted to see the advance which the bank has made, and it affords me intense pleasure to compare the period 1902-3 with 1911-12. In 1902-3 the depositors numbered 80,043 persons, the amounts to their credit being £3,772,686, an average amount to credit of each depositor of £47 2s. 8d. In 1911-12 the number of depositors had increased to 139,091 persons, the amounts to their credit being £7,342,811, an average of £52 15s. 9d. for each depositor, the year

1911-12 showing an increase of 74 per cent. in depositors and 95 per cent. in amount of deposits over the year 1902-3. Truly this comparison discloses the highly satisfactory financial position of a large number of our people. The establishment by the Commonwealth Government of a rival Savings Bank in our midst necessitated our leaving the post offices of the State, in which, for many years, much of our Savings Bank business had been conducted. Active steps have been taken, during the last few months, to provide suitable business premises in the various cities and towns of the State, and I have pleasure in informing hon. members that 444 offices, branch offices, and agencies have been successfully established, thus placing within easy reach of our own people additional facilities for depositing their savings in the State Bank. Deposits can be made in amounts as small as 1s. and up to £500, without charge for the keeping of accounts, the whole of the deposits being secured upon the consolidated revenue of Queensland. When it is remembered that Savings Bank funds made available by the purchase of Government securities are wholly expended in and for the benefit of the State, and are used for railway construction, for the purchase of estates for closer settlement, for loans to settlers by the Agricultural Bank, and to aid in the erection of homes under the Workers' Dwellings Acts, the people of Queensland should co-operate with the Government and assist them to retain this business, and to resist the encroachment of the Commonwealth Government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMONWEALTH AND STATE.

The TREASURER: I have already referred to the fact that the question of interest on transferred properties has been dealt with by the Commonwealth Government, and that payments of interest at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum since 1910 are to be made, leaving still open the question of amounts which I claim are due to Queensland for interest prior to 1st July, 1910. It is true that the Commonwealth Government paid a sum of £6,059,000 in excess of the three-fourths of the Customs and Excise revenue due to the States under the Bradon clause, which was, no doubt, a gain to the States participating therein, but, unfortunately, Queensland was not a sharer in such distribution, as the bookkeeping clauses of the Constitution prevented its distribution on a per capita basis. Thus we occupy the invidious position of being the only State in the Commonwealth that received less than three-fourths of its net Customs and Excise revenue, the shortage during the bookkeeping period being no less a sum than £94,725, while the other States received large amounts in excess of the three-fourths of the net Customs and Excise revenue. Since accepting from the Commonwealth Government the £1,000,000 already referred to, another offer of money has been made by them to us; but, as other arrangements had been previously entered into, we were unable to avail ourselves of it, although appreciating the offer.

IMMIGRATION.

The past year has been an exceedingly active one, and a large number of people

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

availed themselves of the opportunities offered of coming to Queensland, the number from oversea being 13,699.

In addition, Queensland continues to draw settlers from the Southern States and New Zealand, who have decided to settle with us after satisfying themselves of the quality of our lands and the conditions generally prevailing here. All such have had a hearty welcome, and to other settlers who desire to come a similar welcome will be extended, believing as I do that those coming will assist us who are here in our development and progress. Queensland cannot fill its rightful place as one of the greatest countries in the world unless its population is added to. The total expenditure on immigration for the year 1911-12 was £162,055. The contributions by immigrants and from their relatives and friends on account of passage money and nomination fees during this period amounted to £18,452.

RAILWAYS.

The revenue for the past year showed an increase over that of the former year of £326,041; and it may be reasonably expected that, with the continuation of good seasons and the general development which has taken place as a result of Government and private enterprise, the railway returns will continue to increase. It will be noted with pleasure that, although there was practically no wheat crop last season, and, owing to the dry weather conditions which prevailed over a considerable portion of the State until late in the winter, the traffic in wool and live stock was adversely affected, the returns from the railways showed such a satisfactory increase. It should be a source of gratification to every citizen, and to all who are interested in Queensland, that the actual receipts from railways for the year ended 1911-12 were no less a sum than £3,032,929. The net return on the capital invested was not so good as the previous year, being £3 9s. 11d. per cent. as against £3 18s. 10d. per cent., and imposed a charge upon the consolidated revenue of £56,206. (See Budget Table N.) A vigorous policy of construction work has been carried on, and I hope that the hardening of the money market may not make it necessary to curtail it. In view of the great possibilities of the State, and notwithstanding the large number of lines completed, in course of completion, or for which parliamentary authority has already been obtained, it yet may be said, when we consider the extent of our State, "So little done, so much to do." During the year 218 miles of new railways were opened for traffic, making the total length of our lines open for traffic at the end of the financial year 4,266 miles. The new lines opened last year were as under—

	Miles.
Herberton to Tumoulin	17
Finch Hatton to Eungella Range	7
Dalby to Kumbarilla	26
Warwick to Mary Vale	19
Tallwood to Thallon	38
Kumbarilla to Tara	26
Pittsworth to Milmerran	27
Kingaroy to Nanango	15
Kirkup to Kungurri	1
Roswood to Marburg	9
Oakey to 17 miles 38 chains	17
Bajool to Port Alma	16
Total	218

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

Other lines under construction are—

	Miles.
Woodford to Kilcoy	17
Mount Morgan to Dawson River	69
17 miles 38 chains to Cooyar	21
Cordalba to Dallarnil	31
Gayndah to Mundubbera	23
Keefton to Imbil	24
Benarkin to Yarraman	15
Miles to Taroom (1st Section)	44
Thallon to Dirranbandi	40

Great Western Railway—

Section A—From Westgate, westward	245
Section B—From Blackall, south-west	348
Section D—From Malbon, south-west	328
Cloncurry to Mount Cuthbert (1st Section)	42

North Coast Railway—

Section A, from Rockhampton northwards to near St. Lawrence	123
Section B, portion from Mackay southwards to near St. Lawrence	72
Section C, from Bobawaba northwards to Burdekin	17
Section D, from Ayr southwards to Burdekin River	5
Section D, from Townsville northwards to near Cardwell	86
Section E, from Babinda southwards to near Cardwell	88
Total	1,638

It is anticipated that during the present year the following lines, which are at present under construction, will be opened, namely—

	Miles.
Mount Morgan to Dundee	29
17 miles 38 chains to Cooyar	21
Cordalba to Dallarnil	31
Benarkin to Yarraman Creek	15
Thallon to Dirranbandi	40
Cloncurry to Mount Cuthbert (1st Section)	20
North Coast line—	
Rockhampton to Yaamba	22
Mackay to Sarina	21
Bobawaba to Burdekin	17
Burdekin to Ayr	5
Babinda to Cardwell (Russell River)	5

Great Western Railway—

Section A, Westgate to Tobermory	40
Section B, Blackall to Windorah	39½
Section D, Malbon to Duchess	36
Total	341½

From Malbon to Duchess (36 miles) traffic is being carried by ballast train, but the line is not finished.

The following lines have been passed by Parliament, but will not be commenced until

some of the lines at present under construction are completed, namely:—

	Miles.
Great Western Railway—	
Section C, from Winton south-west	361
North Coast Railway—	
Section B, from Mackay Railway northwards to near Midge Point	50
Section C, from near Midge Point northwards to Proserpine	13
Kingaroy to Tarong	19
Pialba to Urangan	5
Logan Village to Canungra	21
Munbilla to Mount Edwards	16
Oakey to Mount Russell	19
Dalby to Jandowae	28
Roma to Orallo	29
Malanda towards Millaa Millaa	9
Tumoulin to Cedar Creek	5
Total	575

LAND SETTLEMENT.

It is pleasing to be able to report that land settlement continues to make satisfactory progress, and this may be taken as, perhaps, the surest indication of the prosperity of the State. Revenue derived directly from Crown lands is expanding, and at a gratifying rate. The total area selected during the year was 6,730,464 acres, and the gross revenue from Crown lands £843,402, constituting a record in each respect. It is worthy of note that last year was the sixth in succession in which the revenue from pastoral occupation showed an advance, and this notwithstanding that an active policy of resumption is being pursued to meet the strong demand for grazing selections and for land on closer settlement tenures. This is in marked and pleasing contrast to the experience of the previous decade, during which the revenue under this particular head showed an almost uninterruptedly downward tendency, and I think, if I may be allowed to digress for a moment, that this is a most happy state of affairs, and one that points to the true position of Queensland. The pastoral rents due on 30th September last amounted to £316,772, and of this amount £310,597, or over 98 per cent., has been paid. The rents due on all selections on 31st March last amounted to £372,039, and 95½ per cent. of this amount has been paid. Another feature in the operations of the Lands Department which indicates the present general prosperity, and particularly the activity in the building trade, is the greatly increased demand for Crown timbers. The revenue from this source has increased sixfold in a period of seven years, and for the past year reached the unprecedented total of £62,239. The second section of the Widgee Estate, acquired under the Closer Settlement Act of 1906, came into the hands of the Government on 1st May, 1912, the area being 19,977 acres, and the purchase money £38,836. The total area of this estate taken over by the Government is 46,826 acres, and the area selected is 24,104 acres. The total area repurchased under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Acts and the Closer Settlement Act to the end of the past financial year is 664,363 acres, for which a total price of £1,713,165 has been

paid. The area disposed of by the Government amounts to 585,045 acres at prices aggregating £1,680,394. The instalments of purchase money have been well paid up. The arrears amount to £18,038, of which £13,565 is owing by settlers on the Gowrie Estate. Unfortunately, weather conditions have again militated against the payment of these arrears, but the present bright outlook gives ground for the hope which the settlers entertain of being able to meet their engagements this season.

MINING INDUSTRY.

The features that latterly have characterised the mining industry remain unaltered, and the total value of last year's mineral output—£3,661,063—varies little from that of its immediate predecessor. The decline in the gold yield continues, but it may be doubted whether the extent to which the deficiency is made good by the growing production of the industrial metals is sufficiently recognised. The gradual extension of railway communication in the wide and practically undeveloped Cloncurry district is opening what promises to be the largest and richest copper-field in Australia. Late returns from Mount Morgan show that the obstacles which, for some time, have restricted the output of that mine are being overcome; the erection of furnaces by the Mammoth Copper Company at Cardrose, in the Chillagoe district, has created a new centre of industry; and the resumption of smelting at the Great Fitzroy and the Mount Perry works has relieved any immediate fear of the dispersion of communities dependent upon the continuance of operations at these places. The high price of tin has led to many fresh and valuable discoveries even in our old-established tinfields; and the bountiful rains that have recently fallen in all parts of the State have replenished the dams and watercourses in the alluvial centres, where water is the chief agency in the recovery of the mineral. The production of coal, temporarily checked by the industrial upheaval which during the earlier months of the year disturbed and dislocated trade, has resumed its normal dimensions; and with good seasons and industrial rest the demand for coal must grow with the extension of our railways and the increase in manufactures and shipping. Notwithstanding depression on individual fields, the general outlook for mining is far from discouraging, and I think that I may safely say that the value of the mineral output for 1912 will exceed that for the year that has closed.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY.

The wool outlook for the ensuing twelve months would seem to indicate that the quantity will be somewhat diminished consequent on the short but severe drought through which most of the State passed. Some authorities seem to indicate that the deficiency on the whole of the Australasian clip for the season 1912-13 will be about 250,000 bales. It may, however, be confidently expected that, with the increased demands by so many countries for wool, prices will be well maintained, if not above those obtained during the 1911-12 season. Cattle, owing to the dry conditions of the year, suffered somewhat, and, for the first time since 1902, the number in the State declined. There was certainly more activity among

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

the meatworks, and additional works commenced operations, but, after allowing for this, it is to be regretted that the normal increase was not reached; and, although the number of horses and sheep increased, yet it was not equal to the annual average of the preceding years. On 1st January last the State held 618,954 horses, an increase of 4.23 per cent. over the year before; of sheep, 20,740,981, the addition equalling 2.01 per cent. only; while our cattle diminished to 5,073,201, a proportionate reduction of 1.14 per cent. Pigs, on the other hand, were added to by 14.25 per cent., the number being 173,902; and it would seem that this profitable stock is now receiving more attention than formerly. With these figures and the opinion expressed by some that the meatworks are not able to handle the available output, the operations in that respect will be interesting. In 1910 there were thirteen establishments, employing 1,923 persons, engaged in the slaughter of stock for preservation as food, and there were so treated 167,064 cattle of all ages and 1,119,660 sheep; but, though the cattle slaughtered last year numbered 200,256—an increase of 33,192—there was a drop in the sheep treated to 303,932, a reduction of 815,728. Whatever may be the reason for this fall, it cannot be said that the dry season will account for the whole of it. The total value of meat of all kinds produced during the year was £1,575,463 as against £2,141,156 in 1910, while the value of the by-products—such as hides, skins, bones, oils, etc.—totalled £392,851 in 1911, and £518,705 in 1910. The sheep shorn during the year numbered 20,037,491, and the total wool obtained from them, reckoned as in the grease, and including the quantity fellmongered and exported on skins, was 142,382,269 lb. The estimated value of the clip (based on oversea values, which as practically all our wool is exported is the correct value to take) was £5,580,000, as against £5,908,000 in 1910. The decrease is accounted for by the drop in average prices of about 1½d. per lb. for greasy, and a little over 2d. per lb. for scoured wool. Queensland held 618,954 horses last year, being an increase of 25,141 head over the previous year. The export of horses numbered 16,543, of the value of £210,515; of these 4,209 head, of the value of £55,962, were exported oversea, and of the remainder the greater proportion, although destined for a similar purpose, would, in accordance with the Commonwealth system of compilation of statistics, figure in the records as the products of another State. The pastoral industry maintains its leading position among the oversea exports of the State, the proportion for last year being 80.72 per cent. of the whole. From a State point of view, the Commonwealth statistics of production, consumption, export, etc., are highly unsatisfactory, as they convey a very misleading idea of quantity or value of an individual State's products, etc. It is hoped that when the Trade and Commerce Statistics Bill, which will be introduced this session, becomes law, full and complete statistics of this State's activities will be made available. (Hear, hear!)

AGRICULTURE.

Generally speaking, the past year was a satisfactory one as far as prices for products were concerned, the demand being good, and the net results for the labour put into the various branches of the industry

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

encouraging. This year a very large area of land is under wheat and barley, and it is confidently expected that abundant crops will be harvested, and it is believed that those engaged in the wheat industry will reap a considerable reward for their labour. From a cultivation point of view the coming season promises all that can be desired, and in all branches of rural pursuits, excepting the sugar industry, there is enthusiastic activity. The total area under cultivation in 1911 was 779,800 acres, a reduction of 15,026 acres as compared with the previous year.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Still getting less.

The TREASURER: There were 57,969 persons engaged in farming and dairying, who required for their purposes machinery and implements to the value of £1,332,611 and irrigation works worth £38,093. The number of people engaged in the agricultural industry shows no advance. The demand for skilled and unskilled labour of a reliable nature is still good, and all immigrants who understand agricultural work are readily engaged. The position in the area devoted to sugar-cane is one of great uncertainty, and there are signs that, unless there is early alleviation, the conditions imposed upon the industry, if no satisfactory set-off is given, will so far affect the campaign of 1913 that the production of sugar in this State will be far below the requirements of Australia, and that many areas now under cane will be devoted to other products. It is to be hoped, however, that the efforts now being made for a satisfactory adjustment of the difficulty will be entirely successful, and that this important industry, so necessary for the Commonwealth and for the State of Queensland, may continue to prosper. Of the principal crops of which statistics are taken, those that show an increase in area are pumpkins and melons, cotton, lucerne, and green forage, bananas, pineapples, oranges, mangoes, and apples. Thus it will be seen that the tendency of development during the year was in the direction of fruit-producing. The value of crops taken off during the year totalled £3,185,792, of which sugar-cane represented £1,107,451. No other crop reached in value half a million sterling, but lucerne was worth £465,245, and hay of all kinds £365,777. Potatoes, owing to the prevalence of the Irish blight in the other States, continued to bring high prices, and there is but little prospect of the values ruling being reduced for some time to come.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

What has been said concerning the pastoral and agricultural industry applies also to this industry, our upward progress being checked by adverse natural conditions. The production of butter from factories and farms was 27,858,535 lb. as against 31,258,333 lb. in 1910, a decrease in round numbers of 3,400,000 lb., which at, say, 10½d. per lb., means a loss to the State of £145,000. In a like manner the cheese production was affected, the output for 1911 being 3,718,257 lb., or less than in 1910 by 428,404 lb. Notwithstanding this setback owing to the season, the contrast between 1890, when we produced but 2,000,000 lb. of butter and 170,240 lb. of cheese, and the present is so great that it may safely be predicted that with the return of good seasons, which we now enjoy, the

loss of last year will be made up, and there will be a return to the normal average increase. As the production decreased, so, automatically, did our oversea trade, the value of our exports amounting to £643,023 as against £751,590 in 1910, and this on a fallen average value of 3d. per lb. It must be remembered, however, that the oversea trade is not a true index of our export trade, because large quantities of our produce go South at times when, owing to climatic conditions, the Southern States are short in their supplies. Probably our interstate trade is equal in value to the oversea, but in the absence of statistics, figures cannot be ventured upon. The position of the industry last year will be made plainer from the knowledge that the return of dairy cows, dry and in milk, was less by 8,349 than the number for 1910, the figures respectively being 357,095 and 365,444, and this is to be accounted for by the number of dairymen who had to cease operations owing to the want of feed. The keeping of pigs being now considered a branch of dairying, it is pleasing to record that the upward tendency since 1903 has been maintained, and that there are now 173,902 pigs in the State, a number that, considering the profit that is awaiting a farmer in this industry, might vastly be increased. The output of 11,667,654 lb. of bacon and hams and 789,837 lb. of salt and fresh pork was produced from the 150,669 pigs that were slaughtered by the factories and by farmers.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

The year on the whole has been a satisfactory one, and the statement made last year can be repeated this year—namely, that our primary industries are upon a sound foot-

ing. For our principal products—such as wool, cattle, sheep, butter, timber, coal, fruit, etc.—there is an excellent market; and, generally, ruling prices are satisfactory. The building trade continues very brisk, and reports from all important centres of the State show remarkable activity. The following table, showing the number of houses erected or that are in course of erection under the Workers' Dwellings Act, from 1st July, 1911, to 30th June, 1912, will be interesting reading:—

	Number.	Amount.
Applications—		£
Received	828	221,451
Approved	751	189,472
Refused	6	1,180
Withdrawn before consideration	17	3,545
Awaiting consideration	54	15,117
Withdrawn after approval	22	4,870
Completed houses—		
Number		544
Amount advanced		£133,120
Amount owing		£125,706
Value of security		£207,204
Incompleted houses—		
Number		91
Amount advanced		£10,361

The activity in this department, as shown by the above figures, is typical of the building trade generally, and, I think, also fairly represents the condition of trade in other callings.

The subjoined table of statistics, relating chiefly to our productive powers, shows that in many of the items there have been gratifying increases over the previous year:—

	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.
Railway earnings	£ 1,949,240	1,985,048	2,218,194	2,562,643	2,535,609
Tonnage of shipping inwards	tons 1,446,635	1,601,107	1,640,344	1,842,497	2,010,781
Tonnage of shipping outwards	tons 1,402,331	1,663,911	1,628,413	1,831,720	2,004,444
Quantity of sugar produced*	tons 188,307	151,098	134,584	210,776	173,296
Value of raw sugar produced	£ 2,075,539	1,510,472	1,461,033	2,218,419	1,940,765
Quantity of butter produced	lb. 22,789,158	23,838,357	24,592,711	31,258,333	27,858,635
Value of butter produced ...	£ 949,548	1,067,760	1,092,004	1,364,853	1,180,783
Quantity of wool produced	lb. 99,461,711	110,545,577	129,668,298	139,250,592	142,382,269
Value of wool produced ...	£ 4,153,000	4,193,000	5,453,000	5,908,000	5,580,000
Value of minerals	£ 4,132,163	3,844,457	3,656,564	3,710,222	3,661,063
Number of cattle	3,892,232	4,321,600	4,711,782	5,131,699	5,073,201
Number of sheep	15,748,047	18,343,851	19,593,791	20,331,838	20,740,981
Savings Bank deposits ...	£ 2,379,091	2,489,839	2,776,677	3,317,061	3,961,711
Savings Bank withdrawals	£ 1,987,968	2,394,353	2,580,653	2,818,833	3,434,832
Area of land selected under the Land Act, 1897 ...	acres 4,711,812	4,902,314	5,910,728	5,859,633	6,261,719
Excess of arrivals over departures (recorded)	white 7,659	13,276	10,099	10,206	12,160

* £94 per cent. net titre.

