

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 22 JULY 1915

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, 22 JULY, 1915.

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

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Principal Shorthand Writer on the cost and circulation of "Hansard" for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

Report of the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board for 1914.

Regulations under the Workers' Dwellings Acts, 1909 to 1911.

Regulations under the Pearl-shell and Béche-de-Mer Fishery Acts Amendment Act of 1913.

Regulations under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1911.

QUESTIONS.

CHEESE AND BUTTER STATISTICS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. What were the quantities, respectively, of cheese and butter made in Queensland during the month of May, 1914, and the quantities of the same made during May of this year, and the market prices per pound of cheese and hundred-weight of butter during the same months?"

"2. What were the quantities, respectively, of cheese and butter made in Queensland during the month of June in 1914, and the quantities of the same made during June in this year, and the market prices per pound of cheese and hundred-weight of butter during the same months?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. Lennon, *Herbert*) replied—

"1. Amount of cheese made in Queensland during May, 1914, 551,685 lb.; price, 7½d. to 8¾d. per lb. Amount of cheese made during May, 1915, 242,338 lb.; price, 1s. per lb. Amount of butter made during May, 1914, 2,751,253 lb.; price, 104s. per cwt. Amount of butter made during May, 1915, 1,810,557 lb.; price, 194s. to 202s. per cwt.

"2. Amount of cheese made during June, 1914, 594,056 lb.; price, 8½d. to 8¾d. per lb. Amount of butter made during June, 1914, 2,047,251 lb.; price, 108s. to 120s. per cwt. Amount of cheese made during June, 1915, 177,110 lb.; price, 1s. to 1s. 0¾d. per lb. Amount of butter made during June, 1915, 1,307,760 lb.; price, 196s. to 215s. per cwt. The cheese figures are practically correct, but not exactly so, as the returns from a few small factories are not available."

GOODNA ASYLUM WARDS.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*), for Mr. H. J. Ryan (*Cook*), asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. Were tenders called for the new wards at Goodna Asylum?"

"2. If so, what were the names of the tenderers, and the amounts of the tenders?"

"3. What was the estimate of the Works Department for same, and, if same had been accepted by the Minister, what would have been the saving on the work?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. E. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. W. Kitchen, £17,417 7s.; W. Chaplain, £14,967; W. Beavis, £14,839; J. G. Hobbs, £14,380; A. Keddie, £13,987 6s. 6d.; G. A. Baumber, £13,946; W. Kerr, £13,900 (accepted).

"3. The department's estimate was £13,941."

GOVERNMENT'S DEALINGS WITH BUTTER.

Mr. STEVENS (*Rosewood*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. Is he aware that McKeever, to whom the Government sold 200 boxes of butter, is one of the biggest speculators in butter in Australia?"

"2. Is he aware that the price of butter advanced to 235s. 4d. in Melbourne on the 19th instant, and that, therefore, McKeever will make a profit of over £13 per ton on the butter sold by the Government?"

"3. Is he aware that the Crown Law Office holds that the law prohibits f.o.b. export, and that, therefore, the Government broke the law in selling f.o.b.?"

"4. Who was the agent through whom the Government sold this butter to McKeever, and what rate of commission did he receive?"

"5. Why was not the Farmers' Co-operative Distributing Company given an opportunity of selling the butter?"

"6. Is it not a misleading statement to say that the price of butter has dropped locally below 196s. in consequence of the Government's action?"

The PREMIER (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*) replied—

"1. No.

"2. I have not the particulars of the profit made by Mr. McKeever.

"3. It is not the custom to disclose the opinions of the Crown Law Office, or to answer questions of law. (See Speaker's ruling of yesterday in reply to a question by Mr. Macartney.)

"4. Mr. H. M. Russell; 1 per cent.

"5. I know of no particular reason. They, no doubt, had already collected their commission on the sale to the Government.

"6. The Government was unable to sell butter locally at 196s. net to certain firms, who stated they could purchase on more favourable terms."

WOUNDED SOLDIERS' SANATORIUM.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"Considering the likelihood of many wounded soldiers returning to Queensland during the summer months, will he consider the advantage of making provision for wounded soldiers in the Stanthorpe district?"

The PREMIER replied—

“The matter will be brought under the notice of the Commonwealth authorities.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): I desire, with the permission of the House, to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member should make a personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: During the course of the proceedings yesterday afternoon, a statement was made by the hon. member for Keppel, a statement of which I have taken the precaution to obtain a copy from the “Hansard” record. That statement is in the following words:—

“I wish to point out that it is quite evident why the hon. member for Toowong has been elected to the position of leader of the Opposition. He has been elected because he is the legal representative of the American meat trust, the representative of the shipping ring, and of the tramway monopoly, and other combinations that have been defrauding the taxpayers of Queensland lately. He has been elected outside Parliament altogether; he was elected by the commercial magnates of the State, who insisted that he should be appointed to that position.”

Referring to that statement subsequently, he said—

“I have good authority for it. . . . I say his election was brought about in a certain way. . . . I say it is absolutely correct, and the hon. member knows it is correct.”

The hon. member also said—

“The influence to which I have referred may have been at work without his knowledge.”

Later on, he said—

“I could prove my contention up to the hilt.”

On being asked what his grounds were for making that statement, the hon. member merely said—

“Hon. members opposite have so often indulged in victimisation, that I feel sure that if I gave my authority, the person who gave me the information would be victimised, and placed at a serious disadvantage.”

That implies a substantive charge, reflecting upon my character in the position I hold as leader of the Opposition, and a member of this House, and it also involves a serious substantive charge against the members who have elected me to the position of their leader. I do not wish to refer to the earlier part of that statement, further than to say that, so far as my position as a legal member is concerned, certain suggestions were made as far back as 1912, and I then made a personal explanation to the House, which is to be found at page 566 of volume cxi. of “Hansard” for the year 1912. I have endeavoured at all times to keep within the lines of that personal explanation. With

reference to the other part of the hon. member's statement—the part which suggests that I was forced into the position of leader of the Opposition in this House by commercial magnates, by the money interests of Queensland, I say the statement is unfounded in fact, and absolutely false. (Hear, hear!) That hon. members who elected me to that position, in the ordinary course, were forced by the same reason, is also absolutely false. (Hear, hear!) I do not wish to abuse the permission which the House has given me to make a personal explanation. I invite the fullest inquiry into the matter, and if the hon. gentleman who leads the Government will have an inquiry made by a Supreme Court judge into the truth or otherwise of the allegation to which I refer, I am prepared to abide by the result of that inquiry, even if it means my retirement from the public life of this State.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I will deal with you later; I will prove what I said later.

The SPEAKER: Order!

ENEMY CONTRACTS ANNULMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

On the motion of the PREMIER, it was formally resolved—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill relating to contracts with enemy subjects.”

RESTRICTION OF HORSE-RACING TO LICENSED CLUBS.

* Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*), in moving—

“That, in the opinion of the House, legislation should be introduced to confine the conduct of horseracing to properly organised and licensed clubs, that do not race for the private profit of a racecourse proprietor or lessee.”

said: I called “Not formal” to this motion so that I might be able to bring under the notice of the House the character of some of the racing that takes place in Queensland. I do not wish to block the motion going to a division, but I think it would be to the advantage of the House if a little light was thrown on the subject. This motion I brought before the House last session, but somehow or other it always got to the bottom of the list on the business-paper, and we never had an opportunity of properly debating it. The subject is one which need not be approached in any party spirit; it is a matter which interests the whole of the people of Queensland, and I do not wish to treat it in any party manner. I hope that when the vote is taken I shall have the support of members on both sides of the House. I do not know whether the general public are aware of the fact that there are three or four different sorts of racing in Queensland. There are the clubs which are properly constituted clubs and which are registered by the Queensland Turf Club. There are also properly constituted clubs which are not registered and which do not run under the rules of the Queensland Turf Club. There are registered proprietary clubs, that is private clubs which run under the rules of the Queensland Turf Club. Then

there is a fourth class of clubs—namely, unregistered proprietary clubs. If a man is disqualified by registered clubs, he can immediately go and race under unregistered clubs, so that in some cases a disqualification is practically no disability. In England clubs are registered by the principal racing clubs. In America there are various methods of registering different clubs. Some of them are the same as those which prevail in Australia, the registration being done through the principal racing clubs, but in some of the States the Governor appoints a committee who attend to the registration of racing in the State. The best method is that adopted in New Zealand; there are some fifty or sixty clubs in New Zealand, and each of those clubs sends two delegates to Wellington where they meet each year, thrash out all the different complaints connected with racing during the year that is past, and appoints a committee whose functions are to manage racing during the following year.

Mr. MURPHY: A racing council.

Mr. GUNN: A racing council. That council takes charge of all the racing in New Zealand, and they refuse to register proprietary clubs at all. We might do something of that sort in Queensland. It is not so much an Act of Parliament in New Zealand as a custom, and the custom has become so prevalent there that it is equal to an Act of Parliament. I think that proprietary racing and unregistered racing has become so prevalent in Queensland that it will be necessary for us to pass an Act to deal with racing. If my motion is carried, you will observe that it is nothing very great. It is only a request that the Government deal with racing matters, and pass an Act pertaining thereto. If, on the other hand, my motion is defeated, it means that it will be taken as a hint to all proprietary clubs, and people of that sort, who like to go in for racing as an occupation, and make a living at it, to do so without any chance of being prohibited from doing so.

Mr. BOOKER: And exploit the public.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and exploit the public. There is no doubt about it, but that in recent years the blood stock is not what it was in the old days. Go back in history, say, 100 years, when they used to have races for 3 miles in Great Britain, and the jockeys carried 10 stone. The consequence was that the horses in those days were very efficient horses in time of war, and they produced good remounts, and carriage horses, and good riding horses. The sires which those horses produced came out to Australia, and I can remember some of the stock that came from them. I can safely say that the blood stock in Australia in those days were far better horses than those we have at the present day. (Hear, hear!) A great deal of that has been brought about by the short distances which the horses of to-day have to race, and the early racing, horses having to start racing now at two years old. If you follow the advertisements, you will see racing programmes put before the public for ponies of 13.2 hands and 14 hands. And, really, they have to race round a short course that no horse of any respectable size could get round. In olden times racing used to be the sport of kings, and of commoners, too, for that matter, as I don't say that it should be confined to kings. But in those

days everybody went to the races and considered it was a fine day's sport to see the fine animals that were racing. At the present time it is coming to this: that not only do we have racing on Saturdays and holidays, but we also have racing every day in the week. There are many men who have occupations as clerks in stores and banks, and when their employer finds out that they are in the habit of going to the races every Saturday, the employer begins to wonder why they are going there, and it is not long before these young men find that their situations are filled by someone else.

Mr. KIRWAN: How will you get over that difficulty?

Mr. GUNN: I will show you how to get over that difficulty later on. If the racecourses were controlled properly, as they are in New Zealand, or in some other way, by registering them, we could restrict the number of days of racing to, say, Saturdays and holidays, and we could only give permission to each club to have so many days' racing each year. That would restrict the racing very materially, and in that way we would get over the difficulty I was just speaking about, because these young men would not be able to go to the races so often. I am not one of those who believe that everything should be nationalised, that everything should be run by the State.

Mr. SMITH: You are coming to it, though.

Mr. GUNN: There are many things that it is necessary for the State to take charge of. I do not think the State should have unlimited racing, and the people should not be allowed to spend so much money as they do on racing at the present time. I think a lot of the money now spent on racing would be better spent if given to charity. Under the old system, at places like Warwick, Toowoomba, and other centres, they only had races two or three times a year; but if proprietary clubs are established at Sandgate, Gympie, or other places, the proprietor wants to make money out of the racing, and, instead of having races two or three times a year, he has races every Saturday and holiday. That sort of thing is not conducive to the breeding of good horses, nor to the breeding of good men either. (Hear, hear!) I am not acting merely in opposition to the proprietary racecourse owners. I am here in a public spirit. I do not want to interfere with anyone's enterprise or anything of that sort, but I want to prevent our young men from wasting their money on the racecourse when they might be better employed. They would be better employed in sport, such as rowing, football, or cricket, than by spending their time on the racecourse. I do not know how we can get rid of proprietary racing all at once, but under the Liquor Act we have a system of local option polls, under which the number of licenses to hotel-keepers might be reduced or increased. We might have something the same for racing. At any rate, no new licenses should be issued for racing. Perhaps we may have to pay compensation to those who own proprietary clubs; but, at any rate, the proprietary clubs should be absorbed in some way or other in the duly constituted racing clubs, and on all those racecourses of half a mile or six furlongs in circumference, it should be illegal to hold races there at all. It should also be illegal to race on any day but Saturday or a holiday, and it should be illegal

[Mr. Gunn.]

to race by electric light at night. A great number of young people attend these race meetings, not to see the races at all, but to gamble on the totalisator. It is not the excitement of the racing that attracts them but the excitement of gambling. You might just as well have a lot of iguanas racing round the bottom of a washtub as to have such race meetings as that. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: You would get a run for your money then. (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: At any rate, the iguana would not be "pulled," like the horses are at the present time. He would be a trier. (Laughter.) There is another matter in connection with racing, and that is the totalisator. I do not know if everyone understands how the totalisator is run. The owner of the machine gets 2 per cent., the Government get 5 per cent., and the club gets 6½ per cent. for their share. That is a good profit for the club. It is quite enough; in fact, I think it is too much. Then comes along the fractions. That amounts to this: If your dividend comes to 19s. 11d. on the totalisator, you only get 19s., and the other 11d. is collared by the club or by the proprietor of the racecourse.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is a pretty big fraction—too much.

Mr. GUNN: It is a big fraction, and it comes to more than people think. A friend worked out the figures for the metropolitan area last year, and the fractions that the people did not get, and which they ought to have got, amounted to £5,300. That money ought to be handed over to the hospitals. (Hear, hear!) If that money was handed over to the hospitals, and they got a subsidy of £2 for £1, it would mean that they would get nearly £16,000. There are other things that want looking after, perhaps, just as much as racecourses, but I think it is necessary that a Bill should be brought in to deal with racecourses. I do not want to talk on this matter, as I hope to see a division on the motion, and when the division comes, if the motion is passed, it will only be a request to the Government of the day to bring in a Racing Bill, and then the racing clubs and other people interested in the matter can deputationise the Premier, or whoever has charge of the measure, and make suggestions as to the best way of carrying on racing in Queensland. Before I sit down I would like also to say that there is another class of amusement that wants controlling, and that is the picture shows.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The TREASURER: That is outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: All I want to say is that they are on a par with racing clubs. I don't want to interfere with anybody's legitimate business, and I don't want to spoil sport in any way. I want to see clean sport and the blood horses of Queensland improved, but I don't want to see the people led astray at racecourses as they are at the present time. I hope my motion will be carried. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon. I am strongly opposed to proprietary racing. I do not know anything about the men conducting proprietary racing in Queensland at the present time; it is the principle I oppose. It has often been argued, in favour of pro-

proprietary racing, that an individual can run a meeting quite as honestly and as fairly as a club. I have nothing to say against that. If a straightforward, honourable man comes along, rents a piece of land, forms a course, and holds a meeting, no one can take exception to it, but I think the principle is a bad one, and it is about time that the Government of Queensland had some control over racing institutions. There are many reasons why I say that. In the first place, one of the first rules embodied in the constitution of a jockey club is that it is for the improvement of horses. Queensland is looked upon as one of the best horse-breeding countries in the world. I think the good horses that have been reared in Queensland in days gone by could hold their own with any horse in any other part of the world. I have had a lot to do amongst the stock of Queensland, and I know from experience that it is now hard to get a decent horse to ride. Five and twenty years ago you could go to a station yard, and it was just as interesting to look through the horses on the station as it is to look through the horse section at the Exhibition now.

Mr. TOLME: Quite true!

Mr. LAND: You could get a horse in those days off the grass that would carry you 100 miles, and you could run a lot of brumbies all day long; but you cannot find a horse to do that to-day. How many people, when one is talking in that strain, will quote the time? Yes, but they generally quote the time about spring. You take a programme and look at the acceptances at the end of the day and you will find the big farmers' prize, perhaps £500 or £1,000, and the smallest field starts at that time of the day. You will find in the country at most race meetings the hack race—the half-mile flutter—as a rule is the best race of the meeting, which goes to show that the horse is deteriorating. I had a look at some horses that were purchased by the Government for military purposes, and I can assure you that many of the horses were not too good. I know some of the men that were appointed to purchase horses for the military of Queensland, and I know them to be good judges and experienced men, and the fact that some of the horses were not too good goes to show that the horse in Queensland is deteriorating. I go a lot further, perhaps, than most people. First of all, I would like to say that I do not think there are many men and women in Queensland who would favour doing away with racing. The people of Australia generally are fond of racing; they are fond of the sport, and they are fond of horses, and consequently they will race, and while they race they will bet. You might as well try to stop the tide coming in as try to stop the people of Queensland from betting at race meetings. I do not see why you should stop them either. That being so, I think it is right that the Government should control racing for the protection of the people who frequent racecourses and the people who bet. If I had my way I would have bookmakers, and I would issue the licenses direct by the Crown. Hundreds and thousands of pounds pass through the bookmakers' hands every year, and I would like to know what the Government get out of that. The Government, or past Governments, seemed to think they had a right to get something out of betting because they legalised the totalisator and they took 5 per cent. of the money invested. Then, why should not the people of Queensland get

Mr. Land.]

something out of the bookmakers? I think that is nothing but fair. If you legalise bookmaking, you protect the bookmaker, and protect the betting public also. I think it is nothing but fair that the people should be protected, and that the Government should be protected also, and by that means you would get some revenue. I do not say that revenue won in that way should be earmarked for hospitals or any other charitable institutions at all, because I think it should go into the consolidated revenue, and I think that hospitals ought to be financed out of the consolidated revenue—(hear, hear!)—and all our charitable institutions, too.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Why not tax picture shows?