‡ Total excess of arrivals. Figures relating to arrivals and departures of coloured aliens not now supplied by Commonwealth authorities.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Last year I drew attention to the improvements then being undertaken in the

1912—4 c

navigable channels of the Brisbane River, and I have pleasure in again reporting that these are still going on, and that the work of harbour improvements generally through-

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

out the State has been actively prosecuted during the past year. At Brisbane efforts have been chiefly concentrated on the new channel across the bar to provide a straight and easy entrance to the Brisbane River, and this channel, which is some 3 miles long, with a bottom width of 400 feet and depth of 24 feet at low-water springs, will be completed and opened to navigation early next month.

The following is a statement of the total cost of dredging the new bar cutting from 1st March, 1909, to 31st July, 1912:—

"Hercules"—	£
8th June to 30th June, 1909 ...	700
1st July, 1909, to 30th June, 1910 ...	14,708
1st July, 1910, to 30th June, 1911 ...	12,015
1st July, 1911, to 30th June, 1912 ...	9,242
1st July to 31st July, 1912 ...	1,687
Total "Hercules" ...	£38,352
"Hydra"—	£
17th June, 1909, to 30th June, 1909 ...	464
1st July, 1909, to 30th June, 1910 ...	10,382
1st July, 1910, to 30th June, 1911 ...	7,785
1st July, 1911, to 30th June, 1912 ...	1,699
1st July to 31st July, 1912 ...	1,120
Total "Hydra" ...	£21,450
"Maryborough"—	£
1st March, 1909, to 30th June, 1909 ...	2,977
1st July, 1909, to 30th June, 1910 ...	3,452
1st July, 1910, to 30th June, 1911 ...	10,593
1st July, 1911, to 30th June, 1912 ...	8,432
1st July to 31st July, 1912 ...	1,130
Total "Maryborough" ...	£26,584
Grand total all dredges to 31st July, 1912 ...	£86,386
Allow to complete ...	2,738
Total cost of dredging new cutting	£89,124

For the information of the Committee, I might mention that the original estimate of the cost of this work was £93,000. The remaining cuttings now all have a minimum width of 400 feet, and have a depth of 24 feet at low-water springs. A large and powerful dredger to deal with maintenance work generally, and especially in the town reaches of the river, has been obtained, and recently commenced work. The Engineer for Harbours and Rivers reports that so far the results obtained by this vessel have been "very gratifying, and prove the great value of the machine." The final cut for the removal of Bulimba Point is in progress, and Parker Island has been cut back a further 100 feet. Vessels experience practically no hindrance to navigation in the Brisbane River at present, save that the largest deepsea vessels, drawing 24 or 25 feet, do not proceed at or about low water. Oversea vessels, however, occasionally have to remain in the bay waiting for a berth, and, in view of this and of the anticipated increase in the number of vessels coming to Brisbane, steps have been taken towards the provision of suitable accommodation in the Hamilton Reach that can be carried out progressively until, when the whole of the first section has been completed, accommodation for forty-one of the largest vessels, with the necessary

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

sheds, roads, railway connections, etc., will have been provided. In connection with the scheme for wharfage accommodation, nearly the whole of the land required for the purpose has been secured, and arrangements are now being made to obtain the necessary remaining areas. At Mackay, detailed plans have been prepared for the harbour proposals submitted by the board of inquiry appointed by the Government last year, and these have yet to be submitted to the ratepayers by the harbour board. These proposals consist of a breakwater at each end of Flat-top Island, a pier projecting from the island, and railway connection to the mainland by means of a reinforced concrete viaduct. At Bowen the entrance channel and basin now carry 18 feet at low-water springs, and the latter has been extended in width. The berths at the jetty carry 24 feet at low-water springs. An extension to the jetty head wharf inwards for 250 feet is in progress, the increasing volume of trade demanding more accommodation. At Townsville the harbour board has made good progress with the construction of a new reinforced concrete pier for large vessels in the harbour, and the increase in volume of trade there will probably demand that the construction of a second pier be proceeded with. At Cairns the harbour board has completed the construction of the first section of the reinforced concrete wharf, and the second section is in progress. Specifications were also prepared, tenders invited, and a contract allotted for a special type of dredger for the Cairns Harbour Board, delivery of which is expected in January next. At Mourilyan Harbour the rocky entrance has been enlarged, providing a channel 170 feet wide and 18 feet deep at low-water springs, and at Port Douglas the depths in the basin and entrance channels have been restored. The increased volume of trade and shipping is illustrated by the harbour dues collected and paid into the trust fund in the Treasury during 1909 and 1912, the amounts being £50,134 and £75,461, respectively, which is exclusive of harbour dues collected by the five Northern harbour boards.

SHIPPING.

The figures in connection with shipping are interesting. It is pleasing to note, in comparing this year with last year, that although the number of vessels coming to port has not increased, yet the gross tonnage for the period under review has increased by 50,356 tons, which points to the fact that vessels of much larger tonnage than hitherto are visiting our ports, and it is particularly gratifying to find that some of the oldest established shipping companies in Queensland are finding it necessary to add to their already splendid fleets by building new vessels or arranging to employ larger vessels in the trade. The leading lights on Fisherman's Island have been transferred to their new position on Bulwer Island, and the residences for the lightkeepers are now being removed there. The connection of Port Alma by rail with Rockhampton necessitated the beaconing and lighting of the channel leading to Port Alma; this work has been successfully carried out, and vessels can now visit this port either by day or night. Two motor launches have been built and despatched—one to Innisfail and the other to Cairns. They are a good type of boat, with fair speed, and should prove very useful for pilotage purposes and attending lighthouses,

etc. A launch of smaller dimensions has also been forwarded for the use of the pilot at Bowen. So far as the passing of the lighthouses to Federal control is concerned, although the Lighthouse Bill has been passed by the Federal Parliament, no intimation has been received as to when the transfer will take place, but it is noticed that appropriation has been made on the Estimates of the Commonwealth Government for the erection of new lights on our coast.

BANKING.

The banking returns enable us to form an estimate of our general prosperity, and, as usual, are interesting reading:—

—	Average Deposits.	Average Loans, &c.	Deposits per Capita.	Loans, &c. per Capita.
Year ended	£	£	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
31-12-1890	10,365,960	17,384,998	26 6 3	44 2 7
31-12-1900	13,653,775	12,599,306	27 8 1	25 5 9
31-12-1910	19,260,847	15,054,330	32 3 0	25 2 6
31-12-1911	20,949,203	16,878,541	33 13 6	27 2 7

From the above table it will be seen that during the year ended 1911 the deposits per head of the population amounted to £33 13s. 6d., whilst loans and discounts amounted to £27 2s. 7d. per head. It will be noticed, therefore, that loans and discounts have slightly increased as compared with last year, and in that regard are not so satisfactory as last year; whilst, on the other hand, it is satisfactory to note that the deposits per head of the population also increased.

I may further direct hon. members' attention to the fact that in 1902 deposits exceeded loans by 5s. 8d. only, whereas in 1911 deposits exceeded loans by £6 10s. 11d. This, whilst not being such a satisfactory comparison as that shown last year, nevertheless indicates a sound position.

REVENUE.

My estimate of revenue for the coming year is as follows:—

Amount from Commonwealth	£	790,452
Taxation—	£	
Income tax	350,000	
Stamp duty	347,500	
Licenses	62,000	
Totalisator tax	20,000	
		779,500
Land revenue		831,550
Mining receipts		35,300
Railways		3,220,000
Other receipts		561,500
Total		£6,268,302

This estimate represents an increase of £278,955 on the actual amount received last year. It is an easy matter to forecast the amounts to be received from the Commonwealth, as our population is known as well as the amount per capita to which we are entitled. It will be observed that the amount set down for income tax is £350,000, being £22,497 less than last year's receipts. It is quite true that pastoral matters are now

buoyant, that farmers are experiencing a good season, and that the prices more or less are such as to encourage producers, but the dry period through which we passed during the early part of this year will affect results, and I do not anticipate that a greater revenue will be received than the sum mentioned. The amount set down for railways—namely, £3,220,000—is, I consider, a fair estimate, and should be realised, being an increase for this large and important service over the previous year's receipts of only £187,071. This should be a safe forecast, bearing in mind the continued increase in the mileage of our railways, and also of the consequent settlement that is taking place. The estimate of receipts from lands, I think, may be safely counted upon, and shows an increase of £38,148 over the previous year. It is very difficult to forecast the receipts from other sources, but the estimated receipts from other services shown in above table should, I think, be realised.

EXPENDITURE.

The following is an estimate of the expenditure for the year ending 1912-13:—

	£
Schedules	144,732
Executive and Legislative	18,930
Chief Secretary	129,767
Home Secretary	731,638
Department of Works	184,915
Department of Justice	84,044
The Treasurer	222,397
Department of Public Lands	211,539
Department of Agriculture and Stock	68,612
Department of Public Instruction	493,768
Department of Mines	65,424
Department of Railways	2,037,037
	4,392,803
Interest on public debt	1,869,830
Total	£6,262,633

Compared with last year's estimates the above total represents an increase of £494,000. The Department of Public Instruction shows an increase of £51,413. Last financial year the sum of £10,000 was voted to provide a minimum salary of £110 per annum for adult male teachers in charge of small schools, and of £90 for females. In continuance of this policy of improving the position of teachers, financially and otherwise, the Government has determined this year to increase the salaries of pupil-teachers and classified teachers, and a sum of £23,108 has been provided for the purpose. The system of itinerant teachers has been extended so as to bring the means of education within the reach of as many families as possible in the sparsely-settled districts. The medical and dental branch of the department has been strengthened by the appointment of four part-time medical inspectors and two full-time dental inspectors. A highly-qualified ophthalmic inspector is also being appointed to deal specially with the eye troubles in the West and North-west. These extra services will explain in part an increased appropriation in connection with this department. Additional expenditure has had to be provided for as a result of the abolition of the one-fifth contribution towards the establishment of new

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

schools, and the obtaining of which often pressed heavily, more particularly upon struggling settlers. The Department of Railways shows an increase over the previous year, brought about by the opening up of new lines, and increases that have been given to the lower-paid members of the service. In connection with the Home Department, claims of the officers and men of the Police Department for higher emoluments have been recognised, and increased payments are to be made to them. Last year provision was obtained to cope with the prickly-pear pest, both the Lands and Home Departments having votes for this purpose, but very little money was expended during the year. This year provision to the extent of £10,500 has been made. Hon. members will agree with me, I think, that the spending of money in connection with the destruction of prickly pear is justified. Extra provision has also been made for the Department of Mines, in the hope that the assistance given will help to revive this most important industry. In other departments what is considered ample provision for all reasonable requirements has been made. Hon. members will note from a study of the details of the Estimates that increases throughout the public service—with the exception of police officers previously referred to—have been provided only for officers in receipt of a salary of less than £400 per annum.

The summary of estimates and expenditure for the coming year gives the following results:—

Estimated revenue for the year	
1912-13	£6,268,302
Estimated expenditure for the year	
1912-13	6,262,633
Estimated surplus	£5,669

In conclusion, Mr. Stodart, I have to say that special attention has been given to the Estimates, which have been prepared with much care. It is impossible to have considerable growth without an increased expenditure, and the greater our prosperity the larger are the demands made upon the State Treasury. We have, however, commenced the year under favourable auspices. Fortunately, thanks to the blessings of Providence, splendid rains have fallen throughout the greater part of the State, and these have inspired hope and given confidence to the people; and with the continuation of good seasons we may anticipate another prosperous year, which I believe will, at its close, show more marked progress than during any previous similar period.

I move that there be granted to His Majesty for the service of the year 1912-13 the sum of £300, to defray the salary of the aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: Does the hon. gentleman propose to go on with the debate to-day?

The TREASURER: I propose to move that the Chairman leave the chair.

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

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The TREASURER: I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. RYAN: I rise to enter a final protest from this side of the House against the third reading of this Bill. It is one of the most important measures from any point of view

that has been brought before any [5 p.m.] Parliament in Queensland for some time. It is a measure

which, from its nature, should not have been passed through the House and through the Committee by means of the guillotine. It is a Bill which, from the nature of its provisions, has aroused a great deal of opposition amongst the electors of Queensland outside the House, as has been evidenced by the many resolutions which have been passed in various parts of the State and also by the largely-signed petition which I presented to the House this afternoon, which is signed by over 6,000 members of industrial unions, electors, and residents in Queensland, and I believe that that number is only a fraction of the number which will ultimately sign a petition of a similar kind. It was stated at the outset that this Bill was introduced on lines similar to the legislation which has been introduced and passed in other States. We have taken the opportunity, during the various debates which have taken place on the measure, to point out that in its very essence and main principle it differs from the measures of a similar import passed in the other States. We have pointed out that it has not got the same foundation as those measures, that it is not based upon organisation, but that it is rather based upon a system which, as pointed out by the President of the Federal Arbitration Court, is unworkable. No system of arbitration—and this will be admitted by all who claim to have any practical knowledge of the working of the arbitration—can succeed that is not founded on organisation both on the part of employers and employees. Professedly this Bill is not founded upon organisation, but upon the principle of disintegrating the organisations that already exist. In that respect I say that the Bill, as it has passed the Committee, is aimed essentially at the very vitals of unionism. It is an attack upon organised labour primarily. Incidentally it may be pointed out that it does not encourage the organisation of employers. But there are organisations of employers which cannot be affected by this Bill, and employers are in a better position to fight than individual workers are. I desire to emphasise here and now that this House is asked to pass the third reading of a Bill which has not the foundation necessary to make any system of arbitration workable. It has been passed by a Government which has no sympathy with, and no knowledge, and no opportunity of knowledge, of what the requirements of the workers are—of what the aspirations of the workers are—and that is shown from the very first line of the Bill to the very last line. This Bill, in laying down the jurisdiction of the court, placed a certain limitation upon the powers of the court in deciding upon industrial disputes, and that limitation is this—that the court shall not have power to discriminate between members of unions and those who are not members of unions. That is claimed by the Government to be a great virtue in the Bill. But the Bill then

proceeds, not to place in the hands of the court power to give preference to non-unionists but actually gives preference to non-unionists. It does not give the court any opportunity of doing away with that preference, and I think hon. members on this side of the House have pointed out that on account of the manner in which penalties may be enforced against members of unions, there is a distinct preference to non-unionists. It has been pointed out more than once that this Bill provides that penalties, or portions of penalties, may be taken from the funds of unions. But in the case of penalties enforceable against non-unionists there is no common fund from which a portion of the penalty can be drawn. Therefore this Parliament itself, the members of this House, and the members of another place, when this Bill is passed by them, will actually be giving preference to non-unionists by legislative enactment. The hands of the court are being fettered to that extent. I have shown that there is no foundation for this Bill that makes it a workable one, and I have shown that Parliament is giving preference to non-unionists. I trust that some members on the other side of the House, even at this late stage, will make some attempt to justify or explain their action in having voted to give such preference. In this Bill they have also done this—this House has done it, has said to the great body of workers in Queensland, "You shall not have liberty of choice. You shall not have the liberty to choose who shall be your representatives upon the board that is appointed." By what right have members of this House authority to say to the workers of Queensland that they are not competent to say who shall represent them upon the boards provided for by this Bill? Can any hon. member on that side of the House give any reason that will justify us in limiting the right of choice to the workers of Queensland to say who shall represent them? Can the Government point to any other Act on the statute-book of any State of Australia, to any Act on the statute-book of the Commonwealth, or of any other country in the world, where the right of the workers is limited as it is limited in this Bill? I challenge them to do so. They will have the opportunity of showing it if they can, but I know they cannot. We have a Bill with a foundation that is unworkable, we have a Bill that gives preference to non-unionists, and a Bill that says to the workers, "You shall not have the right to say who shall be your representatives on the board that is appointed to decide your industrial disputes." We also say that the workers of Queensland will be deprived of their right to be tried by a jury. In what other Act has that right been taken from them?

Mr. KIRWAN: A suspension of Magna Charta.

Mr. RYAN: It is a direct contravention of the provisions of Magna Charta which gives the right of trial by jury to every man—the right of trial by his peers. In the Committee stage of this Bill an amendment was moved to allow a worker, if he so desired, to be tried by jury. By what right or by what authority have the members of this House who voted against that amendment said to the workers of Queensland that they shall not have the right to be tried by a jury if they so desire? How are the Government going to explain that to the electors of Queensland? How are

those who supported them in passing a provision of that kind, going to explain their position? Not only have they deprived the workers of Queensland of the right of trial by jury if they so wish, but they have actually also said to the boards that are to be appointed without the right of free choice to the workers—they have said to those boards, "We are going to clip your wings; we are going to limit your power, and we say emphatically that you shall have no right to allow overtime payment except on the seven days in the year which this House appoints." Seven days only, although experience has shown, and practice has shown—with regard to the boards which have been already appointed, and which have given decisions and awards in this State—that they allow overtime on other days in the year, and that they allow overtime at a higher rate than is proposed to be sanctioned by this Bill. Has any hon. member on that side of the House, during the debates on this question, pointed out that those awards are not just—that too much is allowed for overtime, and that too much overtime is allowed? Yet, although these things have not been proved, this House is passing this Bill limiting the power of the boards and wiping out rights that now exist under awards that have been arrived at by wages boards in this State. Can any hon. member sitting on the front Treasury bench justify that? Can members justify the principle which is incorporated in this Bill? Can they honestly go to the workers of Queensland and say to them that they have passed this measure, actuated by a desire to assist the workers, when they cut down their rights and privileges in that manner? I am only pointing out, in passing, a few of the more glaring defects of the measure—the more glaring injustices that are being inflicted on the workers of Queensland by its provisions. This Bill actually goes so far as to say that agreements that have been arrived at between employers and employees, after careful negotiations, shall not be binding; and that awards which have not given satisfaction to the employers, which have not given satisfaction to the workers, and which the employers have not insisted upon—shall stand and be binding upon the workers of Queensland in place of the agreements which are now in operation. I refer particularly to the agreements that have been arrived at with regard to the coalworkers, and also with regard to the sugar-workers, and the iron, brass, and steel moulding trades. In all these trades there are agreements now existing and working satisfactorily—agreements arrived at after proper consideration of all the facts and circumstances, and arrived at in place of the unsatisfactory decisions of the boards—awards of boards which did not meet with the approval of the workers—and yet this House is wiping out those agreements and saying to the employers, "You are not bound by them." Yet we are binding the workers by awards which have been set aside by mutual agreements. What answer do we receive from those on the other side of the House who pose as representatives of the employers?

Mr. THEODORE: It was inserted at the dictation of the Employers' Federation.

Mr. RYAN: Exactly, as the hon. member for Chillagoe interjects, those provisions are inserted at the dictation of the Employers' Federation, and, we are told, forsooth, that

Mr. Ryan.]

the high honour and principles of the employers will not allow them to take advantage of the privilege conferred upon them by this Bill. By what right or what authority has this House conferred upon the employers such a right or privilege, in face of the agreements which they have arrived at? We are told, "Oh, they won't enforce that. We are simply putting that in for the sake of uniformity." They are putting in, too, this provision against the workers, that if they do not abide by these unsatisfactory awards, which we are giving the force of the law to in the schedules of this Bill—if they do not abide by those unjust and unsatisfactory awards, they shall be guilty of striking, and liable to all the severe pains and penalties that are provided in this Bill—penalties which not only go to their union funds, but which go to their private investments. Not only can they follow the funds of their unions, but they can follow any association or enterprise in which those funds are invested, so that they can attack the funds of the Labour papers now springing up in the other States, and even in this State.

Mr. THEODORE: And also the benefit funds.

Mr. RYAN: They have no regard for the benefit funds which have been accumulated to make provision for the wives and children of those who belong to unions.

Mr. BOOKER: How much did they get?

Mr. RYAN: They got a considerable proportion.

Mr. BOOKER: Not much; politics get the greater amount.