Mr. LAND: I would be out of order if I dealt with that question. (Laughter.) I do not want to be drawn off the track, but I think that it would be a fair thing for the Government to take that matter in hand at once. With reference to the totalisator, if a man invests £1 in the totalisator, it is gone in six times. Of course, practically we can say that it takes eight times to follow up £1 in expenses on the "tote," but some people go further and say that £1 is gone after six investments. Now, that seems very unfair. But I think that, instead of the Government taking 5 per cent., they ought to take the totalisator over altogether, and run it themselves, and let the whole of the money go into the consolidated revenue. The fractions have been referred to. I think the fractions have no right to be taken away from the public at all. It is their money if it is anyone's, and if it is not theirs it is no man's, and I think the Government should step in at an early date and take the fractions. When we come to consider the number of race meetings that are held in the metropolitan area, the class of meetings, and the way they are held—if we watch the people who follow up racing—it is not a fair thing. You can go round to some racecourses on race days, and you will see a great number of people upon a hill, carrying on betting transactions, clear away from the racecourse altogether. At Kedron, as you drive along the road close to the course, you will see people with betting tickets, which shows that they must be doing a very great business outside the course altogether. That kind of thing is done, and it is under no control, and I think that, if for no other reason than to protect the people who patronise races, the Government should take action. I think, also, that it is about time they took some action towards controlling the distances that are run by the horses to-day. It would be a good thing to fix a minimum distance. We will say, for argument's sake, that six furlongs should be the shortest distance that a race could be run. (Hear, hear!) I think, too, that horses should not be allowed to race as early as they do. It is the cause of many of our horses being small in size, and helps a good deal to bring about the small horse. The hon. member for Carnarvon referred to racing ponies being 13.2 hands. I would not have any objection to anyone racing ponies; I would not mind about the size, but these ponies are small weeds, and there is no doubt that many people try to breed them as small as they possibly can. They try to breed thoroughbreds as small as they can to race in pony meetings. I think it would be in the interests of Queens-

land for the Government to step in and control racing at our meetings. I hope that if this motion is carried the Government will give the matter fair consideration, and take some action towards minimising the evils in connection with racing at the present time. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I have pleasure in rising to support the motion that has been moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon and seconded by the hon. member for Balonne. Before I go any further, may I be permitted, as this is the first occasion on which I have spoken in the House, to offer my congratulations to you, Sir, on the position you have been placed in as Speaker of this House, and to hope that you will enjoy that position for some time, and also any higher position that the representatives of the country may be wishful to confer upon you. In speaking on this motion, I agree with the hon. member who moved it, that this is an opportune time to bring forward a question of this sort. There is not the slightest doubt that our country, with other parts of the Empire, is passing through a strenuous time which demands the earnest consideration and attention of every member of the Legislature and of the people generally, and if the House can do anything to rivet the attention of the people to the serious matters that are before us in connection with our nation while at war, I think that a splendid object will be served in bringing forward a motion like this. I am not particularly adverse to horseracing, in a certain sense, but I say that horseracing as it is carried on to-day, more particularly in connection with proprietary clubs, is not an advantage, either to the horsebreeder or the State, and it is detrimental to the young people of our country; and for that reason I think we shall be well advised in bringing forward a measure that will at least abolish proprietary racing, and will place such limits on other racing as will make it such as not to adversely affect the young people of the State. It might have been considered once that horseracing was necessary for the development of the horse, but I think that day has gone by. With the advent of the motor-car, the motor-cycle, and the aeroplane, the great need for splendid horses in war time which was emphasised in days gone by is rapidly passing away, and the time will soon come when they will not be required in that direction. I hope the time will soon come when they will not be required for that pursuit alone, because I trust that the nations of the world will, after this war, find other methods of settling disputes. I trust that the motion will come to a division, and that it will be decided in favour of what is best for the people of the State, and more particularly our young people. I wish to emphasise the fact that ponyracing as it is carried on to-day, in fact, horseracing of all sorts, does not lead to the production of the best horses. We have an example of that in connection with a recent visit some months back of the military expert to buy horses throughout Queensland. He had the utmost difficulty to get the class of horses required for remount purposes. Ten or twelve years ago that was not so, and Queensland in particular was noted for a splendid breed of horses. The deterioration that has taken place of recent years is a condemnation of the practice of breeding horses for racing short distances. The object nowadays seems to be to breed a light animal which is only able to scamper perhaps

[*Mr. Land.*

half a mile or six furlongs, or at furthest a mile and a-quarter, and after a race he requires three or four weeks to get fit to race again. Ten or twelve years ago a man could do 100 miles in a day on the one horse, and perhaps he could ask him to do another 60 miles the next day. I want to draw attention to the evils of gambling that are associated more particularly with proprietary racing, but it also applies to other racecourses as well. Attention should be paid to the evil before it goes too far. There is not the slightest doubt that the proprietary racecourse is the recruiting ground for the gamblers who are growing up to-day. Gambling was not so much in vogue ten or twelve years ago; but let any race meeting be held in any town now and you will find gathered there a group of men who once were workers, but who now never do a tap of work, and in between race meetings they are simply running a "two-up school" or a "hazard school," and they often find the pigeons to pluck at these proprietary race meetings. In the interests of the young men of the State, and perhaps in the interests of some of the young women, too, I believe that proprietary racing should be condemned and should be done away with at the earliest opportunity.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*): I have a few words to say with reference to proprietary racing, which has not done the vast amount of evil in this State that has been stated. So far as racing itself is concerned, I may say that I have not been on a racecourse for the past two years, so that I am not speaking from the personal point of view; but I think the hon. members who have previously spoken have not shown any fair and lucid reason why proprietary racing in this State should be abolished. I think also that to do so would be to interfere a great deal with the liberty of the subject. Whoever takes up the business of proprietary racing is not doing it, as a rule, for the public good, but he naturally wants to make a certain amount of profit out of it. The proprietary race meetings, by giving good prizes, have compelled registered clubs, such as the Queensland Turf Club, to follow suit, and give much higher prizes than they gave some years ago, before the advent of the proprietary clubs. The business of proprietary racing is like any other business. Those who invested a large amount of capital in it did so thinking they would have a fair chance of getting a certain return. No man will go into a thing bald-headed unless he expects to get some fair return from it. There is another thing with regard to this racing. Vast numbers of horses are being bred every year, and they are also importing the very best sires and mares from England, and from America, and they are paying very big prices for those horses to get good stock for racing and other purposes. But, no matter how good your sire may be, or how good your dam may be, there are always sure to be some animals that are not as good as others, and those which are not good enough to compete in the classic races compete in races in connection with the smaller clubs, where they have more chance of winning. Then again, supposing we do away altogether with proprietary racing, there are other directions in which people will gamble—directions which are much worse than gambling at the proprietary race meetings which exist in our midst at the present time.

Of course, we are not allowed to touch upon picture shows, but even now there are more picture shows than there are race meetings.

Mr. COLLINS: Are the picture shows an evil?

Mr. MAY: Undoubtedly they are a rank evil; but the hon. member is leading me off the track. (Laughter.) I do not wish to dwell upon the question at any length, but I would point out that there is a vast number of young men making their living at racing who are not up to the standard to go to the war on account of their light weight, but who are the support of their parents, and the abolition of proprietary racing would throw those young fellows out of employment.

Mr. MURPHY: Put them on the land.

Mr. MAY: They would scarcely be fit to be put on the land; they have not got the strength. They would not even be able to go into the fighting ring. That is another evil equally as bad as horseracing. There are undoubtedly worse evils than this proprietary racing; and, if it was not for the proprietary racing, the club racing which has always existed would not be nearly so good as it is at the present time.

Mr. BOOKER (*Wide Bay*): I am in absolute accord with the motion proposed by the hon. member for Carnarvon. When the motion was discussed in the last Parliament, I spoke at some length upon it. My sentiments to-day were my sentiments then. I rise particularly to-day to give voice to the fact that only quite lately a club at Gympie, representing, I understand, the Kedron Racing Club—an unregistered club in Brisbane—made application to the Maryborough Municipal Council to acquire the Maryborough racecourse for a term of years, to race in Maryborough once a fortnight under unregistered conditions. That clearly indicates the trend of the racing world at this particular time in Queensland. It is a notorious fact that in Brisbane at the present time the sporting world is controlled by one individual, who controls racing not only in Queensland but in other States. (Hear, hear!) He also controls another section of public life, and it is quite possible that, eventually, he may control still another section of public life. He may control Parliament. That is why I am on my feet to-day, just in a quiet way, to throw out a suggestion. The question comes to this: Whether Queensland and Queenslanders are going to hand over bodily the sport of this State to private individuals, whether it is racing, whether it is running, or whether it is fighting; sailing, boating, or any other form of sport. And the Premier made some reference to the necessity for putting the brake on something, and if it is necessary to put the brake on private enterprise that is growing food for the people, then there are ten thousand more reasons why Parliament should put the brake on something else and prevent the accumulation of great riches out of the misery of the people.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: Nobody can question the fact that racing, next to drink, is doing more harm to the people of this country than any other circumstance. All [4.30 p.m.] you have to do is to walk down the main street of the city, and what do you find at this particular critical

Mr. Booker.]

time—and any other sporting centre? You find able-bodied men, who should not be there; they should be somewhere else. (Hear, hear!) And that is one of the reasons why I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the proposal of the hon. member for Carnarvon. It is also a very opportune time that this motion should come before the public men of Queensland for this reason—and it is for this reason that I hope that the vote this afternoon will be unanimous, or as near unanimity as it is possible—that next week the annual meeting of the Queensland Turf Club is to be held, at which, I understand, this question will be discussed very fully by the racing men of Queensland. And no doubt, if Parliament indicates to the Queensland Turf Club that Parliament is behind a proposal to restrict unlimited racing under unlimitedly bad conditions, it will be a means of letting them know that in anything they do they will have the representatives of the people behind them to legislate in the proper direction. Nobody without prejudice can say that this thing is helpful to the horse-breeder; nobody can say that it is helpful to the sporting men who love a good race, or to the young people who are growing up in this State. To me there is not one redeeming feature about it. Nobody can question that horseracing in itself is an ennobling pastime; under proper conditions it is good for everybody concerned, but when it comes out of its proper sphere, and is controlled by men, or sets of men, who are out to make profit, large or small, out of the sport, then the public men of the State, who are here to control every channel of enterprise in a proper way, are under an obligation to do the right thing. I have great pleasure in supporting the proposal, and I do hope that Parliament, in its wisdom, will give such a vote this afternoon that when the Queensland Turf Club meets next week to discuss this matter amongst others, the men who are supporting the abolition of unregistered racing, and also proprietary racing, will have the feeling that in anything they do they will have Parliament behind them.

Mr. MURPHY (*Burke*): I have heard a good many Thursday afternoon debates in this House, but I think this is the first occasion when I have heard a motion go without some expression of opinion from some member of the Cabinet upon it.

The PREMIER: It has not gone yet, you know.

Mr. MURPHY: It has been usual, and it is customary, so soon as a motion is proposed and seconded, that some member of the Cabinet should rise and address himself to the question. Of course, that is a matter upon which the members of the Cabinet will please themselves. I would certainly have liked to hear that expression of opinion from some member of the Cabinet, because we know perfectly well that this is merely an abstract motion, and even if the House carry it, unless the Cabinet take the matter up, it will end just as a decision of the Assembly recorded in the proceedings of the Chamber. Now, the hon. member for Flinders, to my mind, gave excellent reasons why this proprietary racing should be abolished. He pointed out the immense profits that the proprietors of certain racecourses in this district are making. He said, "Look at the amount of money he is distributing in prizes! Before he came here prizes were not nearly

[*Mr. Booker.*

as big as they are to-day." To my mind, that showed conclusively the immense profits that this individual must be making out of his racecourses. He does not put his hand into his pocket and, from philanthropic motives, give the prizes back for the owners of racehorses to compete for. He makes a profit out of it, and he increases his prizes, because this enables him still further to increase his profits. The hon. member for Carnarvon, in moving this motion, referred to vested interests. I remember reading a very interesting article on the question of vested interests recently in the "Brisbane Daily Mail," and that article pointed out to the present Government, a Labour Government, that they should give no consideration to vested interests whatever; that vested interests should not count against the interests of the people; that those vested interests should be swept away; that it was the duty of the Labour Government and its labour following to place the interests of the community first, and the interests of vested interests afterwards. That is the position to-day. So far as this Chamber is concerned, it has got to look to this question of proprietary racing from the community standpoint, and say whether private enterprise should be allowed to make immense profits out of racing? There are properly constituted clubs everywhere throughout Queensland, and people are able to go there and back their fancies, and join in the sport of kings.

Mr. COLLINS: Kings!

Mr. MURPHY: Well, it is usually referred to as "the sport of kings." Of course, the hon. member, not being a king, nor likely to be a king, does not appreciate the nicety of the expression. Having descended from a long race of kings, I realise the position. (Laughter.) I like to refer to the matter in a nice way—the sport of my ancestors, "the sport of kings." (Laughter.) Now, racing is promoted in the various States of Australia in order to fill the pockets or swell the banking accounts of private individuals. In the old days people formed clubs to help the sport along in order to help their annual carnival, and the profits went to beautify their courses and increase the prizes. Some hon. member has told us about the betting outside the Kedron Park racecourse. I suppose that this is brought about because the proprietor of this course has been compelled to increase his prizes, and has to get the extra amount of money out of the pockets of the people, with the result that many of them are unable to pay the increased cost of admission, and look over the fence and do their betting outside. To leave that out of the question altogether, it seems to me that the question that this House has to consider is whether, if we pass this motion, we will be doing an injustice to any individual? Will we be getting away from the position of the last Parliament in connection with the Licensing Act? We know members of the present Government stood up in their places when on the Opposition side of the House, and said that we were perfectly justified, that Parliament had a perfect right to interfere with the liquor trade, because no vested interests existed. If we have got that right in connection with the big liquor trade, this Chamber has also a right to give an expression of opinion in relation to the continuance of proprietary racing; and I certainly say that it will be in the interests of the community, it will be in the interests

of the business people, and certainly in the interests of the working classes also, if there were less racing in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) We hear a good deal about the cost of living, and we know that it has gone up, but any Saturday, or on any race day, you can go down the street and see the people paying 6d. to Mr. Badger to take them to Ascot or other courses to see the races, and you wonder where the money comes from. Read the reports of the sporting in the newspapers, or of the amounts that go through the totalisator, or read of the amount of betting that takes place, and one can come to no other conclusion than that the great majority of the people in Queensland—the people in the city, at any rate—are in pretty flourishing circumstances. As the hon. member for Balonne has pointed out, Australians are fond of horseracing. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber who can be described as a "spoil-sport." The mover and seconder of the motion, and members generally, have no objection to race meetings, but they say that racing should be properly conducted—that it should be conducted in the way it is carried on by ordinary race clubs, that racing should not be permitted to be conducted for private profit, and that a single individual should not be able to run a racecourse, make his own rules, and increase his bank balance by racing. I think it would be a good thing to request the Cabinet to take this matter into their serious consideration, and introduce legislation to abolish proprietary racing. When the hon. member for Carnarvon was speaking, I intimated that the fractions from the totalisator really belonged to the public, and that is a fact. It has been suggested that they should be given to the hospital, but if the fractions belong to anybody they belong to the investing public. Why should those who patronise race meetings be singled out for special taxation on behalf of our charitable institutions? Our charitable institutions should be maintained by the whole community, and, if anything is done with the totalisator fractions, we should insist that they are returned to the public who contribute the money. Not only proprietary race clubs, but what may be termed co-operative racing clubs, should hand that money back to the public. If I go into a shop and buy an article which is marked 19s. 1d., and hand the attendant £1, I have to get my change, and why should the proprietors of racecourses not give the public the full amount of their dividends? I hope that, at no distant date, the Cabinet will take this matter into consideration, and introduce legislation which will very speedily abolish the system of proprietary racing.

The PREMIER: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat has suggested that some member of the Cabinet should have something to say on the motion moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon. I remember that the hon. member for Carnarvon brought forward a similar motion last session, and that it was eventually put down at the end of the list. I do not know by what means the motion got there, but I know that it got to the very end of the list of private members' business.

Mr. MURPHY: Was it not due to the arrangement made about the separation motion?

The PREMIER: I do not know how it got there, but it got to the end of the list.

If I understand the motion aright, the hon. member for Carnarvon desires to have proprietary racing prohibited, and if I understood him correctly he indicated that existing proprietary racing should not be interfered with, except upon terms. Do I understand the hon. member aright? Does he mean by this motion that existing proprietary interests are to be confiscated?

Mr. GUNN: I think that is a matter for the Cabinet.

The PREMIER: Yes, but I should like to thoroughly understand what the House would be carrying by agreeing to a motion of this kind, and what is in the mind of the mover, so that the Cabinet may have some indication as to what he desires to be done.

Mr. GUNN: I mentioned the Liquor Act and local option.

The PREMIER: I will put the matter very plainly. Does the hon. member suggest that existing proprietary interests should be confiscated without compensation?

Mr. GUNN: I do not, but some do.

The PREMIER: Well, I now know that the mover of the motion does not suggest that. I am of opinion that something should be done with regard to the regulation of the conduct of horseracing, whether it is carried on by licensed clubs or proprietary concerns. I am also of opinion that some action should at some future time be taken by legislation—whether it should be on the lines followed in New Zealand or on the lines adopted in Victoria is a matter for investigation; but whatever action is taken should be taken on sound lines. Listening to the speech delivered by the mover of the motion, it is impossible for me to gather exactly what he desires to be done, and I think that in dividing the House on a motion of this kind we should know specifically what the House is dividing on. The hon. member who moved the motion says he thinks existing proprietary interests should not be confiscated, unless compensation is given.

Mr. GUNN: According to the New Zealand Act and regulations.

The PREMIER: Do they provide that compensation shall be given if proprietary interests are confiscated?

Mr. GUNN: They provide that a council shall be constituted.

The PREMIER: I take it, then, that the hon. member desires to have legislation for the purpose of regulating the conduct of horseracing.

Mr. GUNN: With a view to the prohibition of proprietary racing.

The PREMIER: The abolition of existing proprietary racing?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

The PREMIER: Without compensation?

Mr. GUNN: I do not say without compensation.

The PREMIER: I should like to know what the hon. member desires. If the motion is passed, it should state something definite. I am anxious, as the leader of the Government, to know what is the wish of the House, and I should like to see the motion put in a specific form, so that we can translate it into legislation if we think fit, and not have the hon. member saying

Hon. T. J. Ryan.]

afterwards, "I did not mean this," or "I did not mean that." I am of opinion that at this particular time there are more urgent and pressing matters for legislation than horseracing. (Hear, hear!) I know it is the intention of the Government to see that undue profits are not made by anybody, whether out of horseracing or speculation or in any other way. The Government will take what steps seem best adapted to secure a proper share of those profits reaching the public Treasury, but there must be no discrimination.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): I would like to have something to say on this motion, and I may say, in the first place, that I have not discovered anything in the remarks of hon. members to-day to cause me to alter the opinion I formed on this question when it was before the House last session. Those who are supporting this motion have not given any reason at all why I should alter the opinion I formed last year. We are told that we want to do away with betting. I want to know what more inducement there is to bet at the proprietary meetings than there is at the meetings of the Queensland Turf Club?

Mr. LAND: No one said anything about wanting to do away with betting.

Mr. COYNE: The main argument used by hon. members was that they wanted to do away with betting.

Mr. LAND: I never heard that.