Mr. RYAN: These funds cannot be better spent in the interests of the wives and children of the workers than in political propaganda. It is by returning members of Parliament—by getting political power that the welfare of the wives and children will be seen to.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: It is all very well for hon. members opposite to say that they believe in unionism as long as their funds are not spent for political purposes. But what is the good of unions if they do not spend their funds in that direction—if they do not endeavour to get political power? This could be no more strongly illustrated than it was illustrated in the late general strike which took place in Brisbane, where it was proved that the executive power—the police, and the Commissioner for Police—who has been rewarded with an increase in salary of £200 a year, was brought against unionists. See all the power they had against hundreds and thousands of workers who were on strike! Would that have been so if the workers had spent their union funds for political purposes, and had placed a Government in power which would have had due regard, not only to the rights of employers, but also to the rights of the workers of Queensland? There are some provisions in this Bill which are included nominally to protect unionists—to protect members of organisations—but they are included in such a way that they are incapable of application. If an unfortunate worker, who has been dismissed, can prove that his employer dismissed him merely because he was a member of a union, the employer is liable to a certain penalty. In all the other States of Australia there is a similar provision with regard to a penalty, but there is a method of proof provided which throws upon the employer the onus of

[Mr. Ryan.]

proving that he dismissed the employee for some substantial reason other than that he was a member of a union. Here, we have not that provision at all, so that what is alleged to be inserted in this Bill in the interests of workers, in the interests of unionists, is really only a sham provision and cannot be properly enforced. When this Bill was going through a certain amendment was proposed in Committee by the hon. member for Keppel, who asked the Committee to direct the court to have regard to certain things—to have regard to the cost of living. That amendment was moved because the hon. member, in studying the working of Arbitration Acts in the other States, and, in studying the remarks of those who have been appointed to preside over those courts, found that the cost of living was one of the main things to be taken into consideration in arriving at what would be a fair and just award. That was particularly so in the case of the West Australian Arbitration Court, where Mr. Justice Burnside pointed out that in any amendment of the Arbitration Act in Western Australia there should be some provision giving the court power to deal with the cost of commodities—with the cost of living. Yet this House, although we have all that information, and know that boards in the past have refused to consider such matters as the cost of living—although we know all that, we are allowing this Bill to go through without inserting such a useful provision as that—a provision which could only have been inserted in the interests of those who would come under the operation of this Bill—refused to accept that amendment. An amendment in the schedule to the Bill was accepted last night to include the field workers in the sugar industry. Nearly every amendment—substantially every amendment—proposed from this side of the House was refused.

Mr. KIRWAN: All but two.

Mr. RYAN: All but two, and they were only small amendments, and the Government relied upon its majority to force this Bill through under the guillotine with as little amendment as possible.

Mr. LAND: With the Employers' Federation at their back.

Mr. RYAN: The Government, in doing that, set out to establish a very bad example, which, I trust, will not be followed when they do not occupy the Treasury benches. It is an abuse of parliamentary procedure—it is doing away with parliamentary procedure—to say that they will receive no amendment from this side, no matter how reasonable the amendment may be.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The Premier himself said at the beginning that amendments which would improve the Bill would be accepted.

Mr. RYAN: That was said at the beginning. I was told, as I am reminded, that any reasonable suggestion would be accepted—anything that would improve the Bill—but, apparently, nothing emanated from this side to improve the Bill. I quite conceive, if the object of the Bill is what I take it to be—if the intention is to down the worker in the interests of the employers—then any amendment which was proposed from this side would certainly not be accepted; but an amendment was received last night, and voted for by those who supported the Government, to include the field workers in

the sugar industry. For what purpose is this large body of workers to be included under the operation of this Bill, and the rural workers on the Downs and other places not to be included? For one purpose only—to lower the wages that have been established now at 1s. per hour. Why did the Government not refuse that amendment? Why did they not advocate the equalising of the excise and bounty, or some other provision of that sort? Why did they not advise the sugar farmers of Queensland that their interests were closely interwoven with the interests of the workers, and that if the producer and the worker combined against the millowner and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, that would be the way to get equal justice for all? It is well known by hon. members on this side that it is against the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, and such institutions as that, that there should be a combination of farmers and workers. Surely there is no one who will say that 1s. per hour is too high a wage to pay to those who labour in the sugar-fields of Queensland? Does any hon. member say it is? Every hon. member who voted for that amendment last night says so. What we say is that it is a fair wage, and we say that the farmers and the workers combined can both get a fair deal by getting a larger proportion of what the consumer has eventually to pay for his sugar. The acceptance of that amendment proves conclusively that the object of the Government is to place all the power they can in the hands of the employer.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: To lower wages.

Mr. RYAN: To lower wages, and be against the workers, and the mover of the amendment has not hesitated to attempt, by the insertion of an amendment like that into this Bill, to try and gain political capital against the Federal Labour Government. How can it be said that the inclusion of the sugar-workers under the provision of this Bill can be for any other object than to lower their wages? They cannot gain them the equalisation of the excise and bounty. What are hon. members who supported and carried that amendment last night going to do with the sugar industry? What party do they want to get into power? The Liberal party—those who are associated with black labour, those who want cheap sugar, and those who will wipe out the duty on sugar if they get the opportunity of doing it?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: They won't have their £6 a ton protection on sugar if the Liberal Government get into power.

Mr. FORSYTH: If they do not get £6 a ton, how will they live?

Mr. RYAN: What does the Liberal Government care whether the industry lives or not?

Mr. FORSYTH: They do care.

Mr. RYAN: What does the Liberal Government in South Australia and Victoria care?

Mr. FORSYTH: They do care.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: They do not care whether the sugar industry lives or not.

Mr. BOOKER: Do you care?

Mr. RYAN: Certainly I care. I have the interests of Queensland at heart. (Government laughter.) We want the sugar farmers and all concerned to get a fair deal, but it is not in the way proposed by hon. members on that side that they will get that fair deal. I refer to this by way of warning from this side of the House to the sugar farmers of Queensland. Let them not be led away by this discussion about the rate of pay to the workers in the sugar-fields, so as to be gulled into handing over to a party the power to deal with legislation in a way which will remove the duty, or considerably reduce it. Perhaps the provision in this Bill which points most clearly to the want of knowledge and want of sympathy on the part of the Government with the unionists and workers generally, appears in the clause under which unionists will have to assist strike-breakers. Supposing a strike takes place in a particular industry, and strike-breakers come in to take the place of the men on strike. Then the members of every union in Queensland will have to handle the goods produced by those strike-breakers.

Mr. KIRWAN: And act as strike-breakers.

Mr. RYAN: And act as strike-breakers. They are actually asking the unionists of Queensland to be strike-breakers—to participate in strike-breaking. The inclusion of such a provision as that, as I have remarked, points clearly to the fact that the Government do not understand the workers of Queensland, because I do not care how many Industrial Peace Bills are passed, or how heavy your penalties may be, or how much you extend the accommodation of your gaols, you will never get unionists to act as strike-breakers against their fellow-unionists who are on strike for causes which they consider just.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: To go further and show how far this Government were prepared to go in attacking unionism and in frustrating the aspirations of the workers generally, I need only point to the provisions with regard to the execution of penalties. There is a clause in the Bill which, on account of the operation of the guillotine, we were unable to discuss—it slipped through without discussion—and a very pernicious clause it is. It is a clause which I say advisedly is aimed at the suppression of the Press which is already established, and which is likely to be established, to advocate the interests of the workers generally. It is clause 50, which lays down the procedure with regard to the recovery of a penalty—

“(1.) Where a penalty is imposed under this Act on an industrial association, or an industrial association is under this Act ordered to pay any sum, then, for the recovery of such penalty or sum, process may be issued and executed against the property of such association, or any property in which such association has a beneficial interest, whether vested in trustees or howsoever otherwise held, in the same manner as if the association were an incorporated company and the absolute owner of the property or interest.”

They are attacking the *Worker*, and any union which has an interest in any newspaper.

Mr. PAYNE: It belongs to the unions.

Mr. Ryan.]

Mr. RYAN: Execution can be had against the *Worker*. The *Worker* can be suppressed, as a punishment, perhaps, for some irresponsible action on the part of unionists in a remote part of the State. Is that just or reasonable? Do the workers of Queensland understand how far the Government have gone, and how far this Bill goes? They will soon understand. This clause is aimed deliberately at the Labour Press, and it is aimed at preventing the establishment of Labour papers owned by unions. How are the unions going to have a Press which will advocate their cause unless it is by co-operation? Yet this clause not only gives preference to non-unionists, but tells the unionists of Queensland that if they start any paper advocating their cause, there is a bludgeon contained in this Bill which will wipe it out. I am very sorry that we had not an opportunity of fully discussing this clause in the Bill. Fancy a thing like that being guillotined through without discussion, without giving hon. members an opportunity of expressing their views upon it! We had the grim satisfaction of sitting here and voting against it, but I trust that we shall have an opportunity, when the Federal referendum comes along in the near future, of pointing out the defects and iniquities of this measure, which we have not had the opportunity of doing in our own deliberative assembly. We are sent here to legislate in the interests of the people, and we actually had not the opportunity of discussing and reasoning out provisions which were brought before us.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You deprived yourself of the opportunity.

Mr. RYAN: Were we not told by the leader of the Government, when this Bill was introduced, that he was not going to apply the gag, that he was going to allow full discussion?

The PREMIER: You had it.

Mr. RYAN: Why was the policy of the Government altered? The hon. gentleman said he would give full time for the discussion of this measure, even if it occupied the whole session, and subsequently went back on that promise. The guillotine was applied, the automatic gag was placed upon clauses that I have referred to, which means, if it means anything, an attempt by the Government to suppress Labour journalism. Efforts of that kind can only lead to a revulsion of feeling amongst fair-minded people in Queensland, whether they are unionists or non-unionists. I have great faith in the fair-mindedness of the workers of Queensland.

The PREMIER: So have I.

Mr. RYAN: That is why you started a prosecution against the hon. member for Bacham, I suppose. That jury was not composed only of unionists or labour sympathisers, yet they gave the Premier the answer he deserved. That prosecution is only an illustration of the kind of policy that this Government is pursuing in order to bludgeon the workers of Queensland.

Mr. BOOKER: You only say that.

Mr. RYAN: Not only do I say that, but a jury of twelve men said it by their verdict. The people of Queensland were never given a hint that such drastic provisions would be introduced as have been introduced in this Bill. If any such inkling had

[*Mr. Ryan.*]

been given them, they would not have returned this Government to power. It is not my desire to prophesy. I have every confidence in the good sense of the electors of Queensland, and I say they will see through the iniquitous clauses in this Bill, and they will rise up and revolt against the manner in which the measure has been forced through this House without discussion. I say that in my opinion the opportunity will very soon be given for some of the people of Queensland to pass an opinion upon it. We will then see what the people of Queensland think of the Government and its industrial peace measure.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: What we have heard during the last thirty-five minutes is a fair sample of the way in which the time of the House and Committee has been occupied for many weeks—endless repetition without argument, with occasionally an attempt at intimidation and abuse. Anything more grossly incorrect than the statement that this Bill was rushed through the House never was uttered in this Chamber. There was no attempt on the second reading to curtail discussion, and, if I am not mistaken, every member of the Opposition, except two, spoke, and those two were out of the House at the time. Opportunity was given to them to speak. During the second reading the same tedious repetition was indulged in, and we sat through it and allowed members opposite to exhaust themselves in that regard. And in the Committee stage, I question if ever a Bill of this length had so much time given to it—a Bill of sixty clauses and three schedules, and eleven full days given to it. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite had the least regard for the economy of time, instead of one after the other endlessly repeating the same thing, they should have attacked one section, and then reserved themselves for the further section. But no; they just had one story to tell, and they kept telling it with tireless—on their part—reiteration. Again, to-day, during the last thirty-five minutes we have simply had an awakening of the sounds which have been reverberating for many weeks past. Nothing has been said afresh, but the same stupid remarks about the Employers' Federation, who had no more to do with this Bill—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

The PREMIER: Of course, gentlemen opposite know how hopelessly and abjectly they are under the control of the Trades Hall—(Opposition laughter)—and therefore they think that we are the same. I say deliberately that the Employers' Federation have no interest in this matter at all. There is nothing to answer, because it has been answered again and again. We are quite satisfied that we have done the workers of Queensland one of the best things that has ever been done for them, and that in spite of all that has been said, the workers of Queensland—

The hon. member for Paddington and the hon. member for Brisbane interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order! It is almost impossible for me to hear the remarks of the Chief Secretary. I call the attention of the hon. member for Paddington and the hon. member for Brisbane to the fact that if they wish to combat the observations of the Chief Secretary, they should put their

interjections in the form of a speech, and make that speech at the conclusion of the Chief Secretary's remarks.

The PREMIER: I was saying that the intelligence of the people is such that they will understand the measure without seeing it through the distorted gaze of the Trades Hall. The simple principle underlying this Bill is that of equity and fair play. It provides that every worker in Queensland can secure justice for himself without the intervention of the Trades Hall. All they have to do is to make known their request for a board to be constituted, and they will be able to get their wants and grievances adjusted. There is only one point worth replying to, and that is the reference to the men in the iron and brass trades and some other workers who have a better agreement than the wages board award. Yesterday when the Chairman was in the chair that question was discussed at least two and a-half hours. It is said that certain men for whom a board was constituted were dissatisfied with the award. They struck: an agreement was made for higher pay, which higher payment they are now getting. It is averred that the effect of the Bill will be to reduce their wages. What is the position? Formerly under an award men said, "We are not going to submit; we prefer to strike." Then they struck and got higher pay; but they can do that under this Bill, and do it lawfully. After fourteen days they can leave their work; and the employers who formerly realise the situation have common sense enough, apart from the sense of equity, to know that unless they wish their works once more disorganised, the agreement must obtain and prevail. Apart from that, the men could get the agreement endorsed by the Minister for Works at any time. I quite thought some discussion would take place on this occasion, because right from the first, from the initiation of the measure, every mode of obstruction has been followed.

Mr. LAND: Quite right, too.

The PREMIER: Every method was taken to block progress. On the second reading every member had the fullest opportunity allowed under the Standing Orders; when we got into Committee the clauses and schedules went through at an average of five per day; yet members have the effrontery to say the measure was bludgeoned or rushed through. On the 23rd July, I think, the initiatory stages were taken.

Mr. LENNON: Thirteen days afterwards you turned somersault.

The PREMIER: That is not so. We said there would be no coercive measures taken during the second reading; nor was there. Now it would seem that these marvellous democrats are becoming ardent imperialists, because, if what we see in the Press is correct, they have appealed to Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, to protect them.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Not true! Not true!

The PREMIER: Anyhow this is the first contradiction I have heard; and I have not seen it contradicted in the Press. I was under the impression that one called "Martin" and one called "Seymour," acting on behalf of forty-three unions, sent a

cable to Great Britain, asking Mr. Asquith to intervene on their behalf.

Mr. THEODORE: That is not true.

The PREMIER: We are responsible to the people of Queensland.

Mr. LAND: It's a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already called attention to interjections. Since then, the hon. member for Balonne has interjected, and I warn him again. I suggest to the hon. member for Chillagoe that, as he has not already spoken in this debate, he might reserve his remarks until the Chief Secretary has concluded his speech.

Mr. THEODORE: I was correcting a misstatement.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity of correcting it later on.

The PREMIER: I would be very glad to learn that the two men whose names I have mentioned did not act with the authority of the Parliamentary Labour party; and I would further like to know that they did not send the cable at all; but it seems to me as if there is some slight subterfuge. It may not be with the cognisance of the leader of the Opposition; but I believe the two men I have mentioned, acting on behalf of forty-three unions, sent a message to the old land asking Mr. Asquith to afford them protection and counsel, to get under the petticoat of Downing street, and to request the Governor not to give his assent to the Bill. We are responsible to the people for our action in bringing forward this measure. One of the misstatements made by the leader of the Opposition was that the public did not know the nature of the measure. They did not know the details, but they know the lines on which we were proceeding. The fullest opportunity has been given for discussion; and if there has been error, we can abide by the error. I claim, however, that the Government, by passing this Bill, are giving to the workers of Queensland that charter of liberty which for many a long year they have desired; and I am bold enough to say that it will pass its third reading and become the law of the land.

Mr. THEODORE: I want first of all to nail a lie that has been circulated.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THEODORE: Not by the Premier; a lie circulated in the public Press with regard to the question of approaching the Prime Minister of England on behalf of the unions of Queensland to stop the progress of this measure.

The PREMIER: You are very slow in denying it.

Mr. THEODORE: It was thought by those interested from the point of view of the toilers that denial of such a miserable lie was not required. Speaking personally, I believe the representatives of the combined unions in the Trades Hall would ridicule such a proposition. I think they have in their hands sufficient power, and that they have sufficient intelligence and common sense, to take the necessary action against this Bill in their own State.

The PREMIER: Did such a cablegram go to England, authorised or unauthorised?

Mr. THEODORE: The hon. gentleman's own friends may have sent such a cablegram. If he is speaking of Mr. Seymour, who is

Mr. Theodore]

the representative of one of the unions on the combined unions committee, I can say that Mr. Seymour would not take such a foolish action or even suggest it. With regard to the hon. gentleman's statements about free and full discussion on the Bill, I say those statements are not correct. The Government have not afforded free and full discussion at any stage of the Bill. The operation of the guillotine was of such a nature as utterly precluded discussion on no fewer than forty-three clauses, of which thirty-six were contentious.

The PREMIER: Entirely your own fault.

Mr. THEODORE: How can the hon. gentleman say it is entirely the fault of the Opposition? Does he not know that quite as many members of the Government party spoke on the first part of the Bill as members of the Opposition party? In that part of the Bill there are only five clauses, of which three were guillotined; and those who spoke included quite as many on the Ministerial side as on the Opposition side.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They acted quite within their rights.

Mr. THEODORE: Undoubtedly they acted quite within their rights. No one disputes the right of members of that side to speak on the Bill, but we demand the right to speak on every clause of such a measure. We claim the right to have the fullest and freest discussion upon such an important measure, and that is what we have not been allowed. Forty-three clauses out of the sixty clauses in this measure were guillotined through, and no member of the Opposition had the opportunity of speaking on them. On forty-three out of sixty clauses they had merely to sit silent and vote.

The PREMIER: So twelve days were spent on seventeen clauses.

Mr. THEODORE: At least half of that time was taken up by Ministerial supporters. I have carefully gone through *Hansard*, so far as the discussion on Part I. is concerned, and I find that on that part as many Government as Labour members spoke.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They had to refute your arguments.

Mr. THEODORE: They had every right to try and do so. Surely the Chief Secretary does not think that the discussion which took place on Part I. of the Bill, for which two days were allowed, was not an appropriate discussion, so far as this side of the House was concerned. He will not contend that the amendments were unreasonable, or that there was anything in the nature of obstruction. Nothing of the sort can be contended, for the attitude of the Opposition on this measure was reasonable. They advanced amendments which they thought would improve the measure, but every amendment, except one which was of a harmless character, was turned down. In addition to the guillotining of forty-three clauses, the Government also guillotined more than twenty amendments which had been printed and circulated. If the hon. gentleman considers that action of the Government a fair action, then he has a different conception of fair play from that which most ordinary humans have. The question which was touched upon by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, in connection with the clause dealing with no discrimination, was guillotined through Com-

[*Mr. Theodore.*

mittee with other clauses; and, consequently, there was no debate in the Committee stage on the question of the wisdom of establishing such a principle as no discrimination, or on the question of the wisdom of establishing in the Bill the principle of preference to unionists. No opportunity was allowed for the discussion of the merits or the demerits of the principle I have mentioned. As a matter of fact, there are mutual agreements, private agreements, now in force in a number of callings in Queensland, which admit the right to give preference to unionists—agreements in which both parties thereto have admitted the desirableness of preference to unionists.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is their business.

Mr. THEODORE: Under this Bill that will no longer be their business. Under this Bill that measure of liberty to the employers and employees will be taken away. Under clause 34 it is laid down there shall be no discrimination. No person shall be refused employment or be discriminated against on account of membership or non-membership of an industrial organisation.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is not preference to unionists.

Mr. THEODORE: No, it is a prohibition of preference to unionists. No person, without exception, shall be refused employment or be in any way discriminated against on account of membership or non-membership of an industrial association. It absolutely prohibits preference to unionists, even if both employers and employees are desirous of giving such preference. There are numbers of callings, in which private agreements are in force, which recognise the principle of preference to unionists, but no longer will those agreements be able to stand. Is this not an encroachment upon the liberty of the workers of the State? Is it not equally an infringement of the freedom of the employers who recognise the necessity of preference to unionists? It may be contended that had we reached that clause of the Bill it would have been argued, and perhaps shown that preference to unionists is a bad thing, is an evil thing for the body politic. But we were not allowed to hear any such arguments, for the simple reason that we did not get to that clause of the Bill. Let me say here that preference to unionists has proved itself a good thing to unionists, to workers, and, in many instances, to employers, and upon the ground that the principle has proved beneficial, I say that this Bill should not lay down the new principle that such preference shall be prohibited in the future. It will affect many thousands of workers who are working under private agreements, and I contend we should have this opportunity of protesting against the third reading of this Bill, which is a most scandalous invasion of the rights of workers and of private employers who favour unionism. It is a most scandalous attempt on the part of the Government of Queensland to subvert some of the most recognised principles of liberty. It may be urged, as I said before, that preference to unionists is a pernicious principle, but that has not been urged because we never got to that clause of the Bill which would have given us the opportunity to discuss that matter. In justification of my opposition to the third reading of the Bill, I say that preference to unionists is not an evil principle. If preference is considered desirable by employers, and if that preference involves

mutual obligations between employer and employee, I say that it should not be prohibited. The employer gives preference, and, in return, he gets a guarantee of efficient work, and he also gets the guarantee that when any dispute crops up, that dispute will be submitted to a recognised organisation of his employees who will discuss it intelligently and on lines which will probably lead to some satisfactory solution of the difficulty. Many employees recognise that without an established association, and without those guarantees, they are for ever on the edge of an industrial precipice, as the disaffection of a few employees may upset the whole of their business. I say that preference to unionists involves mutual obligations. It has been recognised in the transport industry of the State as a good thing for that industry, but under this Bill that portion of the agreement in which this preference is provided for will be nullified. The employers, equally with the employee, may be penalised if they persist in applying that part of the agreement which has been honourably entered into by both parties thereto. Is that a state of things which we shall allow to pass without protest? Shall we allow to be read a third time a Bill which contains such a principle as that—a principle which we have not been permitted to discuss, because the guillotine precluded discussion on it. The Commonwealth legislation dealing with questions of arbitration and conciliation, recognises the principle of preference to unionists, and contains no such clause as that dealing with no "discrimination" in the Bill, nor is there any such provision in any other Act operating in Australia. It is very probable that there never has

been a Bill yet passed into law [7 p.m.] in any country in the world that absolutely precludes the granting of preference to unionists. We have had in different Legislatures discussions as to the desirableness and usefulness of having preference to unionists, but never yet has there been passed into law—I think I can make the definite statement—any measure which prohibits the granting of preference to unionists, if the employers and employees in the different callings desire preference to be granted. We have in existence in this State, agreements by which both parties have agreed to preference, but this Bill will nullify those agreements, and will prohibit the granting of preference in those callings. That is a pernicious principle, and because there was no opportunity afforded in the early stages of the debate upon this measure to discuss the principle which is contained in clause 34, which was put through under the guillotine—it is because of that, that I desire to debate the question now. Unionists have never claimed indiscriminate preference, neither have they ever claimed preference without conditions or obligations. Always they are prepared to have preference with conditions. They desire preference given to their members, and they themselves undertake in return to comply with certain obligations which they are willing should be imposed upon them. The question often comes up as to whether unionists desire absolute preference—whether they desire preference without restriction in any form whatever. I say they never have taken up that stand. If it came to a question as to whether a married man, who was a non-unionist, should be given preference of employment over a single man who was a unionist, I say, personally—and most union-

ists, I think, will agree with this statement—that I should regret if the married man was overlooked under those circumstances. The unionists have never taken up so unreasonable a stand as to require preference irrespective of any qualification. They realise that because they have battled for improved conditions in the calling in which they are engaged, and because they themselves have put up a fight again and again, and because they are beneficial to the interests of the community at large, that they should be given some concession, when other things are equal; and that when the opportunity is given to the employer he should employ them in preference to the shirker—the man who will not assist to get fair conditions in the different callings. The Commonwealth Government in 1904, when introducing an Arbitration Bill—not a Bill on the lines of this one, not a coercive measure, an arbitration measure to establish the principle of a peaceable adjustment of differences that crop up in different industries—admitted the right to give preference in respect of certain employees, and they inserted in their measure a clause which empowered the court to give preference to unionists on certain conditions. Later on the Commonwealth Arbitration Act was amended in such a way as to enable the court to give preference in certain callings if they thought proper. Mr. Deakin, speaking on this question, when introducing this measure, made the following remarks:—

"The issues as we put them were; Preference? Yes! Unionism, yes! Encouragement to unionism besides preference? Yes! For what purpose? For the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes."

Mr. Deakin admitted that the granting of preference under the conditions which they laid down facilitated the settlement and adjustment of difference that cropped up in the different industries that are affected, and that is the principle for which unionists are contending. They desire preference because it encourages organisation and makes their organisation more effective, and therefore makes the machinery for the adjustment of those differences more effective. There has also cropped up the question, Are we prepared to allow preference to unionists to cover those organisations which take part in politics? That seems to be the objection of hon. members sitting on that side of the House regarding this question. No preference whatever, no discrimination in favour of unionists, because unionists largely believe in political action. I say that practically all questions that concern the conditions of the workers' employment are political questions. Whether they are questions of party politics or not, they are all questions bearing upon political issues. What did the first Commonwealth Act provide in regard to preference? It provided that preference to unionists could be given so long as the objects of the unions were not of a political nature. In laying down that condition they made certain exceptions. The unions were not forbidden from taking political action to secure certain things—

"Provision for the preservation of life and limb.

"Compensation, sanitation, sex and age of employees.

"Hours of labour, remuneration of labour.

Mr. Theodore]

"Protection of wages, and other conditions similarly affecting employment."

If they tabooed politics, they admitted that these matters were essentially political questions, but that they were political questions which would not debar the union from enjoying the privilege of preference to its members. I say you cannot draw such a line of demarcation, and a subsequent Federal Government wiped that away.

On several HONOURABLE MEMBERS conversing in loud tones,

The SPEAKER said: Order! It is disorderly for any hon. member to carry on a conversation with another hon. member. If it is necessary that they should carry on a conversation I hope they will do so sotto voce.

Mr. THEODORE: I was saying that practically all questions with which unionists concern themselves are questions essentially political, and you cannot draw a line of demarcation as to what questions they may advocate, what questions they may concern themselves with, and what questions they must leave alone. Therefore, if preference is a good thing, political unionism must also be a good thing. The objection, I venture to say, is not so much an objection to unionists engaging in politics or having regard to political actions, as an objection to unionists attaching themselves to a particular political party. Why should not unionists attach themselves to a political party? They have free choice in the matter. They never attach themselves to any political party except upon a majority vote of their members. If they think they can sooner attain their objects by taking an active political part in the political war of the State, then I think it is a perfectly legitimate thing for them to do. Their object, speaking generally, is the emancipation of the worker. The question may be asked: Is preference to unionists a fair thing? I say that, under certain conditions, preference is a fair thing. Under certain circumstances, and admitting certain conditions, preference should be given to any unionists who can secure that privilege from the employers in the callings in which they are concerned. Many unionists in Queensland have secured that preference, but henceforward by the passage of this Bill that right will be taken away from them. If they, by their voluntary action, have secured preference to unionists from the employers, henceforward that privilege will not stand, but is to be taken away from them. The right for which they have fought is no longer to be permitted them. I say that is a scandalous trampling under foot of the rights and privileges of the workers of this State, and, because of that, this Bill should not be permitted to pass. It is all the more scandalous that this novel principle of prohibiting preference to unionists was put in this measure, and members of the Opposition were not permitted to discuss it. It is contained in clause 3^d of the Bill, which went through under the guillotine. There were other principles, perhaps not so important but just as pernicious, which went through under the operation of the guillotine. I should like to call the attention of members to the limited meaning given in the definition of "lockout" in the Bill. Clause 35 makes strikes and lockouts unlawful. It pretends to place a burden upon the employer, equal to the burden placed upon the

employee, by making lockouts unlawful as well as strikes. But the fact of the matter is that under the definition of "lockout" what is called a strike is, in certain instances, really a lockout, as we understand it in ordinary industrial affairs. There may be a decision on the part of the employers in a certain calling to reduce wages, or otherwise to adversely affect the conditions of employment so far as the employees are concerned, and, under ordinary circumstances, and in ordinary industrial parlance, that would be a lockout on the part of the employer; but under the provisions of the Bill that is a strike. This definition of "lockout" as a term which includes a strike was not permitted to be discussed while the Bill was in Committee, and the clause went through under the guillotine. The definition of "lockout" reads as follows:—

"The act of an employer in closing his place of business, or suspending or discontinuing his business or any branch thereof, or a refusal or failure by an employer to continue to employ any number of his employees, with intent—"

to do certain things. The actions of an employer might adversely affect the conditions of employment without his discontinuing his business or closing his works, and yet it would be a lockout in the true sense of the term. But if such an action were taken by the employees in resisting encroachments on their rights, and they knocked off work, that action would be described as a strike, for which they would be liable to a fine of £50 for the individual, and at the same time that this penalty was imposed upon them, the magistrate or the judge of the court could cause an order in the nature of an injunction to be taken out against them, and render them liable for further offences to imprisonment for six months. That was a principle in the Bill which the Opposition was afforded no opportunity of amending. Then there was a provision in clause 40, which also went through under the guillotine, and could not be discussed by the Opposition. Under that clause offences of engaging in strikes and lockouts may be tried on a general summons. The mode of service may be by advertisement in a public newspaper. Every person threatening to strike, or even hinting at a strike, can be summoned to attend at a certain place and hear, to be dealt with in just exactly the same manner as if a separate complaint had been laid and a separate summons issued, and, if shown to be guilty of a mere attempt to commit an offence as specified in this measure, can be sentenced to a heavy penalty, and in some cases to imprisonment. These principles are novel in the truest sense of the word, and yet the Opposition members, who are charged with looking after the interests of the workers, have not even had an opportunity of criticising these novel principles. Because of that, I think the third reading should not be gone on with. I have merely touched on the principles which were passed under the operation of the guillotine. There are other principles embodied in this measure, which were carried in the teeth of the greatest opposition on the part of members on this side, and without any reason for their enactment. The principle which was touched upon by the leader of the Opposition with regard to making existing wages

[Mr. Theodore.]

boards into industrial boards under the Bill, whether such boards are giving satisfaction or not, has, I think, been sufficiently dilated upon by the leader of the Opposition. Then there is the objection that no opportunity whatever was given to discuss the various clauses of the Bill in the Committee stage. It is utterly impossible for any party to an award to escape from the jurisdiction of the court, no matter how dissatisfied they may be. If both parties to an award in any particular calling, after twelve months' experience of the operation of the Act, come to the conclusion that it would be better for both parties to remain outside the jurisdiction of this measure, they cannot escape from its operation unless with the consent of the judge, the registrar, and the Minister, and the consent of both parties. I say that that is a thing which should not be permitted. If the employers and employees, after experience of this measure, desire to escape from its jurisdiction, they should be permitted to do so. Then there is this principle contained in the Bill—I would like the non-gentleman who has been in charge of the measure to follow me, because we have not had one word in favour of the principle during the discussion—provision is made for filling certain vacancies that may be caused on the boards. A vacancy may be caused by resignation of a member, and a certain time must elapse before the vacancy can be filled, yet the board has power to sit in the interim during the time the vacancy is being filled, and to make an award.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: But you know the reason for that.

Mr. THEODORE: I know that provision is made to fill vacancies. I want to know why it is that the Government allow a one-sided board possibly to bring in an award favouring the side that has the majority. Provision is made for the board to continue to sit, and the employers on the board may have a majority, and, as a majority rules in these cases, they may bring in a partisan determination, which may be registered. That is a principle which should not be inserted in any measure under any circumstances whatever. The Bill provides that a board may, with respect to the calling for which it has been created, make an award determining any industrial matter or dispute, and that all the powers of the board may be exercised by a majority of the members thereof.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Men were in the habit of resigning in order to hang up the award.

Mr. THEODORE: I do not know what actuated the Minister in framing the clause, but there is no justification in leaving such power in the hands of the majority. Let us fancy the position in any calling where there is a difference of opinion between the two sides. The majority will be able to carry out the functions of the board and bring in an award suiting their particular case. If the employers have a majority they can bring in an award which may be the greatest injustice, and yet that is permitted under this measure. Why was not some provision made to fill such a vacancy temporarily while an ordinary election is taking place, so that the board will not be a one-sided tribunal? There is no justice in such a clause as that, and yet no opportunity was afforded for the matter to be ventilated in Committee. This

is the first opportunity we have had to ventilate the workers' grievance as regards that matter. It is not likely that the evil consequences of the clause will affect the employers, because they will take very good care that they have an opportunity to provide against such a contingency. For a hundred reasons a vacancy may occur on the board, and the employers can take advantage of the situation, and there are employers who would take advantage of it and bring in a partisan determination. Why not allow the employers to fix the determination without consulting the interests of the workers? That principle is established in the clause, and it is a scandalous injustice against the workers who are likely to be affected. The Bill should not pass its third reading without that provision in it. There is a clause also in this measure which makes the association liable for any action of an officer of the association in inciting, aiding, or assisting in a strike. It makes the whole association liable to a penalty of £1,000 because of the action of one officer, whether that action was disavowed by the association or not. Can the Hon. the Secretary for Public Works justify such a provision as that? There are certain unions in Queensland that have 100 officers—officers in every centre of the State—and it would be a wonder if there were not among so many officers one person who is not, to some extent on some question, irresponsible. And because of a possible action of that man the association is liable to a penalty of £1,000; and the judge of the court or other judicial officer in trying the case has no option but to impose a penalty, even if the association disavowed the action. Is there any justice in that? Should we pass the Bill while it contains such a provision? No opportunity was afforded to discuss this in the Committee stages. Because of provisions like that the Bill should never pass, and if it does it will be an incitement to the workers of the State to oppose it, to refuse to come under its domination and coercion, to refuse to carry out its provisions, to refuse to abide by it in any respect whatever. It is evidently a partisan measure; it discriminates against workers, particularly organised workers. Where is the justification for that? The court may attach the funds or property of an association because of the offence of a member, unless the association can show that it did positively attempt to prevent the member taking the action for which he was liable. There are certain unions in Queensland that have 12,000 members. Can they always be watching those members individually, and hearing everything that is said by them? Can they reasonably be expected to prevent every individual member of their association from taking some action which may be interpreted to be an offence against this measure? It is utterly impossible to do so. And yet that is one of the provisions which was guillotined and bludgeoned through the Committee, without giving an opportunity to members who are interested in this question to discuss it and point out its defects. Because of these provisions a member of this House would not be doing his duty if he did not make a protest, whenever opportunities offered, against the measure becoming law. When the workers thoroughly understand the purpose of this legislation, is it likely that they will meekly submit to it? There is encouragement for them to resist legislation which is manifestly directed

Mr. Theodore]

against them unfairly, and without any reason or cause. This measure imposes obligations and duties on men whose relations with their employers are amicable, and makes offences things which they have been in the habit of doing every day of their lives without considering them to be offences. The observance in every day of industrial life of the provisions of an agreement which prescribes preference to unionists is not accounted an offence, but under this measure, so soon as it becomes law, it will become an offence. Any member who knows of these things in the Bill and will allow it to pass its third reading is not doing justice to himself or to his country. We on this side stand for freedom and industrial fair play; therefore I shall vote against the third reading.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): Before the Bill is read a third time, I must again enter my protest against it. Anyone who listened to the speech of the leader of the Opposition, or the deputy leader, must admit, if facts have any impression on his mind, that, instead of being a charter of liberty, this Bill is one of those measures which abrogates some of the essential liberties which we as citizens enjoy. It was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition that it suspends one of the privileges granted by Magna Charta—the privilege of the right to be tried by jury. I think it will be generally admitted that in times of industrial upheaval there is a considerable amount of excitement. Feeling is consequently engendered; and without wishing in any way to pass any reflection on those who occupy high and responsible positions as police magistrates, I think it will not be gainsaid that these men sometimes, unconsciously possibly, impose penalties out of all proportion to the offence committed. Therefore, it is advisable that the question of committing an offence under this Bill should be left to the calm deliberation of twelve jurymen, possibly some time after the alleged offence had been committed. Very likely a more correct determination would be arrived at under those circumstances as to whether the prisoner was guilty or not. We may rest assured that the judge occupying the bench would impose upon a prisoner a sentence which would be more in accord with justice. We heard from the Hon. the Chief Secretary something about the tyranny of the Trades Hall. It is one of those vague phrases which form the stock-in-trade of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. It is used by them whenever they consider the occasion suitable as a justification for measures of this kind; but I venture to say that the Trades [7.30 p.m.] Hall is anything but guilty of tyranny; and it ill becomes the Premier to talk about tyranny in connection with the Trades Hall. We shall get plenty of it under this measure. The Premier said one of the chief reasons why the Bill should pass was that the general body of the workers can get justice without an appeal to unionism. I differ from that opinion. I strongly incline to the view that they will get anything but justice. The provisions of the Bill seem to be drafted specially for the purpose of denying them justice. It has been strongly urged by members on the front Treasury benches that one of the main principles to secure justice to the workers is the fact that they be allowed to elect their own representatives, who must be men working in the industry, and will therefore be better qualified to adjudicate

[*Mr. Theodore.*

on the men's claims than an outsider. Notwithstanding all the arguments used in this direction, the Governor in Council can come along and up-end the whole award. In view of the past attitude of the Government in connection with wages boards' awards, the reason is not far to discover why such a provision has been inserted in the Bill, and I say without hesitation that it is there for the specific purpose of enabling the Government, when the occasion demands, to come to the assistance of their friends, the employing class.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You know that is not so.

Mr. KIRWAN: Whatever views I may give expression to in this House, I hope hon. members will give me credit for honesty. I give that opinion honestly as my view of the matter. It may be wrong, but it is my honest opinion. It was also pointed out by the deputy leader of the Opposition that the Bill denies preference to unionists. I think it should be made clear that we do not wish it to be provided in the Bill that no man except a unionist, and no worker except a member of an organisation, shall get work; we only claim that the judge, if he thinks it desirable in the interests of industrial peace to grant preference to unionists, shall have power to do so. We know why this power is not left to the discretion of the judge; and it is another link in the chain of evidence against the Government that they are out for one particular purpose in connection with the Bill. We find that in all the awards given under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in New Zealand the judge has exercised the power of giving preference to unionists. Of course, he lays down certain conditions; and the deputy leader of the Opposition clearly stated that if preference to unionists is given by the judge it involves certain conditions and duties. It is not a lopsided affair like this Bill. I think, in view of the declaration of the Premier that the Bill is a novel Bill, that it ignores all previous experience in connection with industrial legislation, the hon. gentleman should not have availed himself of the Standing Orders to stifle discussion. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman will adopt a similar course in connection with the Liquor Bill. I venture to say that he will not.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. KIRWAN: I venture to say that I can interpret plain English as well as the next member of the House; and I understood him to say plainly, by way of interjection, when somebody suggested that he would guillotine the Bill through, that he would do nothing of the kind, that he was not going to bludgeon the Bill through.

The PREMIER: The second reading went through in the ordinary way.

Mr. KIRWAN: I do not know whether the Standing Orders give the hon. gentleman the opportunity to bludgeon a Bill through on the second reading.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes.

Mr. KIRWAN: Other Bills of not nearly as much importance as this one have had more time given to their consideration. This Bill contains several novel provisions, one of which is that if a member of a union at Cape York does something the funds of the whole of the unions connected with the one of which he is a member are liable to be

attacked under the Bill. Can the hon. gentleman deny that? It is a principle that only exists in savagedom, where, if one member of a tribe commits a misdeed, the whole tribe is punished. That is the principle the Chief Secretary has enacted in a Bill in the twentieth century; and the hon. gentleman has the effrontery to defend it on the ground of justice and equity.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: And he says "Hear, hear!" In view of that interjection, we may well consider the hopelessness of expecting anything in the shape of justice from the Government where the workers are concerned. We have the Premier defending a principle that exists only in savagedom.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Where is that?