Mr. MURPHY: No one mentioned it.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member for Carnarvon said that a great deal of betting was carried on at these meetings. The hon. member for Balonne also said that a great deal of betting was carried on, and he believed that the public should be allowed to bet.

Mr. LAND: I did not exactly say that. I asked how you were going to stop them from betting?

Mr. GUNN: Not have so many race meetings.

Mr. COYNE: That is all right, but how are you going to stop men from betting by saying that they must not bet on proprietary courses, but they can bet on the course of the Queensland Turf Club?

Mr. MURPHY: We say abolish the proprietary clubs altogether.

Mr. COYNE: I think that hon. members are inclined to wipe out horseracing altogether in Queensland.

Mr. LAND: No.

Mr. COYNE: Oh, yes.

Mr. LAND: Wipe out the proprietary meetings.

Mr. COYNE: Hon. members say they want to wipe out the proprietary meetings because they are run by a private individual, and because he is making profits that would otherwise be made by a properly constituted turf club.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, and distributing the money amongst the horseowners.

Mr. COYNE: We have got properly constituted turf clubs in Queensland to-day. I have got no brief for any proprietary club in Queensland. I have never been on a private racecourse in my life; I have never been on any racecourse in Brisbane. I have seen picnic race meetings out West, and I have seen as "cronk" racing there as you would

[*Hon. T. J. Ryan.*

see anywhere. If you are going to wipe out racing altogether, I can understand what the motion means. The proprietary racecourse induces horseowners to come along with their stock by offering good prizes. I have read the papers, and I see that the proprietary racecourse meetings give as good prizes as those of the Queensland Turf Club. If these race meetings are not going to be properly conducted, so far as the public are concerned, then it is time that the Government of Queensland took steps to properly govern them. With regard to electric light racing, I knew nothing about it, and I cannot speak concerning it. I was never at a race meeting at night, but the police are there to see that everything is conducted in an orderly manner, and see that they are carried out as well as the turf club meetings are.

Mr. STEVENS: What have the police got to do with it?

Mr. COYNE: The police will see that the people are not robbed more than they are at any other meeting.

Mr. VOWLES: They are robbed in other ways.

Mr. COYNE: You don't want to go to a race meeting to be robbed, so far as betting is concerned. You can go down the street at any time and make a bet on the Melbourne Cup or any other race. You are just as likely to be robbed when you don't see the horses as you are when you do see them.

Mr. FOLEY: What about "pulling" the horse?

Mr. COYNE: There is a bigger chance of "pulling" a horse you do not see than the horse you do see. I quite admit that excessive betting is a terrible curse. The hon. member for Fitzroy referred to the fact that proprietary race meetings gave an opportunity for pigeons to be plucked that otherwise might not occur. I know that there are a number of parasites who lay themselves out to pluck pigeons.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: A pretty big number, too.

Mr. COYNE: They have no opportunity of plucking them while the race is on. I think that there is more plucking of pigeons done at one of those "two-up schools" in one day than is done on a racecourse in twelve months.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: The racecourse is a breeding ground for "two-up schools."

Mr. COYNE: Those who frequent proprietary courses frequently attend the other courses, and if you are going to do away with these sharks and parasites from one racecourse, you will have to do away with racing altogether, or they will attend the other courses. The only way to remove the sources of temptation from the public is to do away with racing altogether, or else bring in an Act of Parliament to deal with the whole army of parasites and bloodsuckers who follow up the race meetings. If these people are allowed to exist as they are at present, then the public will be taken down whether you have proprietary race meetings or not. I have not heard a solitary argument from those who supported the motion this afternoon to cause me to alter the opinion I formed last year. The whole object at the bottom of this motion is to get the Government to subsidise the Queensland Turf Club. It is to induce the horseowners to have all their stock racing at the one club,

and it is to bring all the racing into the one channel—namely, the Queensland Turf Club.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: They don't run races two or three times a week.

Mr. COYNE: The whole thing lies in the hands of the public. If they did not attend and invest their money, meetings would not be held two or three times a week. If the public did not attend and invest their money on the totalisator, then the whole thing would fall through very quickly. It is said that these proprietary people are making great profits. That shows that the public want these people. They require them and they desire them. In the bush we have only one or two race meetings in the year. At the shearing-sheds the station-owner gives the horses to the shearing-sheds to run a race meeting for the benefit of the hospital. The men look after the horses there. There is an auction of the horses for the privilege of racing them, and each man bids for a horse according to his fancy. All the money got for these horses at the auction is [5 p.m.] put into a fund, and that goes to the hospital. Then six or seven races are held that afternoon. Do you think that, although this is for charitable purposes, there is no betting carried on? Of course there is betting carried on, and of course there are bookmakers. Some of them constitute themselves bookmakers, and there is always the general crowd ready to back the horses, and probably many of them never saw the horses until they were brought into the yard on that particular Saturday. You cannot do away with betting.

Mr. MURPHY: Nobody suggested you could.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member for Carnarvon used that as his main argument in support of the motion.

Mr. GUNN: No.

Mr. COYNE: Yes; do away with betting. The hon. member for Fitzroy said so, too.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: That is correct.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member for Balonne referred to the fact that he remembers the time when you could get a grass-fed horse that you could ride 100 miles. I believe you can find them still.

Mr. LAND: Yes, but they are very few and far between.

Mr. COYNE: Yes; but owing to improved machinery, their use is decreasing. The hon. member also said that the stamina of the horse to-day is not equal to what it was a number of years ago. The reason why the stamina of the bush horse to-day is not equal to what it was a number of years ago is because a number of thoroughbred sires got away into the bush with brumby mares, and for the first two or three breedings the stock was all right, but when inbreeding commenced to any extent the stock deteriorated. But had proprietary racing anything to do with that? That is what I want to know. I have followed the arguments right along, and I want to know what proprietary racing has had to do with the deterioration in the stamina of the bush horse. Why, the horseowners in the bush never saw proprietary racing. The majority of them does not understand what proprietary racing is. They never heard anything about it till they read the hon. member for Carnarvon's speech last year. I want hon.

members to show me in what way proprietary racing has deteriorated the stamina of horses in Queensland.

Mr. GUNN: It has deteriorated the standard of the people by giving them too much racing.

Mr. COYNE: If looking at races is going to deteriorate the standard of the people, what about the bushmen, who look at racing pretty well every day—men who are never off their horses from one year's end to the other. It is not the looking at racing that deteriorates the standard of the people. I thought the hon. member backed up his arguments in support of this motion by stating that it was betting that caused the deterioration. I say you are not going to do away with betting. The people bet on foot races, on football matches, on cricket matches, on rowing matches—on anything at all—and probably in the course of a year or two we shall hear about some very large bets being made on aeroplane races, or something of that sort. So you are not going to do away with betting.

Mr. VOWLES: On the result of an election.

Mr. COYNE: On the result of an election, certainly. There is any amount of betting carried on in regard to that.

Mr. MURPHY: Nobody backed your opponent, though.

Mr. COYNE: No. I hope, before this comes to a vote, that some hon. members who are against proprietary racing will advance some reasons in favour of the motion. I have a perfectly open mind on the matter.

Mr. MURPHY: You want to be convinced.

Mr. COYNE: I do; and I will be convinced if any hon. member can show me where you are going to improve the standard of horses in Queensland by doing away with proprietary racing, where you are going to improve the standard of the citizens of this State by doing away with proprietary racing, where you are going to do away with the so-called evils of the bookmaker by doing away with proprietary racing, where you are going to keep more money in the country by doing away with proprietary racing, or how you are going to improve the conditions of the bulk of the people of Queensland by doing away with proprietary racing. I want some reason to be given, and no reason has been advanced so far. I am afraid always in matters like this that there is some motive—I do not say behind the hon. member for Carnarvon, but behind those who have prompted him to bring this forward two sessions running—that there is some motive behind it that would probably not be in the best interests of the State, and for that reason I am going to stick to the opinion I had last year, and vote against the motion.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I have listened carefully to this discussion on what I regard as a very important question, and I must admit at the outset that those members who are in favour of abolishing proprietary racing have not brought forward any convincing arguments at all. I must say that I am disappointed, and as this is an important departure, members of this House are entitled to more cogent and strong reasons why the motion should receive approval at the hands of a majority of hon. members.

Mr. MURPHY: Now give us some reasons why it should be permitted to continue.

Mr. Kirwan.]

Mr. KIRWAN: We are told that there are a good number of evils attaching to proprietary racing, which members who are opposed to it allege are not to be found under the club system. I quite agree that legislation is required to more effectively deal with horseracing, and to protect the unfortunate public, who seem to regard horseracing as a pastime or sport, from being plucked. The hon. member for Warrego made reference to the fact that there was a certain class of men who were engaged in plucking pigeons. Now, there are some very shrewd men in Queensland—leading lights in the professional life, in the commercial life, and even members of this honourable House, who go to Eagle Farm, and are plucked continually. We know perfectly well, from reading comments by the sporting writers in the daily Press, that there are some glaring cases of inconsistency at Eagle Farm; but simply because the proprietor of the racehorse is an influential man in either the political or commercial world, the whole thing is winked at, and the average person sarcastically suggests to the stipendiary stewards—who are supposed to look after the public a little—that their eyesight ought to be tested. What I wish to make clear is this: That I, for one, cannot see that horseracing under proprietary conditions is any worse than under Eagle Farm club conditions, as far as fleecing the general public is concerned, as far as inconsistency in form is concerned, and also as far as the general neglect of the stipendiary stewards to carry out their duties and put a stop to what is commonly termed “in and out” running is concerned, for a horse starts one day a hot favourite, with the heads backing it, and comes anywhere, and wins next day, and wins by the proverbial sprint.

Mr. LAND: Do the stipendiary stewards attend at Albion Park?

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member for Balonne wants to know if the stipendiary stewards attend at Albion Park. I understand that the same gentlemen, whose eyesight is very defective at Eagle Farm, attend also at Albion Park, and when there is some poor unfortunate person who has one horse in training, they pounce on him, and send him or the owner out for twelve months, after failing to protect the general public who attend at Eagle Farm. I admit that there is a danger and menace in having a monopoly in proprietary racing, and I am one of those who believe that there are good grounds for taking action in the direction of protecting the public in that particular way. But, at the same time, let us be fair. No one can gainsay the fact that the advent of a certain gentleman, whom, no doubt, this motion will seriously affect if it is carried, has woke up the leading club in Queensland to the fact that they were not offering that prize money to which horseowners were entitled. There is no denying the fact that since his advent to Queensland the Queensland Turf Club has given a large increase in prize money, which previously the committee which governed that body contended that they were not in a position to give. I think it is only fair that when we are denouncing the proprietary race clubs, we should at the same time be absolutely fair. You cannot very well dissociate the individual from the system. To all intents and purposes the individual is more or less wrapped up in the system, and for that reason any attack on the system cannot be effected without imperilling the individual

[Mr. Kirwan.]

who has put his money into this particular enterprise. I trust that, if this motion is carried, any measure which is brought forward dealing with racing will be a comprehensive one, and will deal not only with proprietary racing clubs, but will also give the public more protection than they have received up to the present time from those who are supposed to lead as far as racing is concerned. Reference was made during the discussion to electric light racing. Possibly, the hon. member for Carnarvon is not aware of the fact that it is discontinued at the present time, but in my judgment there were no worse cases of racing and fleecing the public under electric light than there are on our fashionable racecourses in this city or in other parts of the State. There are unfortunately associated with the racing fraternity a number of men who will not run the “sport of kings,” as it was originally intended it should be run, and who are out each time to run for profit and not for sport, and I should have derived considerable pleasure if the hon. member who introduced the motion had given us any enlightenment as to the way in which a legislative enactment could be made to deal with these individuals. If the motion comes to a division, I am prepared to vote for it, but I think that before the Government take any action in this matter, if they are disposed to do so on a majority vote of this House, a full inquiry should be made into the racing systems in existence in the different States, and the whole question thoroughly gone into. We also know that wrapped up in this question is a very important aspect, that is the dealing with the totalisator and the bookmaker. Some people contend that there should be no bookmakers allowed, and that their presence on a racecourse gives an opportunity to the unscrupulous owner—to use a sporting phrase—to “put the horse in the bag,” and fleeces the public, because he cannot get the price that suits him. The argument is that he could not square the machine, and I believe that that is an unanswerable argument in favour of the totalisator, and it should receive the favourable consideration of the Government. If they are going to deal with the question at all, I hope it will be dealt with in a comprehensive measure, and in a manner that will be fair to all the parties concerned.

Mr. McPHAIL (*Windsor*): I think there is one point in connection with this matter which has been lost sight of, which is this: That proprietary control is making racing an utter commercial business, whereas racing under the old system was, or, at least, we understood it to be, really a sport.

Mr. GUNN: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPHAIL: The idea of proprietary racing is to make a profit for those who run the business. Racing under the old system, so I understood, was for the purpose of breeding a better class of horse. One thing I notice to-day, and I am glad of it, is this: that the Opposition, or some of them, are commencing to see a little light in their darkness, and are prepared to realise that there are monopolies in racing. I am thinking that before very long we shall also see them realising that there are monopolies in other walks of life. As far as racing is concerned to-day, my own opinion is that whether it is proprietary racing, or the ordinary form of racing, it has developed simply into a gambling business. I would like to see the Govern-

ment introduce a measure to make gambling illegal altogether. (Hear, hear!) If we just desire a contest between two horses to find out their stamina, and to enjoy the sport, all well and good; but when we know that the majority of people go to a racecourse with only one idea—that is, to back a winner and make money out of it—we realise that the sport has lost its true meaning. We also find that to-day racing has developed into sprint runs, that the racehorses of Australia, at any rate, cannot last more than about two or three years, and then they are done. They are simply bred as delicate machines for the purpose of winning their owners races or to be used in the business of making money, and then they are thrown aside; whereas we have understood in the past that horseracing was for the purpose of breeding a class of animal that would show its ability to stand when it was called upon to be tested. It is my opinion that the sport is not what it used to be in days gone by, and the sooner we introduce legislation that will purify it the better it will be, not only for the horses themselves, but for the general community. I quite agree with what some members said this afternoon with regard to the demoralising influence which is being plainly seen to-day in regard to horseracing. We find men flocking to the racecourses simply for the purpose of placing money upon a horse, to try and add to their earnings, and more often than not they leave their money behind them, or come away emptier in pocket than they went to the course. Personally, I shall support the motion, because I believe it is along right lines. I feel that we should not have any monopolies in regard to these things, and that we should, as long as we have the evil here, make its influence as little felt as possible. If there are those who are controlling racing simply for the purpose of striving to better the class of horses, their intentions may be good, and let us stop at that without allowing it to become commercialised and used simply for the purpose of making profits for individuals. I trust that the motion will be carried, and that later on this House will deal with the matter seriously, and strive to make this sport as clean as other sports. I have heard hon. members here this afternoon say that men will bet on anything. I am quite prepared to admit that, and I know very well that a good deal of money changes hands on the result of the elections. At the same time, you can go to a football match or a cricket match without finding men turning to those sitting beside them and wanting to make a bet on who is going to win the match. I am quite convinced that, if stringent regulations were introduced and if betting were forbidden on racecourses, we would not have so much of it as we do at the present time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): I admit that I know very little about horseracing, but the motion, as it has been submitted to us, appears to deal with one class of horseracing only, leaving all other forms severely alone, to be carried on at their own sweet will. Most people admit that there is no inherent evil in seeing which horse will win a race; but they do admit that there are evils connected with horseracing which are demoralising; and I would like to know a little more about these things before I am prepared to vote for the motion as it stands. I think it could be improved in such a way

as to allow this House to deal with the whole question of horseracing, instead of confining it to one class of racing. I, therefore, move the omission of all the words after the word "introduced," on the 2nd line, with the view of inserting the words, "to regulate the conduct of horseracing." Take almost any class of sport you like, that sport can be degraded in the same way as horseracing. I have seen betting at football matches and at cricket matches. In fact, we are told that some men have even gone the length of betting which drop of rain would run the fastest down the window pane when it has been raining. They will go to any lengths to bet. I do not suppose we shall ever be able to eradicate the betting instinct in men, but we can regulate these things so that they will cause less harm to the public.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I desire to second the amendment moved by the hon. member for Ipswich. I have listened to the debate this afternoon, and I am not quite sure, from the speech of the hon. member for Carnarvon, whether the motion will accomplish what he really wants. I am quite satisfied that, if it is amended as proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich, it will enable the Government, when they do take the matter in hand, to deal with horseracing of all descriptions. If the motion is passed with the amendment now proposed, it is possible that something may be done. I am of the opinion that there is too much racing, both so far as proprietary clubs are concerned and also in connection with registered clubs. It would undoubtedly be to the interests of the people of this State if there was a great deal less racing, for, when it comes to the last analysis, it is the working men who suffer. It has been pointed out this afternoon that people patronise the races, and, therefore, racing should be provided. Well, it is rather a peculiar style of arguing, when it is admitted by those who love racing as a sport but are not so strong on the gambling aspect, that it has not an elevating effect on the community because of the gambling element, to say that, therefore, facilities should be provided for people to indulge in gambling. It seems to me that the better way to deal with the question, if it is not possible to blot out the gambling instinct in people, is to curtail the opportunities for indulging in it. While it is often stated that racing fosters the breeding of a better class of horses, those who know most about it frankly admit that, at the present time, it is not doing anything of the kind; and it is just as freely admitted by those who are best acquainted with the subject that, even if it does improve the breed of horses, it certainly does not do anything to improve the breed of men who follow up horseracing; but that it does the very reverse. It is very well known that when a certain class of men are not trying to take other people down on the racecourse, they are trying to do it somewhere else. In a place like Brisbane it certainly does seem to be becoming really a business, and a business which offers inducements to get people to go to the racecourse. I do not know how often race meetings are held; but, if it goes on the way it is going now, there is a possibility of races being held practically every day in the week, and men will be induced to go to the racecourse instead of going to work. It would be better for the men themselves from a financial point of view, but, unfortunately,

Mr. Winstanley.]

they cannot see it. It is also detrimental from a moral point of view, and it seems to me that it is the duty of the Government, so far as it can possibly manage it, to curtail and discourage it. I do not know whether the hon. member for Carnarvon, when he refers in his motion to "licensed clubs," means that they should be licensed by the Government, or that the Government should recognise them. I should be very sorry to see any Government give its sanction to race clubs further than it has done by legalising the totalisator. Just the reverse should be done. My own opinion is that, if any distinction needs to be drawn between proprietary clubs and ordinary clubs, it should be borne in mind that the ordinary clubs make no profits out of racing, any profits made at a meeting being used to increase the prizes at the next meeting. No individual puts any money in his own pocket. But it is quite different with those people who make a business of it.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it because it is so different that you want to alter the motion?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Not because it is so different, but because I am against horse-racing altogether. I think that the whole lot should be dealt with. I have just pointed out that the distinction between the two classes of racing is certainly in favour of the ordinary clubs, because no single individual connected with them puts money into his own pocket, but I am satisfied that anyone who is connected with proprietary racing is neither a fool nor a philanthropist. He does not run races for the benefit of the community, nor from love of horses, nor from a desire to improve the breed of horses. He runs them for the sake of the money he can make out of the business; and, if there was no money to be made out of it, he would quickly drop it. I think the amount of racing generally should be curtailed, and every club in the State should be allowed only a certain number of days in the year for racing. If it cannot be abolished altogether, then it should be regulated as far as possible.

Mr. LAND: Then you want to legalise it

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I do not want to legalise it, but you can regulate it without giving it legal sanction. I certainly think the motion as it is proposed to amend it will be better than as it has been submitted by the hon. member for Carnarvon, and I shall certainly vote for the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. H. F. Hardacre, *Leichhardt*): I think that the House will certainly be very well advised to accept the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Ipswich.

Mr. MURPHY: A very sensible one. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I certainly think it is, because this motion is very badly drawn, and does not fulfil the purpose which the hon. member evidently had in his mind. It, on the one hand, goes too far, and, [5.30 p.m.] on the other, does not go far enough. It is vague and altogether unsatisfactory as a motion to do the work proposed. Evidently, the hon. member for Carnarvon, in introducing this motion, has had in his mind two or three proprietary racecourses in Brisbane.

Mr. HODGE: One.

[*Mr. Winstanley.*

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Well, perhaps one, but I understand there are two or three, and he evidently had them in his mind. If he had, he should have specifically stated so.

Mr. LAND: He was dealing with proprietary racing altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Where is it elsewhere to any extent? Perhaps, in Rockhampton.

Mr. BOOKER: Gympie.

Mr. TOLMIE: Toowoomba.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ipswich.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He certainly had some specific case when he drafted this motion, and had he said so it might have fulfilled its purpose. But the wording here goes so far as to absolutely prohibit racing anywhere in Queensland except under properly organised and licensed clubs. Does anybody want to see that?

Mr. LAND: Yes.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Everybody.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is an entirely parochial and Brisbane view. Any member in this House who represents a country district knows that in country places numerous race meetings go on of the least harmful character. Every mining camp occasionally has its race meetings, and every shearing-shed has its races, and every meeting of pastoralists when a show is held. There are also picnic races.

Mr. VOWLES: They are all registered.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Some of them are, but not all of them. Very often it is a meeting which is arranged spontaneously, just an immediate meeting of pastoralists or shearers or miners, as the case may be, because somebody says, "Let us have a race meeting next Saturday." They have any quantity of them. They have no time to organise properly, and this motion, as it is prepared, would absolutely prohibit all those meetings. The motion says that "legislation should be introduced to confine the conduct of horse-racing to properly organised and licensed clubs." That, I say, does prohibit any race meetings other than those conducted by properly organised and licensed clubs, and it goes too far. On the other hand, it is vague in various other ways. What is to be a "properly organised club," or a "licensed club"? Who is to say?

Mr. TOLMIE: The constituted racing authority should say.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: On the other hand, it proposes to set up a system of licensing, which would go a long way to perpetuate the very evils against which hon. members have presented a good many arguments, as applying to racing generally. All that is proposed is to prohibit racing in certain cases, whilst it is proposed to establish a universal system of licensing all over Queensland. It would, perhaps, prohibit one or two proprietary race meetings in Brisbane, which could immediately be supplanted by licensed racing, and the evil would not be diminished in the slightest degree so far as the extent of it was concerned. I am of opinion that the proposition of the hon. member for Ipswich is

far better, because it would not only give the Government power to deal with proprietary racing, but it would also give them an opportunity to bring in a Bill to cover all racing, no matter where it happened to be, or of what kind, and so regulate the conduct of it that it would minimise the evil. For this reason, I think the House and the hon. member for Carnarvon would be well advised to accept in substitution of the original motion an amendment something on the lines now proposed.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I think if the hon. member for Carnarvon accepts the amendment, he will find that he has been side-tracked on the most important point that he is trying to bring before the notice of the Chamber. (Hear, hear!) The particular point which, I take it, the hon. member intended was to endeavour to prevent racing for the private or individual profit of the racecourse proprietor or lessee, and the hon. member offered arguments in support of his views in that particular regard. I do not know anything about racing in Queensland. Like one hon. member who spoke, I think I have been once, perhaps twice, on a racecourse in Brisbane, and I have never been on a private racecourse in my life. I do not pretend to know, nor do I know, what racecourses there are in Brisbane, but I infer from what the hon. member for Leichhardt has said that there are three proprietary racecourses in Brisbane, and I infer from a remark made during the speech of the hon. member for Brisbane that those three racecourses belong to one proprietor. If that is right, it is clear that in Brisbane, at any rate, there is a monopoly in private racecourses.

Mr. LAND: It is growing, too.

Mr. MACARTNEY: And that is a monopoly which I think it would be in accord with the Liberal platform to do away with. It may be said that to do away with a monopoly is contrary to the Liberal platform. All I can say is that a monopoly of the character pointed out by the hon. member for Carnarvon is not a wise monopoly. He gave very good reasons for his motion. Many people think that racing is altogether a bad thing, and proprietary racing only adds to it. It adds to the number of days in the week on which racing takes place, and altogether there must be a good deal of ground for the statements of the injury that it causes. It has also been pointed out that proprietary racing does not lead to the results which are expected to come from racing generally. That is pointed out—and very strongly. The hon. the leader of the Government has suggested that the motion is not quite wide enough to be a guide to him. All I can say is that it is a fairly academic motion, indicating the opinion of members of the House with regard to particular matters, and the Government are by no means bound to legislate just in the full terms of the motion. It is fairly expressive of what is intended, and I think another and very much simpler amendment would have preserved what was intended by the hon. member for Carnarvon without practically side-tracking the whole subject. Of course, if the hon. member will say that if the motion is carried in its amended form the Government will introduce legislation dealing with racing generally, and particularly in regard to limiting proprietary racing, then I take it the hon. member for Carnarvon will accept it.

But it is never usual to introduce in motions of this kind all the provisions that will be contained in the Bill.

The PREMIER: Are you trying to make this a want of confidence motion? (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: A want of confidence motion on Thursday afternoon! What are you giving us?

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have not the slightest idea why the hon. member should not allow the motion to go through as it is. I think the intention is to carry this motion over, as has been done with other motions on Thursday afternoons in the past. There is something in the motion that members opposite do not like, but just for the moment I cannot say what it is. If the hon. member for Carnarvon accepts the amendment, he will find himself side-tracked, and the monopoly of proprietary racing will continue to grow and prosper.

Mr. GUNN, in reply, said: It is not my intention to accept the amendment, because if I did the whole object in bringing forward the motion would be side-tracked. (Hear, hear!) We have too much racing, and we shall always have too much racing while proprietary racing is allowed, and we shall always have inferior racing while it is conducted on proprietary racecourses.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Queensland Turf Club gives the dates.

Mr. GUNN: I have no brief for the Queensland Turf Club. My object is to have something better than the Queensland Turf Club constituted for registration purposes. Every properly constituted club in Queensland should send two delegates to a conference, as they do in New Zealand, and that conference should regulate all racing in Queensland. Last year forty-eight days were given for racing purposes at Kedron Park, and that is too much racing altogether. I do not wish to talk out my own motion, so I will now resume my seat.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Gledson's amendment*) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 18.

Mr. Barnes	Mr. Macartney
„ Bayley	„ Moore
„ Rooker	„ Murphy
„ Dunstan	„ Stevens
„ Forsyth	„ Stodart
„ Gunn	„ Swayne
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Tolmie
„ Land	„ Vowles
„ Lloyd	„ Walker
Tellers: Mr. Stevens and Mr. Swayne.	

NOES, 32.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Kirwan
„ Barber	„ Lacombe
„ Bertram	„ Lennon
„ Bewman	„ May
„ Carter	„ McLachlan
„ Collins	„ McMinn
„ Cooper	„ McPhail
„ Coyne	„ O'Sullivan
„ Fihelly	„ Peterson
„ Foley	„ Ryan, D.
„ Gilday	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Gillies	„ Smith
„ Gledson	„ Stopford
„ Hardacre	„ Theodore
„ Hartley, W.	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. McLachlan and Mr. Winstanley.	

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. Gunn.]

Amendment (*Mr. Gledson's*)—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—agreed to.

Original question, as amended, put and passed.

There being no further general business on the paper, the House proceeded with Government business.

SUGAR ACQUISITION BILL.

PROPOSED INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Without wishing to obstruct the business in any way, I would like the Government to give some information as to the necessity for this Bill, and to the extent of the scope of it.

The PREMIER: I would like to point out to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that although I think it should be hardly necessary for me to do so, as the hon. member is well acquainted with the forms and practice of the House, that in the preliminary stages of Bills, as soon as you, Mr. Speaker, leave the chair we resolve ourselves into a Committee of the Whole to consider the matter, and at that stage the information which the hon. member is asking for is usually given, and will be given.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Give us the information now; it will facilitate matters. It will simplify matters to give the information now.

The PREMIER: I do not think it will simplify matters at all. As a matter of fact, I have already moved that the Speaker do leave the chair, and I would be out of order to speak about the Bill now. I shall simply insist on my motion.

Mr. TOLMIE (*Toowoomba*): For some time past the practice has been when a Bill of this kind is being introduced, to give the information at this stage.

The PREMIER: Not at this stage.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You asked for it at every stage.

The PREMIER: I would like the hon. member to point out to me in "Hansard" where it has been given at this stage. It has been given at an earlier stage, but not at this stage.

Mr. TOLMIE: When I introduced a Bill last session, I gave the information about the contents of the Bill at this stage.

The PREMIER: Not at this stage. I challenge the hon. member to show me in "Hansard" where the information was ever given at this stage.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think the hon. gentleman will be well advised if he extends the same courtesy to hon. members on this side as was extended to him last session. I do not think, so far as a Bill of this kind is concerned, that members on this side are going to cavil at it. We would rather facilitate the work of the Government in regard to it. At the same time there are many measures to be introduced during the session, and we desire to extend to the Government every courtesy in regard to the measures they are introducing.

The PREMIER: I would be out of order if I attempted to give the information now.

[*Hon. T. J. Ryan.*]

Mr. TOLMIE: I know the hon. member would be out of order if he attempted to give the information at the present time, but there are other Ministers who can do it. It is merely side-tracking the question when the hon. member raises that point now. I only point out to the hon. gentleman that that courtesy was extended to him, and those associated with him, and in the conduct of the business of the House I hope he will extend a similar courtesy to this side of the House.

The PREMIER: What you are asking has never been done since I have been in the House.

Question—That the Speaker do now leave the chair—put and passed.

COMMITTEE—THANKS OF THE CHAIRMAN.

Mr. COYNE, on taking his seat as Chairman of Committees, said: As this is the first occasion I have taken the chair since I have been elected Chairman of Committees, I desire to thank hon. members for having elected me to this position. (Hear, hear!) I can only say that during my occupancy of the chair, my firm purpose will be to reach the high standard attained by my predecessors, more especially in the matter of impartiality.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: In my endeavour to accomplish that, I trust I shall have the undivided assistance of hon. members on both sides of the Chamber.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER pointed out that he had already offered his congratulations to the Chairman on being elected to the high and responsible position he now occupied. He felt certain, from personal knowledge of the Chairman, that he would live up to the reputation of those who had occupied the chair in the past. He felt sure that the Chairman would have the assistance of members on both sides of the House in carrying out the onerous duties that fell upon him. He moved—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to ratify and confirm a certain proclamation relating to the compulsory acquisition by the Government of raw sugar; to authorise the compulsory acquisition by the Government of other commodities; and for other incidental purposes."

The leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Toowoomba had asked for certain information to be given as to the purpose of the proposed Bill, and he had no objection whatever to giving that information. He pointed out that in his experience in Parliament the information which hon. members opposite had asked for was never given on the motion that "The Speaker do now leave the chair." It had sometimes been given at an earlier stage, and if he had been asked for the information on the previous day he would have given it, on the motion which he then moved.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What does it matter whether the information was given yesterday or to-day?

The PREMIER: This was the stage in the procedure at which it was usual to give

the information to enable the Committee to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not the measure should be introduced.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You have insisted upon getting information at earlier stages.

The PREMIER: He was well aware of that. He had insisted on getting information at earlier stages.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Why complain on this occasion that we should have asked for it earlier?

The PREMIER: He had insisted on getting the information at an earlier stage himself, but at a stage when it was fitting that such information should be given. That stage was yesterday. When the Speaker asked whether the motion on the business-paper of the previous day was "formal," he (the Premier) said "Formal." No one called "Not formal." That was the time when someone on the Opposition side should have called "Not formal," and they could then have asked for the information which was now asked for.

Mr. MACARTNEY: This side regulates its own business.

The PREMIER: That side regulated its own business, and the House regulated what should be done in the House. The proposed Bill was to validate the action of the Government in acquiring all raw sugar, the product of the 1915 sugar-cane crop. The general nature of the action taken and the

arrangements made had already [7 p.m.] been made public by himself and also by Mr. Hughes, the Commonwealth Attorney-General. The direct action of the State would cease when the raw sugar had been taken over from the mills and paid for at a price of about £18 per ton, but varying under varying circumstances. The Commonwealth would take over the product and arrange for its refining and marketing. The action taken by the Government with respect to the 1915 sugar crop of Queensland was, no doubt, a strong and a bold one, but the case was one which demanded prompt and effective action, and he was very gratified that the action of the Government had received commendation from all sources; he thought by persons of all shades of political opinion in Queensland the action of the Government had been commended. They had endeavoured, in making the arrangements, to have due regard to the interests, not only of all concerned in the manufacture of the sugar, but also to that of the consumer. They had endeavoured to look, not merely at the present interests of the sugar-grower, but to his future interests. The difficulties of the sugar question were accentuated by the fact that the industry was dependent on the retention of the tariff, which in turn was dependent on the goodwill of all the States, and any action which should lose sight of the fact that the consumers in all the States were making a sacrifice in order to enable the industry to be carried on in Queensland—they would strongly resent any action which would unduly bear upon them—would be inimical to the best interests of the industry. He did not know whether the leader of the Opposition wished him to outline, at that stage, the contents of the Bill. If so, he would be very pleased to give the contents, so long as he was relieved of the necessity of a repetition on the second reading.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We will be very glad of all the information you can give us, and also to learn why the Bill is necessary.

The PREMIER: He had pointed out why the Bill was necessary. It was necessary to validate the action taken by the Government by means of a proclamation which they issued some time ago, the contents of which must be well known to the hon. member, acquiring all the raw sugar, the product of the 1915 sugar crop of Queensland.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Was it necessary to take that action before getting legislative authority?

The PREMIER: It was.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is what I want to know.

The PREMIER: He took it that the hon. member would assume that any action taken by the Government in that way would be necessary, otherwise it would not have been taken. At all events, in the opinion of the Government, it was found necessary.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I should like to know how it became necessary—the data, and so on?

The PREMIER: It came to be necessary because the Queensland Government had to carry out their part of the compact with the Commonwealth Government. They had to acquire the whole of the raw sugar, the product of the sugar crop of 1915, at a price of about £18—the average price was £18 per ton—and in turn the Commonwealth Government were to purchase that sugar from the Queensland Government and distribute it to the people of Australia at the lowest possible price. That was the outline of the scheme. Now, some of that raw sugar was actually in course of being crushed; the cane was being crushed, and the raw sugar was being sent to the refinery, and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company had, as a matter of fact, shipped 140 tons of raw sugar from their Goondi Mill in Northern Queensland to their refinery at New Farm. Other mills were likely to start, and had started, and the raw sugar would have actually passed from the mills to the refiners before the Government were able to assert their right of property in it. For that reason the Government issued the proclamation at the earliest opportunity, commanding the sugar, and in the proclamation it was intimated that, in so far as it might be necessary, the Government would seek legislative sanction indemnifying them for the action taken. That proclamation was issued by the Governor; the raw sugar was acquired, and the shipment of sugar that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company were making from Northern Queensland by the Adelaide Steamship Company was held to the order of the Chief Secretary at New Farm. It was refined there; and it was now, as a matter of fact, he thought, in distribution. From that statement of fact the hon. member would understand that it was necessary for the Government, by proclamation, to take prompt action in order to acquire their property in the sugar, and also to prevent any possibility of agreements being made in the meantime, whereby mills would have disposed of their raw sugar, perhaps to refiners, or whereby growers might bind themselves to accept a smaller price than they would be entitled to under the arrangements made. All those things made it necessary for the proclamation to be issued; and all

Hon. T. J. Ryan.]

the Government were now seeking was to have legislative sanction given to the action which they took; and, if he judged aright the temper of the people of Queensland, and assuming the Opposition to represent a certain section of them, he imagined that the measure would receive the unanimous support of the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) thought that this question should be treated strictly from a non-party point of view, as it made for the good of a very important industry. (Hear, hear!) It was too late now to talk about whether better arrangements could be made—whether other people could have done better, and so on. What they wanted was for the new arrangement to be put on a proper basis as soon as possible. Some of the mills had already begun crushing, and they desired arrangement to be made at once for the cash payments for their sugar, and he took it that the passing of this legislation would facilitate the making of those arrangements. He trusted the measure would be carried into effect as soon as possible, and steps taken to pay the mills cash f.o.b., as had been the custom in the past.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, which was adopted.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be printed. The second reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. McMINN (*Bulimba*), who was received with Government "Hear, hears," said: It gives me great pleasure to add my congratulations to the Ministry for the splendid programme that they have placed before us through the medium of the Governor's Speech, but before entering upon the details of the Speech I will crave the indulgence of the House to make a suggestion. My suggestion is this—that in future sessions something should be done to curtail, if not directly abolish, the system of debating the Address in Reply. I know that hon. members may consider it presumption on the part of a new member to attack a custom that has grown hoary with age, but I would point out that we have been returned to this House as a party who are to establish precedents. (Hear, hear!) I consider that with such a magnificent programme as we have before us, and when matters could be as thoroughly dealt with on other occasions, it is a mistake, after we have waited twenty years for some of the legislation that is proposed to-day, when we have worked and fought, and desired to see some of those injustices under which we have suffered removed from our statute-books, to take up unnecessary time over this debate, and I feel that I am only doing my duty to the great mass of those who have supported the Labour party when I utter this protest. And I also hold that we are living to-day in an age when actions speak stronger than words, and when it is the desire of our constituents that we should show by our actions rather than by our words that we truly and faithfully represent the opinions and ideals