Mr. KIRWAN: In the South Sea Islands or some part of New Guinea, perhaps. Would the Premier contend that if one of his hundred thousand odd supporters throughout Queensland did something, his Ministry should be hurled from power or made responsible for the action of one of their supporters? That would be just as reasonable as making a union or the funds of a union responsible for the action of one of its members. I contend that if the Premier believes in justice he would insert a clause at any rate in the direction of providing the necessary proof first, that the union was aiding and abetting the action of this particular official—that he was doing it with their consent. If that was done, and the action of which he was found guilty was an offence, then it would be a reasonable thing, possibly, to attach the union and its official if they had aided and abetted this particular individual. But the Bill in this respect is most unjust and unfair. But it is what we might expect from the occupants of the front Treasury bench. I do not intend to touch at any further length upon the Bill. In fact, I think the main objections have been fully and clearly stated both by the leader and the deputy leader of the Opposition, and all I can say is that if the Premier thinks this Bill is a charter of liberty, then his ideas and the ideas of members on this side of the House are entirely different. If he thinks this charter of liberty is going to do anything in the direction of stopping the onward march of unionism, then he is going to accomplish something that has never yet been accomplished in this world. He is going to accomplish a miracle, and I doubt very much whether, in the twentieth century, the hon. member, with all his majority, the Press behind him, and the powers and machinery of this Bill, is going to affect his purposes. There is no disguising the fact that this Bill has been introduced for a specific purpose. It has been hurried through this Chamber, and amendments on it have been refused, but I say the fact that the Premier has been returned by the country with the majority that he has is no reason why this course should have been adopted. And I venture to say that if the hon. member had gone throughout the country and told the people of Queensland that he was going to make the whole of the members of unions, comprising 10,000 men, with their funds, responsible for the action of one individual; if he had pointed out that, notwithstanding all the machinery of this Bill, the Government could upset any award under it that did not please them or

their friends; if he had told them that he intended to refuse to register under the provisions of this Bill any agreements that are at the present time in force, I am afraid he would not have secured the majority that he has. There have been instances quoted of agreements in force which, under this Bill, will become inoperative.

The PREMIER: The same old repetition.

Mr. KIRWAN: The repetition of truth is unpleasant to the Premier, and it is no reply to the arguments on this side of the House to call them repetition. The hon. member, in his attempt to reply to the leader of the Opposition, only proved the strength of his statements, and he may call out "Repetition" as often as he likes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member, in the course of his remarks, has referred to an interjection by the Chief Secretary. Neither the interjection nor the reply thereto is in order, and I ask the hon. member to confine himself to the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. KIRWAN: In conclusion, I only wish to say that it is plainly evident that the Bill will pass its third reading, not because it has justice or equity in it, but simply because of the power of numbers. I have no doubt it will be received with acclamation from the Employers' Federation, in whose special interest it is specially prepared. I have nothing further to add, but to offer my humble protest against the passage of the third reading of this Bill, and again to express the opinion that the Bill will not accomplish the aims of the Ministry in the direction of bringing about industrial peace nor in the direction of smashing the unions of Queensland.

Mr. GILLIES (*Eacham*): I think the petition presented to this House to-night by the hon. the leader of the Opposition should be a suitable reply to the Premier's statement that this measure is what the workers of Queensland have been looking for. I feel sure the Premier will not pretend to make this House think that the Employers' Federation is not behind this Bill after the acceptance last night of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Burrum. It is a well-known fact that the Australian Sugar Producers' Association and the Employers' Federation are now affiliated for political purposes, and it is also well known that the hon. member for Burrum is a prominent member of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association. So in moving the resolution he did he would have the Australian Sugar Producers' Association behind him, and he moved something which we know must have the endorsement of the Employers' Federation. The object of including the sugar-field workers in this Bill is to bring about a reduction in wages. It is well known that the Australian Sugar Producers' Association is representative of the manufacturers of sugar in Queensland. Some people pretend to think the Australian Sugar Producers' Association is a farmers' organisation, but I desire to inform this House that the Sugar Growers' Union of Australia is the official mouthpiece of the sugar-growers of Australia. The Australian Sugar Producers' Association has for its object the wellbeing of the manufacturers, and so the hon. member in including the sugar-workers had no other object, but to reduce wages. I would like to ask the hon. members who are crying

Mr. Gillies.]

stinking fish so much with regard to the sugar industry, do they believe the wages prescribed by the Minister for Customs of £1 10s. per week and food are too high?

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: £1 16s. per week and food.

Mr. GILLIES: I would like to ask any gentleman sitting opposite to say by interjection if he thinks an industry protected by Customs duty to the extent of £6 per ton should not be able to pay £1 16s. a week and food.

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: It is protected to the extent of £5 per ton.

Mr. GILLIES: That is the effective protection now. The Customs duty is £6 per ton. Surely they cannot say that £1 16s. a week and food is too much to pay to the worker. All those gentlemen are silent. I take it for granted they are quite willing to admit that £1 16s. a week and food is not too much for an industry to pay that is protected to the extent the sugar industry is. In their attitude with regard to the sugar industry our friends who are trying to fight fair wages are playing with fire. It is well known that a great many of their own supporters in the Federal House are freetraders, and that the duty on sugar will be reduced if they are not careful. Why do we hear such an outcry about the harassing conditions brought in by the Minister for Trade and Customs? I take it that the hon. member, who is a prominent member of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association—

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: Who is?

Mr. GILLIES: The hon. member for Burrum.

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: I beg your pardon, I do not belong to the Australian Sugar Producers' Association.

Mr. GILLIES: I have the hon. member's word for it. He told me the other day that he was a member.

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: I am not a member.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILLIES: The hon. member repudiates it now, and I accept his denial. The other hon. member who spoke so strongly with regard to the conditions in the sugar industry—the hon. member for Mirani—will no doubt also dispute his connection with the Australian Sugar Producers' Association. I contend that the Australian Sugar Producers' Association is the manufacturers' association, and that a resolution passed by a manufacturers' association cannot be in the interests of the growers; and I want to make it clear that any resolution passed by the manufacturers or Colonial Sugar Refining Company cannot be in favour of the growers or workers. I desire to call the attention of the House to some of the profits that have been made by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company so show that this industry can pay a fair wage. It is passing strange that all the members on the other side who affect to have the welfare of the sugar-workers at heart have never taken any steps to fix the price of sugar-cane. They are quite agreeable for the abolition of the bounty and excise, and they are quite agreeable at the same time to leave the sugar-worker and the sugar-grower to the tender mercies of a huge monopoly. The sugar-workers need not worry themselves any more, because the sugar industry, being a

[*Mr. Gillies.*

Commonwealth industry, the sugar-workers will have an opportunity of going before the Arbitration Court. That being so, the hon. member for Burrum need not be so anxious to include the sugar-workers in this Bill. What is the position of the farmer? If the wishes of the hon. member for Burrum and other members who think as he thinks were accomplished, the position of the worker would be all right, because he would go to the Arbitration Court; but the small farmer would be at the tender mercies of the sugar monopoly. If those hon. members were concerned about the wellbeing of the small farmer, they would make some attempt to regulate by Act of Parliament the price of cane at the mill, just as they are now trying to regulate wages. The farmer has been used as a catspaw to fight against the regulation of £1 16s. a week and keep, in order to bolster up the profits of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. I want to quote some figures, if I am in order, to show that the sugar industry can pay decent wages. I want to point out to the House that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company has paid a 10 per cent. dividend to their idle shareholders plus—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think hon. members will admit that I have allowed the hon. member considerable latitude. The question of the incorporation of the sugar-workers is a detail of the principle contained in the Bill. I have allowed the hon. member considerable latitude, and I hope he is not going into further details.

Mr. GILLIES: I am sorry if I have transgressed the Standing Orders, but I merely wished to show that this industry is not in the frightful position some people affect to think it is, and being one of the leading Queensland industries, I thought I was justified in making that explanation. I also wish to point out that, so far as this Bill is concerned, the sugar-workers have been included—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not wish the hon. member to feel that I desire to curtail his remarks. He is at perfect liberty to deal with the subject generally, but I hope he will not go into details, because if I allowed other hon. members just the same privilege in connection with other industries the discussion would become interminable. The hon. member is perfectly in order in discussing the matter in a general way.

Mr. GILLIES: I want to point out that although Parliament has included sugar-workers under the provisions of this Bill, the sugar-workers of Australia have power under the Constitution Act to go to the Federal Arbitration Court, which I am quite satisfied they will do, particularly now that it is the desire of the Government to include them in a coercive measure of this kind with the object of lowering wages. I am not going to take up much more time, but I wish to refer again to a very serious defect in the Bill itself, inasmuch as it does not recognise the organisation of employers nor the organisation of employees. For that reason, we on this side believe when the Bill becomes law we shall be in the position of being able to say to the Government, "We told you so," because the Bill will be an absolute failure as far as bringing the employer and the employee together and the bringing about of industrial peace are concerned.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): On behalf of the great body of workers whom we represent in the country, I want to give a reason why we have supported [8 p.m.] this Bill right through. We realised that the worker has a perfect right to get the most he can for his labour, because his labour is like the capital of the other party. He has as much right to get the highest price for his labour as the capitalist has to get the highest interest for his capital. We have not tried to put anything at all in the way of the worker, but have endeavoured to give him every facility to adjust his difficulties and get the highest wage he can without striking and without injuring others. The object of the Bill is to allow the worker that privilege. Just after the strike—if we may take an object lesson from it, which I hope we shall—I travelled through several country districts and found that many farmers who had had nothing whatever to do with the strike had lost as much as £4 or £5 from their receipts during that month on account of the strike. That shows that the freedom of other people has caused loss to those who had no control whatever over it, and that is the thing we want to stop if we possibly can. We realise that the war that is going to be fought out will not be between dreadnoughts and between nations, but that it is an industrial war. We realise that if this State is going to hold her own and prosper as she ought, we must have some means by which the worker can get his right and get all that belongs to him without injuring other people, and without injuring trade, as that would injure himself. We realise that trade is the foundation of the success of any nation, and that without trade no nation can prosper. That is the reason we want to stop the workers from injuring themselves. We realise also that we are paying our workers as high wages as we can, and everyone knows that we do not want to see the position here that they are placed in in the old country. But, at the same time, we have to recognise that we are at war with such conditions, and this Bill is to help us to fight those conditions and give to our workers their proper rights, without injuring our own trade. We have seen the results of strikes, and we see something worse at the present time. We see that our workers have been driven out of employment, and that trade has been driven to other countries—that many men looking for work are actually wearing clothes that have been made by sweated labour for a third of the wages that our workers are getting here. That is one of the things that we want to stop—we want to give our workers the right to compete with other countries. We say that if we can get security for both masters and men, whereby masters can undertake contracts with the assurance that the men will work right through to completion, we shall have a better chance of competing with people in other countries. The less money we send away the more money we shall have here to pay our workers with. Strikes are something like bush fires. I do not agree with the remarks made about the workers by some members on the opposite side. I did not hear the remarks myself, but if the newspapers are correct, the hon. member for Bundaberg described our workers as men learning to shoot, and as looking out to shoot each other; and the leader of the Opposition talked about men going to fill

the gaols. That is not the kind of worker I know—the worker I know is a man who builds his home, takes an interest in the community, and supports our churches. (Opposition laughter.) If our churches depended on what they got from the rich they would not get much. This Bill is not brought forward in the interests of the masters, because I know a great many of them are against it—I believe there are more masters against it than men.

Mr. COYNE: Are the farmers against it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I think not. I have never heard one of them speak against it. The farmers, as a body, are the most intelligent men in the State. There is no class of men who get their homes and secure independence quicker than farm labourers. It is a very common thing for men to get their homes after they have been working for a short time.

Mr. HUNTER: They are not interested in this Bill.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They are interested in the Bill in this way: that if a strike occurs down here they are the men who have to pay for it. We do not grumble if the dock workers get a rise in wages; but that is put on to our products which we export, and we are the people who pay. We cannot have our ports shut up, and our produce stopped, and things rotting on the ground just to oblige a few men in Brisbane. That is why we favour this Bill. If our ports are closed down we shall be compelled to come down here and handle our own stuff and put it in the ships. We do not want to do it, but we shall certainly have to do it if necessary. It is well known that we are sending away £12,000,000 in gold more than what we are receiving, and if we keep sending our money away for clothing, boots, and other things, instead of making them ourselves, what are we going to come to? This Bill is going to create confidence between masters and men, and instead of the employee being the least trusted, and always being called out by somebody else, it will make the working man the leading man in the country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: This Bill is more in the interests of the worker than in the interests of capital.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN (*Burrum*): I wish for a few minutes to reply to the remarks I have heard from the other side, with regard more particularly to the amendment which I introduced last night. I was not present in the Chamber when the leader of the Opposition spoke, being at a meeting elsewhere, but I am given to understand that he practically laid it down that the object of the amendment was to cut down the rate of wages.

Mr. RYAN: So it was.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: That statement has been so frequently refuted that it is hardly necessary to go over the same ground again. It must be within the range of knowledge of the hon. gentleman that the object of bringing in that amendment was to arrive at some system of settling the great question that is very much troubling the minds of most of our public men throughout Queensland to-day—that is, the sugar question. The idea of reducing or increasing wages was not contemplated for a moment;

Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.]

it was but an evidence of our desire to carry out an offer made by the Premier of Queensland to the Prime Minister of Australia—an offer which formed part of a despatch which was tabled by the Premier in this Chamber a few days ago. In that despatch the hon. gentleman offered to do certain things, if doing those things would enable the Federal Government to pursue a line of action which would, practically, preserve one of our most important industries—the sugar industry. It was in furtherance of that offer, as hon. members opposite know perfectly well, that my amendment was proposed yesterday and carried. So far from it being anything in the nature of an effort to reduce wages, it practically gives legislative effect to an object which the present Minister for Trade and Customs must have had in his mind's eye when he introduced the Sugar Bounty Bill, which has just passed its second reading in the Federal House. It is laid down in one of the sections of that Bill. The Minister for Trade and Customs, in his second-reading speech on the Bill, actually referred on one of the clauses to such a tribunal as that which I sought to establish by the incorporation of my amendment yesterday.

Mr. RYAN: What section is that?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: It is to be found in the Federal *Hansard*.

Mr. RYAN: He did not recommend a tribunal like this.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Subsection (4) of the proposed new section 9 of the Sugar Bounty Bill, to which I have just referred, reads thus—

“If the Minister finds that the rates of wages and conditions of employment or any of them are below the standard rates and conditions of employment prescribed by any Commonwealth or State industrial authority—”

something may happen; and it was with a view to creating a State authority for the settlement of these points that my amendment of yesterday was introduced. I take it that is sufficient, at all events, to refute the statement made by the leader of the Opposition when he said the amendment was brought in merely for the purpose of lowering wages. Leaving that aspect of the question, I find that it has also been said that it was simply brought in with a view to securing—at a later stage, perhaps—the abolition of the duty on sugar altogether.

Mr. RYAN: Not with that object—with that effect.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: It does not very much matter. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know that the fixed policy of Australia, irrespective of party, at the present time, is one of protection. I would ask how in the name of common sense can the abolition or equalisation of excise and bounty affect the duty on sugar? The tariff question, as hon. gentlemen know as well as I do, is something quite apart from the excise and bounty. The two things are quite separate, and a Bill might be introduced by the Federal Government to-morrow abolishing excise and bounty altogether, without the tariff being interfered with one iota.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[*Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.*]

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: We know full well that there is no desire to raise that question; although I might point out how difficult it is to secure any enthusiastic support on behalf of this industry from hon. members opposite, even though some of them represent the sugar-growers. We have heard a good deal—at all events I have heard a great deal—from the other side of the House about the sugar industry being a spoonfed industry. What is the protection which we obtain at the present time? It is practically only £5 per ton. It amounts practically to about 4d. per lb. on the sugar consumed. It amounts to something like 5s. per head of the population of the Commonwealth. Compare that with other protected industries throughout Australia. Compare that with boots, hats, clothing, or any other article that one wears or eats, and you will discover that, so far from this much-maligned industry being a spoonfed one, it is one which has grown up in opposition to, rather than by the support of, those people who are depreciating it.

Mr. GILLIES: Get on to the third reading of the Bill.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: I am getting on to the remarks made by the members on the other side. I should like to point out that the occasion is too grave for anyone to make a statement that is not absolutely reliable. The sugar industry at the present moment is practically hanging in the balance. It depends entirely on the attitude of those who, at the present time, are charged with the government of this great country whether that industry is to continue to prosper and develop, or whether it is to be abolished altogether. Those of us who have watched the growth of that industry, who have participated in the transforming of that industry from a coloured labour to a white-labour industry, have been pleased to see the stubborn fight that is being put up in its defence by those engaged in it. Those of us who have watched that fight would be sorry to think that any legislative action would be taken that was calculated to strangle the glorious efforts put forth by the pioneers of the industry.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: What about cheap labour?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Does not the very provision which I have sought to put into this Bill, abolish once and for ever any question of cheap labour? How is it possible with a tribunal such as I understand this will be, that we can have cheap labour? All that we have asked for is to be treated like any other industry, to be given the right and freedom to expand and develop along lines which are honourable, honest, and just. It is very desirable on an occasion like this that men should weigh well every word they utter, lest they should give a false impression. My remarks refer to the hon. member for Eacham.

Mr. GILLIES: The hon. member for Eacham knows more about the sugar industry than you do.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: His knowledge appears to me to have begun at the wrong end. While he is endeavouring to pose as the most learned man on his side on sugar matters, he is displaying the most lamentable ignorance, even of the conditions which obtain at the present time, or which are sought to be brought about by Mr. Tudor's regulation. He did not even know the regulation until I corrected him. He

did not know the rate of wages which the regulations sought to enforce, until it was told him from this side of the Chamber. On the very first principles he displayed that ignorance, which has been so dreadfully fatal to this most important industry in days gone by, and which still threatens it to-day.

Mr. GILLIES: What about the ignorance in the *Courier* this morning?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: It is but one step further to refer to the statement that I am a prominent member of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association.

Mr. GILLIES: So you are.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: May I reiterate once for all that, so far from being a prominent member of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association, I am not a member of that body at all.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You will have Pritchard after you.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: So far as Mr. Pritchard is concerned, I have as much to do with him as the hon. member, which is not very much. Nor am I concerned very much with the Australian Sugar Producers' Association. My only concern—and it is a real concern, not for the purpose of advertising myself or any particular society—my only concern is the interest I have in the men who form a large proportion of my constituents—namely, the sugar-growers. It is their interests that I am here to protect and conserve. The hon. gentleman has tried to show that we are desirous of reducing wages by bringing these men under the provision of the Bill. So far from that being our object, our desire is merely to place them on the same plane as the men employed in any other industry—to give them the same measure of protection and the same legal privileges. We have done that, and I think my arguments have been sufficient to show that it was absolutely necessary that a legal tribunal should be appointed, and that excise and bounty should be abolished if the industry is to be carried on. I submit that the figures and evidence I gave conclusively prove that the industry is unable to meet the increased burden laid on it by the latest regulation. The hon. member sought to get away from the point.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think it will be admitted that I have given the hon. member ample latitude in answering the remarks of the hon. member for Chillagoe; and I must ask him to confine his attention to the question of the third reading of the Bill.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: My object was not to transgress the laws of debate, but to deal with the remarks that fell from members opposite. I submit that your custom has always been of the most courteous kind in allowing us to reply to any charges made by members on the other side. I was pursuing that line, and was endeavouring to show that our object in bringing these men under the provisions of the Bill was to improve the conditions of the sugar industry. I think it is my province to pursue that line of action. The title of the Bill is "The Industrial Peace Bill"; and anything calculated to promote industrial peace, not in one particular industry only but also in other industries, should be encouraged; so

I think if I am able to show that the passage of the third reading of this Bill is calculated to advance the interests of any particular industry I am pursuing a line of action which you will not find fault with.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will be quite in order in doing so, and I hope he will confine his attention to that phase of the discussion and not, as he has done during the last fifteen minutes, deal with objections taken by some members on the Opposition side to actions of his taken in the House. The hon. member will be in order if he follows the line he suggested himself, and I hope he will follow that line.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: It has been stated that instead of this Bill bringing about industrial peace it will have the very opposite effect. Reference has [8.30 p.m.] been made to the operations of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. While I hold no brief for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, and, unfortunately, no shares in that company, I say their negotiations, their transactions, and also their attitude, so far as I am aware, have always been honourable and up to the mark. It must be recognised that it is impossible to take out of an industry more than there is in it, and we must recognise also that labour conditions should be of such a nature as to ensure to the worker a fair living wage—fair conditions of life which will enable him to make a home for himself. We submit that can only be brought about by realising that there is more than one party to be considered, and that we have to consider the requirements of all parties. If I were to consider only the position of the worker under this Bill and leave out altogether the position of the grower, I would be doing wrong. The sugar-grower is as much a worker as the man usually termed "sugar-worker." There are numbers of men growing cane on small areas, and those men are just as much workers as the men they employ. We are bound to take into consideration the numerous circumstances that may lead up to the welfare, directly or indirectly, of the men engaged in the industry, and that is my justification for bringing in the question of bounty and excise in connection with the industry. By the term "sugar-worker," I do not merely mean the employee, but also the employer. The deputy leader of the Opposition says that is too thin, or that I do not mean it. Let me tell the hon. member what the Prime Minister of Australia said on this question, as will be found on page 3120 of the Federal *Hansard* for 1912, volume xxv. I quote from that volume the views of the present-time Minister when speaking in the year 1905. He then said—

"There is no justification either for the excise or the bounty, except the fact that white men are struggling in an industry which is not carried on by white men in any other part of the world."