[*Hon. T. J. Ryan.*

of those who have sent us here to represent them. Coming to the subject-matter of the Speech, I am pleased to note that in one of the foremost paragraphs reference has been made to that great holocaust that has taken place in another part of the world, and that the men who have gone from our shores have been eulogised for the part that they are taking in this great conflict. But, Sir, will you allow me to sound a note of warning here? It is this: We recognise that it has been the predominance of the military spirit in Germany that has made this thing possible, and we want to be careful that this same military spirit does not obtain a footing in Australia. (Hear, hear!) We want to guard against the influence that might tend to bring us to a state of this kind, and to determine that we shall do away with, or as far as possible discountenance, militarism in any shape or form. Another thing that pleases me is the fact that the Government have at last recognised their responsibility to those men who have taken upon themselves the burden of the Empire, unlike the Governments in the past, which have simply used the men who have been courageous enough to fight for the welfare and the upholding of the flag, and then cast them on one side to the tender mercies of charity. (Hear, hear!) I think that this is a step in the right direction, and I trust that not only will we provide for those men who are willing to occupy our land, but that provision will be made for those who have given, not their life but their limb, in defence of the Empire, and that they will be saved from the humiliating position of being forced to live upon charity. (Hear, hear!) Some hon. members of the Opposition, speaking on this subject, said that they hoped a freehold would be granted to those men; but there is a danger that we have to guard against. If we make land grants to those returned soldiers, we have to guard against a system of trafficking in those land grants. We can remember under the old system of making land grants to immigrants how trafficking in those land grants was engaged in, and how sometimes the generosity of the Government was abused and taken advantage of by those who desired to get hold of those land grants for speculation, and for speculation only. I trust that due regard will be paid to this phase of the matter, and that if grants are given to those returned soldiers they will be safeguarded so that it will not lead to speculation. One of the first items mentioned in the Governor's Speech is an Elections Bill. That has been dealt with by speakers who have preceded me, but I wish to emphasise this matter. We have charged the Opposition, who were then members of the Government, that by their Elections Act they disfranchised some thousands of the electors of Queensland. We have charged them with having disfranchised a great mass of our nomadic workers. When we come to realise the injustice that has been done to those men, when we come to realise that these are the men who have blazed the track of civilisation in Queensland, that these are the men without whom not one mile of our railroads could have been built, not one pound of our wool, not one ounce of our minerals could have been produced, we must realise the great injustice that has been done to these men, in that they have been deprived of their right of citizenship. There is a phase of this matter which I do not know whether it has been touched upon or not so far, but I heard an hon. member

last night, when discussing the extension of the franchise in municipal matters, emphasise the fact that there should be no taxation without representation. Now, Sir, we have on our statute-book a measure that I am sure will appeal to members on the opposite side, because it affects them more than it does us. That is a measure that is called the Income Tax Act. We have collected income tax from the residents of Queensland from the first month of their residence here, and yet, in spite of that fact, we have absolutely refused them representation until they have been resident in the State for twelve months. That is an injustice that calls for redress, and I trust that the Government will see that it is rectified. Another matter to which I wish to refer while on this subject is the matter of the extension of the franchise to those old pioneers who are now spending the close of their lives in our public institution at Dunwich. We have all declaimed against the injustice that has been done to those old people—those men who have borne the brunt and heat of the day in Queensland—and yet, when they are on the down grade, when they are tottering down the hill of life, we have refused them what is to some of them at least a matter almost as dear as life itself. We have refused them the birthright of every Britisher—the right of exercising the franchise in the country of their adoption. I trust that in the measure that is to be introduced by our Government justice will be done to those people to whom it has been refused in the past. I trust that our franchise will be made one of the broadest that it is possible to introduce. The second measure that I propose dealing with is one that interests me greatly. That is the question of the distribution of fish. In a country such as this, it is almost necessary that fish should form one of the staple articles of diet; but we are faced with the problem that, while we have a public who are eager to buy this commodity, and while we have fishermen who are eager to supply this commodity, in between the two stand a ring of distributors who by their action not only have paralysed the fishermen, but have prevented the needs of the public from being supplied. The neighbouring State of New South Wales has in a measure attempted to solve this problem. There they were faced with the same difficulty that we are faced with—that, while the public required this staple article of food, it was not available. They have sought to solve the problem, and, judging from my experience down there the other week, when I saw $7\frac{1}{2}$ tons of fish disposed of in a very short time, when I saw the public clamouring for this article of diet, then I say it is time that the Government of Queensland took some action to supply a long-felt need in this direction. To the average individual this may not be a problem that presents very much interest; but, when we come to consider the value that it is to other countries, then I think it will be proven that it is an industry that is worth fostering in a country like Queensland. In Japan, for instance, you have an industry that returns £15,750,000 per annum; in the United States, you have an industry of an annual value of £14,100,000; in England, its value is £11,700,000; in Russia, £6,300,000; in France, £5,900,000; in Norway, £1,825,000; in Spain, £1,595,000; in Holland, £835,000; in Germany, £610,000; and in Austro-Hungary, £290,000. Now, if we consider the benefits of an industry such as this, remembering that along

our shores we have waters teeming with fish,

I think it is not too much to ask [7.30 p.m.] that the Government should at the earliest possible opportunity take this problem into consideration and endeavour to solve it, because I can assure hon. members that the people of Queensland are interested in the question, and that not only from a commercial but also from a health standpoint it is essential that this necessary article of diet should be made one of the staple commodities in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) Now, I come to another phase of the Governor's Speech, one that has caused a good deal of discussion—namely, the regulation of food prices. The ordinary individual, sitting here and listening to the speeches of the members of the Opposition, would consider that a good deal of injustice had been done to the primary producers by the action of the Government in endeavouring to regulate the sale and market price of these products. When I heard the hon. member for Drayton, the deputy leader of the farmers' party, and several other of those gentlemen addressing this House, I wondered to myself whether it was possible that an injustice was being done to the primary producers of Queensland, but I was confident that this Government—which has always stood for equity, this Government which has always proclaimed justice not for one class, but for all classes—would endeavour to regulate this matter on the principle of equity. I find, on going into the matter, that no class in the community has had a better return for their products during the course of this war than the primary producers of this country. We were told that the drought, which I am very sorry to say rages over a portion of our State to-day, has almost ruined the primary producers of Queensland; but, whilst we express sympathy with them in that direction, let me endeavour to show that they are not so very badly off as their friends would endeavour to convince us they are. According to our "Agricultural Journal," in January last Queensland, although the rain had fallen rather late, was in a splendid position from the producers' point of view. We find that in February last by the s.s. "Carpentaria," which left Brisbane on the 12th of that month, for London, 35,953 boxes of butter were despatched. That constituted the largest shipment of butter which has yet been made in one ship and represented 2,013,368 lb. The country that could produce such a quantity of that commodity had not then begun to suffer from the ravages of drought, while, on the other hand, the primary producers had through the incidence of the war been reaping benefits from the state of affairs in Europe. I have a price list for this commodity for the years 1913, 1914, and 1915, and I wish to direct the attention of this honourable House to the facts which I now place before them, and leave hon. members to judge whether the Government, in the action they have taken, have been robbing the primary producers instead of safeguarding the interests of the community in general. I may say that in January, 1913, we had had six weeks of an exceptionally dry spell, and it was not till February of that year that we had plentiful rain. On the 26th January of that year the price of butter was £5 per cwt. On the corresponding date in January, 1914, the price was £5 4s., while on the 6th January of this year, owing to the war, the price had

increased to £5 14s., a rise of 14s. from the first date I gave in 1913 and a rise of 10s. from the same time in the previous year.

Mr. MOORE: Owing to the drought down South.

Mr. McMINN: Butter continued to rise. On 11th January it had risen to £5 16s., on the 12th it rose to £5 18s., on the 15th to £6, and on the 19th to £6 4s. If we compare these prices with those which have ruled in Queensland for the last number of years we will find that the primary producer is at least making a fair degree of profit out of his commodities at this time. And I hold that if he is now faced with a drought, then provision might have been made in the past by which he could tide over this time of depression. Take, for instance, the city draper who has had two or three days of rain during the week, days on which he has still to keep up the same staff and still is under the same expense, although he has done practically no business. In some instances the business he does on such days is not sufficient to pay the light in his warehouse. What would hon. members think of him if he immediately on the succeeding days doubled the prices of his commodities to make up for the days on which he suffered a loss? I am afraid that that is the position that our friends the farmers' party are taking up on this question. The deputy leader of that party, not only in this House but also in the public Press, has endeavoured to enlist the sympathies of the people of Queensland by stating that the cost of each pound of butter in Queensland to-day is 5s. I would like to point out to this honourable House that he has been computing from week to week the cost of keeping alive his stock instead of spreading or averaging it over a period, as any business man would do. He wants to prove to the people of Queensland that the week to week cost of butter is the actual cost of it. That is not at all fair, when we consider the amount of profit that was made by the primary producer during the latter portion of last year and the earlier portion of this year. The Government, in fixing the price of this commodity, were only doing their duty to the community in general, despite the protest of the leader of the farmers' party. A great deal has been made of the fact that the Government have fixed the price of butter at £9 16s. per cwt. I would point out that 75 per cent. of the butter which is now being commandeered, or purchased, by the Government at £9 16s. per cwt. is produced in the coastal districts, where not a pound of food is given to the cattle—where the cattle are grass fed, and the cost of production has not increased in any marked degree.

Mr. MOORE: Why, they are buying feed in your own electorate.

Mr. McMINN: When members endeavour to enlist the sympathy of the people of Queensland by statements such as we have heard, I think the Government will be well advised to make thorough inquiry into such statements.

Mr. MOORE: Hear, hear! We would welcome that.

Mr. McMINN: We also would welcome such an inquiry. This party is out to do justice to the community, and it is also out to see that no injustice is done to the whole of the community for the benefit of any one section of it. Another matter in the Governor's Speech which I hail with pleasure

[Mr. McMinn.

is the Bill to control trusts, combines, and monopolies. If the Government are in dead earnest in this matter, I can point to a monopoly within this House that needs controlling, and that immediately. I refer to the monopoly of the farmers' party's benches by men who are members of the Cheesemakers' Association of Queensland. Every member of the farmers' party is a member of the Cheesemakers' Association of Queensland.

Mr. TOLMIE: What about the mover of the Address in Reply?

Mr. McMINN: Not a member of the Cheesemakers' Association.

Mr. TOLMIE: Oh, yes, he is.

Mr. McMINN: Well, the fact that we have one member of the association on this side does not make the monopoly on that side any the less. This monopoly has gone further than being a monopoly; it is a trust, and a trust in the worst sense of the term. Anyone who is acquainted with the marketing of this commodity will know that so far from the price being regulated by the law of supply and demand, it is regulated by the Cheesemakers' Association of Queensland, who compel their members or agents to sell at a certain price, irrespective of the quality of the article produced. A lesser figure than that fixed can only be taken when an agreement to that effect is signed by two rival agents who are engaged in the same class of business. I claim that this trust fixes not only the Queensland price of that commodity but the interstate price also. They fix the oversea export of the commodity on the basis of quantity of milk supplied to the factories, and even if a factory has got a local or interstate trade, it must pay its quota of the cost of the space booked for a shipment by steamer. I say that is a trust of the worst kind to be found anywhere in the world. It amuses me very much to hear the members of the farmers' party proclaiming their loyalty, and saying that the people of Queensland are being fed at the expense of the primary producers. We claim that loyalty to the Empire is something deeper than mere lip service and flag waving. In February last there left the shores of Queensland a shipment of cheese consigned to the London market. That shipment of cheese arrived on the London market at the time the British Government decided to purchase a large quantity of cheese for the troops who were serving in France. I find that this cheese, which had been produced in Queensland from milk for which 6½d. per gallon was paid at the factory, brought the record price of £4 10s. per cwt., but we did not hear the farmers' party protesting that they were getting too much for their product, which was necessary for the men at the front. After such an example of loyalty as that, the farmers' party in this House should hide their heads in shame for all time. When I say the farmers' party, I mean the members who claim to represent the farmers, not the men who actually represent the farmers and who are sitting behind the Government. Another portion of the Speech to which I wish to draw attention is that which deals with closer settlement. There is no greater asset to any nation than its manhood and womanhood—(hear, hear!)—and it grieves one, when travelling over the wide expanses of our broad areas, to see that so few of the nation's assets are making their homes on our rolling downs. Anyone who is at all

acquainted with history will remember that the crofters of Scotland were some years ago driven from their homes to make room for deer forests and sheep runs. A short time ago one of the members of the House of Lords was on a recruiting campaign in the northern districts of Scotland, and in the course of his remarks, growing eloquent, he said, "The fiery cross of our forefathers has gone from hill to hill and from glen to glen summoning the gallant Scotsmen to follow the King and to fight for their country, their flag, and Empire." One old hard-headed Scotsman sitting in the audience looked up and said, "Yes, sir, the fiery cross has gone from hill to hill and from glen to glen, but what do we hear? Instead of the tramp of armed men, instead of the marching of men who are prepared to fight for their country, we hear the rustling of deer and the bleat of sheep." I say that is one of the dangers which I trust our Government are alive to. I am sure they are alive to it when they have brought in this Bill for the closer settlement of our vast areas. (Hear, hear!) I trust before this Government have gone out of office that they will see on those rolling downs of ours a populace that are contented and happy, a population that are rearing the truest asset of the nation, the boys and girls—our future men and women, who will develop the vast resources of Queensland, and thus add to its prosperity. (Hear, hear!) One other matter that interests me as an industrialist is a measure that I trust will be amongst the foremost measures placed before this House, and that is the measure repealing the Industrial Peace Act.

Mr. MURPHY: What hurry is there for that when the referendum is going to be carried in December?

Mr. McMINN: If the hon. gentleman only knew the sense of injustice that rankles in the heart of every true unionist and every true worker of Queensland, he would see the necessity for placing this in the forefront of our programme. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MURPHY: Won't it be passed by the Federal House early next year?

Mr. McMINN: I trust that before next year this measure, which, as one hon. member put it, was cradled in iniquity, will be blotted out from the statute-book of Queensland. (Hear, hear!) We have been told that the effects of the Industrial Peace Act could be seen in Queensland by the scarcity of strikes and the industrial peace that has existed in Queensland; but we who are acquainted with the industrial movement in Queensland can tell the hon. gentlemen on the other side that it is not because of their Industrial Peace Act. It is because the employers of Queensland, owing to the lesson they received in the general strike of 1912, have come to respect the workers of Queensland, and have made it possible for us to flout—and we did flout—the Industrial Peace Act, by making our own agreements as between employer and employee.

Mr. MURPHY: Then, why bother about it at all?

Mr. McMINN: The hon. member says, "Why bother about it?" It is because there are some weaker sections who want it repealed. There are stronger sections of industrialism who can afford to snap their fingers at the Industrial Peace Act, and who can afford to make agreements to break every clause of the Act; and the late Government

have not dared to put one clause of it into operation. While the stronger bodies can do this, there are weaker bodies who have not attained to that position. That is why we want this Act repealed, so that justice will be done to every body of workers in this land of ours. There is another measure which, as a worker, gives me very great pleasure to see on the programme, and that is an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. I was interested in the cases stated by the hon. member for Mount Morgan last night. It shows some of the iniquities and some of the hardships that have been borne under this Act. Those of us who are acquainted with industry can multiply these cases by a great many. I know of a case where an employee lost the sight of an eye, and, while his employer had been willing to pay a certain sum in compensation to him, yet the insurance company have been keeping him waiting, knowing that his chances of getting compensation will be greatly minimised. I trust that the amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act will be made more liberal, and that we shall have an equitable State Insurance Act, which shall do away with some of the anomalies that exist under the Act. As a worker, I compliment the Government on their action in this direction. The Government are fully alive to the interests of the workers, and they are also alive to the justice that will accrue to the employers and workers alike. There is another measure that I am interested in, and that is an amendment of the Workers' Dwellings Act. While we do not minimise in the least the advantage that this Act has been to the workers of Queensland, still we must not lose sight of that fact that it has also been a considerable benefit to the financial institutions, because it has inflated land values to such an extent that a worker has been compelled to pay for the land he wants on which to erect a cottage sometimes three and four times its nominal value. I trust that in the amending Act that we will have an Act that is not only liberalised, but we will have a clause inserted in it by which the Government will give to the worker a house already built, and ready for his occupation, instead of, as it is now, compelling him to be a landlord—a landlord—before it gives him that advantage. I trust that the benefits of State insurance will also be extended to this Act. I believe a measure was placed on the statute-book last Parliament

[8 p.m.] which already does that, but I hope the measure will be extended so that not only will the State insure the workers' dwellings, but also that every worker in the State will be given an opportunity of insuring with the State any property he might own. From a business standpoint, judging by the profits made from this business, it will be a paying proposition for the Government to enter into State insurance. There is one omission from the Governor's Speech that I did hope to see included, and that is the establishment of a market for the sale of fruit. I trust that the Government, when introducing a Bill for the marketing of fish, will also see their way to deal with the marketing of fruit. This also is a necessary product in Queensland, and it is one that cannot bear the cost of the middlemen; and the Government should establish markets in this connection, so that the people of Queensland can obtain a supply of this very necessary commodity. Amongst the many splendid Bills

Mr. McMinn.]

that appear in the programme, there is one for the extension of the local authority franchise. Many arguments have been adduced by members on the other side as to why this should not be done. We should not lose sight of the broad principle of our franchise, and if we come to consider the advantages that will be conferred on the community by the wider scope from which they can choose their representatives, the community will be benefited in this direction, and the Government will receive the thanks of the ratepayers of Queensland for introducing such a measure. I trust, in dealing with the Local Authorities Act, that the question of a Greater Brisbane and the extension of our cities will not be lost sight of, for we recognise that the municipalities can solve many of the problems in a better manner than the State. They can deal with many of those questions that are agitating the public minds to-day—that are not experiments, but that have been tried and tested in the older countries of the world, and have proved to be a success. I trust that provision will be made to allow our municipalities to take over and administer the public utilities. In conclusion, I again compliment the Government on the excellent measures that they have promised to introduce, and I trust that every one of them will find a place on the statute-book. Too long has Queensland been galled by promises. (Hear, hear!) We look to-day to the Labour party to be a party not of promises, but the party of fulfilment, and I venture to say we have behind us the mandate of the people of Queensland. We have been told that we ought to proclaim a political truce, but so long as we have these injustices that exist on the statute-book to-day, there can be no truce. Until we have made this country prosperous in every direction, until we have passed those measures that stand for the protection of those loved ones that men who have gone to the front to fight the battles of the Empire have left behind, until the injustices under which Queensland has suffered for so long have been wiped off, we are not prepared to submit to any political truce, and I say we have behind us the mandate of the people of Queensland to go ahead and keep the wheels of industry rolling, and by doing so we will help, not only the State, but we will also help the Empire.