Later on he says—

"Every increase in the excise duty upon sugar diminishes the price paid to the labour engaged in its production. Every additional £1 that we impose by way of excise means that £1 per ton less is paid to the producer of the raw material."

Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.]

That is the small sugar-grower. Then again he says—

“In the very first communication that I had with the Government I stated that, in my opinion, the whole of the excise duty should go to the white grower, and I believe that if the electors of Australia were polled that would be their view.”

That is what we are asking for at the present moment. The present Minister of Trade and Customs also expressed his views in 1905, when he said—

“I am willing to extend to the growers of white sugar in Queensland a fair amount of protection, and if we are not prevented from doing so by the Constitution, I should be in favour of increasing the excise duty on black grown sugar and abolishing it altogether so far as the white-grown product is concerned.”

Mr. LENNON: That is equalisation.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: The hon. member knows that abolition and equalisation are entirely different propositions. I submit that both the Federal Prime Minister in the statement which I have quoted, and the Federal Minister for Customs in his statement of 1905, practically bound themselves to give that for which we are now clamouring. We have shown our earnestness in this matter as the Premier did in his memo. to the Prime Minister. The Premier offered in a most generous manner to remove any apparent obstacles which stood in the way of bringing in such a measure of assistance to the sugar-worker as the abolition of the excise and bounty would give. Closely coupled with industrial peace is industrial prosperity. Unless you have the one, the other is of little value. You cannot have industrial peace if you have industrial poverty, for the two things are absolute contradictions of each other. Anybody approaching this measure from a statesman's point of view, and not merely from a party standpoint, must go a little deeper than simply seeing how certain individuals are going to be affected. He must view it in a broad spirit, and see how the State is going to be pushed forward by it. In the amendment I introduced I was actuated by a desire to work in the interests of all classes. This industry affects other industries. Take my own electorate, where one of the largest industries outside of the sugar industry is coal. The coalmines at Howard and Burrum employ directly and indirectly 500 or 600 men, and in looking over the figures the other day I discovered that about a third of the output is absorbed by sugar work. If you cripple the sugar industry, you immediately affect the coalmining industry. The coalmining industry affects the revenue of your railways, and in a hundred and one other different ways various other industries of the State are indirectly concerned in the prosperity or otherwise of the sugar industry. I should like to point out that in advocating industrial peace, I am advocating means for obtaining the greatest prosperity for an industry. It should be remembered that the sugar industry, with the very small amount of protection it enjoys, is called upon to compete in the matter of the sale of its product with sugar produced in other countries by coloured labour. The other protected industries of the Commonwealth, such as the hat, boot, and

[Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.

machinery industries, which have been quoted, have only to compete against labour of a similar kind in other countries. Let us see for a moment how, in the matter of protection, we stand in relation to other countries. The Louisiana and Hawaii sugar industries of the United States are protected to the extent of £9 per ton, against our £5. In United South Africa they have a protective duty of £3 10s. a ton, whilst the cost of labour in the field is 2d. an hour. In Japan they have a protective duty of £3 15s. a ton, and the cost of labour there is 1d. an hour. In Spain they have a protective duty of £34 10s., and the cost of labour is 3d. an hour. In Fiji there is a protective duty of £2 6s. 8d. per ton, and the cost of the labour is 1d. an hour. In the Argentine the protective duty is £35 a ton, and the labour costs 4d. to 5d. per hour. I think I have shown very clearly that so far from striving to inflict an injustice on the people of Australia, we are merely striving to build up a most important industry under most adverse conditions. We are competing successfully with those countries who have a far higher protection in proportion to the cost of their labour. Let us look at it again from a still greater standpoint, and that is from the national point of view. We know what this industry means to the whole of Australia. We know that if the industry was wiped out to-morrow it would sound the death knell to the development of the whole of our north-eastern seaboard. It is the only form of agriculture which at the present time lends itself to the climatic conditions of our north-eastern lands, and if we are going to be Australians in the true sense of the term and have an eye to the development and defence of our country, then we must be very careful before we place any obstacle in the way of its development. We know how the Federal Government is agitating its mind at the present time over the settlement of the Northern Territory, and we know that even there the fate of this industry will be a very big factor in the fate of the Territory. We know still further, coming nearer home, as was stated by the Treasurer in his visit to Melbourne the other day, that on passing the Sugar Works Act through this House, the Government proposed to launch out, and develop those Northern lands by the construction of further mills.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must again ask the hon. member to accede to the request I made, and deal with the third reading of the Bill. I am entirely at a loss to know how the hon. member can connect his remarks with regard to the development of the Northern Territory or the development of North-eastern Australia with the third reading of this Bill.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: They say the best way to secure peace is to be prepared for war, and I submit that the settlement of our north-eastern seaboard will bring about peace for Australia. I honestly believe that all members are actuated by a desire to do the best they can for this country, but let us try to work along lines that are calculated to lead to a successful issue. I am quite sure that, so far as the passage of this Bill is concerned, instead of proving a cause of strife, it will do more than any other effort that has been put forward by this House to secure industrial peace and quietude. It has been very fully discussed,

and I had no intention of rising to debate the third reading, if it had not been necessary to reply to some of the statements made by our friends opposite. I feel assured that, notwithstanding the amount of censure the Bill has received, it will be hailed with a feeling of delight throughout the State of Queensland.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): It is rather sad to have to listen to some of the remarks made by members on the other side in their repetition that this Bill is something in the interests of the worker, when every little child of six years of age knows otherwise. The Premier said he gave ample opportunity for the discussion of this measure, and that he did not gag it. If by gagging is meant the suppression of discussion, well, he certainly gagged it, although under our Standing Orders this form of gag is known under the name of the guillotine. The Hon. the Premier said that he did not gag it on the second reading. The hon. gentleman knows, and he must also know that every hon. member knows, we cannot discuss the details of a Bill on the second reading; that the only place where we can discuss details is in Committee. We were not allowed to discuss the details of the Bill in Committee, as free speech was suppressed. This new-found desire of the hon. gentleman to push business through as rapidly as possible is rather strange. I remember that last session there was another matter which was not one tithe of the importance to the community as a Bill of this description is, and still the hon. gentleman allowed the discussion on that matter to go on week after week for fourteen weeks. That was the Liquor Bill. It went on from 1st October to 9th January. There were a few things sandwiched in between in the same manner as a few things were sandwiched in between the discussions on this Bill, which has been going on for only seven weeks.

The PREMIER: There were more days in Committee on this Bill than on the Liquor Bill.

Mr. COYNE: I say the incidence of this Bill is of far greater importance to the community than the Liquor Bill, all important as that Bill may be. Therefore, the freest and fullest discussion should have been allowed on this Bill, which contains a large number of very important principles, a discussion upon which was prevented by the application of the guillotine. We had hon. members on the other side coming along in a nice, captivating manner and telling us—although we know that they had their tongues in their cheek while they were speaking—that this is all for the good of the worker, but now and again something leaks out that showed the disbelief they have in their own statements. The hon. member for Drayton, referring to the agricultural industry, said, "Pay the worker all the industry can afford," but he took fine care not to allow the rural workers—or, at least, the Government did—to come under this Bill.

Mr. FORSYTH: They have no protection.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member reminds me that the rural workers have no protection. Well, if they are so anxious about the rural workers, why not include them in the Bill, if it is going to be such a fine thing? I compliment the rural workers on not

being brought under the Bill. The hon. member for Drayton also said that no man secures independence quicker than the farm labourer does. It is very well known to a number of us that a very large number of our farmers' sons do not stay at home in order to secure their independence so quickly. We find them in the shearers' camp, and everywhere else, rather than on the farm where the hon. member says they secure their independence so quickly. If this Bill was a protection to the worker I would endeavour as strongly as I could to get the rural workers included; but I am pleased they are not included in it, because there is no protection for the rural workers nor for anybody else in the Bill, except for one class of workers—the class which never seeks employment, and never gets employment unless some industrial trouble is on. They are the riffraff of humanity.

Mr. B. H. CORSER: The agitator.

Mr. COYNE: Yes; the scab agitator, and the hon. member is a scab agitator, too. I am an agitator for the uplifting of humanity, and I am very glad to be one, and I hope I shall remain one; and I think my past character will compare very favourably with the character of the hon. member. The hon. member for Burrum made a very long speech in support of the removal of the excise and bounty. He said that he was moving in that direction because he did not wish to injure the interests of the people of Australia. I do not think the sugar-growers or the Colonial Sugar Refining Company are the people of Australia—they are a very small portion of the people of Australia. I do not think the Colonial Sugar Refining Company are the great philanthropists the hon. member tries to make out. There is not a year that they do not secure their 10 per cent. profit. They water their stock as much as they can year after year, and we find the same percentage of profit coming along year after year. They are doing very well out of the people of Australia. If the hon. member thinks he is going to safeguard the interests of the people of Australia by safeguarding the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, he is making a great mistake. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company can look after itself. What we want to do is to protect the people of Australia against the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. There is a clause in this Bill which we were not allowed to discuss that would be a positive disgrace to any measure which might be brought in, because it endeavours to set up a sort of class warfare. It does so in a direction which is much to be deplored—that is, in regard to a certain section of public servants—and this is one of the objections I have to offer to the third reading of the Bill. If the Bill passes as it is, a section of our public servants will be brought in who should not lean to any political party. Even if they leaned to the party I belong to myself I should disapprove of their conduct—I am referring to the police. Under this Bill they would be made the machines to carry out certain orders by way of injunction to restrain members of associations, or officers of unions, from repeating certain so-called offences under this Bill. The members of the Police Force would be called upon to come along and apply for an order restraining somebody from doing something that the court decides is an offence. The position will be, when there is no cause for their doing it, as was the case during the

Mr. Coyne.]

shearers' strikes in Queensland in 1891 and 1894, policemen, some in high positions in the force, might go to any extreme at all to crucify working men. They did on the occasions referred to, and they might do it again, and they would expect to be treated in the same magnanimous manner by the powers that are as the powers that were treated their predecessors some sixteen or twenty years ago. It is much to be deplored that any Bill should be passed through this House which lends itself to anything that might make for corruption such as that. If the Labour party were on the Treasury benches to-morrow, and this was allowed to remain as it is, you would find that it would be those who had anything to do with lock-outs—the employing classes—who would be watched by the police in this connection, and for whose restraint the order would be obtained. It would not be just or right for a person to get promotion by the number of persecuting charges he brings against anybody. If that were so, there is no limit that he will not go to in endeavouring to get charges.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What clause are you referring to now?

Mr. COYNE: I am referring to clause 36, under which the court may make an order in the nature of an injunction to restrain associations or persons from committing offences. It was all right for the registrar to carry out this procedure, but it is distinctly wrong to call upon members of the Police Force in any part of Queensland to take such action. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, who is always quoting the New South Wales Act, cannot find anything like that in that measure. I am not going to identify myself with anything passed by the New South Wales Parliament which I do not agree with. If it is antagonistic to my principles, I am not going to associate myself with anything done by any party in New South Wales. There are certain principles in the New South Wales Act which, if included in this Bill, might modify its evil; but they are excluded from it, and this Bill is the very worst that can be conceived by human beings in a class war. Hon. members opposite have said that this Bill will not damage unionism to any great extent. It will not eventually—and it will not temporarily—but I think the object of the Bill is to destroy unionism as much as possible. I think that during the process of the unions coming by their own a great number in the community will suffer, and that is why I do not wish to see the Bill passed as it is now. A strike cannot take place until after fourteen days' notice, and if you get an employer who will torment his men to break such a law as this, they are going to break it; they are not going to be stamped under foot by any employer, and the outcome will be that there will be a case for the court. They have to go to gaol if they cannot pay the fine. An individual member of a union may do something for which they can come down upon the union, and if the union cannot meet the demands they will come down upon any federation for the penalty that that association is affiliated with, and may attach the funds of the federation. I am satisfied that if that is done where there is not a good cause for doing it, and it cannot be shown that the union is a party to the breaking of the law, then there is going to be trouble. If the federation extended all over Queensland, there would

[Mr. Coyne.

be an industrial war such as no man in this Chamber dreams of. It would fill your gaols, but when you again empty your gaols they will empty you into political oblivion. I do not mind that, but the trouble is that during all this process the country is going to suffer to an extent that no one can conceive of.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is remarkable that you are going to be the saviour of the country, after your actions.

Mr. COYNE: I venture to say that, industrially, I have been the saviour of the country a thousand times more than the hon. gentleman could ever be, and that I have done more to promote industrial peace than ever he will do. When anything takes place in an industrial dispute their [9 p.m.] high panjandrum will go about and say, "Let them stew in their own gravy." (Laughter.) That is not the way we propose to cure these evils, but when conditions are forced upon us as they are in the Bill, we are not going to bear any responsibility for the after-effects of such a measure. This is going to lead to interminable trouble, if you take the administration out of the hands of the persons mentioned in the Bill, and hand it over to the police. We have shown time after time that the police have too many duties placed on their shoulders now. From my experience of members of the Police Force, there are a few members of it who will go to any limit to obtain favour with the powers that be, in order to get promotion—and undeserved promotion, too. I know some now well up in the Police Force, and I am sure it is not through their merit they have got promotion, but through spying and doing something that no honourable man would do. And here you are going to give the same means for attaining that object as those by which these have attained their ends—getting them to ask for an order that certain injunctions might be placed on certain persons restraining them from doing certain things or repeating certain things.

I say now, as I have said all through this Bill, that the measure is not going to accomplish what it sets out to do—that, as a matter of fact, the result will be the opposite of what is intended. Finally, I say that while I do not set myself up as a prophet in any way, I have a sufficient knowledge, from a lifelong experience in industrial matters, to know how a coercive measure of this sort will be treated by the workers generally. I know they will not stand any coercion, and this is coercion of the worst form.

Mr. HUNTER: Even the Government won't stand it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Your prophecy failed just a little while ago.

Mr. COYNE: How is that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We were told a certain thing was going to turn up.

Mr. COYNE: I did say that their attempt to destroy industrial unionism was not going to succeed. It may give it a temporary set-back, for only a week or a month, but it will not be for very long; and the temporary set-back will be when a big industrial organisation breaks this law and a desperate crowd, such as we have on the opposite benches, take the law into their own hands and force matters under this nefarious Bill, they will bring about such a state of industrial unrest in the State of

Queensland as will cause a temporary setback to that particular union for that particular time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The industrial unrest that followed in your steps.

Mr. COYNE: That is one of the kind Christian things that one generally gets from the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has no foundation for making a statement, but thinks that if he gets it into *Hansard* there are a few unthinking people who will believe it. I can assure the hon. gentleman in all sincerity that by the time he has done as much as I have to promote industrial peace, he can shake hands with himself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We are brothers.

Mr. COYNE: We are not brothers at all. I do not claim any relationship with the hon. gentleman. (Laughter.) The action of the hon. gentleman in refusing reasonable amendments during the discussion on this Bill, and the action of himself and his colleagues in destroying free speech during the discussion on this Bill in Committee, when the details should have been discussed, shows that there can be no relationship at all in industrial matters between himself and myself. I am not going to delay a vote being taken on this any longer. I shall have very much pleasure, indeed, in casting my vote against it, and if at any other time I have an opportunity of casting my vote against it, I shall do so. When the Bill goes out, and when the results occur from the Bill which I anticipate will occur, I shall lay the flattering unction to my soul that I was not responsible for it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. E. H. Macartney, *Toowoong*): The complaint of the hon. gentleman has been that there has not been enough time allowed to discuss the Bill in Committee. In passing I should like to say that it is a matter of regret that the hon. gentleman should cast aspersions upon the members of the Police Force of all ranks. I think we can say that the members of the Police Force, in the duties they have had to discharge, have acted with the greatest possible fidelity and the greatest possible fairness.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A general charge, such as the hon. gentleman has made against the members of the Police Force, who are not represented in this Chamber, and are not able to defend themselves, is to be much deprecated; and it is not one of those things which is likely to help either himself or his party when they go before the electors again.

Mr. RYAN: What are you trying to make political capital about?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If I can make a little political capital I shall be very glad to do it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman ever does anything else. I do not think he should claim a monopoly of it. The hon. member has no cogent reason whatever to offer against the third reading of the Bill. I should like to point out that if there is any clause in this Industrial Peace Bill that has not been sufficiently discussed, it has not been for want of time for the Opposition to do it; it is by reason of the concentration of the discussion in the earlier portion of each compartment. I have taken from *Hansard* the

time that has been occupied over the discussion of this Bill, and also, incidentally, the number of pages of *Hansard* the discussion on the second reading and on the initiation of the Bill takes up. The Bill was initiated as far back as 24th July last, and twenty-seven pages were devoted to the discussion of the initiation. The Bill was then before the country, and has been ever since. The second reading was opened on 31st July by a speech delivered by the Secretary for Works, in which the Bill was explained in all its provisions; and time was given to the Opposition to enable them to consider the Bill before they had to enter upon the discussion of it, which was not until 7th August, when it was taken up by the member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Bowman. The second reading of the Bill took six full days, and the discussion in *Hansard* occupies something like 180 pages—or, to be more correct, 179 pages.

Mr. THEODORE: Just as many Ministerial members as Labour members spoke.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The monopoly of discussion is not altogether on the other side; when statements are made on that side it is the duty of this side to reply. The point I wish to make is that the Bill has been particularly fully discussed. I have stated the position on the second reading. The Sessional Order passed by the House provided eleven days for the discussion of the Bill in Committee. For Part I. of the Bill, which contains five clauses, two days were set apart; for Part II., which contains clauses 6 to 18, two days were set apart; to Part III., containing clauses 19 to 30, two days were assigned; to Part IV., containing clauses 31 to 34, one day was allotted; to Part V., clauses 35 to 41, two days were assigned; to Part VI., clauses 42 to 60, one day was assigned; and one day set apart for the schedules. The hon. member for Warrego takes particular exception to clause 39, which is contained in Part V. In that part of the Bill there are seven clauses for which two days were assigned; and there was ample time to discuss every line of every clause. It is perfect hypocrisy for the hon. member to state that there has not been time for the Opposition to discuss every line of the Bill. I have not taken any part in the discussion at any stage, but I have noticed the absence of any reasonable argument against either the principle or details of the Bill; and to object to the third reading on the ground that no opportunity was afforded of discussing the 39th clause is purely empty argument which is not likely to appeal to the electors. At the last election they had enough common sense to sum up hon. members opposite and their arguments, and I have no doubt that on this occasion they will come to the same conclusion as they came to on the 27th April last. The hon. member for Warrego went on to draw a parallel between this Bill and the Liquor Bill, and suggested that the Liquor Bill occupied a great deal more time.

Mr. COYNE: Twice as much time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Liquor Bill was something like four or five times this Bill in length, intricacy, and difficulty; and an examination of *Hansard* goes to show that the second reading only occupied six days, and the Committee stage was disposed of inside eight days; that is in two-thirds of the time allotted to this

Hon. E. H. Macartney.]

Bill. What has the hon. member to say to that? It only emphasises the emptiness of the arguments against the Bill; and it is in keeping with the attitude adopted towards the Bill by Labour members since the measure was introduced. I cannot understand what opinion hon. members opposite have of the intelligence of the electors of Queensland. After this Bill was introduced an article appeared in the *Worker*, in which the statement was made that the Government introduced a Bill without a mandate from the country. They said further that the Government deceived the country by not saying a word on the Bill during the election. It is the rule for articles in that paper to abuse the Government, and this article is by no means an exception; but though it is not very complimentary to the Government I propose to read it. I refer to the article in the *Worker* of 8th August, under the heading the "Editorial Mill—Labour's Way Out"—

"In trickery, and 'pointing' and the arts of deception, it has not its match, look where you will."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is something in accord with the arguments of hon. members in the discussion on the Bill. It goes on to say, referring to the Government—

"It was well aware all the time that it meant to rush off to the Jews for a loan, at exorbitant rates of interest, should it succeed in deluding the electors into giving it another term of office.

"That is why it took such infinite pains at the general election to conceal its legislative intentions."

Mr. RYAN: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Perhaps the hon. member will not say "Hear, hear!" at the finish—

"And it knew that it had received instructions from its capitalistic masters to bring in a Bill to suppress strikes and imprison strikers. Yet, not a word did it drop on either subject. It kept dark. With a more than vulpine duplicity it concealed its purpose; for had any hint of what was going to be done been given, the result would have been fatal at the ballot-box."