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): It gives me very great pleasure to have an opportunity of offering you, Sir, my congratulations on your elevation to the position which your many attributes so eminently fit you to fill. I have listened to the speeches delivered by different speakers during this debate with a great deal of interest and a great deal of pleasure, and I was particularly struck by the speeches of the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Country party. The leader of the Opposition seems to have taken a leaf out of the book of the leader of the Opposition in the Federal House. Almost his first utterance in this House was that the legislation was of a contentious character, and that we should not do anything of the kind. Let us examine the conduct of the hon. member during the dying weeks of the last Parliament. Last November, or rather last December—I think it was on the recomittal of the vote for police—the hon. member took the opportunity of making a very bitter and uncalled for attack upon one of the Ministers of his own party. Mind

[*Mr. McMinn.*

you, this was during war time, and now he is claiming that we should be standing shoulder to shoulder, fighting against the common enemy. The hon. member did not care a "hang" for unanimity then. What was contention then so long as it suited his own purposes? He and other members of his party continued to squabble. That party and the "Courier," the official organ of the party, have everlastingly been telling the people that they should not "swap horses in the middle of the stream"; they were afraid they would be drowned. However, they commenced swapping horses.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Yes, but there was a drought on.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, but they swapped horses all the same, and our friends some time or other may strike the same trouble. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: Nearly every member strikes the same trouble.

Mr. CARTER: However, I do not think the House could spare a buffoon at the present time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not ask him to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. He learned to be funny when he was running a "pub." in Albert street.

Mr. CARTER: I withdraw it. I might say that we could not spare some people on the other side at the present moment; they are useful in some directions, and make the House laugh occasionally. However, as I was going to say, the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues had no thought of what contention would cost the country during the last six months of the last Government. Even as late as the 12th of last January, they met in caucus.

Mr. KIRWAN: They do not meet, do they?

Mr. CARTER: Oh, my word! They met in caucus. The whole forty-seven were there. One of them who attended sat on a rail, the hon. member for Drayton, who did not take an active part, who, it may be guessed, was desirous of being taken to the bosom of either party. Of course, we are told by the official organ of the party, they were very closely united. This is a party that did not deal in contention; they were very contentious then. However, after the leader of the late Government had been successful in defeating this body of "round-robbers" who were attempting to politically assassinate him, he did not get on very well. Then they commenced to jettison some of their own party. They felt they were a sort of Jonahs. (Government laughter.) This party, which is asking this Government to bring in nothing of a contentious character, were quite agreeable to squabble amongst themselves, to fight for the position that they thought they might get to. This party, even after they had patched up the quarrel, or appeared to have patched it up, on 12th January, or earlier than that, the "Courier," official organ, was praying the whole of the time that they still might change their leader. They were still trying to swap horses in the middle of the stream. Even during the election, in my own electorate it was freely rumoured that they had no intention of retaining Mr. Denham as leader of the party, if they were successful in getting back on the Treasury benches. It was freely rumoured

that it was intended to throw Mr. Denham out, and put someone else in his place. This is the party that has come here, and in a hypocritical snuffle asked the present Government to refrain from introducing contentious measures. I contend that it takes two parties to a contention. If there is a thing that is contentious, it takes two parties to make it contentious. (Hear, hear!) The present Government have been returned to power with a strong majority. They have received a mandate from the people to bring in certain legislation, and our platform has been before the people for years. The leader of the present Government, then the leader of the Opposition, made no secret of our programme. The whole of the programme was practically outlined in his election speech. When the people returned the present Government to power, they did so knowing perfectly well that it was the intention of the Government to introduce certain legislation. When the present remnant of the late Government were sent in here with a minority, they knew perfectly well that they had been rejected because they had not brought in that legislation.

Mr. KIRWAN: They had no programme at all.

Mr. CARTER: They had a programme. However, if the present Government were sent here to carry out a certain programme, to introduce certain legislation, and they have received a mandate from a very large majority of the people to do that, who are guilty of contention—those who carry out the desires of the people, or those who are a discredited and a disgruntled party? Who are the contentious people—those who try to bring in what the people require, or those who sit in Opposition and try to prevent it? It must be clear to even the least intelligent of the Opposition that it is the duty of the Government to bring in legislation of the character that is outlined in His Excellency's Speech, and then they come along with this sort of cry after they have been quarrelling among themselves, and say they want peace in this House, and do not want the Government to bring in any contentious matter, and practically state in their first utterance that they are going to oppose everything. That is what it amounted to. Of course, we know that the leader of the Opposition said that if the Bills were to their liking, they would get the support of the Opposition. We know perfectly well that these Bills could not be to their liking. The leader of the farmers' party—a big-hearted man, and a man of broad sympathies—agreed with the programme of the party. He has always been of democratic tendencies, and how he could be associated with the late Government is beyond my comprehension. It is startling to me, however, that one of such broad sympathies could remain in such a narrow crowd. Of course, I can begin to understand it when I learn that the Country party take the Sydney "Bulletin" as their economic text-book. When the leader of the Country party went to some trouble to read out an extract from a page of the "Bulletin," one could understand the sort of wild and weird legislation that that party would favour. Anyone that knows the tendency of the Sydney "Bulletin" to chop and change about according to the size of the advertisement that is offered to it will quite understand the strange surroundings of a party

which takes that as its text-book. The leader of the Country party, however, was good enough to admit that the programme of the Government was broad enough to cover nearly all their requirements. He pledged as many of his party as would be loyal to him to support the Government to carry out their programme. Of course, the Country party claim to be the only people who understand anything about farming in this House.

Mr. PETERSON: They farm the farmer.

Mr. CARTER: I have been a farmer, and to-day I represent a farming constituency. (Hear, hear!) In my electorate there are about 450 votes that are not farmers' votes. Many of the men employed in the meatworks have their selections, and are engaged in farming. Quite a number of miners engaged at Many Peaks are farmers. The whole of the rest of the electors of Port Curtis are engaged in some sort of farming—dairy farming, general farming, or sugar-growing. The electors of Port Curtis were quite familiar with the programme of the Labour party when they returned me instead of the late member for Port Curtis. The farmers of Port Curtis knew perfectly well that they were choosing one who had a better knowledge of their requirements, and who was more likely to obtain through his foresight far more for them than they were likely to get from the other side. (Hear, hear!) I had no paper to support me in that electorate; the only paper in the electorate was owned by my opponent. I was not allowed to put an advertisement in that paper, and not a word of my utterances was published.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Is that true?

Mr. CARTER: It is quite true. When I made my first speech not a word I said was printed in that paper, but a long article was written based on misstatements which were commented upon as my speech.

Mr. KIRWAN: Was there anything about Turkey Station?

Mr. CARTER: Not a word. Had they put in a condensed report of even a few lines, the people would have known that that leading article was a gross falsehood from start to finish. When I wrote a letter to the paper couched in most courteous language, asking it to publish it to put me right with the electors, they did not even acknowledge it, and only that I had the advantage of publishing it in a Bundaberg paper—a paper outside my electorate altogether—I would not have got it printed at all. That is the sort of fair play I got. Yet, in face of this, in face of the enormous sums of money expended by the cattle people of the electorate—for you must remember there are a great many cattle stations in Port Curtis, and the whole of the owners of those stations subscribed large sums of money, together with a few of the townspeople—they failed to secure the return of my opponent. There was one who expected that, if Mr. Kessell and his party were returned, he would be elevated to the other Chamber—or, rather, that he would be made an M.L.C.—and he even went so far as to practise on the people of Calliope; but, of course, he was a failure, and, when the paper that I have just alluded to attempted to publish his speech, it broke down. That is the sort of thing I had to fight against at the last election. We are told that the farmers are afraid of the prices being fixed. Well, around Miriam Vale...

Mr. Carter.]

a great dairying centre in Port Curtis—I got a bigger majority than had ever been secured there before. The dairy farmers of the district gave me their unstinted support, whereas at previous elections they supported the Tory party. At Rosedale—another dairying centre—in one particular part, Tottenham, I venture to say I got the whole of the votes. Of course, at Baffle Creek I did not get one vote, except from an Irishman living there. (Laughter and Government applause.) I do not wish to say a word against the German settlers there. They are a very industrious, hard-working, hospitable body of people; but I am going to say a little later why they took up that attitude, though I am the only candidate who went through that electorate from one end to the other and visited those people from house to house, and who know their requirements. But the people were bludgeoned into taking a certain course. I am quite satisfied that the election before they were bludgeoned and deceived in the same manner into voting for the late member.

The PREMIER: How many votes were there there?

Mr. CARTER: There were eighty, and they had grown to 106 on this occasion.

The PREMIER: And they all went for the Denham party.

Mr. CARTER: The whole lot were given to Herr Kessell. Although the dairy farmers knew that it was the intention of our party if they got into power, to fix prices of commodities, they agreed that it was the proper course to take. They said, "The conditions are abnormal. We would be pleased, of course, if the people could afford to buy at present prices," but they knew perfectly well that the consumers of Queensland could not afford to go on taking butter at 2s. 6d. per lb. It pays the dairy farmers far better to get a reasonable price for all their products than to sell much less and get a higher price.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They will be bringing margarine into the market soon.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, they will. In every speech I made to the dairy farmers in the electorate I pointed out that it was our intention to fix prices, and possibly to take the commodities over, and yet they gave me their unstinted support. That should thrust back in the teeth of the alleged farmers' party the statement that the farmers are not getting a fair deal from the Government.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Were any prices fixed outside of 20 miles from Brisbane?

Mr. CARTER: There were no prices fixed for Gladstone, I may tell the hon. member for Toowong, inasmuch as one of the strongest supporters of my opponent was charging 100 per cent. profit over Brisbane prices. For instance, I saw a box of seidnitz powders which you could buy in Brisbane for 7½d. sold for 1s. 3d. in Mr. Friend's store in Gladstone. I got the docket from the gentleman who bought it, so that I know exactly what he paid. (Government laughter.) I hope that prices will be fixed not only for wholesale but also for goods sold by retail. It is all very well to tell the people that if the wholesale prices are fixed competition will do the rest for the retail. In Gladstone there is no competition. The storekeepers there have "an honourable understanding," and the prices are just whatever they like to charge. To get back to the farmers, so that our friends may know exactly where we stand, I may say that the

dairy farmers told me that, despite the present cost of production—despite the drought—and I venture to say that the drought is just as severe in Port Curtis as it is on the Darling Downs—why it was so severe at Mount Larcom that the late member brought the hon. member for Drayton up there with a divining rod to find water. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOOKER: Did he find it?

Mr. CARTER: He did not. He talked a lot, but he did not find any water; the people were as dry as they were before. (Laughter.) However, they are getting on very well without it. Many of the people at Mount Larcom are engaged in dairying, and those who are engaged in dairying or in other forms of production all complained that if they could get a fair deal from those who were buying and selling their products again, they would be in a better position. Their complaint is not that they are afraid of prices being fixed, but they object to the price fixers being the produce merchants. They said, "We are prepared to send you back so that the Government, instead of the produce merchants, will become the price-fixers." They are not afraid of what the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches will do, but they were full up of what the produce merchants had been doing—some of whom had been occupying the Treasury benches. That is the party they were tired of. The result is that they sent me back here instead of the late member, who was one of the strongest henchmen of the late Government.

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: One of the "round robinners."

Mr. CARTER: He was a "round robinner" also. There is a matter that I want to say a little about, and that is the Elections Act. I do not think there was ever a time when it was so necessary to introduce an amendment of the Elections Act as it is to-day. It took the Labour party something like twenty years to get adult suffrage, and we find that since they obtained adult suffrage every effort has been made by the different Tory parties of Australia to destroy the value of it. In my electorate there were many men on the railways and some in the Police Force who were shifted in the first few days in [8.30 p.m.] December, because they knew perfectly well that six months would elapse before the election and they could not get their names on the roll. That applies to scores of railway men, and they were not newcomers; many of them were natives of the district. Then we are told that the people were not disfranchised under that Act.

Mr. KIRWAN: That was pointed out to them in the House, but they refused to admit it, particularly the hon. member for Murrumbidgee.

Mr. CARTER: That was one of the best methods of dealing with them. But, when the blood of the Government turned to water—through fear at the last election—they rushed to entrench themselves against the attack: they knew that no matter how cowardly and unfair they might be, they were going to be wiped off the slate. Of course, they naturally judged the people by themselves, and they did not take into consideration that the people whom they were going to rob and cheat of their rights were more honest than they were. But the people rose on the 22nd May and wiped

[Mr. Carter.

them off the slate completely, despite the fact that many citizens had been robbed of their rights. We were told that men should not have the right to vote because they lived in a tent. Fancy the condition of the man who is prepared to pioneer the country, who is prepared to blaze the track for civilisation! He cannot carry a house with him; he cannot carry anything but a tent. He is willing to suffer all kinds of hardship to find a new goldfield, something that will enrich the country; and they thought that because these people were a daring people that they would be courageous enough to vote for Labour, and that they should not have a vote.

Mr. KIRWAN: And now they ask them to go to the war.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, they were quite able to carry a rifle and defend the wealth some of these people have hoarded up. They were good fellows then—excellent fellows when they are prepared to go into the trenches to defend the honour of the Empire, but they were not good enough to have a say in the government of their country. These people who were courageous and self-sacrificing enough to give their lives for the honour of their people were not good enough to be trusted with a vote, and they wiped them off wholesale. In my own electorate, where there are 4,300 on the roll, it was estimated that there were only 3,900 on election day. Some had gone to the front and many had shifted out into other places. With regard to the postal vote, that was introduced for a particular purpose, I wish to say a few words. I think I am justified in saying that it was introduced for a particular purpose, because I have figures to prove that it was used in a peculiar way in my electorate. In Gladstone there were 3,709 votes recorded. Of those, 3,517 were polled at the booths, and of that number I got a majority of 101. But of 192 postal votes my opponent got a majority of 48. I got 72 and he got 120. In that same area, at the polls where no coercion could be employed and where no corruption could be used, I got a majority of 101, but out of 192 postal votes he got nearly half that majority.

Mr. BOOKER: Shocking!

Mr. CARTER: It is shocking. I say it is a disgrace. In Gladstone alone, where the people do not shift, there were 53 out of 192. Two active supporters of Mr. Kessell—Mr. R. J. Joyner and Mr. J. Friend—went from house to house witnessing votes.

Mr. KIRWAN: Illegal.

Mr. CARTER: We know it was illegal.

Mr. WELLINGTON: You would have been slung out for it.

Mr. CARTER: Or course, I would. If the other party had got back into power I would have been slung sky high, as our late respected friend, Mr. Breslin, was—absolutely cheated out of it. These men went from house to house and deliberately canvassed the majority of those 53 votes. In Many Peaks, where I got a three to one majority, there were 27. I venture to think I got a majority of those.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Not so bad after all.

Mr. CARTER: No, because they could not be coerced, but in Gladstone they could. They were under the whip.

Mr. MACARTNEY: How was that?

Mr. CARTER: Our friend is very innocent. He does not know anything about

that. (Government laughter.) The people he is associated with do not know anything about victimisation.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I do not know anything about Many Peaks.

Mr. CARTER: I do, though. They gave me three to one. (Hear, hear!) I say that if there is any clause in that Act which cries aloud for amendment, it is the postal vote clause. If we asked the returning officers to give us their candid opinion, there is not one of them in the whole of Queensland who would not ask us to wipe it out.

Mr. FREE: It is corrupt.

Mr. CARTER: Of course, it is. The registrar and the returning officer in Gladstone were among the fairest men I have ever met, and as far as they were concerned it was a fair and square fight. They could not prevent canvassers doing such things. All they knew was that certain people were on the roll, and entitled to vote.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Can you give us an instance of corruption and coercion?

Mr. CARTER: I can give an instance of coercion. I am going to read a letter from one of the leading men in Rosedale.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Now you are talking business.

Mr. CARTER: I am not going to mention his name, but he is one of the leading residents, a man in whom I am quite sure the leader of the Opposition would put absolute faith. He says here, with regard to the poll at Baffle Creek—

“The poll at Baffle Creek is the scandal of the elections. It is certainly an intimidated vote.”

That is the German vote.

“And you should call the attention of the House to the matter when Parliament meets. Neimeyer was down there for days, whipping them up, and whom he could not intimidate Kleinschmidt could. Kleinschmidt met each up the road, and had a final word with them before they went into the booth.”

I will tell hon. members a little more about the same gentleman. I visited Baffle Creek the last week before the election. (Opposition laughter.) Of course, they are laughing at something that they ought to be heartily ashamed of. When I got down there, I told him I expected a friend to assist me in addressing a meeting of those people. I had the use of the dining-room there to address them in. Kleinschmidt said to me, “I think it is just as well that your friend did not come, Mr. Carter, because none of them will come to hear you.” I said, “That looks as if you have been talking to them.”

Mr. BOOKER: Is that your friend who voted for you?

Mr. CARTER: No, that is Kleinschmidt, possibly a friend of yours. (Laughter.) Yet those people had told me a few days before that they would be pleased to hear me and my friend. But Kleinschmidt had got amongst them. No, they were afraid. He went so far as to say that if the price was fixed he would not crush their cane, and they thought, “If the price is fixed, and Kleinschmidt will not crush our cane, what

Mr. Carter.]

are we to do?" They were absolutely helpless. They could not take their cane anywhere else, because they could not afford to pay cartage for the distance, and they could not take the cane by water. Those people had only one place to take their cane to, and they were absolutely intimidated; they were told that, if they voted in a certain direction and the Government did not get in, their cane would not be crushed. That is why the gentleman who wrote the letter from which I have quoted said that place was the scandal of the election, and that the vote was an intimidated vote. Yet our friends on the Opposition benches have the hardihood to say that a measure which will give fair play to such people is contentious legislation. Another thing I should like to say with regard to the repeal of the Elections Act is that, in my opinion, every article which is published should have the writer's name at the bottom of it. (Hear, hear!) Right through the last election a number of scurrilous prints with regard to myself were sent round the electorate. Some contained pieces of poetry or doggerel, and most of them were incorrect prophecies as to the result of the election. The intention was not to do me good. But the point I wish to emphasise is that not one of those scurrilous prints had the writer's name underneath, and that most of them did not even bear the imprint of the paper which printed them. The printers had not the courage to put their names to the documents. The leading articles in the paper that my opponent owns, if one may call it by that name, were not signed. Of course, I do not think it was necessary for them to be signed in order that we might know who wrote them. One could see by the poorness of the matter who was the author of them. (Laughter.) I do not say who wrote them, but you can form a pretty good idea. If articles were signed, there are occasions when we could punish people who are cowardly and contemptible enough to try and injure persons without showing themselves; and for that reason I hold that every article that is published should bear the name of its author. If the statements made in an article are right, there is nothing to be ashamed of; if they are wrong, then the author should be punished.

Mr. MURPHY: Would it not take a lot of litigation to prove whether the statements were right or wrong?

Mr. CARTER: There would not be much litigation over the matter, and writers would be more careful about rushing into print. There is another matter I should like to touch upon. As an old organiser, I should like to have a little say about the Industrial Peace Act. Our friends on the Opposition benches are never tired of telling us that that Act brought about industrial peace. The Czar of Russia brought about industrial peace in the Duma, but it was not fair play or justice; he just turned the whole lot out.

Mr. TOLMIE: The best piece of legislation since the Bill of Rights.

Mr. CARTER: It is a pity there was not a czar to deal with members who recently sat on the Treasury bench. However, a true czar did deal with the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and turned them off the Treasury bench, but did it in a constitutional way. I am satisfied that if the Elections Act had been as broad as it should have

[Mr. Carter.

been, our friend would not be there now, but someone more worthy of the electors would have been sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. GUNN: There would be nobody sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. CARTER: I don't believe there would be. At any rate, I am pleased to see that it is proposed to repeal that Act, and to substitute for it an Industrial Arbitration Act. The Commonwealth Compulsory Arbitration Act has proved to be one of the finest measures ever placed on a statute-book. The Australian Workers' Union, for which I was an organiser for many years—the shearers in particular—had, I suppose, more strikes in one season than took place in most places in a year. They did not strike because they wanted to, but because it was absolutely necessary. The Australian Workers' Union was built up because of the injustices its members suffered at the hands of their different employers—men who were unfair, and tried to rob them to such an extent that they were compelled to build up the Australian Workers' Union—first the Shearers' Union, and then the Australian Workers' Union. Members opposite never tire of telling us that the Compulsory Arbitration Act is ineffective. Since the first award was given under the Commonwealth Arbitration Act, that is something like seven or eight years ago, there has not been one strike among the shearers of Australia. Yet we are told that the Act is ineffective, and that the workers will not obey the law. Whom do we find obeying the provisions of the Industrial Peace Act—the employers or the workers? The workers obey the Act, but there is no Industrial Peace Act for the employers. Only a few months ago I had to appear in the Industrial Court for a sugar-worker, who was trying to get his rights.

Mr. TOLMIE: Did he get them?

Mr. CARTER: Yes. On that occasion two friends of the hon. member—employers—were fined for breaking the Industrial Peace Act. Those are the persons who are everlastingly talking about the unruly conduct of the workers. I dare say those gentlemen would cry out at the action of the unfortunate sweated miners in South Wales, because they have taken up a manly stand against employers who are making immense profits out of the war; they have no sympathy in their hearts for the unfortunate employees. Who screamed about the Industrial Peace Act when it went through and when its provisions were enforced? Who accused the judge of the Industrial Peace Act of being unfair? Was it the workers or the employers? It was the employers, of course, on every occasion. The only persons who are opposing the Compulsory Arbitration Act are the employers. They are the men who do not want to be fair. They cannot be fair. (Hear, hear!) But they will have to be fair when we get the Arbitration Act passed. I am pleased that the Industrial Peace Act is to be wiped off the statute-books and compulsory arbitration established in its place. I do not say that compulsory arbitration is the be-all and end-all of our requirements. I am not a great believer in this patching up of industrialism; but it is a good step on the way. It is one of the good measures which I like to see. I am glad to see that a Cane Price Boards Bill is to be introduced. In the sugar-growing districts of Port Curtis such a Bill is absolutely

necessary, particularly at the Waterloo Mill. I got a considerable increase in the Labour vote there.

Mr. COLLINS: The late Minister for Agriculture owns that mill, does he not?

Mr. CARTER: The late Minister for Agriculture has got a share in the Waterloo Mill. I will quote an instance to show the necessity for the Cane Price Boards Bill. In 1910 they harvested nearly 7,000 tons of cane, and that cane produced 1 ton of sugar from $9\frac{1}{2}$ tons of cane. The sugar was sold for £8,517. Of that sum, £4,000 was paid to the farmers, and £4,517 went into the pockets of the millers for simply crushing the juice out of the cane.

Mr. KIRWAN: They crushed the farmer.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, they crushed the life's blood out of them. They did not stop at refusing to take their cane from them. They did not stop at robbing the cane-farmers of Waterloo; they victimised the canegrowers there who had the courage to stand up against them. I have a letter from one of them, and he tells me he has had to cease growing cane. He had the courage to ask that the canegrowers be allowed to have one of their own men there to see the cane weighed, so that they could see that they were getting a fair deal, and he also tried to form an organisation amongst the canegrowers at Waterloo to get a fair deal. The mill would not take his cane and he had to use it to feed his cattle with.

Mr. KIRWAN: Shame, shame!

Mr. CARTER: It was a shame, a down-right shame. We are taking the whole of the consumers of Australia to the extent of £6 per ton in order to build up that industry, and I do not see that these avaricious, greedy, grasping cormorants should be allowed to stop the progress of that industry. They say that it does not pay them to grow cane at Baffle Creek. The unfortunate growers there get 6s. 6d. per ton for their cane. That is the base price they get. They were told that they could not get more because the mill there is not good enough to get more sugar out of the cane. So far as the mill is concerned, I think it would make an ornament to the Museum as an exhibit of scrap iron. (Government laughter.)

Mr. TOLMIE: That is where you got your votes.

Mr. CARTER: No, I did not, but I will get them there next time. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Mr. TOLMIE: You should have advertised yourself.

Mr. CARTER: I believe in advertising. It is the propaganda of our party that wins the election for us, because we never tire of trying to educate the people (Hear, hear!) Our object is not to keep them in ignorance, and prevent them from getting a vote by a bad Elections Act. Our policy is to have an Elections Act so broad that the people can put in who they like. We have the courage to face the electors at all times, and we give them a broad franchise and the broadest Elections Act, and we educate them so that every man and woman will understand the situation. (Hear, hear!) Whatever may have happened at the last election in those districts where I did not get a majority last time, I am certain that I will get a majority next time. (Hear, hear!) I am certain that there are no people who will welcome the sugar legislation of the

Government more heartily than the sugar-growers of the Port Curtis district. At the different places I visited the people were frightened to speak, as their employers were such Gradgrinds. They are treated in a tyrannical way.

Mr. BOOKER: They will all be capitalists next year.

Mr. CARTER: I hope they will. I would like to see all men capitalists. I would be pleased to see all working men able to call themselves capitalists. (Hear, hear!) I hope they will all get something. It was the object of the late Government to keep them without anything.

Mr. TOLMIE: Claptrap!

Mr. CARTER: That is why the hon. member is sitting over there—because he looked on it as claptrap. (Hear, hear! and Government laughter.) The hon. member has been keeping the wool in his ears too long, and when he takes it out to hear the truth he will probably take on some other business.

Mr. TOLMIE: Keep a "pub."

Mr. CARTER: You might do better at keeping a "pub." than you are doing here. (Government laughter.) I think the hon. member for Toowoomba would be more useful keeping a "pub." and selling good beer to the Toowoomba people than he is by staying here and preventing the Government from passing useful measures. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) At one place in the Port Curtis district the canegrowers, because they were turned down by the mill close to them, sent their cane to Bundaberg, and the hon. member for Bundaberg will bear me out in this: I was told that they had to pay so much freight on their cane for carrying it to Bundaberg that when it was crushed the price they received was less than the bounty. Is it not time that a Cane Price Boards Bill was introduced to see that those men should get a fair deal? I hope when that Bill is passed the Government will allow someone to go to each mill to test and weigh the cane in the interests of the growers. At Baffle

Creek it was the constant com-
[9 p.m.] plaint of the sugar-growers that the miller not only gave a low price for the cane, but did not allow the proper weight. If one of the growers went to the mill, and asked, "Where can I find Mr. Kleinschmidt?" he received the reply, "Oh, you will find him on the weighbridge. He lives on the weighbridge." (Laughter.) He weighed the cane. I say it is nearly time the Government appointed someone to weigh the cane and give the growers a fair deal. While I am dealing with the question of fixing prices, there is another useful body of men who are not getting a fair deal; that is the timber-getters. In my electorate nearly every selector has a good deal of hardwood timber that he might cart in. What do we find? That when these hardwood logs are brought in they are paid for by the millers at 7s. to 8s. 6d. per 100 feet. The price is fixed just as truly by the millers who have an "honourable understanding"—if I might use the term—as it is fixed for the sugar-cane, and in almost every case only the absolute measurement that is cut out of the log is paid for. Lots of people will say, "Oh, they get 7s. or 8s. 6d. in the log, and when it is cut up and sold for £1 4s. or £1 5s. per 100 feet it does not cut up so much. I say in every case they allow for a pipe, whether there is a pipe in the log or not.

Mr. Carter.]

They also allow so much for wastage; for a log that will pan out at 500 feet they only allow about 400 feet. They cut out of the log as much as they pay for, and then sell it for £1 4s. or £1 5s. per 100 feet. That is 300 per cent.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is 25 per cent. loss in cutting.

Mr. CARTER: My friend does not know very much about cutting timber.

Mr. TOLMIE: What about the cut?

Mr. CARTER: Out of every 12-inch flitch they take 12-inch boards, despite the cut. There is no 25 per cent. loss. The actual timber is taken out and sold that is paid for. I say if anything cries aloud for a board for the fixing of prices, it is between the timber-getter and the millowner. Then, again, in other things. Although they pay no more for log timber in long lengths than for short lengths, they charge a special price for that timber. Then, for small logs they pay a lower price than for big logs, but the unfortunate timber-getter has to pay the same royalty. Every post is a winning-post for these millers. So, I say that amongst other Bills for fixing prices, I do sincerely hope the Government will provide for a board for fixing the price of logs supplied by timber-getters.

Mr. TOLMIE: I thought you said this timber belonged to the selectors.

Mr. CARTER: Of course, it belongs to the selectors, and they cart it in and sell it.

Mr. TOLMIE: They do not pay royalty on freehold.

Mr. CARTER: Of course, they pay royalty. Does my friend not know that for a certain number of years the selector has to pay royalty? The hon. member ought to know that.

Mr. TOLMIE: You must not come down to the House and spin these fairy tales.

Mr. CARTER: They are not fairy tales. Does the hon. member say they are not paid 7s. to 8s. 6d. for hardwood?

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not say that.

Mr. CARTER: Does the hon. member say the millers do not sell it at £1 4s. or £1 5s.?

Mr. TOLMIE: You said it is on their freehold, and they do not pay royalty for that.

Mr. CARTER: The selectors have to pay royalty for the first five years. Then, there is another matter I wish to mention. I am very glad to see that the Government propose to deal with the Local Authorities Act. I am in hopes of seeing a broader franchise. Our friends on the Opposition benches years ago—or rather men of the same kidney—years ago used to use the same arguments at the time we had the property votes and plural voting that they use to-day. They are constantly telling us that only property-owners ought to have a vote. I say every man who lives in this city pays the rates. (Hear, hear!) I had a bookshop at the corner of Queen and Albert streets for which I paid £45 a year in rates. I did not pay the rates. I put it on to the price of my books to my customers. They pay it. They have to pay the rent and pay the rates, too. It is absurd to say I paid the rates for that place. I say that every man who lives in the city, who pays for his board, pays for the rates. Every man who pays in any shape or form for living in the city pays his full share

[Mr. Carter.

of the rates. He is just as interested in the cleanliness of the city, in the lighting of the city, and in the well-being of the city as any man in it, and it is much fairer and more just to give a vote to the man who lives in the city, and who has to suffer for the want of proper sanitation, or for bad lighting, than to give a vote to a man who lives in Sydney. The man who owns the bookshop that I refer to lives in Sydney.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What does he care about the health of the people?

Mr. CARTER: He does not care a rap about the health of the people; he cares for nothing but the rent of his shop. If anyone should have a vote, it should be the people who live in the State. I am quite satisfied that the only fair franchise is adult suffrage, and when we have adult suffrage in this State it will blossom into a place worth living in. The people will then see that something is done. Every time an attempt is made to better the conditions of the people, to borrow money to make better conditions, the people who own the property turn it down. What do they care when they live in another place? They do not care a hang for a sewerage system. The same as Gladstone. The people have turned down the water scheme until it has been forced on them. No water supply for fifty years because three or four of them own the property there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him by the Standing Orders.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): Before addressing myself to the various matters that will be the subject of discussion during this debate, I desire, in common with other members, to offer you, Mr. Speaker, my hearty congratulations. I think it only goes to prove what the Labour movement can do, when men like yourself can rise from humble positions in life to occupy the high position which is the gift of the members of this Assembly.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: I have no doubt that you will carry out the duties of the office in a manner that will prove that the Labour movement can produce men who can occupy any position in this House as well as attain to Cabinet rank. We have heard during the debate many reasons why the late Government was hurled into political oblivion, and why we see to-day a mere remnant of the antiquated Liberal party occupying the Opposition benches. I remember some time ago, when "the handwriting on the wall" seemed clear and distinct, even to their official organ, the Brisbane "Courier," which pointed out that unless they altered their ways there was every probability that the elections would spell disaster for them. It is rather noteworthy that, on that occasion, the Brisbane "Courier" set about fogging its joss in a most remarkable manner, when it used the following language:—

"If between now and election time the members of the Government will show the courage of their opinions, and absolutely perform some of the things they were put in power to perform, they will save the situation for Liberalism, and handsomely at that. But if they go along the lines indicated by the Premier, the inevitable result is not difficult to divine. The sessional programme out-

lined on Tuesday night is not by any means satisfactory. It is obviously intended that there shall be among the slaughtered innocents of the session many proposals to which the Government is committed, if not by specific promise in the Governor's Speech of July, then in former speeches and in trusting pledges. . . . This abandonment may spell disaster to Liberalism, and certainly spells treachery to the country."

These hon. members who say that the result was due to misrepresentation certainly strike me as people who are well qualified to be authorities on misrepresentation. As one who has been connected with the Labour movement for some years, I have a vivid, clear, and distinct recollection of the campaign of mendacity that was launched when the Labour platform was first put before the electors of Queensland—a campaign that has been continued ever since. But evidently the electors on the 22nd May did not hearken any longer to the old bogey cries, and, realising that the Labour party were equal to the occasion if the responsibilities of office were placed upon their shoulders, decided once and for all to get rid of the party which was continually climbing to office on promises which they never fulfilled. I believe that if it were within the realms of possibility to collect the unredeemed pledges of the Tory party in the past, it would only be with some difficulty that they could be placed in the spacious rooms of the Executive Building in George street. It is, perhaps, interesting to follow the statement that this party secured their election on misrepresentation. I have in my hands one of the pamphlets which was issued by the Liberal party at the last election, and, amongst other things, here are some of the deliberate and wilful misrepresentations that are contained in that circular—

"Who gave you adult suffrage in Queensland? The Liberal party."

Anyone who has followed the political history of Queensland knows that the Liberal party, or the party which is now represented by the remnants which we see scattered on the Opposition benches, has always been opposed to any extension of the franchise in Queensland. We know perfectly well that, when the Labour party formed a coalition with a certain remnant of the democratic party that was then in the House under the leadership of Sir Arthur Morgan, then Mr. Morgan, one of the conditions of that coalition was that the party should bring in an Elections Bill, in which the principle of adult suffrage was duly recognised. We know also that it was absolutely essential that a special session of Parliament should be held in order that the measure might be passed, and the people of Queensland be enabled to express their democratic opinion. Why is it that the party now on the Opposition benches have always been unfavourable to adult suffrage? We know that they strangled it at the last election when they brought in the Elections Bill. They had not the moral courage to openly repeal the principle of adult suffrage, but they so restricted it that a large section of Queensland's most desirable citizens—the men, for instance, engaged on railway construction work—would be disfranchised. Every man who shifted his residence from one electorate to another between the 2nd December and the 22nd February was disfranchised, was unable to record a vote on 22nd May.

Mr. STEVENS: They made it compulsory.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member makes a silly interjection about compulsory voting. His party brought in compulsory voting because they believed that it would return them again to the Treasury benches; but they did not know that it was loaded, and so they are where they are now, in a place which they are well fitted to adorn, and may they remain there for very many years. Then, here is another statement in the circular—

"Who gave you an eight-hour day and a minimum wage?"

Is it not within the recollection of hon. members that when the Railways Bill was going through, and when a member of this party sought to incorporate that principle in the measure, the party opposite, to a man, voted solidly against a minimum wage for the railway workers of Queensland? Then they have the effrontery to say to an intelligent body of electors in a circular of this description—

"Who gave you old-age pensions?"

Anyone looking at the records of the House to-night will remember distinctly that a member of the Labour party, as far back as 1898, moved a motion affirming the principle of an old-age pension, and it took ten years' fighting on the floor of this Assembly before the Kidston Government brought in an Old-age Pensions Bill. If the Liberal party were always in favour of old-age pensions, why was it necessary for a ten years' contest to be waged on the floor of this House before that much-needed measure of justice was given to our old pioneers in Queensland? Of course, the people of Queensland now—thanks of the propaganda of the Labour movement—are becoming aware of the political facts associated with the history of the party opposite, and they are no longer misled in the manner they were misled in previous years. We have heard a great deal during this debate from the self-appointed representatives of the primary producers to the effect that they were being robbed by the present Government. We know that, as a matter of fact, the primary producer, not only in Queensland, but throughout the length and breadth of Australia, under Liberal Governments, has been robbed in the past. We know that when it was sought by the Labour party in the Federal Parliament to introduce an amendment of the Federal Constitution that would give the National Parliament and the people who sent its elected representatives there power to deal with those questions directly affecting themselves, those self-appointed representatives of the farmers opposed the very necessary amendments of the Constitution, thereby allowing trusts and monopolies to exploit the primary producers. I have no hesitation in saying that, as far as the robbing of the primary producer is concerned, that is being done by the party opposite and by those who support them. To show that there is no sincerity in that party, and that they have never attempted to seriously take any practical and definite action to remedy this undesirable state of affairs, when the Cane Price Boards Bill was before the House, the ex-Premier, Mr. Denham, stated (vide "Hansard" of 5th November, 1913, page 2500)—

"Honourable understandings, combines, and trusts of any kind whatever will be dealt with, if we are spared, in the next session of Parliament."

They were spared for the next session of

Mr. Kirwan.]

Parliament; but this is another Liberal promise unredeemed, and an outraged democracy rose up in their might and smote them on the 22nd May last, and they are not now entrusted with the government of Queensland. Reference has been made to the action taken by the Labour Government in connection with the protection of the primary producers. We heard it from public platforms during the late election campaign that the action of the Holman Government in New South Wales in connection with the Wheat Acquisition Act was nothing more or less than deliberate robbery. We heard an hon. member who is associated with the Country party—I refer to the hon. member for Aubigny—endeavour to explain away the fact that, although the Castlereagh by-election was contested on this very question, although it is an entirely farming constituency, yet they elected by a larger majority than previously a member of the Labour party.