Does the hon. gentleman still say "Hear, hear"? Is that a correct statement?

Mr. THEODORE: It is quite correct.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Very well. I have in my hand the manifesto delivered by the Premier on the 28th March, at Corinda.

Mr. THEODORE: You heard it delivered.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I heard it delivered.

Mr. THEODORE: Are you not ashamed of it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am not ashamed of it, and I propose to read from it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS at the table interjecting,

[Hon. E. H. Macartney.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope hon. members will cease interjecting from the table. This is the first time I have had occasion to call attention to it this session; but the hon. member for Cairns and the hon. member for Warrego—particularly the hon. member for Warrego—have kept up a running fire of interjections from the table while the Secretary for Lands has been speaking.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will read from the manifesto:—

"The strike promoters had adopted Keir Hardie's dictum, 'We must capture trade unions, not for the purpose of strengthening unionism, but in order to advance our (socialistic) propaganda.' Can anything be done to make impossible the recurrence of a general strike? Can anything be done to render even sectional strikes a remote contingency—a final resort when every other means has failed? I think that something can be done, and, in the interest of the whole community, must be done. (Hear, hear!) The right to strike we do not challenge, but in no case should it be exercised until every man and woman directly concerned has had an opportunity to learn the cause of the dispute, and afterwards to record a vote on it by an honest ballot conducted by a duly accredited officer. (Loud applause.) Very large numbers of men recently on strike were either not aware of the cause of the strike, or were deliberately misinformed as to it, and when the truth became known to them they were indignant at being misled. (Hear, hear!)

"PROTECTING THE WORKERS.

"Our aim will be to protect workers against such misfortune, to save them from humiliation and losses, their families from deprivation and distress, and the whole community from the insecurity and the evil passions which such strife engenders. (Applause.) I do not propose to burden my speech with further details more than to say that penalties both appropriate and of practical application will be provided to meet the cases of such as strike in spite of, and in defiance of, wise and humane provisions to preserve industrial peace to the advantage of the whole community. Our industrial laws will be entirely reviewed, and if a further term of public service is allowed to us, we will, when the Houses meet, be prepared to deal fully and effectively with matters concerning labour and employment, industry, and trade. (Continued applause.) What the unionist and the non-unionist alike want is adequate remuneration and stability of employment—(hear, hear!)—and what the manufacturer and the capitalist want is security—that is, reasonable assurance that the success of the enterprise in which they have ventured their all will not be imperilled by such unnecessary acts as recently for a time brought the whole industrial life of Brisbane to a standstill. (Applause.) Those who look below the surface of things recognise that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the interests of employers and employees are, under existing conditions, practically identical."

Mr. KIRWAN: Is there anything there about the suspension of the trial by jury?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The contents of this very Bill are outlined in that article, and I believe they are the views of a great body of the citizens outside. Hon. members have endeavoured to call meetings to object to the Bill, and there have been a few meetings with 100 or 200 persons present thereat. But there was no enthusiasm, and no seething objection to the contents of the Bill. I venture to say that this Bill has got the approval of a large majority of the workers. It has come to my knowledge, and I have no hesitation in repeating it, that even officials of certain unions are in favour of the Bill.

Mr. KIRWAN: Name the unions.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The assertion that the country is against the Bill is something like the arguments that have been offered here—without any foundation. Hon. members have presented a petition supposed to be signed by something like 6,000 unionists. Does the hon. member say it is signed by unionists?

Mr. THEODORE: We do not say that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I know that when the Clerk read the petition it became clear that it was a petition signed by unionists, electors, and residents. But the impression on my mind was that it was supposed to be a strong protest from the unionists of Queensland.

Mr. RYAN: I wrote down what I said.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: When we remember the number of electors of Queensland, we recognise what an insignificant thing this petition is as an expression of the feelings of the workers of Queensland. Will the hon. gentleman say that this petition is signed by 6,000 separate persons?

Mr. RYAN: Of course it is.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: How dare you insinuate it is not?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I take the responsibility of saying that I have come to the conclusion that it is not signed by every person whose signature purports to be on it.

Mr. RYAN: Name them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not think for one moment that the hon. gentleman, when he introduced the petition, thought otherwise than that he was introducing a document that was in perfect order. I have, however, no hesitation in saying that I have casually taken up the first two or three pages and have found several instances where names have been signed by the same individual.

The PREMIER: In the same handwriting?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Taking the town of Barcaldine, which is in the hon. member's electorate, I find, if not quite half a page, quite a large proportion of half a page of signatures apparently by the same person. Coming to a page with names belonging to my own neighbourhood, I find two signatures signed by the same per-

son. When a petition like this is presented to this Chamber as evidence of the feeling of the people in connection with a measure before the House, the gentleman who introduces it ought to take sufficient care to see that the petition is absolutely what it purports to be.

Mr. RYAN: The first election will prove what the people of Queensland think.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Perhaps it will, but I do object that when the members of the other side find themselves deprived of argument they should press such a petition on the notice of this Chamber.

Mr. RYAN: That petition was sent to me.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. gentleman presented it as being signed by each of 6,000 unionists, residents, or electors, as the case may be. Anyone who takes up that petition can only come to the conclusion that it is not so signed.

Mr. HUNTER: There is not much in it, anyhow.

Mr. THEODORE: It is only your prejudiced mind that allows you to come to that conclusion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not like to strike a man behind his back. If the leader of the Opposition would like to examine the portion I refer to I will hand it to him.

Mr. RYAN: Read it out.

Mr. THEODORE: Read out the names.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: This is the petition. The first signature is P. Moran, of Barcaldine. The first signature on the second page is T. Doonan. The first signature on the third page is Mrs. E. Jackson, Barcaldine, domestic duties, and on the next page is that of H. Marnane, hairdresser, etc. The leader of the Opposition will see a number of names together on that page mostly Charlesworths. If the hon. member will say they are all separate signatures I have nothing further to say. There are a dozen signatures there altogether that are worthy of his observation.

Mr. HUNTER: Whom do you blame for it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will say in reference to this Bill that I believe it is a fair measure. What is sauce for the goose will be sauce for the gander, and the provisions that relate to employees are similar to those which relate to employers. It provides a ready means by which industrial peace can be obtained if both parties are desirous of having it. It does not provide preference to unionists. That is, perhaps, its greatest defect in the eyes of its opponents.

Mr. THEODORE: It prohibits it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It does not permit the hon. member for Chillagoe to get a grip over his fellow-workers which will enslave them and deprive them of the exercise of their political rights or the expression of their [9.30 p.m.] political opinions. We know that the hon. member tried to register a union in Queensland under conditions which, combined with the principle of preference to unionists, would make every

Hon. E. H. Macartney.]

worker belonging to those unions slaves. They could not obtain their living unless they subscribed to the political principles of the hon. member. This Bill will not recognise that sort of thing. This Bill says that every man is equal before the law; that he should have the same treatment, and I say in its essential provisions it is an absolutely fair Bill. The arguments that have been adduced by the other side against the Bill are practically on a par with what I have exposed to-night.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Mount Morgan*): Had I chosen to remain silent on this question, the excellent speech just delivered by the Secretary for Public Lands would have been my justification, but some remarks have been made this afternoon on which I feel I must make some comment. I have been astonished at hearing the variety and versatility of the expressions used by members opposite in regard to this Bill. I have had one attitude towards the Bill right through—that it is a good Bill, framed in the interests of peace, framed for the purpose of giving the workers of Queensland an opportunity of preserving that peace which is essential to their progress and to their welfare; a Bill framed in the interests of freedom and in the interest of giving to the workers opportunities for emancipating themselves from the thralldom into which unconsciously they have drifted, and which hon. members opposite have been endeavouring to fix upon them in every possible way by almost every amendment which they have offered to this House. The Minister would not have been justified in accepting one amendment from the opposite side, because their attitude right through the piece, from the very inception of this Bill—even before it was announced by the Hon. the Minister—was one of absolute opposition. Why? For this reason—they wanted a Bill which would keep the workers in their power. They wanted a Bill which would blind, delude, and diseducate the workers, so that they might be the more humble, and so that they might be the more easily kept under the power of the Trades Hall. There is no Labour party in Queensland to-day. The old Labour party has gone, and a solid wedge of officialdom has been driven in between the workers and Parliament—a wedge of Trades Hall officialdom—and it is only through that blinding wedge that the workers can see the work this party is doing in their interests. Opposition members have practically said to the workers, "Certainly, fellow-workers, you shall have peace, but if you attempt to take it from the Liberal party, well, we can only think you are going crook on the movement." That is absolutely what they would say to them. They must not have peace at all unless they can get that peace through the Trades Hall. The amendments that have been placed before us from time to time, show to what a condition of servitude and slavery the workers would be reduced if a Bill emanating from the Trades Hall were passed into law. Happily for the interests of the country, happily for the welfare of the workers of Queensland, and, I think, happily for the welfare of the workers of Australia—because this Bill will be copied right throughout the length and breadth of Australia—happily for all those interests, a party has been returned

[*Hon. E. H. Macartney.*

to power in Queensland which has the full confidence of the workers of Queensland to pass a measure of this description—a measure which in every phrase breathes the atmosphere of democracy. (Hear, hear!) It puts opportunities in the way of the workers of meeting their employers and finding out for themselves that these employers, far from being the scoundrels hon. members opposite would have them believe, are as anxious as anyone possibly can be to see that those whom they employ are developing themselves, are making progress, and are increasing in intelligence. I say, as a worker myself, as one who has gone through the hard mill of strenuous existence—as strenuous an existence as that of any man on the opposite side of the House—that this Bill is in the interests of the workers because it increases their opportunities. But what has been the course of the amendments from the other side? I take no notice of their silence.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is because their consciences smite them. (Laughter.)

Mr. CRAWFORD: It emphasises the correctness of my remarks when I say that they have insulted the workers of Queensland. They say that in every community of workers and in every industry twenty men can be found who will be so far degraded, so low, and so anxious to become disgraced in the eyes of their fellow-men, that they will lead their fellow-workers astray. That is what hon. members opposite have said on every possible occasion—that twenty men will lead all their fellow-men astray. When I was before my constituents the other day, I asked them—there are 400 or 500 men working down below in the mine, not counting the men working above—I asked them if there were twenty men who were so ambitious of ridicule and disgrace that they would stand publicly before the court day after day and endeavour to bring their fellow-workers down? They did not answer. I then asked them, if twenty men publicly endeavoured to get an award to pull down wages or lengthen the hours of other men, what would the other 480 men be doing in the meantime? Is it not an insult to the intelligence of those 480 men? It is an insult to the whole body of men. And that is what hon. members opposite have been doing all the way through. During the interval, when they were not engaged in branding the employers as scoundrels, they were branding the workers as fools, and I think the workers ought to understand that. They ought to clearly understand that the very people whom they imagine are here to represent them have been engaged during the past fortnight in saying that they are fools—that they are absolutely devoid of intelligence. They go further than that; they say that the men employed in the industries cannot be trusted to look after their own interests, that if they get any advance at all they must get it from the Trades Hall. They say to them, "Yes, fellow-workers; certainly, Christian brothers; you shall have advance, you shall make progress, but do not attempt to get it unless through the officials of the Trades Hall." I challenge them to deny the accuracy of my statement. It is absolutely correct. They have said to the workers of Queensland that no notice shall be taken by them, and no advantage shall be taken by them of the measures introduced into this House for

their benefit unless that advantage is taken through the Trades Hall. They cannot deny that. The hon. member for Rockhampton, who does occasionally pay some attention to political accuracy, will not attempt to deny it. He cannot deny it; neither can the hon. member for Maranoa, whose large experience in trade unionism is so apparent to the House. (Laughter.) Can any member on the opposite side deny that from the beginning to the end of the debate upon this Bill they have endeavoured to insult the intelligence of the workers? If the workers are unintelligent, what is the cause of it? A little while ago I used a term, which is perhaps etymologically correct, when I said that the workers have been diseducated. It is correct, and it conveys my meaning very clearly when I say that by a long course of reading the *Worker* and the speeches of hon. members opposite, the workers have become diseducated. What wonder is it that we find them signing petitions such as the one shown by the Minister to be inane, and so wanting in knowledge of the contents of the Bill against which they were petitioning.

The HOME SECRETARY: They never saw the Bill, even.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to say, in pursuance of my duty as a representative, that I have received from the secretary of some union in Mount Morgan, the following resolution with regard to this Bill:—

“Sir,—At a public meeting held at Mount Morgan on the 7th instant, the following resolutions were unanimously carried, viz.:—“That this meeting protests against the passing of the Industrial Peace Bill, believing it to be against the best interests of the workers of Queensland, and respectfully requests you to use your best endeavours to defeat its passing in the present form.”

These union officials at Mount Morgan, not once, but repeatedly, endeavoured to arrange meetings for themselves, but failed. The public would not turn out to hear them. They had to wait until I went to Mount Morgan and called a meeting for myself. (Government laughter.) Then these union officials, one at £5 and one at £4 10s. a week, came up with this resolution all arranged, and with a few people who had been deluded by their harangues and by reading the pages of the *Worker*, and when I had finished my meeting, they brought a box from the near by hotel, and gave an explanation, not of the Bill, but of my private character. (Government laughter.) Having done that, they asked the people to carry this resolution. That shows how, in a town like Mount Morgan, with 5,000 electors on the roll, a resolution, carried at the tail-end of a meeting addressed by me, and endorsed by about fifty or sixty people, who never read the Bill and never will, is put forward as the representative opinion of the electors of Mount Morgan. It is absolutely misleading. I know that a copy of this has been sent to the leader of the Opposition, but he never mentioned it; I think he was wise enough to know how absolutely false and hollow was this protest. That shows the spirit of the protest that has been made all through this State—it is absolutely hollow, and wanting in spontaneity. It shows that the people are satisfied to see this Bill in operation, and dis-

trust the statements that are being made by people who set themselves forward to be their representatives—by the members of the Labour party. The attitude of the country towards this Bill is a very clear indication and endorsement of the fact that this party possesses the confidence of the country, and that they will not trust the party opposite, who are speaking so loudly about the Bill being a coercion measure. On the general matter of law, I dare say it would be within the competence of a bright luminary like the hon. member for Maranoa to bring in a Bill absolutely devoid of coercion, but no law could have any force unless there was an element of coercion in it. I am glad to say for my own constituents that they see far more clearly than they have even been able to see before that the real Labour party in this Parliament is on this side. (Hear, hear!) They understand that more and more, and they will further understand it when they see this measure in operation. We, as British people, if any measure of coercion were directed against us by Parliament, would try in our might and strength, and in our multitude, to oppose it; but where do we see any multitude opposing this Bill? Has not every meeting called together by hon. members opposite been a frost? The great mass of the people, confident in the security they enjoy under a Liberal Government, know that this Bill is for their interests, and they will avail themselves of it as soon as it comes into operation. Some remarks have been made with regard to preference to unionists. I say that if preference means that all unionists—members of every union—should be preferred, it might be a good thing, but the preference to unionists contemplated by hon. members opposite is preference to those who are subservient to the Trades Hall, and that is a preference which we will not give, because it means slavery. We are not going to differentiate between the people—we are going to emancipate them. We want to trust them, and show them the opportunities they have of making progress, and we do not want to have them saying to one another: “Are you a unionist?” “Yes; I am a unionist.” “What union do you belong to?” “To such-and-such a union.” “That is not affiliated to the Trades Hall—you have no chance; go and starve.” That is the preference which hon. members opposite are agitating for, and that is precisely the preference to unionists which this party cannot agree to; and no citizen who wished to uphold freedom for one moment would agree to preference of that sort. We offer in this Bill freedom of opportunity to all. We do not insult employers by saying that they are always on the lookout to take advantage of those whom they employ, and we do not insult the employees by saying that they are wanting in intelligence—that if 500 or 1,000 are employed, twenty shall lead them astray. We put before them opportunities for advancement in this Bill, and we believe that, once in operation, it will have the effect of teaching the people that great things can be done by meeting their employers, and arriving at a proper estimation of the character of the employers by conversation, and not by being kept apart through the efforts of Trades Hall officials. I feel that a proper understanding is required between employers and employees, not an understanding between employers and Trades Hall officials.

Mr. Crawford.]

I am not going to hand the workers over to those who have been living on them. Let the workers and the employers come together under the wise provisions of this Bill; let them understand where their interests lie; let them understand what is meant by a cessation of industry; let them understand who suffers and who gains; let them consider the people who, for a time, are union officials, and later on get into Parliament or get a good organising job; and they will have nothing more to do with that species of unionism, which has broken away from the great original principle of unionism. What we want to do is to build up a unionism which makes for the betterment of the people in every possible way.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*): If there is anything that pains me, it is to listen to the hon. member who has just sat down. However, I always try to listen to him in such a way that he cannot say I interfere with him. During the election campaign, and in this House, he has gone out of his way to have a shot at me in his remarks. I allow him to do so, but it is not because I am afraid of him in any way or at any time. (Government laughter.) If there is any man who stands in an undesirable position in this House it is the hon. member for Mount Morgan. A little over three years ago I went to Mount Morgan to speak. The hon. member was then supporting the Labour party tooth and nail, and moved a vote of thanks to me for my speech. He said certain things about unionism and the Labour party, and he spoke well. I thought he would be a credit to the House, and I said I hoped he might be returned as the Labour member for Mount Morgan; and he was returned. When I think what he has done since; when I think about his career in the other States—well, I will not say what I think.

Mr. MORGAN: Do you constitute yourself his judge?

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not; but when a man throws stones, and is living in a glass house, he ought to look out. I read some of the speeches he made at Mount Morgan, and there was not an argument in the whole of them; and there is never a scintilla of argument in the speeches he makes in this House. He made four speeches on this Bill, all on the same lines. He tells us we are under the thumb of the Trades Hall, that our unionism is simply Trades Hall unionism. It is very seldom that I go to the Trades Hall; and I have never been under the thumb of the Trades Hall. I never would be; and I do not believe any member on this side is under the thumb of the Trades Hall. What is the Trades Hall? What is it in Sydney? What is it in Melbourne? What is it in many of the towns I know in England? It is the rendezvous of the best unionists and the best leaders of unionism. The Trades Hall stands for all that is best in unionism.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is merely assertion.

Mr. ADAMSON: Unions representing 150,000 workmen meet in the Trades Hall, Sydney, and unions representing more than 100,000 workmen meet in the Trades Hall, Melbourne. That is a statement of fact.

[*Mr. Crawford.*]

And whatever hon. members opposite may say about members of this side being under the thumb of the Trades Hall, they are not speaking the truth. The Minister for Lands was put up to make statements to damage us at the end of the debate. I had a chance to look at the part of the petition to which he referred, but he told us there were names written by the same hand in that petition, and I want to say that is not true.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is true.

Mr. ADAMSON: Let us have a careful scrutiny of the petition by impartial examiners.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: By experts.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes, by experts. What I saw was that some of the addresses were in the same handwriting, but not the names. If it can be proved that there has been a lot of duplication of names, let the men who did it take the blame, not the men here who received the petition in good faith. I believe it will be found on examination to be as faithful a petition as ever was presented to the House. With regard to the hon. member for Mount Morgan, I have said sufficient already, and I do not propose to deal with him any further; but I want to say one or two things as a reason for opposing the third reading of this Bill. It flies in the face of all industrial history and experience; and, as the Premier stated, it is a novel Bill. The Minister for Lands told us that in the speech the Premier made to his constituents at Corinda there was an outline of the Bill; but that is a statement that will not hold water. The Bill outlined in the Premier's speech might have been applied to the Federal Arbitration Act, the New South Wales Arbitration Act, or the New Zealand Act. It is a bare statement that a Bill would be brought in to prevent strikes and bring about industrial peace, and that penalties would be provided. We do not object to penalties on this side.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is a new discovery.

Mr. ADAMSON: It is not. We would not object to the penalties if the Bill contained proper provisions for conciliation and arbitration. That has been said again and again, and the Minister knows it. I say that it flies in the face of all industrial experience, and I will mention another reason why I protest against it, and that is because it discourages organisation. It goes right against co-operation, and it stands for individualism. It sets itself against industrial cosmos, and seeks to bring about industrial chaos. No one knows that better than those who sit on the front Treasury bench. Progress in the past has been towards the encouragement of unionism, and some of the biggest ironmasters and coalmasters in the North of England said thirty-five years ago, and are saying to-day, "Let us have our men combined, as we will be better able to deal with them when they are in an organised state." But this Bill tends to disintegration rather than to unionism.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You were arguing that it was only certain men who could represent you.