Mr. MURPHY: Why, Mr. Hughes took action against the Labour Government in New South Wales.

Mr. KIRWAN: I am not here to debate the constitutional question. I am here to state the simple fact, that the action of the Holman Government contented the farmers of New South Wales.

Mr. STEVENS: Are you sure that it is not a point of law, like the question yesterday?

Mr. KIRWAN: If the hon. member wants legal advice, there is a firm in this city named Thynne and Macartney, and they will give him legal advice, if he pays the necessary fee. As has already been said by hon. members who have discussed this question, the action of the Holman Government gave to the farmers of New South Wales the highest price they have ever received for their wheat—5s. per bushel—and they received their seed wheat at from 3s. to 3s. 6d. per bushel less than was paid by the unfortunate farmers in Victoria under the alleged benign legislation of a Liberal Administration. Surely, it is obvious to any intelligent person that farmers who receive the record price for twenty-five years for wheat, and yet get their seed wheat at a lower price than any other body of farmers in Australia, are doing well! We heard the hon. member for Drayton, in perhaps one of the best exhibitions of mock heroics that we have listened to in this Chamber, comparing the Labour party to the Kelly gang. If the bushrangers of Australia were alive to-day, they would not need to "stick up" banks and stations. They could start as butter exploiters and wheat speculators, and, doubtless, if the hon. members occupying the Opposition benches were in power, they would be promoted to another place, and would be referred to as "honourable gentlemen." What are the class of men for whom the apologists on the other side are using all their arguments and reasons to justify their actions during this debate? The Melbourne "Age," on 3rd April last, in a special article entitled, "Gambling in Wheat. A Nefarious Practice. Need for Government Action," said—

"One of the lessons of the high price of wheat caused by the combined forces of war and drought, is the necessity of suppressing, by drastic action, these parasites of the grain industry, who gamble in what are known as wheat futures. The wheat trade is infested

with a swarm of spielers and sharks, whose nefarious practices are more damaging to the interests of the producer and consumer than are the operations of a scheming horseowner, a shady bookmaker, to the interests of honest racing."

And yet those are the gentlemen who find apologists and defenders amongst members of the Opposition! A few illustrations might not be out of place to demonstrate the truth of my assertion that the farmers of New South Wales did well under the Holman Wheat Acquisition Act. In a certain district in New South Wales the farmers had sold for forward delivery 161,505 bushels, at 4s. per bushel. When the Bill became law that contract was cancelled. The result was that the wheat was sold to the Government at 5s. per bushel, and the farmers netted another £8,000, which they would never have got if the speculator and the parasite had had their way. And yet in the face of evidence of this kind, we are told by hon. members opposite that it is wrong. It is computed that the farmers in New South Wales received half a million of money more for their crop than they would have received under the ordinary conditions which prevail in connection with the buying and selling of wheat.

Mr. BOOKER: That is pure supposition.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member is challenged to get up in his place and prove that it is pure supposition. A bald assertion from the hon. member carries no weight in an intelligent Assembly such as this. We are also told that the Holman Government, or any Labour Government, is an awful incubus for the primary producer to have in power. Now, what are the facts? Finding that there were a number of farmers in New South Wales who were affected by the drought, whose stock was almost in a starving condition, and who had spent whatever little savings they had in purchasing feed at a very high price in order to keep their stock alive, the New South Wales Government decided to purchase fodder and sell it to the farmers on terms. Surely, that is not the action of a Government that is out to crush the primary producer. Has the Government of Victoria done anything of the kind? Is it not a fact that in New South Wales the Government have spent £400,000 in helping the primary producer to tide over this disastrous drought, which has affected, not only the sister State, but every other State in the Commonwealth? Speaking at Coonabarabran, according to the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 26th March last—

"Referring to speculators, Mr. Grahame, assistant Minister, said the Government wanted to purchase a large quantity of chaff for the farmers, and speculators asked £9 per ton for chaff. It was not worth that money, and he told them, if they were not prepared to sell for less, he would take the matter before the Necessary Commodities Commission, and see what was a fair value. The result was, just before he left Sydney, they sold him 4,000 tons of chaff, at £7 10s."

There you see the saving effected, and it goes to demonstrate clearly and unmistakably that the attitude of the Labour Government in New South Wales, and the similar

[Mr. Kirwan.

attitude which is being adopted by the Labour Government in Queensland, is in the direction of helping the primary producer. We have heard a great deal during this debate about butter. In fact, someone has said that this session will go down to posterity as the "butter session." Hon. members on the other side have accused the Ryan Government of robbing the primary producer. Is it not a fact that a large quantity of the butter which was purchased in January in Queensland for £6 per cwt. was sold in Victoria for £9 2s. per cwt. I ask the hon. member for Rosewood: How much of that extra profit was divided amongst the farmers in Rosewood? How much did the farmers in Rosewood get out of the profit that was made out of the "Wandilla" shipment, calculated at £9,000?

Mr. STEVENS: They got it all.

Mr. KIRWAN: If they got it all, it is very strange that there is no documentary evidence of the fact. It would have been very simple for the hon. member to have produced documentary evidence, if any exists. If I can get the evidence on Monday with regard to that shipment, I will pass it on to some other hon. member to make use of it. It will probably surprise the hon. member for Rosewood to know that the farmer was exploited, as he always has been exploited, by a gang of exploiters, who take the cream, and leave only the skim milk for the farmer.

Mr. STEVENS: The farmers of Rosewood do not dispose of their butter to speculators. They market it themselves.

Mr. KIRWAN: In connection with this butter question, we are always being told by hon. members opposite that it is governed by the law of supply and demand.

Mr. GUNN: Well, if you feed your cow, she will give butter. If you don't, she won't. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: I am not going to deny that the law of supply and demand may apply in the illustration given by the hon. member for Carnarvon; but what I want to know is why the butter in cold storage in Brisbane increased between the 19th and 26th April last by 100,000 lb. And it is also a strange thing that in England, where very little is manufactured, where they have to depend on Denmark and Siberia, [9.30 p.m.] and to some extent on Australia, that butter was being sold—and anyone can verify my figures by looking up the Melbourne "Age"—at £6 15s. to £6 19s. per cwt., when it was being sold here and in Melbourne at £10. Why was not the price governed by London parity on this occasion, as we are always told it is? It seems rather strange that in London, notwithstanding the submarine activity of our enemies, which, to some extent, must affect the transhipment of butter from Denmark, and notwithstanding that the conscription in Russia must have had the effect of decreasing the Siberian supply considerably, and very little has gone to England owing to the winter and the closing of the ports, the people there could buy it 8d. or 9d. per lb. cheaper than we can here practically right alongside the factory. Talk about the law of supply and demand—it does not operate. It has been the common cry for a number

of years, and we all know that prices are fixed. The only trouble is that hon. members opposite are quarrelling because they have been fixed by the Government in the interests of the consumer, and not by a ring of speculators in the interests of themselves. I think it was the hon. member for Mirani who made a very feeble attempt to explain the fact that cultivation had not increased in Queensland as it ought.

Mr. SWAYNE: I pointed out that Queensland was doing very well as compared with the other States.

Mr. KIRWAN: And I am going to point out that she is doing very little compared with the other States. (Laughter.) We have been told in this House, and have heard on the hustings, that one of the achievements of the late Government, that was fired out on the 22nd May, was that they had increased the railway mileage to a greater extent than any other State. The mileage has certainly increased very largely, but what sort of a land administration, what sort of encouragement to agriculture have we had under a Liberal Administration, when, although the increase in our railway mileage was 100 per cent., the increase in our cultivation was only 23 per cent.? There the hon. member for Mirani has got a cold piece of steel that he can chew for the rest of the evening and the session, and if he can find any explanation of why, notwithstanding the increase in our railways, which are supposed to develop our vast resources, including the agricultural industry, we find ourselves the most backward State in the Commonwealth so far as agricultural settlement is concerned, and if he requires proof of the accuracy of my statements, I refer him to an individual to whom he gave great prominence during the election campaign, a gentleman by the name of Knibbs. Reference has been made, and very properly so, to the great exploits of the Australians at the Dardanelles. As an Australian I am delighted to know, although I regret that a disastrous war had to come along to prove it, that Australians have again justified the high encomiums that have been passed on them, and have laid once for all the foul slanders and vile libels that have been uttered upon them by the "stinking-fish" party. We were told when there was a demand some years ago for a white Australia that the white worker could not do the work of the kanaka in the canefields. We were told that they were shirkers. When the Government went in for the day-labour policy in connection with the construction of railway lines, we were told that all the loafers and ne'er-do-wells would be employed at high rates of wages. We have been told by the president of the Employers' Federation and by other prominent men, occupying, I regret to say, the positions of representatives of the people, that Australians wanted high wages and were shirkers. Did they shirk it at the Dardanelles? (Hear, hear!) I think now that all those individuals who uttered those vile slanders ought to go and drown themselves.

Mr. STEVENS: What are you talking about?

Mr. KIRWAN: Does the hon. member mean to tell me that he does not know it is a fact that members of his party have declared over and over again that white men could not do the work in the canefields of North Queensland? Does he not know that

Mr. Kirwan.]

even now there are employers who prefer to employ all the coloured aliens of the world before they will give a white man a job, and when you ask the reason will tell you that they are more reliable? And yet they are asking these men to go to the front and protect their fat interests here while they remain behind to still slander them. I am speaking the plain, unvarnished truth, and I am glad of the opportunity, as a young Australian, to deal it out to the members of the "stinking fish" party who have so slandered my fellow-countrymen. I say that the Australians have made a name for themselves in the Dardanelles, and when we consider their glorious achievements, when we consider that the task they were expected to do in three days they accomplished in a few hours, we may feel sure that when the history of Australia comes to be written their magnificent exploits will be immortalised both in song and story. (Hear, hear!) The only people who would have shown equally wonderful dash would have been a company of wheat speculators and butter exploiters, who, if they had been sent to the front, would have charged the Turks as they charged the poor producers and consumers, and would have won a glorious name for the British arms unparalleled in the history of the British Empire. Reference has been made in the Governor's Speech to the necessity of an amendment of the Elections Act. I think this party are amply justified in placing this in the forefront of their legislative programme. They have been returned by the people, not to sit idly on the Treasury benches and adopt the policy of the late Government of "doing nothing." Previous Governments have been returned and have forgotten their election pledges and have sat down and done nothing but boast of how they were returned; but we have a Government, and a party behind them, determined to honour to the full our election pledges. We have seen the remarkable attitude of members who declare that the Government have done nothing to reduce the cost of living, while in the very next breath somebody gets up and says that they are robbing the farmers. What are we to think? You have only to put the two statements in juxtaposition to discover that gentlemen on the other side do not know where the are, and they are pretty well bankrupt of anything in the nature of argument or criticism, and being in that position they are prepared to grab anything that comes along in the hope of besmirching the fair name of the Government. And when the Elections Act is brought in I trust that if it be possible it will be drawn up on Commonwealth lines; and, further, if a practicable scheme can be devised, I will be very much in favour of using one roll for both State and Commonwealth. The Speech also promises a Royal Commission to deal with Government departments. Now, if there is one of the public departments that needs turning inside out and upside down it is the Queensland Railway Department.

Mr. SWAYNE: You did not become Minister.

Mr. KIRWAN: No. I did not get to be Minister, and I am not disappointed, may I inform the hon. member. Members of this party are loyal to the members they have selected to fill those positions, selected by exhaustive ballot. I do not think that any member, whether on that side or this, can quarrel with the fact or deny the fact that

[*Mr. Kirwan.*]

every one of those hon. members deserves the position in which he has been placed. I am a colt in the party. I can afford to wait. If my time comes, well and good, but if it does not I will be none the less sincere in my adherence to the platform or loyal to the gentlemen who are placed on the Treasury bench to carry it into effect.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! That is the proper sentiment.

Mr. KIRWAN: With regard to that department, I think I can honestly and sincerely congratulate the hon. member who has been appointed to the position of its Minister. He is certainly a man of action, and he has done many things which previous Ministers had not the courage to do, and his decentralisation scheme is one which I believe will work out beneficially, not only for the Railway Department, but also for the whole of Queensland. It is absolutely essential to have a gentleman with sufficient capacity to see what is required, and, above all, with the will-power to carry out what he regards as requisite, and I think that in the present Minister for Railways we have a man who will worthily discharge the duties of the office and protect the interests of the taxpayers. Still, a Royal Commission will be a considerable advantage to the Minister, as it will be able to collect and collate information which, busy man as he is, it would be impossible for him to collect. The Minister has to depend upon the reports of his officers for information, and it is not likely that highly paid officials are going to point out to him that they are committing blunders or wasting public money. The only method of arriving at a correct view of the position with regard to railway construction and the general management of our railway system is to appoint a Royal Commission with full power to call witnesses and collect the necessary evidence. When that is done we shall have an opportunity of testing some of the highly paid officials, in perhaps a better manner than some of the employees were tested when they went out on strike. Last session I mentioned that we had a General Traffic Manager's Office, in which there were four men to do the work which was previously done by one. I notice that under the decentralisation scheme two of those men have lost their job, and I do not know that it would be a great loss if they were out of the department altogether. I know that, although there were four men in that office, it was necessary at Christmas time, when, of course, the traffic is heavier than it is at ordinary times, to get a station-master off a platform to do traffic work. An anomaly such as that will certainly be rectified as the result of the inquiries of a Royal Commission. If we have a station-master who can take on traffic work, he should be placed in a position where he can do that work, and the traffic managers should be given less arduous duties to perform. As an evidence of the capacity of the officers to whom I refer, we have only to look at what happened during the visit of the Japanese cruisers, when, because a few thousand extra people had to be taken to Pinkenba, the whole service was tied up. I think the work of the proposed Royal Commission should be extended beyond the Railway Department, and that it should deal with the Marine Department. I had occasion last session, when the Estimates were going through, to draw attention to the fact that although the Government had spent £28,000 on a new pilot boat, yet that vessel was

absolutely unfitted for the purpose for which it was constructed. I was told by the then Treasurer that I did not know what I was talking about. I find now that I actually understated the position. The Brisbane "Courier," which is not given to exposing the blunders of the late Liberal Administration, published a paragraph, in which it was pointed out that it was necessary to dock the boat almost every time she came to Brisbane. I should like the commission to ascertain who was responsible for preparing the plans and specifications for that boat, as it is pretty hard lines that the general taxpayer should be called upon to pay the piper to the tune of £28,000 for a vessel which does not answer the purpose for which it was required. The pilots waited patiently for a number of years for a new boat to be provided, meanwhile doing their duty with a coffin ship, the old "Excelsior," expecting that the new vessel would enable them to perform their duties with more comfort and less danger; and now they find that they have a vessel which is ill-suited for the climate of Queensland. The cabins are little more than boxes. It is only right that we should know who is responsible for this condition of affairs, and that the responsible officer should be dealt with in the same way as navvies are dealt with when they do not do the right thing. Reference is made in the Governor's Speech to an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act, and we have had some excellent speeches from new members on this subject. If there is one feature of the debate on the Address in Reply which is more pleasing than any other, it is the splendid speeches delivered by new members. Although I do not question the right of the leader of the Opposition to refer to certain men who are no longer members of this House, yet I must say that the new element which has arrived has sufficient ability to justify the statement that they will be a valuable acquisition to the House, and be able, if their constituents place confidence in them for the necessary length of time, to undertake Ministerial responsibility with credit to themselves and advantage to the country. I do not propose to discuss the Speech at any further length. I may, however, be permitted to say that members who have been associated with the Labour movement in Queensland for a number of years must be delighted with the splendid and magnificent victory achieved by the party on the 22nd of May last. It is evident that the people of Queensland are waking to the fact that they can secure from their own ranks men who are capable of performing the responsible duties of parliamentary representatives, and who are equal to the responsibilities of office if they are placed on their shoulders. I remember the time when some people sneered at the idea of men taken from the humblest walk of life being able to perform Ministerial duties, and to properly represent the electors in the Assembly. The hon. member for Oxley has been sneered at by members opposite because he is a business man and has associated himself with the Labour party. In the early days of the Labour movement, when a Labour candidate was generally a man from the artisan class, we were told that we were running hobnail boot men, and we were asked why we did not get business men and well-educated men into our ranks. Now that we have a professional man like our respected leader and a business man like the hon. member for Oxley in our ranks, they are

sneered at, and it is said they are not Labour men. When Mr. Wilson stood for Brisbane, it was said, "Why don't the Labour party bring out a Labour man? He is a landlord and owns a terrace of houses. What sympathy has he with the workers of Brisbane?" Again, in 1912, when the workers ran a railway porter as their candidate, supporters of the party opposite still growled, and said, "Why don't you get a man who is fit to represent Brisbane?" I remember during the election before last that a gentleman made a sneering remark at me, because I chose to stand on the principles of a lifetime, and because I sacrificed my job in preference to going back on my principles. He said to me, "You are going on to a different platform to the one you have left, and you will not feel so much at home as you did on the one you have left." I replied with as much dignity as I could command, "I have always done my duty on the platform I have just left, and I shall endeavour to do it on the platform I am going to."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: That gentleman thought there was no possibility of a railway porter from the Central Station being the member for Brisbane, and he has been very deferential to me since, and altogether a very different gentleman to what he was then. If the Labour movement has done nothing else, it has demonstrated that there are men in the ranks of the workers who are fit to occupy the Treasury benches. (Hear, hear!) In that they have accomplished something. So far as the Federal Parliament is concerned, there have been many of the greatest intellects of Australia there, and yet men who have previously followed the humblest vocations have held their own with these men in the National Parliament. We have only to refer to the late Senator McGregor, and to the late Mr. Roberts, who left his barrow on the wharf at Adelaide to go into Parliament as the representative of the constituency so long and honourably represented by that sterling democrat, the late Charles Cameron Kingston (Hear, hear!) These things have inspired the workers of Queensland, and had the result of returning a Labour Government to power on the 22nd of May last. I have no hesitation in saying that after the present Ministry have served their three years, and come before the electors again, they will secure a further lease of power. (Hear, hear!) I hope, like the Premier, that the leader of the Opposition will be long spared to occupy the position which he now holds. (Hear, hear! and Government laughter.) I respect that hon. gentleman because he has been consistent in his political principles. He has always stood for one set of principles; and whether he was in the majority, or whether his party were defeated, he has never wavered. I can always respect an hon. gentleman like that, and I entertain towards the hon. gentleman a feeling of the highest regard. I am sorry that I cannot entertain the same feeling for some of the shandygaff politicians sitting behind him on the Opposition benches.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 10 o'clock.

Mr. H. L. Hartley.]