Mr. ADAMSON: The argument on this side of the House in relation to the trades

union secretary is, that he is the man who is chosen by the trades union, and that he is the man best fitted for the position. He is chosen to represent them because he is most au fait with the affairs of the union, and we have argued that the trades union official should represent the men.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He is often the man who is beating the drum.

Mr. ADAMSON: Here again we come in contact with another objection which has been fired at us from that side again and again, and which has been met by us again and again. Here we have the man who beats the drum objected to. We have the case of the man who becomes an agitator, who becomes a trades union secretary, and then a member of Parliament, all of which some hon. members on the other side feel very keenly. It has been said in relation to the hon. member for Chillagoe that he sought to register an illegal union. The hon. member for Chillagoe had 12,000 men behind him, and they wanted registration, and they had the right to have registration. There is no more honourable member in this House than the hon. member for Chillagoe, and I believe that there is no more honourable member than the hon. member for Cairns, against whom also something has been said in this connection. But why is there so much umbrage taken against these men? Because they have loved their fellows, and because they are determined to assist their fellows against greed on the part of individuals. Why, the same kind of charge could be laid against some of the best members of the British House of Commons. There is the name of Thomas Burt. He became a secretary to a union, and he was one of the first Labour members in England. He is now the oldest member in the British House of Commons, and I could name many others who have had equally honourable careers. I hope myself that the member for Chillagoe will remain in this House until he is the oldest member, and I believe the members opposite are compelled to say amongst themselves that he is an exceedingly creditable member of the Queensland Assembly.

Mr. TROUT: I do not think we ever said anything else.

Mr. ADAMSON: I give the hon. member for Enoggera the credit for the very best of intentions, but we are on opposite sides and have to fight each other. There is another thing I want to say against the passing of the third reading of this Bill. There has been nothing done in the history of industrial unionism to warrant the passing of such a measure. I know the members on the other side say that there is a need for such a Bill, but, as I said during an earlier discussion on the measure, it is one that was conceived in panic, one that was born in panic, and one that has been carried through the House in the spirit of panic. This Bill is born as a result of the Brisbane lockout—for it was a lockout, so far as the tramway men were concerned. Then there was a sympathetic strike, and, as far as those men who stood by their fellows, I say that the Government, who stood by Badger, should have protected them. The very fact that the recent Brisbane strike took place is in no way a justification for a Bill like this. In England they have had ten times the upheavals that we have had, and are they proposing to pass a Bill like this there? They are inquiring into the Canadian system, and that system is compulsory conciliation. I believe, from

the speeches of five prominent members of the British Parliament which I read the other day, that they were trying to get back to voluntary conciliation, and were not desirous of this compulsory arbitration that we have in this country. There is no real cause in the past industrial history of the State for a Bill like this, and I, therefore, protest against its being passed. It has been truly said that we have had no chance of discussing all the clauses, and the Hon. the Premier has sought to lay the blame on members on this side. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to fight it to the last ditch, and the challenge has been thrown down by the other side for an all-night sitting. As far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to sit up to-night and to-morrow night, and I hope those on the other side will keep it going.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You American citizens feel on this matter—

Mr. ADAMSON: I am simply stating a fact. There is one clause in this Bill that I particularly object to, and that is the clause referred to by the hon. member for Warrego—namely, clause 39. It says there, "upon the application of a member of the Police Force." I do not want to say anything unkind about the Police Force, but I want to say that we are in danger of Americanising our Police Force, and I would like to read a short paragraph to show how American citizens feel on this matter—

"The working man sees, too, in this extension of police jurisdiction another evidence that the master class is adding to its arbitrary power. The opposition of working men to injunction proceedings is largely fear of this arbitrary power. For the injunction not only stops intended action, but it throws further proceedings (contempt proceedings so called) into a court without a jury. Easy riddance of troublesome and successful officers of the labour army in a time of strife is so congenial to the employers that the judges are naturally accused of collusion with them."

I want to say that there is a danger of our police becoming Americanised, and there is a great deal of talk of men convicted here on "third degree" evidence. I have received letters calling my attention to this. Men are taken prisoners and are induced to make statements. These statements are taken down, and the men are convicted on their own statements. That is a thing we want to prevent here. This Bill gives power to the police that they ought not to have. Everyone knows that a policeman is a policeman the world over. I know there are some good policemen. But just as we have to legislate against bad employers, so it is just as well for us to prevent too much power being given to bad policemen. The Hon. the Chief Secretary has talked to us about reiteration, and I am sure there has been a great deal of reiteration; but the hon. member knows that we are fighting the cause of the workers. We are fighting an attempt to curtail the liberties they have got, notwithstanding the fact that we are told this Bill is going to give them liberty from the Trades Hall. We know that on one great historical occasion a great historical figure said, "Oh Liberty, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" I think that in the future great crimes will be perpetrated under this Bill in the name of liberty. It is said that eternal vigilance is the price of

Mr. Adamson.]

liberty, and we intend to reiterate again and again the arguments, which were never answered by the other side, against this Bill which we are opposing. I would like the Premier, who knows something about the Bible, to remember that one of the leading prophets, one of the great social reformers of the people, one of the politician prophets of the Old Testament, when speaking to his countrymen concerning great questions, said there is to be "line upon line, line upon line, precept upon precept, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little, that they might hear." And we have been doing that so that he might hear. It is perfectly right that we should have in our Standing Orders a rule which forbids mere repetition. I do not think mere repetition is a good thing, but I believe there are times when it is necessary to repeat the same truth again and again, and if we are standing for the liberties and the rights of the workers, and standing against those things which will deprive them of their rights, we have just as much right to stand here and reiterate our arguments as members on the other side have the right to reiterate their arguments, and I want to say nobody has done more reiteration than the Premier, and nobody has made weaker speeches during this debate than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER: Except the Secretary for Public Works.

Mr. ADAMSON: I won't say that about the Minister for Works. He has given some cogent reasons in some instances, but I do not think his reasons are sound. (Laughter.) We are standing for the rights of the industrial worker. The Hon. the Premier boasted that the members sitting on the Government benches were instructed by the country to pass this particular Bill. I want to say that the numbers on the Government benches and the numbers on this side do not reflect the feelings of the country. Speaking roughly, there were about 120,000 electors who voted for the Government candidates, and something like 109,000 or 110,000 who voted for Labour candidates. If there was just the same proportion of numbers on either side of the House as there were votes cast for either side, instead of there being forty-seven members on one side and twenty-five members on the other side, there would be something like thirty-eight on the Government side and thirty-three or thirty-four on this side. I also wish to state that in Brisbane, where the facts of the strike, which was the cause of this Bill being introduced, were known, the Government were defeated.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No; the Government have a majority in Brisbane.

Mr. ADAMSON: It all depends on what you say is Brisbane. (Laughter.) Of course, if you are going to take places about 10 or 12 miles round about and say that is Brisbane, there might be something like equality. I am speaking about Brisbane North, Maree, Paddington, Ithaca, and those places. We have sitting here a man whom some of the people try to belittle now he is here, and who try to neglect him, and do not treat him as the representative of Brisbane; but I am inclined to say that there is not one man in this Chamber who expresses his ideas more clearly or more cogently than the hon. member for Brisbane. Hon.

[Mr. Adamson.

members on the other side of the House may sneer at him and they may slight him, but he is here, and he will do his best for the workers who sent him here.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ADAMSON: I am not going to transgress any further, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that on a matter like this you have allowed a good deal of liberty, as it shows you have risen to the occasion. We stand here for the rights and liberties of the workers of Queensland, and for the Premier to tell me that the great majority of workers are in favour of this Bill is to tell me what is not true.

The PREMIER: What you think is not true.

Mr. ADAMSON: What I know is not true. The hon. gentleman also told us that the meetings in opposition to his Bill were a failure. That is not true. The meeting held in Maryborough was not a failure, and the meeting held at Rockhampton was not a failure. We did not call those meetings. The meetings were called, and we were asked to go and speak at them, and when the Premier tells us that we are under the thumb of the Trades Hall, or the hon. member for Mount Morgan tells us that we are under the thumb of the Trades Hall—

The PREMIER: You make the same allegation about the Employers' Federation.

Mr. FIDELLY: But we are correct. (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: We are not under the thumb of the Trades Hall. We stand for the rights and freedom of the workers—

"Is true freedom but to break fetters for our own dear sake,
And, with leathern hearts, forget that we owe mankind a debt?
No! true freedom is to share all the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be earnest to make others free!

"They are slaves who fear to speak for the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose hatred, scoffing, and abuse;
Rather than in silence shrink from the truths they needs must think;
They are slaves who dare not be in the right with two or three."—Lowell.

The Premier says he has got the numbers. Well, if we are only the two or three, we believe in standing for liberty, and I am prepared to stand for it all through, to fight this Bill all night if the Premier wants to do it.

The PREMIER: Barkis is willing. (Laughter.)

Mr. MCCORMACK (Cairns): I think hon. members should compare the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. member for Rockhampton with the speech of the hon. member for Mount Morgan. It is a very good object lesson to myself as a new member to listen to the different opinions as expressed by those two hon. members. In discussing this particular stage of the Bill, I think it is necessary for the Opposition to put up a final protest. During this debate a good deal of personal matter has been introduced not only by Opposition members,

who are always blamed for introducing these matters, but by members of the Government party and by Ministers also. The Secretary for Public Lands made some scathing remarks about the petition that was sent to the leader of the Opposition for presentation to Parliament. I think the leader of the Opposition accepted that petition in the spirit in which it was sent, and I have not heard any argument adduced by the Secretary for Public Lands which would show that his remarks were correct. I have looked over the petition, and I say that it is a big thing for the Secretary for Public Lands to say that somebody has committed forgery. I think that if he had considered the matter he would not have made that charge. I have looked at the signatures, and I find that in the case of husband and wife, the two names may have been written by the same person, and that the addresses are written by the same hand in several instances. That is quite likely, but we are not aware of that fact. Those petitions were in Barcardine. Surely the hon. gentleman does not deny that; but he simply took advantage of the position to have a gibe at the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Mount Morgan went to some pains to criticise unions. I sat in a room one night three or four years ago and listened to the hon. member for Mount Morgan talking to a body of unionists for whom he was the paid secretary. He talked political unionism and he climbed into power on the backs of those working men, and we hear the hon. member to-day criticising men like myself and men like the hon. member for Chillagoe. I believe he was genuine at that time, and I believe he came to this House from Mount Morgan to do the best he could for the men whom he represents. He was elected by the Labour men, and when secretary of that union he did real good work for the men, both in the inquiry into the accident at Mount Morgan, and in everything in connection with them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He did not say anything derogatory of the working man.

Mr. McCORMACK: He said a good deal derogatory of men in exactly the same position in which he was. I know the hon. member in North Queensland, when he worked for his living the same as I did, and I hold I am equally as honourable as he is. The hon. member said nothing at all about the Bill. He set out simply to accuse us of Trades Hall officialdom and many other things, and yet nobody knows better than the hon. member that the Trades Hall has no more power over myself or over the hon. member for Chillagoe or any other member on this side of the House than the Premier has. In fact, it has no power at all, not even official power over the union of which I was secretary, or of the union of which the hon. member for Chillagoe is president, and which is the most powerful and most militant union in Queensland to-day, and the union that a good deal of this Bill is aimed at. This Bill is aimed at destroying unionism, and that is why I am opposed to it. There are a good many things in the Bill, which, had its principles been otherwise, I would have supported and would support to-morrow. I desire to see the arbitration system given a trial at least, but still, when preference is given to non-unionists, I think that I am justified in opposing the whole

measure. I would like to mention in regard to this matter that members on the other side of the Chamber have repeatedly stated that this Trades Hall unionism, or the unionism which sends representatives to Parliament—sends their secretaries and their organisers to Parliament—is a bad form of unionism. I am going to try and prove that it is a very good form of unionism—a unionism that has done a remarkable amount of good in Queensland during the last few years without any Industrial Peace Bill at all, and, in some cases, without a great deal of industrial trouble. I refer to the organisation which one Minister said was refused registration. That did not stop that organisation from becoming a very powerful concern and of being a great benefit to its members. The blocking of registration did not interfere with us a little bit. That organisation was started—and I am very proud to say that I was one of the men who for years tried to form that organisation, and I was hunted from one mining town to another because I was an agitator. I have had to suffer for holding my opinions. A man does not do that kind of thing because he wants to be an agitator. He does it because it is his nature to barrack for his fellow-workers, and he takes all the risks and responsibilities. The membership of that organisation when it was first started numbered 114, and to-day, in spite of all that is said against unionism, it numbers over 12,000. And let me say that it is one of the few unions which, at its conference, said it was not in favour of preference to unionists. As its president said to-night, in our mining towns we have preference given by the employers through an agreement with the Australian Workers' Association, and we say to those men, if you have scruples and do not care to join, a married man who is a non-unionist will get preference over a single man who is a unionist.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What do you do with a single man who is a non-unionist?

Mr. McCORMACK: We say if he is a single man he shall help to pay for some of the benefits that we have had to fight for. When the union started in North Queensland, labourers were paid 7s. 6d. a day. When the Atherton line was built they were paid 6s. 6d. a day. I was a single man, and could hardly keep myself, and how were married men to get on? That convinced me that unionism was necessary. The Australian Workers' Association, by agreement with the Chillagoe Company, have got the labourers' wages up to 10s. a day, which is now the minimum wage in North Queensland. Miners' wages have also been considerably increased. I myself worked for 9s. a day, but to-day in Irvinebank we have an award given by the warden fixing 11s. 8d. a day. Should we not barrack for unionism when these things have happened to ourselves? At Cloncurry, the men rushed into the organisation, and from 9s. a day in that mining district, we have got to 11s. 6d. a day, as the minimum labourer's wage. The work is worth it. Just imagine the position of a man with a wife and family up there three years ago; he could not live on the wage paid then. We found the sugar industry a black man's industry. Even the men who have spoken here to-night have not said that they were fighting against the 1s. an hour; they only said that the industry would not pay it. We found that the wages

Mr. McCormack.]

in the industry were 4½d. an hour, and £1 1s. 6d. a week and twelve hours a day. If there is a union in Queensland that is militant, and is called hard names, it is the Australian Workers' Association. During the period that I was general secretary there were something like twenty-five or twenty-six strikes. That was because the conditions were so bad. I am using it as an argument that, since we have got stronger we have been able to arrive at all our decisions by conference. Could we have fought at first under these humane ideas—could we have gone to the boss as individuals? When I went to the boss as an individual with a grievance, I got the ancient order of the sack. I do not blame the boss, because he is out for profits. The Minister for Lands said that the Bill intended to preserve an industry, and allow an employer to carry on an industry without disturbance, but he never mentioned profits. One of the biggest employers in Queensland said to a deputation of which I was a member that it was a religion with an employer to get as much work for as little money and as long hours as he could, and he said, "It is your duty to get as much money for as short hours as you can."

Mr. PETRIE: Give the name; he must be an exceptional employer.

Mr. McCORMACK: He is not an exceptional employer; he is a most humane man and a good employer. He is a man who has fought my association bitterly, and always honourably, but I am afraid a lot of other employers do not do that. The hon. member for Mount Morgan takes it upon himself to say things which the Government would not say themselves. He is not a genuine supporter of the Government, because when he joined the Government he thought of getting something, but he has no hope of getting anything, and the Government will only make use of him for a time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McCORMACK: This Bill takes away the right to strike. In some instances, if we had not the right to strike and act quickly in our organisations, the boss would defeat us every time. From past experience, we find that no permanent industrial peace can come about where there is no organisation among the employees. I have found that the most trouble has been in half-organised industries. In the sugar strike we had about half the men organised, and made certain demands upon the employer. They refused to meet us, on the ground that we were not representative men, and they said they would discuss the matter with the individual employee. But what is the position now? We have employers and employees meeting together. If anything is done for the sugar industry, it will be by the workers and the growers combining. Some of us have openly advocated this equalisation of excise and bounty, so that it would not be necessary to bring these parties under the measure.

Mr. SWAYNE: Your party has always been against it in the Federal House.

Mr. McCORMACK: If the hon. member for Mirani had given a little consideration to other members in the House who represent sugar districts, he might have got a little better hearing when he went to Melbourne. I am satisfied that the sugar industry, rightly or wrongly, will be brought under some arbitration court, but I shall be

[Mr. McCormack.

sorry if this court has an opportunity of dealing with that industry. If there is anything I can do to keep them from coming under this Bill I will do it. I will do my best to take a case to the Federal Arbitration Court, in preference to the one under the Bill. I think no good will come from this Bill. You cannot stop industrial strife, and if you penalise an organisation, and the members of it, then why not give them the responsibility? Hon. members opposite know that if a non-unionist knocks off work, a unionist will not scab on him. When the unionists take a vote, and bring about a strike, we take the whole responsibility of that strike. Under the present trade union law, unionists involve all their property, and can be got at just as well as under this Bill. Mr. Wade showed how he could put Peter Bowling in gaol under an Act of George IV. The Government evidently intend the Bill only to act as a deterrent to men coming out on strike. The Minister for Works said the other night that it would be ridiculous to think that the penalties would be imposed. But why have penalties in the Bill, if you are not going to impose them? Where there are more than 50 per cent. of the members of the industry in a union, they would be quite justified in imposing any penalty to make them abide by their agreement. I think if the waterside workers had a just cause to have a strike over the whole of the seacoast of Australia they would be justified in paying £1,000 for breach of the agreement, and going on strike. A fine would not stop them from striking. There are penalties in connection with the Federal court, and what happens? They say they do not knock off work; they say, "We are not going to work to-day." Fifty or sixty men in Sydney were summoned for a breach of an industrial award, but the Government could not do anything. The men were justified in saying, "We are not going to work to-day." They stopped out three or four weeks, and no one could compel them to go to work. We desire, in the first place, to have a conciliatory Bill which will meet the case of both employers and employees, but this Bill will fail. There are certain provisions in the Bill which spoil all the good which is in it. The Bill could have been made a good one by including principles which the Opposition wished to embody in the measure, but it is a bad Bill as it stands, and I intend to oppose it all through.

* Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): Members on the other side, who have spoken in support of the Bill, have argued that it will place employers and workers on the same level, but that is not the case. The worker's economic position places him at a great disadvantage as compared with the employer. A few years ago the Bishop of North Queensland, [10.30 p.m.] speaking of the time to which the hon. member for Cairns referred when he spoke of the workers in and about Chillagoe, said it was impossible for a man with a wife and family to exist in reasonable comfort on the wages paid. The wages were so low as to be only sufficient for single men. Hon. members opposite say they are not opposed to unionism, but are opposed to political unionism; but we cannot expect any favourable reform unless the workers are armed with the weapon of political unionism, which is more effective in this country than in any other part of the world. If it had not been for political

unionism, there would have been no "white Australia," and no old-age pensions. The Bill is in the interests of the employing classes, and its main object is to prevent the further progress of political unionism and drive people into units, thereby making it harder for the workers to improve their position. Do the Government wish the workers to be content with their present conditions? I do not think it would be right, for the workers to be content with their lot, because that would prevent them from trying to get better conditions. I stand here to enter my protest against the passage of this Bill, which is not in the interests of the workers. I believe it was framed at the wrong time, when the Government were elated with their so-called success at the polls. It was hatched in suspicion, and was passed by means of the bludgeon and the guillotine.

Question—That the Bill be now read a third time—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Macartney
" Appel	" Mackintosh
" Barnes, G. P.	" Morgan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Paget
" Bebbington	" Petrie
" Booker	" Rankin
" Bouchard	" Roberts
" Bridges	" Stevens
" Caine	" Stodart
" Crawford	" Swayne
" Denham	" Tolmie
" Forsyth	" Trout
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" Welsby
" Hodge	" Wienholt
" Luke	" Williams

Tellers: Mr. Welsby and Mr. Wienholt.

NOES, 24.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Huxham
" Barber	" Kirwan
" Bertram	" Land
" Breslin	" Larcombe
" Coyne	" Lennon
" Fihelly	" May
" Foley	" McCormack
" Gilday	" O'Sullivan
" Gillies	" Payne
" Hamilton	" Ryan
" Hardacre	" Theodore
" Hunter	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Coyne and Mr. Hardacre.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Blair. No—Mr. Murphy.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered that the Bill be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Mr. RYAN: What will be the business to-morrow?

The PREMIER: The business for to-morrow will be as it stands on the paper—the Brisbane Exhibition Lands Bill, the Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill, the Fruit Cases Bill, and the Railways Bill. If the hon. member is prepared to make a compact, we will adjourn early if we get through Nos. 3, 4, and 5 on the paper.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock.