

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 1915

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, 18 NOVEMBER, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

EXAMINATION OF ENGINE-CLEANERS.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

- "1. The names of candidates who sat for the recent examination for the position of engine-cleaners at Toowoomba?
- "2. Place of birth?
- "3. Position attained in examination?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Adamson, *Rockhampton*) replied—

(1.)	(2.)	(3.)
Richmond, Jas.	Clydebank, Scotland	1
Cullinan, P. J.	Aubigny	2
Houlihan, J. J.	Warwick	3
Day, R.	Southbrook	4
Ryan, D.	Allora	5
Lorrimer, J.	Gowrie	6
Strohfeldt, W.H.	Toowoomba	7
Griffith, H.	Bolton, England	8
Drews, H. R.	Drayton	9
Collins, T.	Allora	10
Stirling, W. T.	Warwick	11
Weir, E. J.	Toowoomba	12
Dalton, W.	Cabarlah	13
Cherry, A.	Oakey	14
Anderson, H. E.	Toolamba, Victoria	15
Desmond, R. T.	Toowoomba	16
Jennings, F.	Christchurch, N.Z.	Failed in examination.
Burley, W. A.	London, England ...	do.
Phister, R. M.	Milmeran	do.
Fett, H.	Oakey	do.
Gaske, F.	Chinchilla	do.

BASIS OF LAND TAX.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*) asked the Treasurer—

- "1. Is he aware that the valuations of city and shire councils vary according to the ideas of valuers and councillors, and are not a just foundation on which to levy a State land tax?
- "2. Also, that land purchased for some years past has been purchased on future values?
- "3. That years of drought in certain parts of the State have shown that these purchases have been above the producing values, and, therefore, above fair value on which to base a State land tax?
- "4. If the Government appoints its own valuator, will he give instructions for the following principles to be carried out in order to get a just base for taxation?
- "5. What percentage of the land is agricultural; what percentage is grazing, or unsuitable for cultivation?
- "6. What would be the cost of making agricultural land fit for cultivation? Is the ordinary rainfall sufficient to warrant the expense of cultivation and the maturing of crops, if sown?

- "7. Carrying capacity of grazing land in dry seasons?
- "8. Will he leave out of consideration prices paid for land or otherwise, and fix values for taxation on producing values only?
- "9. Will he, in his usual courteous manner, give all information possible, even if it takes a later date to give the answer?"

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

- "1. I do not desire to express an opinion on the valuations or the methods of valuing adopted by city and shire councils.
- "2 and 3. I am not aware of this.
- "4 to 9. The principle on which valuations are to be made are stated in the Land Tax Bill."

MANUFACTURE OF SHELLS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Miranji*) asked the Secretary for Railways (in his capacity as chairman of the State Munitions Committee)—

- "1. Why was not the letter, dated 9th September, 1915, from the Town and Country Amalgamated Motors, Limited, stating they had already made a body for an 18-pounder high-explosive shell, and offering, if supplied with steel, to at once commence making 500 such bodies per week, not passed on from the Advisory State Munitions Committee to the executive committee?
- "2. Had not the State Munitions Advisory Committee already in a letter, dated 30th August, 1915, inquired as to how much work this firm was prepared to undertake in connection with the supply of shell bodies?
- "3. Will he cause inquiries to be made as to what became of the letter from the Town and Country Amalgamated Motors, Limited, dated 8th October, which, in his reply to my question asked on 16th November, he states cannot be found? If found, did not this letter not only offer to supply shell bodies at Government workshop cost (£1 0s. 6d.), but also offered, if over a fair profit then remained, to pay over the same to the State?
- "4. If the above or other firms were prepared to supply shell bodies in September last, and continue the same from that time onwards, has not a valuable opportunity to augment the supply of high-explosive shells been missed, while we are waiting until the end of November or beginning of December for the State workshops to be built, equipped, and commence work?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

- "1. This letter was not addressed to the executive committee, but was in reply to a letter from the secretary of the advisory committee.
- "2. Yes.
- "3. Inquiries have been made, but, so far, the letter has not been traced.
- "4. Firms could not have supplied shell bodies in September last, because the necessary steel was not available, therefore, work could not have been

continued from that date onwards. The Commissioner for Railways' tender was dated 20th September, and there has been no delay in getting on with the work of making shell bodies. It is not necessary to wait until the end of November or the beginning of December for the State workshops to be built, equipped, and commence work, as work has been commenced, and is well forward at the present time—in fact, much more so than many of the other States. The Government proposes turning out 2,500 shell bodies per week on and after the 18th December next."

REPRESENTATIVE AT PANAMA EXPOSITION.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*), in the absence of Mr. Morgan, asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. Is Queensland still represented at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition?"

"2. If so, by whom, and from what date?"

"3. On what date did Mr. Robertson cease to be the representative of Queensland?"

"4. What circumstances brought about his retirement from the position?"

"5. Were Mr. Robertson's expenses paid by the State of Queensland?"

"6. What was the amount due to Mr. Robertson on the date of his retirement?"

"7. Has the amount since been paid?"

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

"1 and 2. Queensland is represented at the Panama-Pacific Exposition by Mr. Mobsby, a highly qualified officer of the Agricultural Department.

"3 and 4. Mr. Robertson voluntarily retired from his position as Queensland commissioner.

"5, 6, and 7. Mr. Robertson's expenses have been defrayed by the Commonwealth Government, and any information in regard to this matter may be obtained from the Department of External Affairs, Melbourne."

ASSISTANCE TO MINING INDUSTRY.

Mr. H. J. RYAN (*Coock*) asked the Minister representing the Secretary for Mines—

"1. What amount was voted as assistance or subsidy to the mining industry for the twelve months ending 30th June last, under the following heads:—(a) Prospecting; (b) deep sinking; (c) roads and bridges and water supply?"

"2. What was the amount expended under the above heads (a), (b), (c), respectively, for the above-mentioned period?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. H. F. Hardacre, *Leichhardt*) replied—

"1. (a) £2,000; (b) £10,000; (c) £4,000.

"2. (a) £2,581 10s. 6d.; (b) £16,847 10s. 4d.; (c) £3,255 2s. 10d.

"(a) and (b). The amounts provided on the Estimates having been found insufficient, additional money was provided from unforeseen expenditure."

REMISSION OF SENTENCES.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) asked the Attorney-General—

"Will he place on the table of the House all the papers or copies thereof relating to (1) The case and sentence of Denis McCarthy, and (2) the case or cases and sentences of Williams and Dark, referred to in the remarks of His Honour the Chief Justice at the conclusion of the recent Supreme Court criminal sittings, Brisbane; including any petition or petitions, evidence in support, reports obtained, and all endorsements and minutes made thereon?"

"2. Will he also place on the table of the House all the papers or copies thereof relating to the case and sentence of one Davis, tried at Rockhampton for murder some time ago before His Honour Mr. Justice Lukin, and whose detention was directed pending His Majesty's pleasure; including any petition or petitions, evidence in support, reports obtained, and all endorsements and minutes made thereon?"

"3. Will he also place on the table of this House all the papers or copies thereof relating to the case and sentence of Joseph Deissler, tried before His Honour Mr. Acting District Court Judge Dickson, in July, 1915; including any petition or petitions, evidence in support, reports obtained, and all endorsements and minutes made thereon?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*) replied—

"This question should have been addressed to the Home Secretary, and I would ask the hon. member to give me notice of the question for Tuesday next."

PAPERS REGARDING MEATWORKS.

Mr. VOWLES asked the Chief Secretary, without notice—

"In view of his reply to an interjection by me when he was introducing the Constitution Act Amendment Bill a few nights ago, in which he said that he would be pleased to put certain papers on the table of the House, will he place on the table of the House all correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Queensland Government with reference to meatworks since November last, and give us access to same?"

The PREMIER replied—

"In answer to the hon. member, I may say that access will be allowed to those papers to any member of this House. The papers are here now."

PAPERS.

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

Return to an Order made on 17th November, on the motion of Mr. Foley, showing the amounts paid to barristers and solicitors for services rendered to the State from 1st July, 1914, to 30th June, 1915, together with the nature of the services rendered.

Annual report of the Marine Department for the year 1914-1915.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, this Bill, read a third time, was ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council by message in the usual form.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Coyne, Warrego, in the chair.*)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS, in moving—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Land Act of 1910 in certain particulars.”

said the Committee was thoroughly aware that the Bill sought merely to make certain amendments in the Land Act and also to make certain provisions with regard to selectors, both pastoral and agricultural. There was a fair discussion on the Bill in the House previously, and he would merely content himself by moving the motion.

Mr. VOWLES (*Darby*): As far as the Bill was concerned, he thought the Committee ought to get more information. The Opposition had pressed for further information, but they did not seem to carry much weight. They were dealing with one of the most important departments they had to deal with from an administrative point of view, that was one of the biggest assets the State had got, and they were asked to give leave in the dark to amend the existing Act in certain particulars.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You will get that information in the right time and place.

Mr. VOWLES: Unless they took the opportunity of widening the scope of the Bill at this stage, their chance would be gone. If they did not take the opportunity of moving amendments at that stage they would not be able to move them later on, because if they attempted to do so, they would be told that they were outside of the scope of the Bill, and they were out of court. It was not a fair thing that the Committee should be treated in the way they were being treated. They had an idea that the Bill was going to effect certain alterations, but in what particular they did not know. He was rather concerned as regards the interests of the pastoral lessee—the grazing farmer.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Your party always has been.

Mr. VOWLES: He was talking about his own constituents. He was thinking how they were going to be affected and more particularly whether the Minister was going to usurp the functions of the Land Court. That seemed to be the new principle that they were embodying in every measure that came before the Chamber; they were constantly discovering that powers hitherto reposed in the Land Court—a court beyond all political suspicion, and a court which acted on definite lines—were being taken away one by one, and the Minister was deciding in camera practically without evidence those things which were affecting private interests and which should be done in the open, and done on well-defined lines according to precedent and not according to the whim or caprice of the Minister for the time being. In matters of that sort they were not dealing with the Ministry of the

day, but had to consider the future, and that was one of the reasons why he should like to know in what direction it was proposed to make amendments. He referred last night to the fact that nothing had been disclosed as to whether the Government was embodying in the Bill some comprehensive scheme for dealing with one of the biggest national problems, probably the biggest next to the war, that they had to deal with. That was the subject of prickly-pear. In no place in the Governor's Speech or in the Treasurer's Financial Statement could they find any provision made in that regard, notwithstanding the fact that when the Labour party were sitting in opposition they used to stand up and denounce the Government of the day and point out that if they were in a position to do so they would devise some method by which the prickly-pear pest would be taken in hand once and for all. He had heard the Labour party talk about the establishment of boards in different districts to deal with that and other pests. How far had those things materialised? No legislation that would assist the man on the land had been introduced. The only desire of the Government seemed to be to go in for class legislation, and, if it was not purely class legislation then legislation which, from the Treasurer's point of view, would affect one class of persons on the land for the benefit of the other.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about Jimbour Estate?

Mr. VOWLES: Wait till they got the Jimbour Estate. It was a little too early to talk about that, but when they did get it he might be able to tell the hon. gentleman some of the moves which the Minister had been making in the meantime which probably the hon. gentleman thought he knew nothing about.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are perfectly at liberty to know all about it.

Mr. VOWLES: He knew how the hon. gentleman had been trying to cover up his tracks and make himself good.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have been trying to cover up your tracks.

Mr. VOWLES: The Jimbour settlers would not come under the Land Act, because they were under the Closer Settlement Act. He presumed they would get that Bill later, because it was foreshadowed and the sooner it came along the better for the Minister and his party. He was not dealing with the question before the Committee from a parochial point of view, but from a national point of view, and he would ask the Minister whether he was going to honour the statement that he and his confreres repeatedly made when in Opposition; that if they were on the Treasury benches they would amend the Land Act in certain directions which would once and for all deal with the subject of prickly-pear. If members liked to go through the pages of “Hansard” they would find times without number where the Minister in charge of the Bill had advocated certain things in connection with road-making and in connection with providing water in the country, and he would like to know whether those matters were included in the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Road-making and water conservation had nothing to do with the Land Act.

Mr. VOWLES: The public estate improvement fund had to do with those matters. The Agricultural Bank had been taken over

Mr. Fowles.]

by the Lands Department, and the whole administration should be a general administration, and if the powers were not there that was the opportunity to get them and that was one of the chances they might have of moving an amendment so as to give the Minister and his department broader powers than they had under the present Act, and give them all the rights that the mortgagee or owner of the land should have in order to get the best out of the country.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If you do not know better than that, you have been long enough here to know better.

MR. VOWLES: He knew a great deal more about the matter than the hon. gentleman, although he was the Minister. He did not take second place to the Minister on the land question.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, you don't know anything about the Land Act.

MR. VOWLES: He knew a great deal more than the Minister. He was pointing out that that was an opportunity, if those powers were not there—and it was necessary that they should be there in many cases—to introduce the necessary amendments in order to give the powers to which he had referred.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have no right in the Land Act, and have never been there.

MR. VOWLES: Now was the opportunity to bring them in, particularly in regard to water.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Oh, dry up!

MR. VOWLES: That was the trouble. The water was drying up, and the selectors had to go away in consequence. Only the other day he introduced a deputation to the hon. gentleman, and the subject-matter was in regard to a number of selectors who were stranded, owing to the fact that there was no water in their locality. The Minister told the selector that, unfortunately, as all the amount provided for the public estates improvement fund had been expended, there was no fund under the Land Act from which he could assist them, and the only persons who could assist them would be the local authorities or the Treasurer. That hon. gentleman said there was no power in his department to assist desirable cases such as that. Now, the Opposition wanted to assist the Minister in that direction. They wanted to put him in the position, as Minister, in suitable cases to be able to give assistance, and the Treasurer could find the money necessary in such cases.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Pure bluff.

MR. VOWLES: It was all very well for the Minister to sit back, drawing big dividends from his business in Roma, a big salary here as Minister, and also as head butcher in the butchering department—getting money from all quarters and sitting back. What about the poor, unfortunate selector—the man he was supposed to represent? Those were the people he should be helping, and the Opposition were trying to assist him by suggesting that amendments in that direction should be made when amending the Land Act. The Minister would not take them into his confidence and tell them in what direction he proposed to amend the Act. Were he to do so, they might be able to show many things which would be advantageous to the man on the

[*Mr. Vowles.*

land as well as to the department. If the Minister restricted his amendments to what his own brains suggested, then he was not treating the Opposition properly, because he was not giving them an opportunity of extending to him the benefit of their experience and the opinions of selectors of all classes.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The benefit of your experience is not worth much.

MR. VOWLES: They had the benefit of the hon. member's experience on previous occasions, and if they turned up "Hansard," they would find that the hon. gentleman had advocated all classes of things in connection with the lands, and he (Mr. Vowles) was very anxious to see the contents of the Bill, and see whether one per cent. of those things would be included.

MR. MURPHY (Burke): He hoped that one of the particulars in which the Act was to be amended was to make it easier to obtain pastoral leases for the man of small means. Under present conditions, leases were put up to public auction and public competition, and that meant that the man with money could obtain them every time. That was the position in the Gulf and in other parts of Queensland.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: This Bill provides for that.

MR. MURPHY: He was very pleased to hear that. That was all he wanted to know.

HON. J. TOLMIE (Toowoomba): The hon. gentleman did not desire to give information; and the probability was that when they were in Committee and desired to make some amendment the Minister would come forward and say their opportunity had gone; that they had the opportunity when the Bill was introduced to widen the scope of the Bill. They had missed that opportunity, and, although he was very sorry, he could do nothing. He did not know that they would be able to widen the scope of the Bill, but they could make the attempt, and, at any rate, they would then have justified themselves in the eyes of the country. He regretted that the Minister had not seen his way to take over and include

[4 p.m.] in the Bill the work that had been done in connection with the public estate improvement fund. The Minister said that that matter had no association with the Land Act itself, but it had an association with the administration of the department. There was no land thrown open by the department in connection with which there was not provision made for water and roads from the public estate improvement fund, and in order to pay for the improvements a charge was placed on the land when it was thrown open for selection. After the money in that fund was exhausted it was not possible to assist places requiring development. Settlers came and asked the Minister to assist in that direction, but the Minister had to turn the applications down because the scope of the Land Act would not allow him to make any further advances.

MR. GILLES: Why did you not do it when you were there? You were Secretary for Public Lands.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The most appeals for advances from this fund were from the constituency represented by the hon. member for Eacham, who, when he had the opportunity of widening the scope of the Land Act in

order to obtain more money for the selectors, was obstructing in every possible way.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You were three years there. Why did you not do it?

HON. J. TOLMIE: That had no bearing on the question as to whether those powers should be in the Bill. The Minister could say if he liked that he (Mr. Tolmie) had failed in doing these things.

THE PREMIER: Do you plead guilty?

HON. J. TOLMIE: That was not the point. The Minister could not make him a scapegoat for his own sins in that respect. The Opposition were willing to give the Government every assistance to make the necessary amendments, but they were not willing to accept the assistance of the Opposition in giving them those powers.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We doubt its sincerity.

THE PREMIER: You are trying to make the Bill so that the Council will throw it out, like everything else.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. gentleman was trying to work out the converse of that proposition by throwing out the Council. The scope of the measure should be sufficiently wide to enable any amendments to be moved which were necessary. The provision of water and roads was essential for new settlers. He had found himself handicapped in that direction when he was in the department, and the hon. gentleman would find himself handicapped. The hon. gentleman had come down with deputations pleading the cause of the selectors who had no means of access to their selections, and who were not able to carry out their agreements as selectors—that they were practically acting as dummies as far as their selections were concerned.

MR. GILLIES: Why did you not do something?

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member for Eacham, as a member of the party which was now in power, should fight for his constituents, and now was the time for him to get his work in. When they attempted to do anything for the selector the Minister got up and moved the Chairman out of the chair if he thought things were not going as they ought to go.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Would you like me to do that now?

HON. J. TOLMIE: The Minister could please himself. In order to test the anxiety of members on the opposite side to be the friends of the selectors, he moved the omission of the words "in certain particulars," with a view to enlarging the scope of the Bill, so that when they came to discuss it later on they might put in any amendments that might be considered essential to the development of the land in the State.

THE PREMIER: That is out of order. You are trying to introduce an amendment that was refused when the Speaker was in the chair.

HON. J. TOLMIE: They would have the opinion of the Chairman in regard to that. When the hon. member for Murilla moved an amendment he was told that was not the time, and surely the Premier was not going to take up the position that he was going to jerrymander legislation between the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker of the House.

THE PREMIER: There is no fear of jerry-mandering.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The Speaker had given his ruling that this was the time when action should be taken in this direction.

MR. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*) rose to second the amendment. There was no Bill tabled in the House that interested country members more than a Land Bill, and the Minister should have given more information to members in introducing this Bill. Judging from the Minister's remarks, it was intended to amend the Land Act in many particulars. He wished to refer to the selectors who selected small grazing farms on the Darling Downs, particularly in the Warwick district, ranging from 1,280 to 2,000 acres in area. They were engaged principally in dairying, and the leases of their farms would expire in from one to three years. They were a deserving class of people, and also had a cheese factory erected, and were assisting materially in the development of the district. They were very anxious to know how they would stand when their leases expired. Did the Minister intend to allow them to select land under perpetual lease or under some other leasehold system? It would have been better if the Minister had given them more information about the contents of the measure, so as to relieve the minds of country members. He had been a member of the House during the time the Minister had been member for Maranoa, and no one had taken a greater interest in land matters than the hon. gentleman when in opposition and tried to elicit more information from different Ministers than the hon. gentleman had. He had never heard a Minister when introducing a Land Bill give so little information as the hon. gentleman had given this afternoon. He trusted that the Minister would explain the provisions of the measure, and there would then be no more trouble.

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

AYES, 34.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Lacombe
" Collins	" May
" Cooper	" McLachlan
" Fihelly	" McMinn
" Foley	" McPhail
" Free	" O'Sullivan
" Gilday	" Peterson
" Gillies	" Pollock
" Hardacre	" Ryan, D.
" Hartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hartley, W.	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hunter	" Smith
" Euxham	" Stoford
" Jones, A. J.	" Theodore
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. Gilday and Mr. McLachlan.	

NOES, 20.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Hodge
" Barnes	" Moore
" Bayley	" Murphy
" Bebbington	" Petrie
" Bell	" Roberts
" Booker	" Somerset
" Bridges	" Stodart
" Corser	" Swayne
" Grayson	" Tolmie
" Gunn	" Vowles
Tellers: Mr. Bridges and Mr. Roberts.	

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Armfield, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Gledson, Mr. Wellington, and Mr. Bowman.
Noes—Lieut.-Col. Rankin, Mr. Appel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Macartney, and Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. Grayson.]

Original question put.

Mr. GRAYSON again asked the Minister if the Bill would contain a provision stating what kind of lease would be given to the lessees of land in the Warwick district when the present term expired?

Original question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution and it was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The Bill was presented and read a first time, and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. J. TOLMIE (*Toowoomba*), on rising, was received with Opposition cheers.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear the Tories cheering.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is their last cheer.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The leader of the Government, in introducing this Bill last night, said he regarded it as perhaps the most important measure he had introduced since he had been on the other side of the Chamber. He might have gone still further and said that it was the most important measure that has been introduced into this Chamber since it has been a Chamber, and the results of our deliberations here are going to have an abiding influence and an abiding impression on the people of the State. (Hear, hear!) The Bill is of a momentous character, and hon. gentlemen, in discussing it, should approach it from that standpoint, because we realise that in doing away with the second Chamber in this State we are reducing Queensland to a position of a great deal of impotence. We are placing it on a lower plane than it stands at the present time. We are placing it on a plane amongst the lowest-advanced States in this universe, and thereby we are reducing the status of every citizen in the State of Queensland. The leader of the Government, whilst realising the magnitude of the task before him, did not address himself to that task in such a way as will be a pride to him, when, in after days, he comes to look over the work he did last night. There were no strong reasons advanced by the hon. gentleman why this change should be made. (Hear, hear!) In the course of the debate he lost his temper and made a wild diatribe against the Legislative Council for the reason that it had opposed the Bills sent up from this Chamber. Was that any reason why the Chamber should be removed—because hon. gentlemen in that branch of the Legislature did not see eye to eye with the legislation passed in this House?

The TREASURER: Passed here by the will of the majority.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Under the Constitution power rests with the Legislative Council to deal with measures after we have done with them, and they also have power to initiate legislation themselves. So far as all legislation dealt with in that Chamber is concerned, they have co-ordinate powers

[*Mr. Grayson.*

with the Legislative Assembly in so far as they may reject Bills, and they also have co-ordinate powers so far as amendment of Bills is concerned, except in regard to money Bills. It is easily understood that the functions which belong to that Chamber are large, and its rights co-ordinate almost in every respect with this Chamber. As such we cannot find fault with them because the views of hon. members opposite are opposed to the views of the majority of hon. members in another place as now constituted. There has been a difference of opinion between the two Houses of the Legislature in the past, and in every country where there are two Houses it has been the same; but means have been adopted by which those differences of opinion are reconciled, and as a result the will of Parliament, as a whole, can be placed on the statute-book. What are the reasons which guided the hon. gentleman last night in his endeavour to impress this Chamber—at any rate, this side of the Chamber—with the idea that it was necessary that the Legislative Council should be abolished? In the first place, he opened his remarks by saying that it was the desire of the Labour party that this should be done—it had been the aspiration of the Labour party for many years that this should be done—that there should be the abolition of the Legislative Council. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a sufficient reason why the second Chamber in the Legislature of Queensland should be abolished? I think myself that if the opportunity is given to the people of Queensland to speak in regard to this measure, they will look at it from quite a different aspect to what the hon. gentleman did last night. They will not regard it as a fundamental reason why this Chamber should be abolished because it is obnoxious to the Labour party of this State. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to say that the franchise of some Legislative Councils was narrow, and in some cases they were nominated just as the Council in Queensland is nominated. If it is undesirable that the Council should be a nominee Chamber, then the attitude to be assumed is one of a reconstruction of it.

Mr. LARCOMBE: You voted against that.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Let the franchise be widened. The hon. gentleman should take up the attitude of widening the franchise so as to make it acceptable to what is believed to be the majority of people in this State.

Mr. KIRWAN: You voted for a nominee Chamber.

HON. J. TOLMIE: In an interjection last night an hon. gentleman said that the Legislative Council was a relic of feudalism, and the hon. gentleman in his speech took it up and said that was so. No man in this House knows better than the hon. gentleman that it is not a relic of feudalism. It is the result of the power that grew out of feudalism when the barons opposed the will of the Sovereign who reigned supreme in feudal times. From that time there has been an advance all the way until we have the liberties which we possess to-day. When the barons took the stand they did at Runnymede in 1214, and Magna Charta was granted to the British race, then the House of Lords—the Upper Chamber as it is called—did a great service for the British people, a service which should be remembered for all

time. (Hear, hear!) The Upper Chamber did a great work then, and so it has been all down through the ages that Chamber has been doing good work. Sometimes they make mistakes, just as the Legislative Assembly makes mistakes. The House of Lords is composed of men with human frailties just the same as members of the Lower House. The Upper House, therefore, may make mistakes, because they are men with human frailties and are prone to make mistakes. But, at the same time, the work of the Upper Chamber in all their Legislatures has been a work that has been for the good of the people. Then, he next proceeded to say that another reason why this Chamber should be [4.30 p.m.] abolished was that it was an obstruction to the war measures which had been introduced into this Chamber and passed on to the Upper House, and were not carried there. There, again, his reasoning is at fault. That forms no reason why it should be abolished. It possibly establishes a reason why the constitution of the Chamber should be altered. But what war measures did it interfere with? The hon. member mentioned two. He mentioned the Meatworks Bill. Now, that was not a war measure when it was introduced into this House. That measure was introduced here by reason of the fact that some 2,500 butchers in this city of Brisbane were out of employment, and they brought the hon. member, led by the hon. member for Ithaca, up to the Trades Hall, and put before him their workless condition, and asked that something might be done. The hon. member, according to the public Press, pleaded ignorance of the condition of those workers at the time. He said that he would look into the matter, that there was going to be a meeting of the Cabinet next day to deal with the question, and he would see that there was no oppression of the workers of the State of Queensland by the owners of the various meatworks of the State. And the following day he came down to the House and tabled a motion in favour of legislation to take possession of the meatworks of the State. It was not then a war measure. It was a measure dictated by the butchers of this State, in behalf of their own interests. That was the admission when the Bill was introduced, but public opinion became so strong in regard to the matter that the hon. member saw fit before the Bill passed this House to declare that it was a war measure.

Mr. BOOKER: Under pressure.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Under the pressure of public opinion. But that did not establish it as a war measure. There was nothing in that Bill that gave greater power than was already possessed by the Government, if they wished to operate the meatworks for the meat supplies of this State in the interests of those who are engaged in the war. The next reason that was assigned for his motion was that the Upper House had seen fit to reject the referenda proposals that passed through this House and were transmitted to the Upper Chamber. And the assertion was made that those referenda proposals constituted a war measure. When did they become a war measure? This is a question that the hon. gentleman did not answer. All those proposals were before the State of Queensland.

Mr. FREE: And carried by the people of Queensland.

HON. J. TOLMIE: And before the public of Australia, not once, but twice. Three years ago they were before the country, and they were not war proposals then, and there is nothing in this proposal which to-day constitutes them war proposals. When the question was put to Mr. Holman in the New South Wales Legislature the other day as to whether these were war proposals, the only way in which he could get out of the position in which he was placed was by saying that they were war proposals in as much as otherwise some of the operations of the Federal Government might be hampered.

Mr. LARCOMBE: What did Mr. Thynne say?

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: Senator Millen too.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Those were the reasons why the hon. member sought to abolish the Upper House, and in regard to that certain telegrams were read by him, with which I do not propose to deal exhaustively, because there were other opportunities of placing them before the House. The hon. member, however, did not begin at the commencement of those papers. I asked him to read the telegram that initiated all this business, the telegram that came on the 6th August, and also the cablegram of 11th August, with the cablegram of the 21st June, which showed conclusively that all and more than was asked had been done by the late Administration. All those cablegrams proved that up to the hilt, and even the very cablegram that he read, of the 21st January, when we got the full details before the Chamber, showed that the Home Government were satisfied with the conditions that obtained, were satisfied with the work that had been done in the past. The full cablegram is now before hon. members, and, no doubt, it will be dealt with in this Chamber before the discussion is ended on this Bill. I merely mention it to emphasise the fact that when the hon. member read it, he did not give credit to the late Government—I may go further, and say that he did not put it in a way which would do justice to the late Government.

The PREMIER: I put it fairly.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The hon. member commenced in the middle instead of at the beginning, and the whole connection of the cablegrams shows, as will be proved in this Chamber, that the Government acted along the lines on which they should have acted, and no wonder Mr. Bonar Law expressed surprise that the measure was going through this Chamber as a war measure because it had been demanded by hon. members on the other side of the House. I am not going to deal with the constitutional powers to bring about the result which the hon. member desires. I am not going to question whether that power exists, because it is immaterial to the issue. If the power does not exist, the hon. member will not be able to do what he desires. The Act, 18 and 19 Victoria, chapter 54, probably is all right, so probably are the letters patent of June, 1879, and the contemporaneous Order in Council, No. 17. The Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865, I have no doubt, also is all right, and so is the Constitution Act of 1867. The point that is of interest to us at the present time is whether the Act of 1908 is valid. It is valid until it has been tested. Whether the test will be

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

made, of course. I cannot say at the present time, but until the test is made it remains valid, and under that Act the Chief Secretary has the powers that he has claimed.

The PRÉMIER: You are collecting money now to test it that should go to war purposes.

HON. J. TOLMIE: It is the first time I have heard of it, but, at any rate, I will say this: That those who are collecting money for that purpose are doing just as much for the war funds as the hon. member is. I am quite prepared to say that, and I am prepared to say a similar thing in regard to other hon. members on the other side. I am not going to question the validity of that Act, but the fact remains that there is a doubt as to its validity. If that be so, and it is tested, of course we will know whether it is true or not; but, as I said last night, it does not matter whether it is valid or not. This question has to be carried to the people of the State of Queensland if the Act is proved to be valid, and that is where we will meet the hon. member—that is where we will deal with the front Treasury bench and their statements in regard to war measures—that is where we will deal with their followers as to the part they are playing in that connection.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. TOLMIE: We will deal with them when we go before the people; we will ask the people to judge between us and hon. members on the other side. We will ask the people then to say whether, in view of the work that has been done in this State, they are going to put the power of complete legislation in the hands of hon. members opposite. That is the time when we will have an opportunity of dealing with war measures. All that concerns us at the present time is whether it is desirable or not to destroy the bicameral system which has been in operation in this State right from the beginning. The hon. member, in his speech last night, quoted a number of States where there are single Chambers. He read out that in the Dominion of Canada, with the exception, I think, of Quebec and Nova Scotia, all the provinces had a single Chamber, and he said that that was the reason why we should have one here in Queensland.

Mr. FOLEY: A very good reason, too.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He knows, as the hon. member who interjects does not, that there is a difference between the Constitution of the Dominion of Canada and the Federal Constitution of Australia. The Constitution of Australia gives wider powers to the States of the Commonwealth than are possessed by the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. There the Legislatures are more like divisional boards in comparison with the Legislatures of the States of Australia possessing the wide powers which we possess, and are we to descend to the same level as they at the present time? Let us see, in regard to the British dominions, what States there are which have the bicameral system. First of all, there is the mother of Parliaments itself. The House of Commons is a sovereign Parliament. The Commonwealth is a sovereign Parliament. Each of the States of Australia possesses sovereign powers. Those sovereign powers are not possessed by the provinces of the Canadian Dominions.

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

But in Canada itself there are sovereign powers. Nova Scotia, Quebec, and Newfoundland and New Zealand have sovereign powers. South Africa has sovereign powers, but New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, as pointed out by the hon. member, have not sovereign powers. That is the difference between those seven and the others I have enumerated. Now, let us see what the position is in regard to the other countries of the world—let us see which of those countries have the bicameral system, and which the single Chamber system. Those which have single Chambers are Bulgaria—and the hon. member wants to put us down to the level of Bulgaria—Costa Rica, Crete, and then this long list of petty German States—Oldenburg, Anhalt, Brunswick, Saxe Altenberg, Saxe Coburg Gotha, Saxe Meiningen, Schaumberg Lippe, Schwartzburg Rudolstadt, Schwartzburg Sonderhausen Liechtenstein, and Luxemburg. Then there are little principalities and States in South America, as follows:—Honduras, Monaco, Nicaragua, Panama, and Salvador. Those are the States in the world which have the single Chamber system, but all the great countries—all the countries that have made progress and stand high among the nations of the world have the dual system. We, at the present time, are in the proud position that we do stand shoulder to shoulder with the great States of the world, but hon. members on the other side are going to degrade us from that position, and put us on the level with the little States I have mentioned—little States that you could take a hop, step, and a jump across if necessary—1,000-acre blocks, or something of that kind. Queensland is to be degraded to a condition of that kind, all because an hon. member on the other side, in his autocracy, desires to place his own will on the statute-book of Queensland.

Mr. KIRWAN: The people's will.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Is it the proper thing? Let us see what the value of the second Chamber is. There is a recognition of value of the second Chamber all the world over. And what is the standard of value? That is the question that I may put to hon. members opposite. The standard of value is this: that wherever new countries are being set up, or new Governments are being set up, in almost every case the Government that is set up is a bicameral Government, with the exception of, perhaps, some of the very small States where these things do not count. That is the position all the world over, and you have only to turn to the records to ascertain what States have changed their Governments in recent years for the purpose of discovering that. Wherever constitutions are founded, they are founded either upon the establishment of new States or because of revolution, and then it is easy to discover—with all the new States that have been established in the last century—how many adopted the bicameral system and how many have adopted the single system. When we were establishing a new Government in this country of Australia—in this Commonwealth—what did we do? After a long experience, did we establish a single Chamber? Not at all. We adopted the bicameral system here in Australia. What was the action of the Dominion Parliament in South Africa? That is only of recent construction. It is

within the last few years that they have set up there a Dominion Parliament. What system did they follow? They followed the bicameral system, and all the States of the dominion followed the same system. What can speak more eloquently in regard to the establishment of these various Governments than the action that has been taken by Governments in the past? Why is this done? Simply for the purpose of securing the greatest amount of liberty to all the subjects in the State.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

HON. J. TOLMIE: Give all the powers to the many and there is bound to be tyranny. You find it in this Chamber now. What could this side, with its few members, do against the tyranny of hon. members on the other side? Give all the power to the few and you establish a tyranny also. Here, also, you find it in this Chamber. You have the tyranny of the caucus—the few impressing its will over the many. I said yesterday, while discussing another matter, that a caucus, with twenty-three members on the other side of the Chamber, could dominate the whole of the legislation in this Chamber, and those twenty-three members are trying to dominate the whole of the legislation of this State of Queensland. Is that not the tyranny of the few being exercised over the many? Twenty-three members can impress their will on seventy-two. So we need the dual system. I have pointed out where the majority can tyrannise over the minority, and where under certain circumstances the minority can tyrannise over the majority. Another reason why we should not depart from the present position in which we find ourselves, with a bicameral system, is that, in the past, when countries had departed from the bicameral system, they returned to it again. We have examples of that even in our own motherland. During the time when Cromwell reigned in England, he reduced Parliament to a single Chamber, but in the very last speech which he made in Parliament, he saw the mistake that he had made, and the necessity there was for a return of the older condition. These are the last words uttered by Cromwell in the House of Commons—

“I did tell you that I would not undertake such a Government as this unless there might be some other persons that might interpose between me and the House of Commons to prevent tumultuary and popular spirits.”

Those were the last words uttered by the great Cromwell in the House of Commons—in the British Parliament—after he had brought about the conditions which had reduced England to a single Chamber, and we know that after his death there was an immediate restoration of the second Chamber. The House of Lords came back to its own again. Turning away from England, we find that there have been other countries in which an attempt has been made to govern the country with a single Chamber. Let us turn to France. Between 1790 and 1870—that is, a period of eighty years—the Government of France was overturned no less than eleven times, and four of those occasions the people of France set up a single Chamber—a single Chamber that did not last, in the longest period, for more than ten years, because it did not give satisfaction; and when the time of revolt came, in 1870, they returned

to the bicameral system, which has endured for the last forty-two years, and is stronger in France to-day than any Government ever established, because the Upper Chamber in France to-day has greater powers than is possessed by any Upper House in the civilised world. That is the position that has been arrived at in France. After a varied experience, during which it passed through tumultuous times—during which its people suffered hardships of the worst possible kind—during a period when the streets ran red with blood, because of the conditions that had arisen by reason of the fact that one power, and only one power, ruled in France, and it had become autocratic—they returned to the bicameral system. Then we turn to the consideration of other countries. Italy has passed through similar conditions, and with the establishment of Government it comes back to the dual system. Then the same may be said in regard to Germany when the Empire was founded. There, so far as the great German Empire is concerned, they have the dual system. Japan was the same. When it was establishing its first Government, China did the same. Then I have already spoken of Australia and South Africa. Here are all those great countries of the world, and they found that the experience of the ages spoke in favour of the dual system, and that is the reason why they came back to it. I have pointed out what has been the effect, so far as the history of the world is concerned, in the establishment of Governments, that the dual system has prevailed in any State that has been great. And yet, here we are seeking to destroy that system, and to come back right down to the petty German States, or the States of South America, which I have already spoken of, and which are in a constant state of revolution. Let us consider for a moment what the great minds have said in regard to this. I have already read what has been said by Cromwell.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you call that a great mind?

HON. J. TOLMIE: I would not compare him with the hon. member. Professor Lieber, in “Civil Liberty and Self-government,” says—

“The bicameral system accompanies the English race like the common law, while no one attempt at introducing the unicameral system in larger countries has succeeded. The bicameral system is called by the advocates of democratic unity an aristocratic institution. In reality, it is a truly popular principle to insist on the protection of a Legislature divided into two Houses.”

Then there is a gentleman known to history by the name of John Stuart Mill, a gentleman who, I am sure, has a profound interest for the Secretary for Public Instruction.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You would not accept him as an authority the other night.

HON. J. TOLMIE: If I did not accept his authority on taxation proposals, I said there were a great many new economists since his day. If I did not accept his taxation proposals, that is no reason why I should not accept him in regard to this matter. Now, we shall hear what John Stuart Mill says in regard to the Upper Chamber. He says—

“It is important that no set of persons should, in great affairs, be able even

Hon. J. Tolmie. }

temporarily to make their 'I will' prevail without asking anyone for his consent. A majority in a single Chamber when it has assumed a paramount character, when composed of the same persons habitually voting together, and always assured of victory in their own House, easily becomes despotic and overweening if released from the necessity of considering whether its acts will be concurred in by another constitutional authority.

"The same reason which induced the Romans to have two consuls makes it desirable that there should be two Chambers—that neither of them may be exposed to the corrupting influence of undivided power, even for the space of a single year."

Mr. Gladstone, in 1870, at a time when he was in difficulties with the other Chamber, said—

"It may be that my hon. friend, aware that the House of Commons is the Chamber in which, in the main, the great work of national legislation must be conducted and the business of the country done, thinks that by means of a single instead of a double Chamber we should simplify the work of our Constitution and more speedily and satisfactorily settle great public questions. Sir, that would be a very grave conclusion to adopt. I do not think it is the belief of the majority of this House, on the one side or the other, and I am perfectly convinced it is not the belief of the country."

In 1893, again speaking on the same question, Mr. Gladstone said—

"The first effect of a second Chamber is to prevent an undoubted and unquestionable security against hasty legislation. It interposes a certain period of time; it interposes reflection apart from the possible heat of popular discussion; it interposes an opportunity for allowing full consideration of the modes by which an approximation may be effected between the opposing parties by some accommodation of their differences. . . . The mere fact of it causing an interposition of time before a final decision is made is a very great recommendation."

Mr. Bryce, who was a member of the Liberal Cabinets of 1892-1894 and 1906, and afterwards British Ambassador at Washington, speaking when the two Chambers were in conflict, says—

"It is said that two Chambers work harmoniously together. My observation on that is that the object of having two Chambers is to secure, not that things shall always work smoothly between them, but that they shall frequently differ, and provide a means of correcting such errors as either may commit."

Again, Professor Bryce says—

"The existence of a second Chamber is confirmed by reason itself, because tyranny may proceed from a body as well as from one man; and it is a protection that the ruling body should be divided into two branches, the emulation, and even the rivalry of which may prevent dangerous measures from being hurried through."

That great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald, who established the Dominion of

Canada, is reported in Joseph Pope's "Memoirs of Sir John A. Macdonald," as follows:—

"Among constitutional questions, few possessed for Sir John Macdonald greater interest than the bicameral system. . . . His view of the necessity for a second Chamber may be expressed briefly by the story told of Washington, which Sir John was fond of relating. It is said that on his return from France, Jefferson called Washington to account for having agreed to a second Chamber.

"Of what use is the Senate?" he asked, as he stood before the fire with a cup of tea in his hand, pouring the tea into his saucer as he spoke.

"You have answered your own question," replied Washington.

"What do you mean?"

"Why did you pour your tea into your saucer?"

"To cool it," quoth Jefferson.

"Even so," said Washington, "the Senate is the saucer into which we pour legislation to cool."

"This illustration, Sir John used to say, was perfect. Indeed, the all but unanimous opinion of Imperial statesmen, coupled with the fact that every British colony possessing responsible government recognises the utility of a second Chamber, was to his mind a general admission of the necessity for an Upper House, and limited useful discussion to the nature and constitution of that body."

Now, let me deal for a moment with the reasons for a second Chamber. First of all, it is necessary that we should have a second Chamber because of the force of example, the example that is shown to us by all great countries that have found it necessary to make a change of Government. They have decided that a second Chamber is essential to the wellbeing of the country, and I say that that example is one which we should follow. The second reason why we should support the bicameral system is that in all great countries that have abandoned it there has been a restoration, thus showing that the people have not been able to work without a second Chamber, and that they have taken the earliest opportunity to come back to it again. Then, again, one of the reasons why we should support a Chamber of this kind is that it is a means for the prevention of corruption. That was pointed out by John Stuart Mill when he said that even not for a single year should a country be without a double Chamber, and he pointed out that under the old Roman system they had two consuls, so that there should be prevention of corruption. He indicated then the essential necessity of the second Chamber, if we are going to preserve purity and honesty in the government of a country. (Hear, hear!) In the countries of South America where they have only got one Chamber, dishonesty runs riot and rampant through all the Governments; they are upsetting Governments almost every month of every year because of the dishonesty of the Governments. Then, we have another reason why we should retain the second Chamber, and that is that it is a bulwark against the unrevised and hurried legislation that is passed through a Chamber such as this. We have had experience here

[Hon. J. Tolmie.]

during the last few weeks of legislation, not the will, I believe, of the majority of this Chamber, but the will of that section that dominates the majority in this House. We have had hon. gentlemen opposite sitting in their places like puppets and not rising to speak when legislation of the gravest kind was passing through this Chamber, because they were under the domination of a body that was exerting an influence over them. Do such conditions make for honesty? Is it not necessary that there should be protection against corruption when such things as this are possible? Then, I say, just as John Stuart Mill said that the necessity existed in England, that the necessity exists here for a second Chamber. Then, the bicameral system is a means for obtaining sane legislation, and that is not what we have been getting during the last few weeks. No matter how impetuous and hot hon. gentlemen may be in the passage of their legislation through the Chamber, when it gets up into the other place—as has been pointed out by Washington—there is a saucer in which it cools; and after calm deliberation, the legislation is sent back to us so that we may have another opportunity for consideration, and it is only by endeavouring to adopt a compromise between this Chamber and the other that we can secure legislation that is of value to the State of Queensland. Then, I might point out that although the Upper Chamber may delay a Bill, and may occasionally alter it, the amount of evil they do is small in comparison with the enormous amount of good they do in revising legislation that is passed up to them. (Hear, hear!) For reasons of self-interest legislation may be passed in this Chamber for the benefit of the few, and, under conditions such as these, persons who are interested in the passage of certain legislation may be able to force their will on this Chamber; but, when it goes to another House, which is free from any considerations affecting this Chamber, there is the probability of the element of self-interest being dropped out. And, again, a second Chamber is also a check on what we may call personal ambition. One strong man in a House such as this, or a strong man in a party, may impress, not the will of the people, but his own will upon the people, but he cannot do that if he has the other Chamber to contend with. Further, where there is a second Chamber it gives continuity to law. Where there is a single Chamber, there is no continuity so far as legislation is concerned. The will of the majority to-day is expressed on the statute-book and they go to the people; there is the return of another party and the whole legislation passed by the preceding party goes into the wastepaper basket. But, where the legislation is safe and sound, as it is on passing through the two Chambers, there is not this tendency to overturn the work of one Government as soon as another Government gets into power; and I say that a Legislative Council that gives protection against that deserves every support that we can give it. It gives stability to the legislation of the State, causing few changes in the law to take place. If there has been a compromise effected and the will of the two Chambers finds expression on the statute-book, then you generally find that the public outside—who are the real judges of the work that is being done—find that the work is satisfactory. Now, I want to deal just briefly with some of the weaknesses of a

single Chamber. Some of these weaknesses will, no doubt, be apparent to hon. gentlemen, because I have already shown the necessity there is for two Chambers. First of all, the great weakness of a single Chamber is the possibility of intemperate and hasty legislation being passed. We know that can be done. We have had a demonstration of that being done here in this Chamber within the last four or five months. We have seen Bill after Bill passed through the Chamber, in the hope that they might become law, that were intemperate in regard to their provisions, and required to be carefully considered. Then, we know that members who constitute a single Chamber are not free from the frailties inherent to human beings, and their frailties are likely to find expression in the legislation that they pass, and in the legislation that they endeavour to put upon the statute-book. Where a second Chamber revises that legislation, some of the mistakes can be overcome. Another thing we find is this: hon. members are more extreme than are their constituents. A member when he goes before his constituents, perhaps, works along a single idea and convinces the members of that constituency that he is the right person to represent them; and, in electing him, they are dealing with one idea and one idea only, just the same as at the last general election, the one thing that engrossed the public mind was the cost of food. The one thing that hon. members on the other side spoke about day in and day out was the cost of food, telling the people that the then existing Government had raised the cost of food to them, and that they were going to reduce the cost of food. On the morning of the 24th May, the Monday succeeding the election, the hon. gentleman who is now Chief Secretary, stated that the reason for the victory that had been given to his party was that the people were dissatisfied with the late Government because of the high price of food. That is the very factor that put them in their places, and now what are they doing? Have they done those things that should be done to reduce the price of food?

The SPEAKER: Order!

HON. J. TOLMIE: Mr. Speaker, I am keeping within the four corners of the Bill before the House. I am dealing with the question that members are more extreme than their constituents are, and legislation that is passed is not legislation that the constituents approve of. I am proving that members go before their constituents on a certain platform, advocating certain planks, and their constituents return them because they think those planks are going to be put into operation. When those hon. members come back here, they do not put those planks into operation, but they do something different altogether. They are less prudent than are their constituents, and, for that reason, I think there ought to be a revising Chamber. Then, again, there is a certain opportunity in the Upper Chamber to expose what may be vulnerable in the legislation that we put forward. No party can say that it has all the wisdom of the ages concentrated in it; there is no party that is free from error. Even with the very best intentions, it is possible that mistakes may creep into legislation and even the occupants of the Opposition benches may not make discoveries of these mistakes until it is too late. The other Chamber, having

Hon. J. Tolmie.]

a fuller opportunity, and not having any political bias, not having any party purposes to serve, by going through that legislation uncovers the vulnerable points and gives us an opportunity of correcting them. That is a further reason why we should retain our bicameral system. Then there is another very valuable point that ought not to be overlooked at the present time; that is, that industrialism is now becoming so complex and necessitates legislation of a character of great complexity that it requires to be very carefully checked before it becomes law, because legislation that is injurious to the working man, or injurious to the employer, is not going to be of benefit to the State. A single Chamber, carried away by excitement, will, and does, pass legislation that requires the greatest amount of checking before it passes into statute law. That, I say, operates in the field of industrialism to an extent that it is not possible for us to realise, but there it is. The law passed here has an influence, and an evergrowing influence, on all of those connected with industrial enterprises outside of this Chamber; and, if that influence is a bad influence, then it is not going to be for the benefit of the wellbeing of the people who live under that law. I have just about exhausted the time at my disposal, and I do not propose to go any further in regard to this matter, only to say that the unicameral Chamber gives opportunities for faddists to dominate the Ministry, and consequently, by dominating the Ministry, to put legislation on the statute-book that is not likely to be of benefit to the people of the State. What has arisen to call for the destruction of the Upper Chamber? I can quite understand hon. gentlemen taking up the position that there should be two Chambers, but that the Constitution of the Upper Chamber should be changed. They should have a wider franchise, perhaps, than they possess at the present time, but to say that all the powers should be concentrated in one Chamber is something we cannot realise. Would any man like to say that all the powers should be concentrated in himself? What a serious position it would be to realise that the wellbeing of the whole community rested entirely upon his action! If he is misguided by some reason, or misinformed, or ill-informed in regard to any matter under discussion, once he has given his word in regard to it it would be like the pebble cast into the middle of the pond and it would make ever widening circles, which would inflict injury upon countless thousands never before known to him. This is how the injury would arise if all the power were concentrated in one individual, and the same would take place if all the power were concentrated in one Chamber. What do we say of individual people who have all the powers concentrated in themselves? Do we not call them tyrants? Have we not heard of people putting them to death because they have acted like tyrants? If we have single Chambers, will they not be tyrannical in the same way, because a single Chamber will be composed of small sections of individuals? And, if we give all the power to one Chamber, we will be placing tyrannical power into their hands. If we bring about the abolition of the Legislative Council, we will bring down the status of Parliament to something a little better than a municipality. Is that a good thing for this State, which

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

we have been pointing to as the Queen State amongst all the States of Australia? Queensland is a large State, and we have large undeveloped resources, capable of giving employment and finding homes for millions of people. Should all these millions of people be subjected to the one controlling influence so far as Parliament is concerned? Is that the right position to be taken up by people who have the welfare of the country at heart? I do not think that the hon. gentlemen opposite in their heart of hearts believe that a single Chamber is going to be the best for the State of Queensland, but they are compelled by the force of circumstances that control them, and which they cannot control themselves, to be hurled along with those who desire to see destruction wrought in the State of Queensland. I trust that the time has not come when the good sense of Parliament, and the good sense of the people of Queensland, will seek to do something which is going to degrade this State amongst the States of Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I am pleased to think that I have lived to see this day, because all down the ages of the past the people have been struggling to come into possession of their own. (Hear, hear!) While we have been making the laws, I claim that, outside the Commonwealth of Australia, there has never existed in any part of the British Empire the right to make our own laws at all. All this talk about representative government, in my opinion, is all moonshine. When I was in the House in 1909, 1910, and 1911, I learned that lesson well, and if this afternoon I show some bitterness in discussing this question—I do not want to be bitter—but if I do show any bitterness it is because it is running in my blood, as I belong to one of those who have been oppressed right through the ages of the past. I say that we have not had representative government at all. The House of Lords, in Great Britain, has only granted concessions to the people when the people have become dangerous.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: In other words, I must give credit to our forefathers who thought out this system of Government. They said, "We will convince the people that they are governing themselves, while at the same time we know that they are not governing themselves. We will establish a House of Lords, and we will only allow legislation to go through that House of Lords which is not going to injure us who belong to the ruling classes." (Hear, hear!) And they established the House of Lords, and we have a similar House in Queensland, which we call the Legislative Council. That is the history of the establishment of the House of Lords in Great Britain. It was only when the people outside became dangerous, or were on the eve of a revolt that the House of Lords gave way and extended to us the rights which we had been deprived of in the ages past. I well remember the time in England when my father did not possess a vote, and had no voice whatever in the making of the laws of Great Britain. I remember the time when a Bill went through the House of Lords to enfranchise the agricultural labourer, and I remember full well the noble Lords saying, "Just think of it, giving the ignorant agricultural labourer a vote." They

treated the agricultural labourers as less than human beings. They recognised that they had no rights, because those noble Lords fought against the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers in 1855. I remember that well. With regard to the Legislative Council in Queensland, I remember that even when the Labour Government has been in power they only allowed measures to pass through that House which they did not consider a danger to themselves. We have had an illustration of that. If any measures were introduced for the benefit of the masses of the people, if the rulers in the other Chamber thought these measures were dangerous to their class, they rejected those measures. That is the history of our so-called representative government in the British dominions. I may be told that this country is equal to any other country in the civilised world, but that is not saying much. The leader of the Opposition referred to the great nations of the earth which have the bicameral system. He made reference to these great nations. What have these great nations really done? Take the present war. Have they not led us into the shambles, the whole of them? I am not condemning one Government more than another. The Governments of these great nations, with their bicameral system, have led us into the shambles to be slaughtered by the million. That is what you call representative government. Representative government up to the present time has only been a farce. It is only when we bring about the abolition of the Legislative Council that we are going to get real representative government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: It is only then that the people are going to rule, which they have never done up to the present time. The trouble with most Englishmen is that they thought they ruled when they did not do so. They have been reading Tory newspapers which convinced them that they did rule, when the rulers who went to make up the House of Commons on the one hand and the House of Lords on the other hand knew that they were fooling the people all the time. They knew that the House of Lords would not allow any legislation to go through that House if it was going to injure the well-to-do classes. Down through all the ages of the past the working classes have cried out for justice to be done to them. I was surprised to hear a reference made by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon when he talked about one controlling influence. The only controlling influence that there should be, in my opinion, is the people. The people should be the controlling influence, and the people alone. There should be no other control outside the people. The leader of the Opposition quoted from the time of Simon de Montfort, who established the parliamentary system in the year 1200 odd. Surely in the twentieth century we have outgrown the ideas of Simon de Montfort and other Englishmen who lived in the thirteenth century? What was suitable in those days should not be suitable now. If we applied the same arguments to our industrial conditions, the hon. member for Drayton would be ploughing his fields with a wooden plough—(laughter)—instead of using the most up-to-date machinery known to man. Surely after all

the wisdom of the past, after all the intelligence that has been produced upon this planet, we should make some progress. Millions of the class to which I belong have gone beneath the soil undeveloped, owing to these second Chambers, having been denied the rights of education. They never had the right to develop their intellectual faculties. We do not know what might have been the position of Great Britain and the other civilised nations to-day if they had only recognised their people as human beings and extended to them the human rights they are entitled to. Great Britain has denied us our human rights. I mentioned that my father was unable to exercise the franchise when I was a boy. They blocked him just as they blocked thousands of the race to which I belong from exercising that right. It was the House of Lords that blocked them. Who was the first to make up the House of Lords? Was it not the men who came over with the Conqueror—not the men who immediately came over with him, but their children and their children's children? These were the men who robbed the soil from the people of Great Britain, and they are the men who went to make up the House of Lords. In later years who went into the House of Lords? Was it not the successful brewer and the successful merchant, who made all their profits out of the lives of little children?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: Anyone who has lived in Lancashire will know that what I am saying is true. These are the men who were sent to the House of Lords—the men who helped to make the laws, and who blocked the laws from being made in the interests of the masses, and they were the men who sent the little children to early graves. I am not going to deal with the constitutional aspect of this question, because that has already been dealt with by the leader of this party. I want to say, if we are not able to abolish the Legislative Council, then cease your prattling about representative government; say at once that we are not a self-governing people, if we cannot abolish this Legislative Council of ours. If the people are not supreme, who is going to be supreme? Surely we have had enough of the plutocracy in the different countries of the world—we have had enough of this so-called democracy, because that is a high sounding name, especially during this great conflict that is going on, and it is therefore much used by our opponents. Who go to make up the Upper House, even in the State of Queensland? How many men are there who came from the plough, from the railway cutting, from the mine, or from the factory? Who are the men in the Upper House to-day? Your successful merchant, your successful manufacturer, your successful squatter, your successful sugar planter, your successful sugar miller, your land jobber, your lawyer, your newspaper proprietor—and, by the way, the newspapers, as a rule, have been misleading the people—have not been trying to teach the people.

Mr. BAYLEY: Some of them are on your side.

Mr. COLLINS: I am surprised to hear the hon. member make that interjection, because he knows full well that there are not many men in the Upper House representing the farming classes. They do not, as a rule,

Mr. Collins.]

*pick farmers for the Upper House, just the same as they do not pick out the workers. How could you expect these gentlemen, who have been sent there owing to the fact that they possess wealth—because, by the way, there are only one or two, so far as I know, who belong to the Labour party—how can you expect these men, who represent wealth, to pass legislation for the worker? And what of all this talk about their being broad-minded gentlemen? Broad-minded in what? How could you expect these men to pass laws in the interests of the masses of the people? They are not there to do that; all that they are there for is to serve the interests of the class to which they belong—the wealthy class.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: And if we have got certain measure through that Chamber, I want members of this Legislative Assembly to realise that we have got those measures through only because those gentlemen did not consider them dangerous to their class. Once a measure comes along which they see is dangerous to their class, it would not be passed. I am not going to quote learned authorities. I am not going to quote university professors, because, although I am quite willing to admit that there may be a few professors who are in sympathy with the working class, the democracy, so far as their ideals go, especially in regard to the abolition of Upper Houses, nevertheless, as a rule, the learned professors that come from the universities and also many of the learned authorities that may be quoted here against us are not in sympathy with the working class ideals. They are just the same as the political economists of old, who were in the pay of the wealthy classes. They have been proved over and over again to be wrong. They said that so-and-so could not be done, but we—we who belong to the working class—have come along and, notwithstanding what all these learned professors and learned authorities said, have done what they said could not be done, and done it successfully.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: However, I am not going to quote them, because, perhaps I am not qualified to do so. I suppose that is what the learned professors would say. Maybe I am not qualified to quote them, but I do say that all that is required to govern mankind is common sense, and if we had more of common sense we would make better progress.

Mr. BAYLEY: And justice.

Mr. COLLINS: And justice, as my friend interjects; but you will get no justice from the Upper House. How can you expect justice? The wealthy interest comes first with those gentlemen, and I am surprised that, in this twentieth century, there should be anyone found in any representative Chamber who believes in a nominee Chamber such as we have got here in Queensland to-day. I am surprised that men should not have made more advancement in ideas than to uphold a system which I contend was never useful, which has outgrown its usefulness, and never would have existed but in the interests of the huge wealthy classes that have lived in different countries of the world. Now, the leader of the Opposition quoted Cromwell. I do not think that there is much of the Cromwell about him, and I do not

[Mr. Collins.

think that there is much of the Cromwell about many of us in this Chamber. In fact, although I belong to that great race of Britishers, I think we have degenerated, because we know that the world produces very few Cromwells after all. And it is a wonderful thing that Cromwell is now held up to us as an example. I remember reading a lecture by no less a person than Lord Rosebery on Cromwell—Cromwell the rebel—Cromwell who took off the King's head—Cromwell who abolished your House of Lords, and for a time abolished your House of Commons, too. That is the man who was held up to me, as a young man, as a shining example, by no less a person than Lord Rosebery. Yet I am not made of the material that Cromwell was made of, neither are there many in this House made of that material, unfortunately for the people of the world. I am going to quote, too. I am going to quote from a little work here by J. Morrison Davidson, barrister-at-law, called "The House of Lords."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The little red book?

Mr. COLLINS: No; not the red book. I am going to quote a few words about Cromwell. He says—

"After the proclamation of the republic, a number of peers had the assurance to return to their posts and endeavour to resume their legislative functions, but the Commons would not so much as deign to receive a messenger from them. They were promptly voted 'useless and dangerous,' and, for nine years—from 5th January, 1649, to 20th January, 1658, when Cromwell made an abortive attempt to constitute an Upper House—England was without a second Chamber."

The leader of the Opposition this afternoon told us about the calamities that we might expect to come upon us if we did away with the Upper Chamber. I suppose the hon. member is well versed in history, and he knows that, when there was no House of Lords in England, and when no king ruled over England, England was never more prosperous—never more prosperous than she was in the reign of Cromwell. I am going to quote a little more from my friend Morrison Davidson. He says—

"During this period, the high-water mark of national greatness was indisputably attained. So rich did the people become under the vigorous rule of the Commonwealth that, in 1653, the then vast sum of £900,000 a year was offered for the Customs and Excise, and offered in vain. The English flag floated triumphant on every sea, and commerce expanded by leaps and bounds, princes, popes, and cardinals did suit and service to the majestic people that had put down kings, peers, and prelates, and dared to assert its own unfettered sovereignty."

And that is what we are about to do in Queensland—to assert our own unfettered sovereignty. He goes on—

"Are these glories incapable of revival? Did the restoration of 1660 and the sham aristocratic revolution of 1688 extinguish for good all that is noble, chivalrous, and patriotic in the bosoms of Englishmen? Let us hope not."

And that is what I say. Let us hope not.

Let us hope that we are returning to similarly glorious times as those depicted by Morrison Davidson, when it was said that the British flag floated on every sea. Never was there greater prosperity than when the people were supreme. Of course, we all know that intrigue set in afterwards, and we saw the overthrow of that Commonwealth. And, by the way, I was taught to believe in a Commonwealth. I come from the country that produced that great "Joe" Chamberlain, of whom we used to read, when I was a youth, as "Republican Joe," and here it would be considered almost treason, here in this twentieth century, in Queensland, if I were to stand on the street corner and deliver some of the speeches delivered by "Republican Joe" in England, in the seventies. At any rate, I look forward to the future with hope, realising, as I do, that the class to which I belong have never had a fair deal. We have gone to the grave with our talents undeveloped, over and over again. And that was all through a few rulers—through a few narrow-minded creatures who went to make up your House of Lords—your House of Lords, which has been condemned by nearly every thinker of importance in modern times. Who are the failures in connection with the present war? The only hope at the present moment is for the working class to take complete control, and run the country in the interests of the working class, and not in the interests of the merchant class and the wealthy class, as is being done at the present time. The people must be supreme. They shall be supreme—I believe it—but they will not be supreme until the second Chambers are abolished. And what was the use of the leader of the Opposition quoting different countries in the world? He quoted the principalities in Germany as being governed by one House. What does that prove? Then, how often have I heard in this Chamber references to the mother of Parliaments. What do they mean when they say that? They refer to the parliamentary system of Great Britain, do they not? Then I say, if we should abolish our second Chamber, in years to come future generations will refer to the Parliament of Queensland as being the first Parliament in our Commonwealth that abolished the Legislative Council.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: Generations yet unborn will bless us for what we are trying to do to-day, and what I hope we will do. Generations yet unborn will bless us for doing what I have said should have been done long ago, to give the people a chance. No one can tell what heights we may yet reach in our development once the people are made free, and that they have not been up to the present time. How can a people call themselves a free and self-governing people when, having elected men to this Chamber, they find that men who have not been elected—men who have been put in another Chamber owing to the fact that they are wealthy—owing to their position in society—owing to the fact that some of them were good land grabbers, good sweaters, maybe—

Mr. CARTER: And brewers.

Mr. COLLINS: And, as my friend says, owing to the fact that they were successful brewers—how can a people call themselves free, when men of that kind have been sent to the Upper House to block the legislation that the people desire? I want to say that a

Britisher said on one occasion—no, less a person than Tom Carlyle—

"Will one revolution suffice, or shall there be two?"

There will be just as many as are needed.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: There will be a revolution here, very likely.

Mr. COLLINS: He was not arrested, even in Great Britain, for uttering those words. He was what was called one of our great thinkers, and I am satisfied that the hon. member who interjects, who belongs to the same race as myself, I think, has lost that Cromwellian strain that ought to run in his blood. (Laughter.) As I said at the commencement of my remarks, I rejoice to have lived to see this day. As a man who has read the works across the ages of the struggles of the working classes from the time of Cæsar up to the present time, I rejoice to think that my class is now going to be in the ascendancy; that the Upper House is to disappear; that we are to be triumphant all along the line. Now, I want again to quote Carlyle before I sit down. I am quoting now from his "French Revolution." He deals, as you know, in that magnificent description of his, with the position of the people in France at that time, and he uses these words—

"How the whole people shakes itself, as if it had one life; and in thousand-voiced rumour, announces that it is awake, suddenly out of long death-sleep, and will thenceforth sleep no more! The long looked-for has come at last; wondrous news of victory, deliverance, enfranchisement, sounds magical through every heart. To the proud, strong man it has come, whose strong hands shall no more be gyved; to whom boundless unconquered continents lie disclosed. The weary day-drudge has heard of it; the beggar with his crust moistened in tears. What! To us also has hope reached; down even to us! Hunger and hardship are not to be eternal! The bread we extorted from the rugged glebe, and with the toil of our sinews, reaped and ground, and kneaded into loaves, was not wholly for another then, but we also shall eat of it and be filled."

Hon. J. TOLMIE: What do you say about the tumbrils rolling through the streets?

Mr. COLLINS: We don't want the tumbrils through the streets because we are passing through a revolution at the present time. Whether the hon. gentleman realises it or not, I realise it, and it may be just as important as the great French Revolution, considering the population of our State; and it is in the interests of the masses. I say, what Carlyle said there is quite true; that "the people shall eat of it and be filled." How can the people get their rights so long as we have Legislative Councils to block them? It is impossible. As I said before, I cannot conceive of any man in the twentieth century, who believes in the principle of representative government, favouring the bicameral system that we have at the present time. I want to quote again the poet who says—

"Though the mills of God grind slowly,

Yet grind they exceeding small;

Though, with patience He stands waiting,

With exactness grinds He all."

The mills of God have been grinding slowly,

Mr. Collins.]

but, as the poet says, "With exactness grinds he all." The working class have waited for this. We have had it in our platform ever since we have been a party, and, to the credit of this Government, we are leading the way. I am one of those who believe that what Queensland thinks to-day, so Australia thinks to-morrow, and later on all the civilised world. Some one must lead the way. Here in this Northern State, although with a population of only 600,000, we are leading the way. I realise that it is not always the great populations that count. If that were so we should look to China and India to lead the way. We all know that ancient Greece, with its small population, led the way in the past; and so it has been left to this small State of Queensland, a part of the great British Empire, to try and teach the rest of this great Empire what should be done so far as human progress goes. I am satisfied that when we appeal to the people of Queensland, which I believe we will have to, by the referendum, that the people will respond just the same as when the referenda proposals were put to them they responded to the occasion by giving a big majority. I am satisfied that in the far North, in the outposts of civilisation where democracy has reached, it may be, a higher point of development owing to the number of men we have in those parts who have travelled from State to State and who are great leaders—I am satisfied that when these proposals are put before the people of the North that they will be carried by an overwhelming majority; that they will do away with the Upper House. Away with it! Let it go into oblivion, from which it never ought to have emerged! Let it go overboard! Let it disappear! Let the people rule! And once again I say the people shall rule. They must rule if there is going to be human progress at all. (Government cheers.)

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): We are dealing with the most important change that has been suggested in the Queensland Constitution since we have been a State, and it would be just as well if we came down to the hard, cold facts of the case. Further, I should like to say that unless it can be shown that there is a vital need for such change at the present time on account of the war, unless it can be shown that the need for this legislation arises out of the war, there is no justification for introducing legislation of this kind just now, which must divide the whole of the State into two factions. Before this question is decided we shall have the whole of Queensland divided on the subject; people will feel warmly on it, and this is not the time for raising a question of that kind unless the needs of the war directly demand it. Is this the time for us to be split up into factions? Are our enemies at the present time talking about altering their Constitutions? Are not their whole energies centred upon one thing, and that is to defeat us? If it can be shown that this alteration of the Constitution is directly necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, then I am quite willing to acquiesce in it.

The PREMIER: I say it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SWAYNE: So far, in spite of what the hon. gentleman has said, it has not been shown that such a need has arisen. We must remember that before this change can take place, it will be next year for one

[*Mr. Collins.*

thing; and events are moving very quickly just now. We can do even better work to bring about what we all hope for—a successful issue of the war—without distracting our attention with such a matter as this. Regarding the alleged grounds for the abolition of the Legislative Council, the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill when speaking centred the whole matter upon two points; that was the refusal of the Upper House to pass the Meatworks Bill and also the refusal to grant the request that we should transfer nearly all the powers we possess in Parliament to the hands of the Commonwealth. I am not going minutely into the question regarding the Meatworks Bill, because I believe that will be dealt with very fully by someone else before this debate finishes, but I should like to remark that the ground of disagreement between the two Chambers has come down to one point. I have here the "Votes and Proceedings" for 11th November, and I find that the Council insist upon the words "All such property shall be acquired on just terms," and insist on the substitution of the word "the" for the word "such" on line 49. Surely there can be no objection on our part to the substitution of the word "just." Surely it is not contemplated that these works shall be taken over on unjust terms? All the Council is asking for is that the works shall be taken over on just terms. As far as the acquisition of the cattle and the acquisition of the meat after it has been treated is concerned, that has already been dealt with in an Act passed by a previous Parliament. It has been shown by the leader of the Opposition that the charges made against this party for remissness in that connection are largely trumped up. Regarding the other matter of disagreement between the two Chambers in connection with the transferring to the Commonwealth Government of certain powers, can it be shown that through the lack of such powers our efficiency and our ability to do our share in the war has been in any way impaired or affected? No. It cannot be shown that the Commonwealth has been handicapped in any way through the lack of the powers that we are now asked to hand over to them, and because the other place has refused to fall in with that request, the Premier says they should be abolished. Further, I should like to say that unless it can be shown that it is vitally necessary for the successful issue of the war that this legislation should be passed, there is no excuse for it. It is a most inopportune time to introduce legislation of the kind just now. I say further that Parliament should not be sitting at the present time except to deal with matters of vital importance, with matters bearing directly upon the big questions at issue. Instead of dividing the country into factions, we in this Chamber should be somewhere else; the young and single men instead of sitting opposite on the benches should be in the trenches. There are single men in the House of the fighting age who are kept here when they could be far better employed in the firing line. Those of us also who are engaged in the producing industries would be far better employed in carrying on those industries instead of discussing legislation, which, after all, is only carrying out the Labour party's platform under pretext of assisting in the war. The war in this matter is only being used as a stalking-horse; in fact, I might say that the war cry is being prostituted to bring about changes in many

ways that the people of Queensland in their same moments would never for one moment consent to. Regarding the question of the bicameral system of government, I have here a book on the Federal systems of the United States and the British Empire, by Arthur P. Poley, B.A., a barrister, and he points out the necessity for an Upper House in constitutional government.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: Why is he an authority on it?

Mr. SWAYNE: He is as great an authority as many men quoted by hon. members opposite. This gentleman is often quoted as an authority on the subject, and the case he makes out is so strong that even without mentioning the name of the author it would carry weight. In his book called "The Federal Systems of the United States and the British Empire," Mr. Poley gives various reasons as to the necessity of the bicameral system in our Legislature. He says—

"The arguments in favour of two-chamber government in a Federal Constitution received support from the precedent of the United States Constitution; there was also the additional historical example of the evils of a single legislative body, witnessed during the French revolution, which had since been added to the precedents which condemned one-chambered Legislatures. Single chamber Governments, it may be asserted, have always failed to preserve the true balance of power between the legislative and executive departments. Where there has been one Chamber only there have been exhibited two effects; the Legislature has either subjected the executive to its will, and thereby introduced anarchy into the administration, which has only proved curable by a military executive that has ultimately ended in a subjection of the Legislature; or the executive, by obtaining control of the Legislature and moulding it to its wishes, has established a new species of executive tyranny speciously disguised under legislative forms."

Now, he might have mentioned that there was a third danger arising from a single Chamber Legislature, that is, its being seized, or controlled, from outside. For instance, he might have spoken of a State where a political organisation—quite irresponsible and unanswerable in any way to the majority of the people in the State—obtains control of a Government and the Government majority in such a Chamber as ours—perhaps on false pretences—and forces that majority—in the matter of lawmaking—to do all sorts of things that the people themselves never contemplated when they elected them. I think such a risk as that will be very apparent to the people of Queensland. They will say, if only for that reason, that there is most certainly a very great need for a revisory body, a body to act as a break, as it were, between the two to give time for thought in connection with any drastic steps which may make for very great injury in the future, if they are brought about. Again, I notice, quoting from the same authority, that he furnishes comment upon the argument that was brought forward by the Chief Secretary when moving the second reading of this Bill. One of the Chief Secretary's strong points was that in the Canadian provinces,

out of, I think, twelve provinces, only two had a double Legislature. Referring to the same subject, Mr. Poley says—

"Whilst the system of one-chamber government has been generally adopted in the Provinces regard must necessarily be paid to the limited powers of government that the Provinces possess and the existence of the political veto of the Dominion Government."

Hon. members will notice that while it may be urged that in the Canadian provinces in the generality of cases there is only one Legislature, there is a revisory body—a second body, possessing the direct power of vetoing—in that case the Canadian Dominion Government. In order to complete the parallel laid down by the hon. the Chief Secretary we should have to have unification, and make this Parliament entirely subject to the Commonwealth Government. That position does not obtain yet, and I hope it never will. Therefore, I cannot see that the argument on which he seemed to rely so much holds water. Now, while we are dealing with other countries and their retention of the bicameral system, I notice that the hon. the leader of the Opposition mentioned many countries amongst the most progressive and most important in the world which adhere to the two-chamber system. I have here a list of the United States of America, and, like our Australian States, they are sovereign States. I notice that of the whole forty-eight each State has a double Chamber, and I also notice that of these forty-eight, twelve of the States have a population considerably less than Queensland—and yet they have double Legislatures, for they evidently felt the need for them—and six of the States have populations much the same as Queensland. So it cannot be urged that any difference of population causes the need for a double Legislature in the American States as compared with us, because eighteen out of the forty-eight have populations about the same as ours, or less. Now, coming to other phases of this question, I think it just as well to refer to the speeches delivered by members of the other side, in which great stress was laid on having a non-elective body blocking the way of the people's desires. That is not the case here. It is a misrepresentation to say such is the case in Queensland. We know that in the event of there being a difference of opinion between the two Chambers, provision was made some years ago by which the question at issue can be referred directly to the people, so that the argument that it is possible that the Legislative Council may raise a bar against the people's desires does not hold good. There is a way out of that difficulty if it arises. Then, a revisory Chamber is a protection against unduly hasty or rash legislation introduced in this Chamber. I should like to say that it has been demonstrated amply this session that there is need for such a body as that. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have had an exhibition here in this Chamber of the gag being applied on most important questions, most momentous questions, where the people's liberties have been concerned—where it was proposed to make the price of a man's ability to earn a living that he must be a member of a political organisation, and that he must subordinate his political conscience to that of others. We have had the spectacle of measures such

Mr. Swayne.]

as that being forced though when only two members of the Opposition had completed their speeches. While the third speaker was on his feet we have seen the question gagged. Could hon. members require a stronger argument in favour of having still another body before whom such questions can be deliberated, discussed, and made known to the people? Under the circumstances that have prevailed under the Government this session, the people's rights may be whittled away, and they would not be the wiser, because the freedom of discussion has ceased to be allowed in this Chamber. Again, we find that Ministers themselves have only been too pleased this session to avail themselves of the wisdom of the other place. We have seen Bills which left here in a crude, incomplete state, come back with amendments placed in them in the Upper House at the Minister's own instance. They themselves, by that action, have given one of the strongest arguments for the retention of the Upper House. Before I conclude I should like to say that there have been no facts brought forward showing this Bill to be a measure needful for the carrying on of the war. It has no bearing on the war, and I think it is a wrong thing and an unjust thing that such a vital alteration of the Queensland Constitution should be brought about in the absence of so many of our citizens at the front. We know that one of our ablest men in this House—I refer to the deputy leader of the Opposition—is away doing his duty at the front; and, while men like that are out of Queensland, it is wrong to deprive them of the opportunity to debate this very important question and to deprive them of their votes. By the time that the vote is taken I think there will be 100,000 to 200,000 of the best men out of the State, and it is absolutely wrong to take such a vote while they are away. It has not been shown in any one way that the Bill is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, and, therefore, any point of difference between the two Chambers could be settled by a reference to the people, just in the same manner as this question itself can be settled. The Meatworks Bill, which is one of the points of difference between the two Houses, can be settled by a reference to the people under the Constitution as it stands at present. The difference of opinion between the Upper House and the Government in regard to the transfer of powers to the Commonwealth can be settled by a reference to the people, just as the existence of the Upper House can be settled; and, seeing that there are only two important points of difference that the Chief Secretary was able to bring forward when asking us to pass this Bill, the better way would be to refer the question of the transfer of powers to the people, and not to refer the question whether the Constitution should be altered in such a manner and at a time when the very fate of the Empire itself is trembling in the balance. The best way would be to simply refer the two questions of difference to the people and to let them decide, and they could be decided just as quickly as the question of the abolition of the Upper House.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Keppel*): I intend to support the motion that has been submitted by the Premier, because I think it is justified by reference to constitutional history,

[*Mr. Swayne.*

supported by every axiom of constitutional ethics, and by constitutional authority, and buttressed by every consideration of reason, justice, and democracy. Of course, the leader of the Opposition, in his speech this afternoon, attempted to disprove that the motion had any support from those considerations; but I think that, without being disrespectful, I can say the leader of the Opposition did not establish his case, and he failed to refute the brilliant speech delivered by the Premier last night. (Hear, hear!) If we were to follow the advice of the leader of the Opposition, we would not effect any changes at all. In every other department of life, as well as in government, things would remain stagnant if we followed the leader of the Opposition, and there would be retrogression. Surely, a superficial investigation of an argument such as that is sufficient to realise that it carries its own refutation, because, while the law of evolution operates, there must be change. There are changes in all departments of life. In the domain of physical science, there have been enormous changes; what Norman Angell and others term the law of acceleration is operating. In astronomy, the spectroscope has revolutionised conceptions and ideas that were formerly held regarding astronomy, and that is strikingly revealed in Professor Alfred Russell Wallace's book, "Man's Place in the Universe." In aerial navigation, and other conditions relating to physical science, there has been tremendous advancement, but in the art of government we have hardly moved at all. It is perplexing to realise how slow this department of life has been in moving. I think that the action taken by this party, through the action of the Premier, is an important contribution to the art of government and to constitutional history all the world over, because, undoubtedly, as the leader of the Opposition says, the result of this motion will have a tremendous reflex action, not only in Australia, but right throughout the civilised world. I, myself, believe that reflex action will be for the improvement and betterment of government and of society. The leader of the Opposition admitted that reform is necessary, at least. He admitted that the leader of the Government had established a case for the reform of the Legislative Council, if not for its abolition.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: No, I did not admit that; I said he had the opportunity.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Does not the hon. gentleman think that reform is necessary? Does he think that the system of Parliament enacted in Queensland years ago is in consonance with the democracy of to-day? Does he not think that something is required to keep pace with the evolution of political thought? If he does think so, then his action upon this question is inconsistent and insincere, because a motion for the reform, or alleged reform, of the Legislative Council, was proposed by the hon. member for Murilla last year. That hon. member wished to make the Legislative Council elective, and the motion was submitted to this House, and the leader of the Opposition—who was then a member of the Government—took up an uncompromising position in opposition to that motion. Now he talks about reform. When he had an opportunity to bring about that reform last year, he signally failed to take advantage of it.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I do not think that the election of members to a second Chamber, as suggested by the hon. member for Murilla, is a reform at all. It would only be a perpetuation of that excrement on the body politic. The true and only reform is the abolition of the second Chamber. Certainly, if we had the system that is in operation in some States, and is also in operation in New Zealand, where the Legislative Council is elected on the same franchise as the Lower House, there may be some justification for a second Chamber. There may be some justification for a second Chamber then, as a revising Chamber.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What is the good of electing them on the same franchise?

Mr. LARCOMBE: I quite agree with the hon. member for Drayton. It would be no good to elect both Houses on the same franchise. It would be superfluous; but it would not in any way infringe the principles of democracy. The leader of the Opposition, in attempting to refute the arguments of the Premier, referred to the analogy that the Premier made between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the State of Queensland and other Australian States. The leader of the Opposition refuted that analogy in comparison, and said there was only a few thousand acres in those provinces.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I said the German States.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The hon. gentleman referred to Ontario particularly, and he tried to prove that the leader of the Government was entirely wrong.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I said that the Australian States are sovereign States—that the Canadian States were not.

Mr. LARCOMBE: They have got large powers of self-government and large areas of country, and a population of 2,500,000 between them. One has a population of 1,500,000, and the other of a little over 1,000,000.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: One of those provinces has the bicameral system.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Quebec has one Chamber only.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: No; Quebec has two.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Well, Ontario has only one Chamber, and its population is within 500,000 of that of Quebec.

Mr. SWAYNE: The veto exists in Canada in another place.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The right of veto remains in another place in Australia also, so that it is not right to talk of Queensland being a sovereign State.

Mr. SWAYNE: I am leaving out the Crown.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Leaving out the Crown altogether, we have the Federal control in Australia. The State is only supreme within a certain circumscribed limit set down in our Constitution. We know that the Federal authority has large powers, and the greater their powers the less powers we have in the State. We have not sovereign powers to-day in the same sense as we had before federation. There is a certain veto exercised by the Federal authorities. Take a case where there are concurrent powers, which frequently happens, where the State's powers and the Federal powers come together. Where the interests of the two powers conflict the Federal power prevails. According to the leader

of the Opposition and his supporters, one would think there was absolute sovereign power in Queensland, but I say there is every analogy between Ontario and Queensland and the other Australian States. There are places in the world where there is only one Chamber. Take Finland, for example. They decided on having one Chamber there in 1905. That was a tremendous change from what existed previously. Has any pernicious or injurious consequence resulted from that Chamber? Nothing of the kind. The people there are happy and prosperous. I will not take all the States mentioned by the leader of the Opposition. He went to South America to back up his arguments. Could anything be more ridiculous than comparing the States of South America with Queensland? He went to all the bloodthirsty places he could think of to compare them with Queensland. There is autocratic power in South America, but there is no autocracy prevailing in Queensland at all. It is not a question here of autocracy or democracy. We have been told that we should look at history regarding this question, and I am going to make a short reference to the history of the second Chamber. In listening to the leader of the Opposition and his supporters, one would think that the second Chamber was something sacred devised by the wisdom of our forefathers. As a matter of fact, the bicameral system is only an accident of history. It is a question both geographical and chronological. Systems are different in different countries; and have been different in our country at different times. We find that in Finland, Canada, and the places I previously mentioned, they have had one Chamber without injurious results. There have been no pernicious results, as the leader of the Opposition would have this House believe, following the establishment of one-chamber Parliaments. Let us take the opinion of one of the great men the leader of the Opposition did not refer to. Take the opinion of Professor Freeman in his "Origin and Growth of the House of Lords"—

"Does anyone believe that there was a time when the English nation or some king or law-giver among them came to the conclusion that it would be a good thing to have a Parliament of two Houses, rather than of one, three, or four?"

"If anybody does believe all this, he would find it a little hard to find the law-giver who determined it all. It was no part of the wisdom of our forefathers—that is, no part of their wisdom acting of set purpose—to have two Houses at all. We might just as well have had, like some other nations, one House, or three, or four. That we happened to have two—that a great many other nations have imitated us in having two—simply came about, like other things, by a chapter of accidents."

In his "English Constitution," at page 93, he also says—

"That form of government which political writers call bicameral—that is to say, where the Legislative Assembly consists of two Chambers or Houses—arose out of one of the accidents of English history."

I would like the leader of the Opposition and his supporters to bear in mind that that almost sacred Chamber is simply an accident of history, and we should have no

Mr. Larcombe.]

hesitation in abolishing it when the exigencies and circumstances of the case demand it. It was no special creation. It was an accident only, and yet we have all this sacred edifice built up, metaphorically speaking, by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Although precedent and custom has an important bearing upon our development, we are living in a day when we test precedent by merit. If it is good, we uphold it; but if it is bad, we discard it irrespective of how long it has existed. The hon. member for Mirani and others argued that the second Chamber is a revising Chamber. It is not historically a revising Chamber, nor has it served that purpose in this State. Hear what Professor Freeman says about that in his "Origin and Growth of the House of Lords"—

"The House which we sometimes speak of as the second Chamber is historically the first. It was in being before the other. Therefore, the House of Lords was certainly not called into being to revise or obstruct the acts of the House of Commons."

So it was not a revising Chamber at all. It was in existence before the House of Commons. All the arguments raised by hon. members opposite, as soon as we place the searchlight of investigation upon them, will be dissipated by reference to history and by a reference to our experience here and elsewhere. In Queensland we are told that the second Chamber is a revising Chamber. Why, it destroys anything that tends to improve the condition of the producer or the needs of the consumer. Let us take the experience of last session. We sent up to the Council a Pure Seeds Bill and a Stock and Farm Produce Agents Bill, and other measures to protect the position of the producers in this State. These measures were mutilated beyond recognition by the second Chamber. In New South Wales a similar position obtained, and still obtains. In that State the legislation that has been passed by the people's representatives has been mutilated by the second Chamber. To come back to Queensland, legislation passed in this Chamber to protect the interests of the primary producer was ruthlessly cut out, yet, at the same time, the Companies Act Amendment Bill, specially designed to benefit the Mount Morgan Company and other mining companies to obtain better results from the capital invested, was rushed through with dazzling speed. Yet we are told that this excrescence is a revising Chamber.

Hon. J. TOLME: Did the Mount Morgan Company do well out of it?

Mr. LARCOMBE: We know that they have done well out of the Legislative Council for years past, just as other big companies in this State have done. I know what the hon. member is driving at, and [7.30 p.m.] he is not going to catch me with a question like that. I want to point out further that the action of the Council in rejecting this Commonwealth Powers (War) Bill, which was passed through this Chamber two or three nights ago has given us every justification for the motion that has been introduced. That measure was the outcome of a compact entered into by the Premiers of the States acting on behalf of the electors of the States. And, further, it had this buttressing feature: that upon two occasions when the question was

[Mr. Larcombe.

submitted to the electors, they endorsed it by an overwhelming vote. They endorsed the surrender of these powers to the Federal authority. Notwithstanding that, the Legislative Council rejected this measure with hardly any investigation or consideration at all, directed in their action by their opposition, by their virulent antipathy, to this party and all that they stand for, and so they threw out this measure, which is likely to produce political turmoil in the State. Those powers were certainly not only surrendered by Labour Premiers, but also by the anti-Labour Premier of Victoria on behalf of an anti-Labour Government. Why were those powers surrendered? They were surrendered because they were necessary, the Premier of Victoria said, in order to successfully prosecute the war. What did the Hon. Mr. Thynne say when the matter was under consideration in the Council? He is one of those who have always opposed Labour, but he supported the measure, not because he believed it should result in a permanent transfer of those powers to the Commonwealth, but because firstly, he said it will prevent political turmoil in the State, secondly, because it is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, and thirdly, he said, "I ask you to consider your act, because if you reject this measure you will probably bring about the abolition of the Upper House."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Did he vote for it?

Mr. LARCOMBE: Certainly, he did vote for it. He voted against his colleagues, for the reason that it was a war measure, that it was absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. The Legislative Council have deliberately handcuffed this Government in their attempt to bring about a successful prosecution of the war and to assist the allies in their tremendous battle at the present time. When we consider that the people outside have twice previously decided that we should surrender these powers, surrender them not temporarily but permanently, and when we find a nominee body, responsible to no one, defying the people's will in that way, surely we must admit that no self-respecting Government would sit upon the Treasury benches and tolerate such a Chamber any further. Further, I want to point out that the anomaly and weakness of the second Chamber has been realised for many, many years—for centuries. We remember 1832, when Earl Grey's Administration carried through its Reform Bill. The House of Lords threatened to mutilate it. The Earl's Administration resigned as a result of further development, and I think it was not possible at the time to form another Administration, or, if I recollect rightly, another was formed but could not carry on and resigned, and Earl Grey was sent for again and asked to form an Administration. He agreed to do so if sufficient peers were appointed to enable him to carry that measure through the House of Lords, and the King agreed to his proposals, agreed to them reluctantly no doubt, but still agreed. So, as far back as 1832 we find all the arguments with which the second Chamber has been supported dissipated by the action of the King at that time. Take Australian history. We remember that in New South Wales in 1899 the Reid Administration was endeavouring to pass the Federal Enabling Bill, and the second Chamber refused to pass it in the form which the Reid Administration thought was necessary. The Reid Administration

asked the Governor to appoint twelve nominees, sufficient to enable them to pass that measure through as they designed it, and the Governor agreed to that request, and made those fresh appointments. And so we see, right back to the time I have referred to and in Australian history also, the weakness of the second Chamber has been recognised. It has only existed on sufferance. Its very strength lay in its weakness, and immediately it tried to assert the powers which theoretically and constitutionally it possesses it went by the board. I want to deal briefly with some of the great minds that the leader of the Opposition did not quote. He attempted to lead this Chamber to believe that all the great minds were in favour of the second Chamber system. As a matter of fact, some of the finest constitutional authorities have condemned it and pointed out its weakness. I do not intend to quote any Labour authorities to-night, for an obvious reason. It is a very simple thing to get high authorities associated with the Labour party in Australia, but I do not intend to do so. Still, I want to dissipate the idea that the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have attempted to create that this measure is a revolutionary result of a revolutionary act of this party. I am not concerned about that aspect of it a bit, because although our aims are revolutionary our methods are evolutionary. First of all, we have the Labour platform. The people of Queensland have returned us to power with a large majority, and the first plank of the fighting platform of the Labour party is the abolition of the Legislative Council and the institution of the initiative and referendum, and I trust that the second great constitutional reform in this State will be the introduction of the initiative and referendum. Then we will find that the will of the people will be supreme, and democracy will express itself to the greatest possible degree. Let me quote such high authorities as Professor Freeman and Sir Charles Dilke. Surely those men are not revolutionary. Surely they would not teach any philosophy that would weaken government or work a revolution in society. Professor Freeman, in his "Origin and Growth of the House of Lords," says—

"When a great wave of popular feeling is aroused, the second Chamber must bow. If they are in agreement, they are unnecessary; if in opposition, a stumbling block."

I think that is a very convincing condemnation of the second Chamber system. Then, Sir Charles Dilke, in his "Problems of Greater Britain," says—

"Colonial Upper Houses, whether nominated by the Crown, as in New South Wales, the Dominion of New Zealand, Newfoundland, or Quebec, or elected, as in Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, are weak."

So we find that those great authorities are behind the action taken by this party in submitting the motion that they have done, and yet it is attempted to be shown that we are doing something absolutely unjustified by history or by authority.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Neither one nor the other says that you should get rid of those Houses.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I think that those quotations which I have read carry their own

meaning. If a House is weak, surely that is sufficient cause for reform, and if you are going to reform, there is only one effective way of reforming in Australia, or anywhere else, and that is by abolition. Let me give hon. members an authority that the Hon. the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have been praising for some time past—that is, the Right Hon. Lloyd George.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Have you ever heard me eulogising him?

Mr. LARCOMBE: I think I have. I have heard members of the party opposite eulogising him. Perhaps they do not agree with all that he has said, but they have eulogised him because of his participation in the war. They realise that his courage and his eloquence and his statesmanship have rendered the Empire tremendous services during the last few years, and having done that, they must attach a good deal of importance to his opinion. And whether the hon. member agrees with the philosophy or teaching of Mr. Lloyd George or not, he will surely pay his opinion a good deal of respect. I quote from an extract in the Brisbane "Courier"—and I have heard the hon. member eulogise that paper. I know the hon. member will not doubt that authority. I know that when he is looking for truth he takes up the Bible or the Brisbane "Courier," and so I am going to give him a quotation from the Brisbane "Courier" of the 2nd August, 1913. According to the "Courier" of that date, Lloyd George is reported to have said—

"Democracy is in greater peril now than for generations past. There is a deliberate conspiracy on foot to thwart and overthrow democratic government. . . . We are fighting the last desperate effort to restore the grip of class ascendancy. . . . The recent action of the House of Lords has made the abolition of the second Chamber essential."

That is the opinion of one of the leading statesmen of to-day. He says that there is a deliberate conspiracy to overthrow democracy. He says that we are fighting the last battle with class ascendancy, and I am sure that he has only temporarily suspended that battle, and after the war clouds have been dissipated and the British and their allies are successful, and the principles of justice, honour, and humanity have been vindicated, then will Lloyd George pursue the battle he started out in a short time ago, and the abolition of the House of Lords will be an accomplished fact.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LARCOMBE: I ask hon. members who are so fond of quoting Lloyd George: Will they support his opinion on this question? If they do, they will support the Government and vote for the second reading. Now, let us take a few authorities nearer home. The Brisbane "Telegraph" in 1906, said in an article—

"It is daily becoming plainer that Legislative Councils are factors that must be eliminated from the simplified problem of State government."

Take another authority in this State—

"The Upper House was only an extra expense to the people. It did not do one bit of good. He said that, although

Mr. Larcombe.]

he was a member of the Council, and although he valued the privilege of being a member."

That is the opinion of the Hon. Peter Murphy, an opinion delivered in the Legislative Council just a few days ago. Here you have members of the Chamber themselves realising that they are an extra expense to the people and that the existence of the Chamber is not justified, and it must go.

Hon. J. A. FIRELLY: All the level-headed men.

Mr. LARCOMBE: All the level-headed men, as the Assistant Minister suggests, all the sound thinkers and the men of a philosophical turn of mind believe in its abolition. I believe with the Hon. Peter Murphy that it is an excrescence and must go, that it is an unnecessary expense, and I also agree with the Brisbane "Telegraph" that it should be eliminated from the simplified problems of government in this State.

Mr. STEVENS: Reduce the salaries of members.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I would reduce hon. members, because—I leave the rest to the hon. member's imagination. (Laughter.) I think that the existence of this Chamber is totally at variance with the theory of democratic government, and we must bear in mind while we are discussing this question that rightly or wrongly we have accepted the democratic form of government. There may be some hon. members, like the hon. member for Wide Bay, who said he would sooner see this Chamber go than the Legislative Council. I can understand the attitude of an hon. member like that, although I do not agree with him. He does not believe in a democratic form of government. But we have accepted a democratic form of government, and while we have that form of government, all our institutions must conform to it. And the Legislative Council does not conform to it, and for that reason it should be wiped off the face of the constitutional earth as soon as possible. Then, we have triennial elections.

Mr. MAY: Sometimes oftener. (Laughter.)

Mr. LARCOMBE: Sometimes oftener, I am sorry to say, although, fortunately, since I have been a member of this Chamber there have been only triennial elections. I realise that just before I came here, from the year 1899 right up to 1909, there was not a Parliament that went its full term, and the Minister for Public Instruction has often told me that he has had to go to the country nearly every year during that period, so I have something to be thankful for. Pursuing my argument, the people have elected seventy-two members to this Chamber to translate their wishes into law, and yet the system permits of another body, a non-elected body, sitting in judgment upon our work and to exercise an absolute veto upon it, notwithstanding the wishes of the people of this State. I want hon. members to bear in mind that it is an absolute veto, and not merely a suspensory veto. We have been told by at least one hon. member that the Council is only exercising a suspensory veto, but in connection with the Workers' Compensation Bill they exercise an absolute veto. In regard to other measures, it is true that the veto only amounted to a suspensory veto. Of whom is this Council composed?

[Mr. Larcombe.

I am not going to reflect upon their personnel, upon their intelligence, or upon their experience. I am not going to deal with that aspect of the question at all, because we are not fighting a battle of individuals; we are fighting a battle of systems. But I want to point out that a majority of members of the Council are men who have been defeated at various times during the history of this State—men who could not obtain election to this Chamber. Let me give one instance, the Hon. G. S. Curtis. Time and again he was rejected for this Chamber, and in 1911 he contested Rockhampton against the present Minister for Railways. The Minister for Railways was successful and came to this Chamber as the representative of the people of Rockhampton. The people of Rockhampton, in effect, said at that time, "We do not approve or appreciate the political opinions of the Hon. G. S. Curtis or of the party with which he is associated," and they said, "He shall not represent us in the Parliament of this State." But notwithstanding that they returned the Hon. John Adamson to represent them, the Government of the day turned round and appointed the Hon. G. S. Curtis to the Legislative Council, and gave him co-ordinate power as a legislator with the man whom the electors returned to this Chamber. A system that will permit a continuance of such anomalies and such an incongruous state of affairs must go. It speaks volumes for the patience and forbearance of the electors of this State when they are prepared to submit to a system which will allow of such an anomaly as that. We are elected here triennially, and the changes of political thought are reflected in this Chamber, but they are not reflected in the Council. How many changes of political thought have there been since the Hon. A. J. Thynne was elected to the Legislative Council? There have been quite a number of changes, but still the hon. gentleman has never faced the electors; he is still there sitting in judgment on the representatives of the people. Like Tennyson's "Brook," they go on for ever, although we have to be elected every three years, and are allowed to pass judgment on us and our actions. The true fact is that the Legislative Council is the asylum of vested interests in this State. I do not think there is any doubt about that. The leader of the Opposition talked about the extremists of this party, but the extremists of this party do not compare with the extremists represented in the Council, nothing compared to the extreme monopoly interests represented there: the meat trust, the shipping ring, the sugar combine, the timber ring, and all these and other predatory combinations that are there represented and who have their wishes carried out when legislation is submitted from this Chamber.

Hon. J. A. FIRELLY: And insurance companies.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Insurance companies also. In the Legislative Councils of Australia Toryism has a fortress which up to the present has been impregnable. They direct their predatory legislation, and it is passed no matter what arguments are urged in opposition to it. It does not matter what logic or what reason the leader of the Government in that place urges, the wish of the Government of this Chamber is turned down without the slightest investigation by these members. Very few of them speak; they simply vote in opposition to anything sent up by the representatives of the people. If we

are to remain true to the traditions of good parliamentary government, that Chamber must go. The power of the Council must be broken; they must be abolished, otherwise we would have in Australia a position of things similar to that which exists in America. There we find monopoly in the extreme; there we find they corrupt legislators; they control the judiciary; and their poisonous influence permeates every phase of life in that country.

Mr. BARNES: That is what you want to introduce here.

Mr. LARCOMBE: There is no relation between the interjection and my argument. I say these great interests dominate the Legislature of America, and they produce all these poisonous effects to which I have referred, and they will do similarly in Australia and in Queensland if we do not prevent a continuance of the Upper House. I am satisfied that, given similar circumstances, similar results will accrue. We now have an opportunity of breaking the back of monopoly in this State, an opportunity which we will not have again in another decade if that Chamber still remains in existence. I suppose hon. members opposite will think the remarks I have made concerning the vested interests that are represented in the Council are somewhat impertinent, and perhaps untrue, but let me give you the opinions of men who are not associated with the Labour party on that particular question. In the "Brisbane Courier," of 14th November, 1912, the Hon. Frank McDonnell is reported as follows:—

"Referring to the Legislative Council, he said it was composed of an intelligent body of men with varied interests, and with a particular eye to those interests. He had been six years in the Upper House, but he was sure the time would come when the Chamber would be no longer tolerated."

That is the opinion of one of the largest commercial men in Brisbane and a representative of the interests in that Chamber.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: A Labour man.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I am told that the Hon. Frank McDonnell is a Labour man. Mr. McDonnell at the present time is not a pledged Labour man, although associated with the Labour party. He had a disagreement with this party before he left the Legislative Assembly, but, whatever he is now, we know he has rendered great service to the democracy of this State, and we know he has rendered great service in years gone by, by his eloquence and industry, for the shop assistants of this State and the workers generally of Queensland. His opinion is worth respect. We know that he certainly has leanings towards this party, and that is one of the strongest arguments that can be urged in support of our platform, because he is a man with big business interests, whose interests are somewhat prejudicially affected by Labour legislation, but he realises the soundness of the foundation of our movement, he realises the humanitarian nature of it, and he realises also that it is politically sound. Let us take another witness, and surely hon. members will never suggest that he is a Labour man or ever was. I refer to the ex-Premier of this State, the Hon. D. F. Denham. In 1911, speaking in this Chamber, the Hon. D. F. Denham said, "The simple facts were that large vested interests were wielded with

immense power in the Legislative Council." That is their own ex-leader, and when we find the leader of the Conservative party in this State so sweeping in his condemnation of the second Chamber, surely it is time that we swept it out of existence.

Mr. BAYLEY: There is no condemnation there.

Mr. LARCOMBE: No condemnation! Mr. Denham said that large vested interests were exercised in the Legislative Council with immense power. Is that no condemnation?

Mr. BAYLEY: No.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Surely, if that is no condemnation, then the English language has no significance. This extract can be borne out by the context. I am not tearing anything from the context and distorting the meaning of what the Hon. D. F. Denham said. If the hon. member will look up Mr. Denham's speech, he will find ample confirmation of the quotation I have given. Let me give another authority, and no one will suggest that this is a Labour authority. I will quote now from the Melbourne "Age" of 12th March, 1910, wherein they state—

"The Conservatives have everywhere turned their faces away from the Federation towards the States. Their reasons are clear. The Legislative Councils of the States offer a protection to a Tory which he cannot find in the broader political atmosphere of the Commonwealth."

There we find a great influential anti-Labour journal like the Melbourne "Age" pointing out that the Legislative Council of the State is simply a bulwark of Toryism and vested interests, and that is why members opposite are so bitter anti-federalists. We know it is characteristic of hon. members to be anti-federal. Wherever you find an anti-labour man you will find an anti-federalist.

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

Mr. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): In the discussion on the abolition of the other Chamber so many authorities have been quoted that I do not think it is necessary for me to follow on the same lines. There is no doubt that opinions differ as to whether the bicameral system should be continued or not. Yet we know that in New South Wales, where they have had a Labour Government in power for five or six years, they still have a nominee Chamber just the same as we have in Queensland, and if they believe the same as our friends here believe, then how is it that when they got into power they did not at once introduce a measure to abolish that Upper Chamber. There is not the slightest sign of such a thing. In every other State, with the exception of Victoria, Labour Governments prevail, and still they have the two Chambers in each State. No doubt, they are elected on a franchise somewhat different to ours, but still it is quite evident that, although there may be a few Labour members who believe in abolishing the Upper House, a large majority of Labour members in Australia believe in the principle of the Upper Chamber. It may be that it might be better to change the franchise. I daresay that might have a very good effect, but whether you change the franchise or not, there is no getting

Mr. Forsyth.]

away from the fact that we have the two Chambers in every State of Australia which is controlled by Labour. If it is a part of their policy that the Upper Chamber should be abolished and that there should be only one Chamber to pass legislation, then I cannot understand how it has not been done.

The TREASURER: They have not the same opportunity of abolishing the Upper Chamber as we have. They cannot take a referendum.

Mr. FORSYTH: I suppose they would if they could. At any rate, they should try and persuade their friends to see if they could have a referendum. I never had any very special objection to the Upper House. The reason why this legislation is being brought in is because the two Bills mentioned by the Premier are supposed to be war measures. As a matter of fact, the Premier, in moving the second reading of this Bill, quoted information in regard to the Meat Bill, which has been rejected by the Council. It is quite true that this Bill was sent to the Upper House. It is equally true that it was sent back with various alterations in it; but, after all, when it did go back and after it was lost for the time being, it was, at the request of the members of the Council, restored to the business-paper. And what was the result? The result was that that Bill came back without any alteration whatever, with the exception of two words in connection with the taking over of the meatworks, and those words were "just terms."

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: That made all the difference.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman says that made all the difference. Then, he does not believe in a number of people having "just terms."

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Yes, I do.

Mr. FORSYTH: Why was it that these two words were not put in the Bill? Hon. gentlemen opposite say it made all the difference, but I say it made no difference, because, when we were discussing this question in the House, we raised the same question, and the Minister stated that we would get just terms. I ask again why the Government did not put those two words in? Because of the insertion of those two little words the Government of the day was not willing in the slightest degree to assist in passing the measure, and the measure was sent back again, and that is how it is to-day. After all the turmoil and trouble and all the great speeches made in connection with the Upper House, and when the Upper House returned that Bill with only the two words "just terms" put in, one would have thought the Government would have accepted a Bill like that. If they had any idea of trying to compromise in the slightest degree, I should have imagined the Government would have accepted those words. But they would not do it. It did not matter what words were put in by the Upper House, they were desirous that that particular Bill should go through with every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed, and with no change whatever. The Hon. the Premier quoted a great many telegrams in connection with this particular matter. We asked him to quote other telegrams, but he did not, stating that he would put on the table of the House all the correspondence, and any hon. member could see it. I went through that correspondence, and before the wire of the 21st January there is

[Mr. Forsyth.

no correspondence there. Fortunately, I have some of that correspondence which I intend to read, and it will show that the late Government, which have been blamed so much in regard to this matter, acted, in connection with the request of the Imperial Government, in a most prompt and most businesslike manner.

Hon. J. A. FIEHELLY: Where did you get the correspondence.

Mr. FORSYTH: Never mind where I got it. If the hon. gentleman wants to know where I got it, he can find out. I did not get it from the minutes. There was a wire sent on 6th August by the Attorney-General, and that particular cablegram reads as follows—

"With approval of Mr. Harcourt and Admiralty, I am engaged in organising frozen meat exports so as to secure continuity of supply and every pound available. Should cable communication be interrupted shall rely upon you enlist co-operation other meat-export States, and so organise and facilitate meatworks and shippers' arrangements on your side as to assure instant full load for every British steamer presenting herself for meat cargo for United Kingdom. If cable fails, Owen Cox, of Birt Co., Sydney, New South Wales, will co-operate with you and arrange port loading and other details. Arrivals of refrigerated steamers will be less numerous and more irregular owing to disturbance caused by war condition and employment of meat steamers in other service. Colonial Secretary and Admiralty have seen and approved of foregoing. Mr. Harcourt urges on me necessity to get all meat for which we can provide conveyance."

That was the first cable, I understand, that came in connection with the meat question, and the Government of the day has been blamed because it did not take some action to carry out the wishes of the Home Government. On the 8th August, two days later, the following cable was sent—

"Assume you are commandeering all meat shipped since 1st June. Now loading in Queensland for United Kingdom "Argyllshire," 2,272 tons beef, "Waipara," 1,700 tons beef, "Carpentaria," 3,027 tons beef, "Argyllshire," 18,000 cases preserved meat. Now loading in Queensland for United States, America, "Harorata," 3,700 tons beef, "Sussex," sailed 30th July, via New Zealand, with 2,444 tons beef and 11,000 cases preserved meat. Five steamers close at hand that can carry 14,000 tons beef. Queensland companies furnishing me with stocks on hand and prospective killing, will promptly advise quantities; have commandeered all meat now in store and hereafter to be slaughtered to the order of Imperial Government; will create competent board of advice to fix and determine fair price each shipment; the closing of foreign ports to tallow and hides makes it very difficult to quote firm price for meat forward. Will put Bill through all its stages Tuesday to protect all interests. Beef season drawing to close, but fair prospects mutton. Am meeting E. Owen Cox, Sydney, Monday. Going Melbourne same evening confer with Prime Minister, Commonwealth, and other State Premiers. Obtain and promptly cable Imperial

Government's approval of this action and their monetary liability for all meat shipped to them by virtue of such action. Ascertain whether they will provide money for immediate payment or reimburse at stated intervals payments made on their behalf by this Government."

Now the Imperial Government asked for certain information.

Mr. COLLINS: Who signed that telegram?

Mr. FORSYTH: Denham.

Mr. COOPER: Where did you get it from?

Mr. FORSYTH: That is my business.

Mr. COOPER: The man who gave that information to you might have given it to Germany as well. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. FORSYTH: I venture to say that no man in the House will dare to say that the Premier, at that particular time, did not take prompt action to give the Imperial Government every information at his disposal, so far as the supply of meat was concerned. He promised to put through a Bill, which he did. He promised to establish a board of control, which he did and which the Hon. the Chief Secretary said never materialised. I think, if you look at the Meat for Imperial Uses Act, you will find the board mentioned there.

Mr. COOPER: Cattle on the hoof. That is what the speaker said.

Mr. FORSYTH: We are not discussing cattle on the hoof; we are discussing this question of the board of control, and that is mentioned in the Act to which I have referred. All the information was given to the Imperial Government that they asked for. The Government did everything possible to help the Imperial Government through their trouble. They did not get any reply to the cablegram, but on the 11th of the same month a further cablegram was sent, stating—

"Referring to my telegram of 8th August, No. 14, Premier has secured available space Federal Houlder Shire lines for ensuing three months, and has arranged with E. Owen Cox to operate at schedule rates their Murarrie and Burdekin meatworks. Imperial Government become owner hides and skins and tallow from cattle and sheep treated at these works. We shall thus get effective guide in fixing prices and purchasing output for other works. Have given instructions to Hood buy stock for Murarrie and Burdekin meatworks. Obtain and cable Imperial acknowledgment of liability for this."

These two wires were sent prior to receiving any reply from the Imperial Government. The Government waited to get a reply, and I will ask my friends opposite to listen what this reply was. The first wire which I quoted states what they have to do—to find out all about meat, to try to get every single pound; and five days afterwards—on 11th August—this reply came from the Agent-General to the Government of Queensland—

"Re your telegram of 8th, No. 14, and your telegram of 11th, No. 20, your telegrams are engaging attention of the Government, but I cannot yet get any decision. Government do not at present contemplate purchasing meat. Both American and Australian meat interests have up to present shown great willing-

ness co-operate with Government, and if this co-operation can be maintained, meat could continue to come forward and be distributed through customary channels. Meantime, necessity making forward arrangements in regard to supply of meat and steamers to carry it, is not quite understood by home Government."

The Queensland Government, at that particular time, had done all they possibly could to assist the Imperial Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They did not appoint that board.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the hon. gentleman will look at the Meat for Imperial Uses Act, he will find it provided for in clause 8.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: What about the abolition of the Upper House?

Mr. FORSYTH: This is the reason why the abolition of the Upper House is brought forward. The Hon. the Chief Secretary distinctly spoke of two particular Bills that were war Bills, the rejection of which was quite sufficient to justify the abolishing of the Upper House. Now, these are wires that give all information so far as that matter is concerned. There was no further cable between August and January, and the Premier, last night, quoted the cable of 21st January. The existing agreement in connection with meatworks were at Murarrie and Burdekin, because the Government had arranged for these meatworks to be taken over, and had arranged with Mr. Hood to buy a large number of cattle. The Queensland Government spent £30,000 in the purchasing of cattle, which, after all, the Imperial Government did not take, because they distinctly said that they would continue to get their meat through the usual channels in the open market. This is the wire the Premier read last night—

"President Board of Trade authorises me to telegraph you as follows:—'Conditions immediately ahead make it necessary for British Government to take advantage of your Meat Supply Act of 1914, and wishes you, on his behalf, to assume control of meatworks. Government assume you will take immediate action purchase cattle and proceed to operate works on their behalf, so that all meat available for export shall be theirs. It is suggested, having regard to existing agreements for leasing meatworks, that it might be an equitable arrangement to pay rental on the basis of, say, 10 per cent. on the value of the works, plus 5 per cent. to cover depreciation. Your views on this point are invited.'"

It would be a mistake for the Government to take over the meatworks. It is best to arrange in an amicable way for the companies to go on and supply the meat at a fixed price.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Are you defending the late Government or the Upper House?

Mr. FORSYTH: These contentions were advanced by the Premier last night and he quoted a number of wires in reference to this matter, although he did not quote them all. I will quote another wire later on. Instead of the Government commandeering these works and leasing them, it is far better to let them carry on themselves. If the Government took over the meatworks and paid

Mr. Forsyth.]

5 per cent. interest and 10 per cent. depreciation it would run into huge sums of money. One of these works alone would cost £250,000. It would cost the Government £40,000 or £45,000 for the use of the meatworks for the time being. That is a huge amount of money to find. It would probably run into hundreds of thousands of pounds to follow the principle laid down by the Imperial Government, if we took over the meatworks. The Premier last year was asked his opinion about it, and he said he thought it was better to let the meatworks carry on the business themselves and supply the meat at a fixed price, which was arranged at 4½d. per lb. f.o.b.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why did he say that?

Mr. FORSYTH: Because he thought it was more economical and a better way to do it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Because he did not have the power to do it. He would have to call Parliament together to get the power, because he did not have the power under the Meat for Imperial Uses Act.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the Imperial Government had insisted on the Queensland Government taking over the meatworks, they would have had to do it, but instead of that they did something that was infinitely better. The price was fixed, and the rate was lower than in any other part of Australia or in the world. Could the hon. gentleman buy meat at that time at 4½d. per lb.? As a matter of fact, the Imperial Government said that the Government of the day, in passing that Act on the 11th August, rendered invaluable services to the Imperial Government. The Premier did not read that wire last night, but I am going to give it now. This particular wire will be found amongst the correspondence if any hon. member wishes to see it. The wire came from the Agent-General, and the information was supplied by the Imperial Government. This, the cable dated 26th January, 1915, was received by the Premier, and I would like my friends opposite to listen to it very carefully—

“Cable, 26th January, 1915.

“Referring to previous telegram relating to meat supply Home Government have only now realised vital importance themselves and allies of maintaining meat supply and controlling price. Although I could not convince them at the time they now fully appreciate wisdom step taken by you at outbreak of war and value of your Act. They anxiously await your telegram and will possibly delay communicating officially with other States until I hear from you. Your loyal helpfulness is of the utmost value at this juncture.”

I draw hon. members' attention specially to those words, “your loyal helpfulness is of the utmost value at this juncture.”

Mr. COOPER: Is not that a wholesale condemnation of the British Government and the allies?

Mr. FORSYTH: The Imperial Government were convinced that the Queensland Government did the right thing and thanked them for their loyal helpfulness. That is plain English, and it shows the effect of the Act passed by the late Government. We are told that the meatworks can be taken over now. If the meatworks are taken over

now, the Government will have to buy their stock and all that sort of thing. Is it not better to let the companies carry on their own meatworks where they have everything at their disposal? The various meatworks came into line and the price was fixed for the meat to be sent to England. Another wire was received from the Imperial Government stating that they were surprised at the splendid arrangement that was made and the low price fixed.

The TREASURER: What are your views on the abolition of the Upper House?

Mr. FORSYTH: All these wires were read by the Premier last night showing that the late Government were wrong in not introducing that measure to take over the meatworks, but the Imperial Government wired stating they were quite satisfied with the arrangements that had been made.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What would have happened if the meatworks had refused to do what was asked?

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman is always raising “Aunt Sallys.” As a matter of fact, the meatworks fell in with the suggestion of the late Government. If the meatworks had said that they would not supply the meat, I have not the slightest doubt the Government would have made them do it. Since then no one has raised the question that the Imperial Government were not satisfied with the arrangements that were made.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How could they have met them if they did?

Mr. FORSYTH: By introducing a Bill the same as this, but there was no occasion to do it. I read a wire showing how anxious the Government were to help the Imperial Government, and the Imperial Government were absolutely satisfied with the arrangements made. The hon. gentleman asked, Why should the Upper House throw out this Bill? The Minister also said that it was an urgent Bill, but where is the urgency? We control every single pound of beef and we can commandeer all the meat we want. There is no company carrying on which the Government cannot commandeer and fix a price for the meat.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: But no one can run the works.

Mr. FORSYTH: I defy the hon. gentleman to run the works. If he did it he would make a fearful mess of it. It is better for the people who are already in the business to do the work and control it, and so long as the work is done under fair, equitable, and decent conditions, it is all right. Everyone knows that the price—4½d. per lb.—was an exceptionally low price. We have had no wire since that wire of the 26th January, asking the Government to take over the meatworks. No wire followed that cable of the 26th, which shows that they were satisfied. Can the hon. gentleman produce a telegram saying that the Imperial Government insist on them taking over the meatworks? No, he cannot do it. There is not the slightest occasion to do it. If there was any need to do it, this House would be only too glad to pass a Bill to help the Imperial Government. The Legislative Council only put in two little words into the Meatworks Bill, and yet the Government would not accept it. That is what they call “sweet reasonableness.” That is what they

[Mr. Forsyth.]

call "compromise." There are only two little words to be put in, and they provide that the meatworks should be paid for on fair and equitable terms, but the Government are not prepared to accept those words. All this talk about the Upper House is so much bosh and so much trash. That is plain English. Some hon. gentleman said that the Government cannot abolish the Upper House. I do not intend to discuss the question from the constitutional point of view at all, because I believe they can do it. It will have to go to the country, and the people of Queensland will have to decide it. They will have to say whether they want it or not. My impression is that if the people of Queensland know the whole circumstances of the case from beginning to end, they will be satisfied that the late Government did everything in their power to try and assist the Home Government in this matter. We come to the other matter of the referendum. Every person throughout the length and breadth of the land, and even the newspapers at home, thought that it was unwise to force through the referendum proposals at this juncture. Why should there be any urgency at this particular time? Has the Minister, or any other member who has spoken, shown that this Bill should be considered a war measure? I have not heard one single argument that this should be considered a war measure. If it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government should have the powers asked for in the referendum proposals, then this House will not be unreasonable. We are prepared to help the Home Government at present in their great struggle. The referendum proposals cannot be considered a war measure, because they were introduced by a Labour Government several years back when there was no war, when there was a quiet time. The Labour Government were determined to get it through because they wished to take the whole of the control out of the hands of the State. I would rather see unification brought about and every State Parliament abolished rather than hand over these powers. We have heard a lot about Canada and Finland having only one Chamber, but we must bear in mind that every single State in Australia was a sovereign State prior to federation. We handed over certain powers to the Federal Government and retained certain other powers for the States. We hear members opposite talking about the bicameral system generally. What about the Federal Parliament? They have two Chambers there, yet we do not hear the Labour party talking about abolishing the Senate. Have they ever said a word about that?

Mr. CARTER: Yes.

Mr. FORSYTH: Then why don't you abolish the Senate?

Mr. CARTER: It will be done sooner or later.

Mr. FORSYTH: If you are going to do it, why not do it now? It has been made an elective body by the people of Australia, and, therefore, they have certain powers, and have to go through the same [8.30 p.m.] process as the members of the House of Representatives, but it appears to be the general consensus of opinion, even amongst the greatest minds of the Labour party, that that should be the policy of the Labour Government.

Mr. CARTER: What do you know about the great minds of the Labour party?

Mr. FORSYTH: Ask Mr. Hughes. Of course, I would not say for one moment that the hon. member is to be compared with Mr. Hughes. I do not believe that the Labour party want to do away with the second Chamber in the Commonwealth, and I think we should retain our second Chamber here. If the people wish it, then by all means change the franchise, but it is most important to have the two Chambers. We know that legislation is often rushed through here at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and then next day mistakes are found in the measures which have been passed through the House, and they require the Upper House to move amendments to straighten things up. In any case, no matter what the powers may be, it is always wise to have a check of some sort, so that hasty legislation shall not be passed. The Upper House has done a great deal of good in the past and will do a great deal in the future. They are not looking for support from certain quarters. When an election comes on, they have not to try and persuade the electors to send them back. We have some of the ablest and most capable men in Australia in the Upper House at the present time, men who have proved themselves successful in their own businesses.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: What do they represent?

Mr. FORSYTH: They represent the general people of Queensland. They have been successful in their own businesses, and they are just as likely to be successful in connection with political life. I hope that better counsels will prevail with the Government. The Chief Secretary agreed down South to do certain things, and he has certainly carried out his contract as far as he can, but I think it would have been infinitely better, and would have been, perhaps, the means of stopping all this trouble, if, instead of the various Premiers only being asked, they had taken the leaders of the Opposition in the various State Parliaments into their confidence, and consulted together. Then they might have arrived at some solution, and been able to pass a Bill which would have met, for the time being, the wishes of the people generally. Something of that kind might be done now—it is not too late—and I hope that something will be done to get over the difficulty, and not abolish the Upper House, which has been of enormous benefit to Queensland, and will, I think, be able to benefit Queensland for many years to come.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*): I desire to say something on what I consider to be one of the most momentous questions which have come before Parliament. I am not going to hang my case upon the Legislative Council rejecting any measures which have been sent up by this Chamber. I belong to a class of individuals who do not believe that there should be an Upper Chamber at all, and it is on those premises that I intend to base my arguments, and give evidence as to why the Council should be wiped out altogether. First of all, what is the difference in the composition of the two Houses? In the first place, we have this branch of the Legislature, which represents the people of Queensland; in other words, as members of this House we have to go before our masters, the electors, every three years, and the people of the State can

Mr. Peterson.]

say whether we have their confidence or not; they can reject us at the poll. In the past, we have seen where the people have rejected certain candidates at the poll, and immediately after the elections the same men who have been turned down by the people of Queensland have been appointed to the Upper Chamber to overrule the will of the people in this Chamber. Take, for instance, the case of the Hon. Mr. Leahy, the Hon. Mr. Fowles, the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn, and the Hon. Mr. Stephens. If those gentlemen are members of what the hon. members opposite call a revising Chamber, can they explain why those gentlemen were appointed?

Hon. J. A. FIDELLY: They are flotsam and jetsam. (Laughter.)

Mr. PETERSON: I am coming to that in a minute. I am trying to give you an illustration of how the people have expressly decided against certain gentlemen whom the Government of the day placed up there for all time. Is there anything more disgraceful than to think that the people in the past should have been flouted in such a way? Those are the things that we have to consider, and in a democratic age and country we have come to the conclusion that the time is now ripe when the Upper House should be passed into oblivion. Whether we are the forerunners in this great reform matters not to me; the fact is evident that the days of Legislative Councils have passed. I am going to quote a few constitutional authorities. Hon. members on the other side have quoted constitutional authorities, and I am going to show that the leading Tories and Liberals in England are endorsing our position. I am going to try and prove that wherever the partisanship of an Upper House comes in, it stands against the interests of the people, and practically every constitutional authority agrees that where a nominee Chamber tries to frustrate the will of the people and their representatives it should be dealt with. The hon. member for Murrumba gave us a rather interesting speech, but it was simply a defence of the Denham Government.

Mr. GILLES: And a poor defence at that.

Mr. PETERSON: I do not know about that.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Where did he get the telegrams from?

Mr. PETERSON: I do not know. He has got them, and he will not tell us. It seems a marvellous thing that he is able to produce those telegrams, but they prove nothing; they are antiquated as far as the power sought for by the Imperial Government is concerned. The Premier produced last night telegrams of a later date, which showed the powers which the Imperial authorities wished the State of Queensland to take.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Mr. Bonar Law said he did not want them.

Mr. PETERSON: I hold that the Legislative Council is a partisan Chamber. I would give them credit if they considered measures which have been sent up from this House on their merits, and be willing, perhaps, metaphorically speaking, to shake hands with them if they were to give them decent consideration. But how can you expect anything else than partisanship from

[Mr. Peterson.]

a number of gentlemen who have been members of the party opposite? How can you expect anything but that when you see hon. members opposite collaborating with hon. members of the Upper House in the lobbies, and discussing how Bills are to be treated? Then they say they are revisers; they have their own caucus. I hold that if the arguments for an Upper House have to hold good, they have to prove that the members of such Chambers are not partisans. Mr. H. V. Temperley, in his splendid work on "Senates and Upper Chambers," writing on the danger of partisanship in Upper Houses, says—

"Before attempting to consider any specific proposals for the reform of the House of Lords, it may be well to outline certain principles, derived from the practical study of Upper Chambers and Senates in other countries, in order to show the true lines on which such reforms should proceed. The first and most obvious of these deductions is that an Upper House must represent a principle rather than a party."

Has that happened here? Has not the Upper House represented a party ever since this party has been returned to power? It has shown its teeth on every occasion on which we have sent our measures to it, with the exception of one minor measure. But to continue—

"for so long as it is linked indissolubly with one political party in the Lower House, an Upper House must sink in prestige and esteem. The danger is most real, for a political party, other than the one that has filled the Upper Chamber, will sooner or later be in the ascendant. Eventually it will have the Upper House at its mercy, and when such is the case, a remodelling will be drastic."

This gentleman, who is recognised as an authority on Legislative Councils and Senates, states in that work that, if a Government places nominees in another Chamber and swamps that House, it will find ultimately that when another party gets into power and the majority of which they have swamped, it will not support the will of the Government of the day, that House can expect drastic treatment. Later in his work he says—

"An Upper Chamber that is serene and above party is admittedly a rarity, but an Upper Chamber that discriminates unfairly against one party in the State is also an exotic."

We could quote innumerable authorities to show the untenable position in which the other House stands, but suffice it to say that the very fact of its actions during the past few weeks is sufficient for hon. members to say that the time has come when it should be abolished. What power have we as true representatives of the people? Take the Central district—the district from which I emanate politically. The whole of the members who sit in the Upper House, supposed to be representative of the Central district, have been rejected at the polls, and there is not one who could get a political footing in this House for that part of the State, and yet they are placed there for a lifelong period, and they go there day after day and reject the measures that we, the representatives of the people, pass. Is that

justice? Is that democratic? If it is called democratic, then it is a travesty on democracy, and the sooner the whole thing is wiped out the better. They talk about a revising Chamber. The best revising Chamber we can have is the people.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETERSON: If we pass measures against their interests, they will answer us. They will give us their answer in three years' time, as they did on the 22nd May last. I hold that we have nothing to fear, and so far as I am concerned, I will spend the last ounce of my blood in going round the constituencies and fighting for this referendum when it comes, and if my younger fellow-men who have to bear the burden of the future and who are going to supplant the troglodytes of this Chamber and the other Chamber all stand together, then we are going to have it so that the people will rule and rule for all time. I want to quote Lord Hugh Cecil. He is not a Labour man, not by any means. He is the essence of Toryism. Lord Hugh Cecil, in his work on "The Rights of Citizenship," said this—

"The weakness therefore of the nominated system in democratic States"—

He was referring to Queensland particularly—

"The weakness, therefore, of the nominated system in democratic States is that it does not take its origin from any respected principles. A nominated member, unlike an elected member, cannot claim to have been chosen by the people; again, if he is nominated by a party Ministry, he cannot claim the authority which, in undemocratic States, is still given to the choice of the monarch. He is weak because he cannot trace his origin to any respected source."

What is the source from which hon. members in the other Chamber have emanated? The hon. member for Bowen said this evening that they had emanated from those who have sweated children in the past; they have emanated from those who denied them much happiness; they have emanated from those who have tried, so far as possible, to keep the workers in such a position that they would not have the franchise at all. That is the position in which we find ourselves, and although we have been elected by the people, we find that we have not that power that the people reposed in us, because we have a Chamber here that obstructs. I have confidence in my assurance that the people, when appealed to, will stand to us in this crisis—this most momentous crisis in the history of Queensland—and will say: "Begone, thou unfaithful servants, begone!" I do not wish to quote Labour constitutional authorities, because hon. members opposite would take no notice of them. When dealing with hon. members opposite, I like to give them the medicine prescribed by their own doctors, and I ask them to swallow it and not complain if the dose is bitter. We find the Right Hon. Sir William Anson, Bart, M.P., in his article on the development and growth of the British Constitution, saying—

"There is nothing in our Constitution which cannot be altered by Act of Parliament. Until 1911 an Act of Parliament required the assent of King, Lords, and Commons. For more than 200 years the assent of the King has been given

as a matter of course to measures approved by both Houses. Under the conditions of the Parliament Act that assent may now be demanded for a measure of which the House of Lords has not approved. Legislative sovereignty therefore, with the power to change our institutions at will, is transferred to the Commons."

Who are the Commons of Queensland? This side of the House and that side of the House—they comprise the Commons of Queensland, and as Sir William Anson declares in his work, Britain has relegated to the Commons the right to say what its legislation shall be, and so we on this side say that we have the right to say, and in no uncertain way, and as clearly as possible, that the rights of the people should be respected. Let us go a little further, and see what the Right Hon. F. E. Smith, K.C., M.P., says. I know our friends opposite like to hear those titles. I suppose they look forward to the time when the Duke of Ithaca, the Duke of Paddington, and Lord Somebody of West End will be in control up there; but, thanks to an enlightened democracy, although it has been evolutionary in its progress and not drastic, the faults of our fathers have not been such that they have given us those things, although members who have been put in our Upper Chamber have exercised their power in a somewhat similar manner to those titled lords at home. The Right Hon. F. E. Smith says—

"We are, all of us, agreed that, for good or for evil, we are governed by democracy. The apparent tendency is to extend rather than to restrict the popular character of our Government. It is, indeed, perhaps a safe prediction that the Government of this country will remain democratic unless the tendency above adverted to should be arrested by civil convulsions."

Like the hon. member for Drayton speaks about. (Laughter.) To continue—

"This speculation, though full of interest, would carry us too far from the immediate subject of inquiry. Democratic government has many merits, and it suffers from some not inconsiderable defects. Some critics will lay stress on the merits, others will be more impressed by the defects, but all alike will agree that it is supremely important, as long as we purport to be governed by democracy, that the reality of our Constitution should correspond with its labels."

We ask to-night that the legislation enacted by this Government and its labels should correspond, and that the will of the people should correspond also, and I have submitted the opinion of a gentleman of hon. members' own party in the other land, Mr. F. E. Smith, one of the rigid Tories there. Then, Mr. A. V. Dicey is looked upon as a constitutional authority of no mean merit. Professor Dicey, in his work on the destruction of constitutional safeguard, when asked what is meant by a "constitutional safeguard," says—

"My answer is this: A constitutional safeguard means, under any form of popular and parliamentary government (such as exists—e.g., in England, in the United States, or in France), any law, or received custom, which secures that no change in the Constitution or the

Mr. Peterson.]

fundamental laws of the country shall take place until it has obtained the permanent assent of the nation."

That is one for hon. members opposite. I am giving hon. members an opportunity of showing how these constitutional authorities agree that we have a right, when we find that the will of the people has been blocked by the operations of the Upper House, to appeal to the people, and to seek redress at their hands, and I hope that the Opposition will show all the fight that they can. Let it be a fight, to the finish, and let it be said, when the battle is over—when we see them lying vanquished on the political battlefield—that the people are paramount. Let them not keep telling us to go to the country, as they have been doing the last few days. Lord Hugh Cecil, writing on the Constitution of Canada, says—

"The members of the Senate, being all of them men of advanced years, vacancies were frequent, and it was not long before a Liberal majority—not less subservient to the Liberal Administration than the former Conservative majority had been to its predecessors—was established in the Senate. A similar process has now begun with the new Conservative Government. It is difficult for those who have not lived in a country to pronounce with confidence on the working of an institution, but it would seem that the principal defect of the Canadian Senate is its subservience to the Government of the day; and that this subservience is caused by a system of nomination which places overwhelming influence in the hands of that Government."

I understand that the hon. member for Murilla last year introduced a motion with regard to making the Upper House elective. I am pleased to see that there are some members of the Opposition who are inclined to believe that some reform is necessary in connection with the Upper House.

Mr. KIRWAN: They move slowly.

Mr. PETERSON: Yes, they are a snail's progress party, I admit. (Laughter.) We are the motor-car party, and are anxious to get to our destination.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: A greased lightning party.

Mr. PETERSON: There is no greased lightning about it. Mr. Denham, in dealing with the motion of the hon. member for Murilla, that there should be an elective Upper Chamber, used this argument in opposition to it. He said—

"And I may quote him in reference to the experience in America. He says—

In a contest, the Senate usually, though not invariably, gets the better of the House.

In our experience, with a nominee House, there is not a case where the opinion of the Upper House has prevailed over the opinion of the Lower House when the Lower House has insisted on its will being put into operation."

Mr. Denham used that as an argument why there should not be an elective House—that the Council had never refused to pass Bills which had been insisted upon by this House. Upon that gentleman's argument, I appeal to members on both sides of the House, if we have not a precedent established within

the last few weeks—that that House has thrown out legislation which this Government wishes to see enacted on behalf of the people? As Mr. Denham pointed to that as a reason for not having an elective Upper House, I now refer to him as an authority—I am showing that the Upper House has opposed legislation sent to it by this Chamber, and I simply refer hon. members to his argument, and turn it round to show that, at last, we have this gentleman coinciding with us; because, if that House had not opposed legislation before, it has done so now, and we have every right to ask members of the Opposition to stand with us on this matter. I do not desire to take up much time, because this matter has been thrashed threadbare in years gone by. For over twenty years it has stood paramount in the Labour platform, and when members on the other side say the people of Queensland have not given us a mandate on this matter, I say they are saying that which is not correct. It has been in the forefront of our platform for many years, and one of the most prominent measures discussed at every conference that the Labour party have had is the question of the abolition of the Upper House. Why is it considered of such paramount importance? Because we, as a democracy, know—as representatives of the people, as representatives of the workers—know that as surely as the sun rises and a Labour Government is placed in power, so surely would the Upper House block the will of the people. It is with the preconceived idea that such a result would occur that we have had it in the forefront of our platform for the last twenty years, and it lies to the credit of the Government that they, so early in the session, are prepared to beard the lion in his den; and I am quite sure that the will of the people will be on the side of this party. Let us think. We are on the brink, as hon. members have said, of a most important crisis. They have said it is important in the interests of Queensland that we should have that change. I have always held to the argument that the will of the people must be supreme—that we must bow to the will of the people; and when the will of the people has returned to power a party which has in the forefront of its platform the abolition of the Upper House, then we have a right to say that we have been elected by the people on those grounds. I was asked repeatedly on the hustings whether I was in favour of the abolition of the Upper Chamber, and I said, "Yes," because it is in the platform, and because I believe in it right from the bottom of my heart. For these reasons, I say, I am opposed to the Upper House; I favour its abolition; and I believe that when it is passed into oblivion a new era will arise in Queensland, that we shall make for a greater and nobler race, and we shall step forward into that position to which we have been aspiring for many years past, and there shall be no block in the way of progress; there shall be nothing to stop the will of the people being carried into effect; and if we make mistakes, then the people can decide. They can turn us out, and they can be the revising Chamber; and in every way I am prepared to abide by the result.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): In speaking against this measure, I do not in any way aspire to rise to the heights reached by the hon. member for Bowen. I intend to deal with details, just merely as we have them in our Chamber, and to refer to things

[Mr. Peterson.]

that come under our notice. I believe in dealing with this question from practical experience, and with our practical experience of the Council, and what is to become of it. The hon. member for Bowen spoke a great deal about the House of Lords, and about the working class being prevented from getting education. Now, we are not dealing with the House of Lords.

Mr. FREE: Yes; with the Queensland House of Lords.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We are not dealing with the House of Lords or anything like them. There is no comparison whatever. But we are dealing with a body with whose work we, as a Chamber, have often come into contact. The hon. member for Keppel has tried to make us believe that we are not a sovereign State—that we are practically on the same level as some of the German States that have been referred to. I am just going to quote one authority on this matter, and that is Quick and Garran, who state—

“Each State retains the right to hold direct and immediate communication with the Imperial Government in all matters relating to State business.”

Mr. CARTER: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Does not that give us sovereign rights? Then, again, they say—

“Subject to the qualification that it shall only speak on national affairs, and that it should leave State affairs to the management of the State.”

That refers to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth can only deal with national matters and not matters in relation to the States. That is as far as I am going to deal with that aspect of the question. I want to say to-night we are living under laws passed by the Liberal party, and passed by the Legislative Council that the Government are trying to abolish, and we want to see how these laws compare with any other countries; or, if the Council has refused to pass anything that has not been to our interests and whether the laws they have passed have been for the interests of the people. That is the course I intend taking.

Mr. KIRWAN: A very wise course, too.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Now I want to refer, first of all, to the position of the worker in Queensland. Under the laws passed, as I say, by the Liberal party and passed by the Legislative Council, what condition is the worker in Queensland under to-day?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Is he richer?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He would not be if he was employed by you. If he had to depend on the hon. member's employment he would not be richer. I am speaking of the general worker to-day, and his condition under proper employment—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman will not be in order in pursuing that line of argument.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am showing the reason why the Council should not be abolished. (Government laughter.) I am showing the good work they have done and the reason why we should not abolish them. I say that the Legislative Council has sanctioned these laws, whereby the

worker who is living under them to-day is independent of the master for the fixing of labour conditions.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is due to his union.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I say he is independent of his master for fixing his working conditions, because the Liberal party, and the Legislative Council which you are seeking to abolish, has passed such laws to give him his industrial court and other machinery to settle his grievances, and without either strife or without being dependent on his union. He has no need to strike, because he can refer his grievances to the court, and they will be considered. We know perfectly well that the Labour party has never been in a position to put a single law on the statute-book that we are working under. (Government dissent.) I will take one thing that the hon. member for Bowen mentioned, and which he said had been refused his father and himself in the old country by the House of Lords. He said they had been refused education. I know that. I know that the House of Lords voted against the education of the working classes, but we have no comparison here with the House of Lords. We are not discussing them. We are discussing the laws passed by the present Council. Now, I ask hon. members, Is there any more liberal Education Act in all the world than we have in Queensland? Is there any more liberal Act in the Labour-governed States?

Mr. COLLINS: Thanks to Sir Charles Lilley.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It does not matter about thanks to anybody. The Bill was passed here, and I am dealing with practical things. Is there an education law in any part of the world that is more liberal and more useful?

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in discussing the merits of Acts passed by this Assembly and the Upper House. He is in order in referring to them in passing, but I cannot allow him to discuss the merits or demerits of Acts of Parliament passed in the past.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am only giving reasons why the Council should not be abolished. I am expected by the people I represent to give those reasons, but I give way to you most certainly. In Queensland what does the worker pay for the education of his children?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am discussing the work of the Council which it is proposed to abolish, and I say there are no conditions in the world—no easier conditions—given than by the Bills the Council has passed. Hon. members know perfectly well that any man in Queensland earning less than £4 a week does not pay any taxes. Can hon. members point out what he has to pay for the education of his children? These are some of the things which should cause us to retain the Council—make it elective if you like. Now, let me allude to the provision for the sickness of workers, because the other man can look after himself. I am only speaking of the man who has to work for his living, as I have had to work for mine, and I say that the provision for our hospitals and old-age pensions—

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will have to connect his remarks with the question before the House.

Mr. Bebbington.]

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I think these are very good reasons why the Council should not be abolished. (Government laughter.) There is another reason why it should not be abolished, and that is that it has protected the producers. If there is one thing we want in Queensland to-day, it is the protection and encouragement of the producers, because, if we are not going to have production, we are soon going to be short of money, and somebody is going to feel it. That is one reason why I am in favour of retaining that Chamber—because they have always stood up and assisted the producer. Let us come to the difference between the way this Chamber—or the Government, if hon. members like—and that Chamber has treated the producers. You know what the difference is. Members opposite know, because they stole our butter. (Laughter.)

Mr. CARTER: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman in order in saying that we stole butter? (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I will say that you commandeered it. The hon. gentleman's conscience accuses him strongly.

Several GOVERNMENT MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask hon. gentlemen on my right to refrain from interjecting, because they lead the hon. member who is addressing the House off the subject. I ask hon. members to allow him to continue his speech without interruption.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Thank you very kindly, Mr. Speaker. The Country party advocates an elective Upper House. We are not going to agree to the abolition of the Council because it has protected the producer from those who otherwise would have injured him. I believe in an elective Upper House, and I think the time will come when the people will demand that the Legislative Council should be elected by the people. If the hon. gentleman had brought that proposal forward he would have had some chance of success, but so far as doing away with it altogether is concerned, the people of Queensland will not agree to it. It is difficult to say what the franchise should be if we make it elective, because we know the Senate is elected on the same franchise as the Lower House in the Federal Parliament, and the Senate has been more of an injury to us than the Legislative Council. There are a number of Bills which the Council amended which are given as reasons why the Upper House should be abolished. Take the Workers' Compensation Bill. Members on this side agree with the Legislative Council in the very things they have objected to. They object to the Government having a monopoly of insurance, and we do the same. We have our own Co-operative Insurance Acts, and we believe in them because they return us 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. The Government, however, wish to wipe them out with one blow. The Government declares that no company should exist outside the Government, but the Council objected to that, and so do we on this side. In that matter the Council have acted in the interests of the people. If the Government are such great business men, what have they got to fear in competition with the public and other insurance offices? These are the reasons why they are seeking the abolition of the Upper House. The next Bill which the

{Mr. Bebbington.

Council amended was the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Workers' Award Bill. We believe that it is only right that these men should get their wages, but the Government having made the mistake, should pay the difference in the wages themselves. We believe the same as the Council in that matter. The Government made the mistake, and they should be responsible. Why should not the Government be treated the same as any individual who makes a mistake? Then, with regard to the Workers' Accommodation Bill: the only objection the Council had to that was in connection with the honorary inspectors, and we made the same objection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member may mention the different Bills, but he is not in order in discussing them.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The amendment of the Industrial Arbitration Bill is another reason why we are asked to abolish the Council. The Council in that have protected the dairying and farming industries. At present we have to compete with other countries and bad seasons, and we cannot work eight hours a day in the producing industries without doing the State a big injury. We are with the Council in that matter. Then, with regard to the Meatworks Bill. The Council inserted the words "on just terms." We agree with the Council in that because we believe that if the meatworks are to be purchased, the purchase should be on just and fair terms. We undoubtedly uphold the Council in that. Now, we come to one thing which seems to be more important to members opposite than any of the other Bills. It is because the Council has stood in the way of the socialistic measures which that party has brought in, and which neither we or the Council believe to be good for the people, that they wish to abolish the Council. We would much prefer the people to settle that matter. We do not believe in the Premier handing over those powers, because we want to retain them for the State. The Premier made a great deal out of the fact that the Liberal Premier of Victoria supported the proposal. I should have been surprised if he had not supported it, because we know that the pressure came from the Victorian unions in the first place to make it a party measure. Is it not in the interests of Victoria to have all the industries of Australia there? Is not the Commonwealth of Australia ruled by Sydney and Melbourne? When the cruiser "Brisbane" was being launched, did not the people say that Brisbane counted for nothing, because our representatives did not receive courteous treatment?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We know that Brisbane and Queensland count for nothing as compared with Melbourne and Sydney. Melbourne is practically Victoria, and Sydney is New South Wales, because you cannot get a railway to any other port but Sydney.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Sydney and Melbourne rule their own States, and they also rule the Commonwealth. It is not in the interests of the people of Queensland to sell themselves to Victoria and Melbourne. For that reason we uphold our Council for throwing out the measure which would practically have sold Queensland to Melbourne and Victoria. These are some

of the reasons why I am going to vote against this Bill. I am quite willing to have an elective Council if we can agree on the franchise. But otherwise I am a home ruler. I believe in retaining all the power we possibly can. If we give the whole of our powers to the Commonwealth, we shall have great trouble in getting those powers back, and we shall get no consideration whatever from the Commonwealth. We shall have far more trouble in Queensland than Ireland had from London, because we are three times as far away from the capital, and we shall get that much less consideration. The Premier, who is a gentleman that I respect very highly, is a man who has very strong opinions of his own, and I cannot understand how he should go down to Melbourne and admit that we cannot deal with our own industrial questions and questions of employed and unemployed, when we are dealing with them ten times better than they would be dealt with by the Commonwealth Government. A few weeks ago the Commonwealth Government had some transports hung up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman has had an opportunity of discussing the Commonwealth Powers Bill.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: As I have said, they tried to take those powers from us, and as I am a home ruler and wish to retain for Queensland all the power I can, I shall vote against this Bill.

Mr. D. RYAN (*Townsville*): It is not my intention to delay the House long on the constitutional aspect of the question, because that was fully discussed last night by the Premier; and the historical aspect of the question has been fully and ably dealt with by the hon. member for Bowen and other hon. members. However, I wish to say that the measure before the House is the challenge that the people of Queensland have been looking forward to for many years. It is a challenge that every democrat welcomes. The abolition of the Legislative Council simply means the fulfilment of a promise which was made to Queensland at the time of federation. We were told that one of the advantages of federation would be that there would be no need for the excrescences called Legislative Councils throughout Australia, and we were induced by that argument to vote for federation, or rather the votes of the people were largely influenced by that consideration. The abolition of the Legislative Council to-day is really the fulfilment of the promise made by the statesmen of that time. The existence of a nominee Chamber in no way responsible to the people, yet armed with power to defeat the will of the electors, is absolutely opposed to every idea of democracy, and is beyond any conception of the principles of government by the people for the people. It is an assertion of self-government that is not self-government. It is an antiquated relic of bygone times, when early responsible government deemed it necessary to specially protect the interests of wealth and privilege, even with the then limited franchise which gave preference to property, wealth, and privilege. I have no hesitation in saying that so long as this system does exist, or so long as there is any obstacle whatever between the expression of the people's will and its accomplishment in law on any question which the majority is entitled to decide, then just so long and to

such an extent is the self-government, of which we have been accustomed to hear such proud boast, a mere instrument of self-deception. Our hon. friends opposite talk glibly of experimental legislation, and make it a rule to strongly uphold everything in the nature of experimental legislation which they look upon as a menace to the privileged class they represent and as relief and value to the mass of the people. We must have experiments if we are going to have progress. The Labour party is a party of progress and is not afraid to experiment and to strike out in new ways. Our opponents are afraid of experiments, and are content to stand still and stagnate, and that is the reason that a Labour Government are on the Treasury benches to-day. The hon. member for Murilla delivered a very interesting speech to-night in defence of the late Government. He gave hardly any reason why the Legislative Council should not be abolished, but defended it by telling us that it was there for a purpose. We admit that the Council is there for a purpose, and it is because we recognise what that purpose is that we are out to abolish it. The hon. member for Drayton, like the hon. member for Murilla, went to a great deal of trouble to show the House what splendid agreement exists between His Majesty's Opposition and the Legislative Council. He also went further back to show us what splendid agreement existed between the Legislative Council and former Governments—Liberal Governments—in Queensland.

Mr. BARNES: Who returned those Governments?

Mr. D. RYAN: A restricted franchise. We know that an agreement exists between the Opposition and the Council—in fact, it is more than an agreement, it is an affinity. The argument we have heard reminds me of a man I met the other day, who told me how his money was stolen the night previous. He said, "I saw the thief, and I had my hand on a revolver." I said, "Did you shoot?" He said, "No, if I had done so I would have been a widower this morning." That is an illustration of the agreement or affinity between the Opposition and the Legislative Council. We have heard that there were disagreements and that they were going to shoot, but they never attempted to shoot, because of a family affair. A very noticeable feature in elections of recent years is that from time to time what is called the Liberal party have been in the habit of stealing planks from the platform of the Labour party. But there is one plank they have never stolen, and which they do not wish to steal because they have no use for it, and that is the plank providing for the abolition of the Legislative Council. That plank has been preserved for the time of the Labour party. It has been protected from white ant and other vermin, and now that the Labour party has at last the power to use it we are turning it into a battering ram to demolish the stronghold of Liberalism, of wealth and privilege—the Legislative Council. The electors of Queensland at the last general election decided that for the future the Government of this State should be neither the perquisite nor the creature of wealth and monopoly, and they have sent here the Labour party to legislate for the people and to protect them. But what do we find? We find that no matter how powerful the Labour party may be, no matter how useful their purpose may be, no

Mr. D. Ryan.]

matter how decisively they have defeated Liberalism, no matter how high the quality and importance of the legislation they have introduced into this Chamber may be, no matter how true they may be to the mandate of the people—they are blocked. Measures leave this Chamber and are sent to the Legislative Council, but owing to the agreement which still exists between the Council and members opposite those measures are decided, and the will of the people is flouted and nullified by the machinations of the Opposition and the Legislative Council. We find the same thing in every [9.30 p.m.] State where vested interests, wealth, and privilege are still entrenched in the Legislative Councils, rendering the State Parliament, as far as democracy is concerned, useless and unimportant. The measure now before the House is the main issue at the present moment in politics. This is to be fought to a finish. The will of the people as represented by the Government and the Labour party cannot be crushed, and there can be no surrender in this fight. The Labour Government has emblazoned upon its banner "Abolition of the Upper Chamber, abolition of wealth and privilege," and it has nailed its colours to the mast, and as long as it has the people of Queensland behind it it cannot go down.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*): This is rather an important question, and I think I may be excused for saying a few words upon it. (Hear, hear!) The Legislative Council, or the second Chamber, is a very old institution.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It has outlived its usefulness.

Mr. GUNN: I am one of those who have been born with the bump of veneration rather strongly developed. I venerate old institutions, and I venerate all things that I know came into being by the will of the people, and perhaps after much blood was shed by our ancestors to get those privileges handed down to us. It has been argued time after time this evening that the Legislative Council does not represent the people at all, and that the people have no say in the appointment of members to the Council, but I maintain that they have. The members of Assembly are elected by the people of Queensland, and the majority of members sitting behind the Government appoint members to the Upper House, and they are, therefore, nominated by the people of Queensland and represent the will of the people. The only trouble with the Labour party is that in the past they have been sitting in opposition, and have had no say in the nomination of these people. But, now they are on the Government side, they can nominate members to the second Chamber, and that is what they ought to do, in my opinion. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: Does the Opposition support such a proposition as that?

Mr. GUNN: Oppositions never support a Government. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman knows that. When he was on this side did he ever support anything that we brought forward?

Mr. STOPFORD: Yes, the adjournment of the debate, sometimes. (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: This is a question I thought of time after time when I was a younger man than I am at the present time. I

[*Mr. D. Ryan.*

advocated an elective Upper House, thinking that might get over the trouble, but after our experience of the second Chamber in the Federal Parliament, it would really be only duplicating this Chamber. I think the present mode of appointing members to the Upper House is the best. Let the Government of the day appoint members to the Upper Chamber. They appoint men of ripe experience, whether members of the Labour or the Liberal party, who are experts in the particular vocations to which they happen to belong, and these experts are in a better position to criticise Bills than, perhaps, members who are elected to the Assembly. The Upper Chamber is very useful, in my opinion, in correcting Bills. Time after time Bills go through this House with imperfections in them which the other Chamber corrects. Another thing, they are very useful in correcting hasty legislation such as we have at the present time. We are piling Act after Act on the statute-book, and there will be a congestion before long, and it is very necessary to have a revisory Chamber to go through Bills. To object to them making alterations is absurd. What is the good of a second Chamber if you do not give it a right of veto under certain conditions? Although the Labour party have in their red book the abolition of the Upper House, they can do away with it when the Liberals cannot, for the reason that they already have a second Chamber. Hon. members sitting behind the Government are really nominated by the Trades Hall people. We know that a Labour candidate is chosen by a plebiscite of the local organisation, but the candidate has still to get the approval of the executive of the Trades Hall, so that matters have to be referred to another Chamber—the Trades Hall. If you abolish our Legislative Council, there will still be two Houses belonging to the Labour party, only with this difference, that the Trades Hall is supported by one portion of the community only—those who happen to have trade union tickets. Hon. members opposite talk about a restricted franchise. That is restrictive franchise with a vengeance. We have two Chambers, and all the legislation going through the Assembly at the present time is initiated in the Trades Hall. We are only a recording Chamber, putting a rubber stamp on it. When the Liberals are in power they have no organisation such as the Trades Hall, and it is necessary to have a second Chamber. The Labour party are not always going to be in power. If they think they are going to be in power for any considerable time, why have all this undue haste? They want to get everything through while they hold the seats which they now possess. They are afraid that they will be turned out, and they are piling all this legislation on the statute-book. I notice that in this red book it says—

"It is for this reason that the Labour party not only demands the abolition of the irresponsible Legislative Council, but insists also on the initiative and referendum."

I would like to know where the referendum is. The two ought to come in together. If you are going to abolish the Upper House you ought to substitute something else. I heard one hon. member say that some of the members of the Upper Chamber, although nominated by the Government of the day, were turned down by the people of

Queensland, but that does not refer to everybody. There are two or three gentlemen in the Upper Chamber who are supporters of the Government, who were turned down by the people. I do not like to give names.

MR. MAY: Mention them.

MR. GUNN: There are Mr. Hinchcliffe and Mr. Nielson. It is, in my opinion, foolish to abolish the Upper Chamber. They have done good work in the past, and they will do good work in the future.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: They cannot get a quorum.

MR. GUNN: You can easily get over that trouble. All you have to do is to shorten the time for which they are appointed to the Upper House. I think it would be better if they were appointed for ten, or fifteen years. (Government laughter.) Then, any change that took place in the Lower House would be reflected in time in the Upper House. What would happen in a case like the present? The people have seen fit to change their political views, and have put the Labour Government into power, and they could fill the vacancies left by the late Government in the Legislative Council; and in two or three years, or whatever the time might be, they would have an Upper House that reflected their own views. I admit that you cannot have two Houses, one pulling one way and the other the other way, for any considerable length of time; but when you have a vehicle going down hill, you must have something like a brake—something that will prevent hasty legislation. The other day, when Mr. Ryan went before the electors, he told them that, if they returned him and his party to power, they would have cheap food, cheap beef, cheap butter, and cheap everything else, and that overshadowed everything else, and they turned out the late Government and put in the Labour party.

THE PREMIER: Where was that?

MR. GUNN: In your Barcardine speech. (Laughter.) Anyhow, I have pamphlet after pamphlet, signed by Mr. Fihelly and Mr. Theodore, talking about the high price of food and other commodities, and saying that, if they got into power, how low they would be! It is no wonder that they are able to run butcher's shops, when they steal their cattle to sell. We have often heard of the tyranny of the despot, but the tyranny of the despot has never been so great as the tyranny of the mob. What can be greater than the tyranny of the French Revolution? Hundreds of the people's heads were cut off without any reason at all. I can quite imagine the hon. member for Bowen working the handle of the guillotine in that revolution. (Laughter.)

MR. MAY: Your head would come off, quick and lively.

MR. GUNN: And I can imagine the time, later on, when some of his fellows would turn round and cut off his head, too. With regard to the hasty legislation that we are passing at the present time, I feel that we are making it so drastic, and we are offending the people to such an extent, that we will drive people out of Queensland and out of Australia. Then we will have a lot of men coming back from the front. They will be under military discipline, and they will have their favourite officers, their favourite generals, and if we are not very careful, we

will have a dictatorship, and all our Legislative Assemblies and Legislative Councils will go by the board, and we will have to begin all over again. The only true socialists that I know of are the aboriginals of Australia. (Loud laughter.) I notice that one of the objectives of the Labour party is the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution, and exchange, and I know very well that the aboriginal owns the country in common.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GUNN: I was going to connect my remarks in this way—that the aboriginal has two Chambers, just the same as any other nation. (Loud laughter.) Hon. members are laughing, but aboriginals have this plank of the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution, and exchange, and they have their lower house and their upper house. I have attended some of their ceremonies, and, although they would not let me be present when their laws were made, I remember, as a kiddie, seeing their two houses—bora rings they called them. There is a small ring and a large ring, and in the larger their laws are begun, and in the smaller they are finished. That is what we are going to come to here, if we do away with the Upper House and go in for nationalisation. I look round the world, and, wherever I see peoples with only one Chamber—although the aboriginals have two and try to nationalise everything—I find that they come to grief. I would like to say, in regard to the Meatworks Bill, that, if the Government wanted to pass that measure, all that they had to do was to put it to a referendum, and if the people wanted it to pass without those few words "upon just terms," it would pass in that way. The same could be done with the other Bills. It would only take a little longer, and in a few years the nominees of the Labour party would be in the Upper House, and that House would be of the same complexion as themselves. There is no necessity to abolish the Upper House to get what they want.

THE PREMIER: Necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

MR. GUNN: When that Bill was brought in there was no mention of the war. It was introduced after that, and that Bill could be passed by referendum.

THE PREMIER: Do you want each Bill that we put through to cost us £30,000?

MR. GUNN: I think that the Government will have a lot of Bills that they will refer to the people. They are going to refer this Bill. And, anyhow, you cannot work the initiative and referendum without spending money.

THE PREMIER: It would cost us £30,000.

MR. GUNN: You could put a lot of Bills through in one time.

MR. FOLEY: One will be enough.

MR. GUNN: If you abolish the Upper House, you have to get an expression of the will of the people, and if the people say that they are to go, then they will go with their tails over their backs—(laughter)—and good luck to them. Far better to go out in that way than to knuckle down to laws that they do not believe in. More power to the Upper House. This is a very important measure. I have not the language or the ability to express my views as I would

Mr. Gunn.]

like, but I feel that it is necessary to have a second Chamber. I do not know of any efficient Government that has been able to carry on without a second Chamber; and if this Chamber is abolished, I think that the people will soon ask for it to be reinstated. But I have grave doubts whether the people will agree to its abolition. If they do—hon. members say that the people are their masters—then they will go out with their tails over their backs. (Laughter.)

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill, recognising that it is a proposal of the utmost gravity, and that it is fraught with great importance to the destinies of the State of Queensland. I do not intend to deal with the constitutional reasons why the Legislative Council should be abolished, nor do I intend to refer to any past actions that makes the abolition of the Council necessary. I depend on what has occurred in this Chamber—on what has been initiated in this Chamber, and which, through the action of the Council, has been referred back, as the basis of my remarks, and I say that the Legislative Council, in rejecting certain measures, have afforded direct evidence why the Council should be abolished. The leader of the Opposition said, by way of interjection when the Premier was introducing the Bill, that the Premier would look back upon that time, and would regard his action on that occasion as a dark blot upon his political career. I think many hon. members opposite will look back upon this episode, and will hang their heads in shame to think that they supported the action of the people in another place spoiling two measures passed through this House, and I think the people of Queensland will thank the Premier of Queensland for the action he took in regard to those two measures and in demonstrating the power of this Chamber to express the will of the people—to put the people's will into force at all costs. It has been the action of the Legislative Council that has made it imperative to bring forward at this time—the most critical time in the history of the State and Empire—this present measure, and they themselves must shoulder the blame for it, and they must shoulder the responsibility for plunging Queensland, at any rate, some of the people, into a state of unrest in order to settle this great constitutional question. At the last election the people returned this party to power by a substantial majority.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: What for?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: They returned them to carry out the platform of the party. (Hear, hear!) They returned them to guide the destinies of this State of Queensland, and to take such action, in conjunction with the Commonwealth, as was necessary to bring about the most active and most vital assistance that the Commonwealth could give to the old country for the prosecution and successful termination of the war. They had all these facts in front of them; they knew that the country was going to be faced with great difficulties; that tremendous problems would have to be faced on account of the dislocation of industry, and they sent this party back to power in the full confidence that they would be able to guide the destinies of the State in such perilous times.

Mr. KIRWAN: They also sent back the Commonwealth Government.

[*Mr. Gunn.*

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: They did the same thing in the Commonwealth at the Commonwealth election, despite the large amount of money that was spent to fasten the stigma of disloyalty on this party. Despite the fact that the people expressed their will in no unmeasured terms on the 22nd of May last, we find that the measures that have passed through this Chamber with the object of assisting the State to bear her part in carrying forward the war, and to assist in bringing about a state of industrial contentment, a sort of happiness for the time being—to give the lightest conditions possible—yet the two measures that would have had that effect were thrown out. I notice that the leader of the Opposition said, by way of interjection on the Commonwealth Power Bill: "Show us where that measure was a war measure." And the hon. member for Murrumba said: "Show us something that will show that the powers asked for by the Commonwealth were necessary on account of the war." I want to draw their attention to the Act that was passed in Great Britain at the outbreak of this war. First of all, there was passed a Defence of the Realm Act. That Act made great inroads upon the personal liberty of the subject; it made inroads on the ideals and traditions that Britishers have always held dear, and many other things. It provided for trial by a military court-martial instead of by jury, and yet there was no complaint from the people of England. It went through without an amendment. Later on, an amending Bill was brought in and passed, and it provided, amongst other things, that, in addition to giving the military authorities power to requisition carriages and horses, and vessels, they also had power to requisition foods, forage, and stores of every description. Practically the whole of the resources of the country were placed at the disposal of the Government merely by the exercise of executive authority, and yet there was no demur from the people of the United Kingdom. It was under that Act that the whole of the railways of the United Kingdom, representing something over £400,000,000 worth of property, were taken over in a single night. Yet, with these vast powers in their hands, the Government of the United Kingdom found it necessary to go still further, and they brought in an amending Bill, and in moving the second reading of that Bill—the Defence of the Realm Act Amendment Bill, No. 2—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, said—

"The House will agree that it is vitally important to this war that we should increase the output and offer every facility for the output of munitions of war."

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: What has that to do with the question?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: This Bill was brought in practically to deal with everything. If the hon. member would listen, and try and wait till my argument comes to a logical conclusion, he would probably learn something. Mr. Lloyd George continues—

"The operations of the war depend on it, and I think the success of the war depends on it."

And Mr. Bonar Law, later, speaking on the Bill, said—

"The Attorney-General kindly handed me a copy of the proposal to-day, and I

therefore have had an opportunity of considering it. I want to say at once that the powers which are now demanded are probably the most drastic that have ever been put to any House of Commons. They enable the Government to go into any factory and tell them what they are to make and what they are not to make there. They can go into any factory and tell them that their machinery is not being employed to the best advantage, and that we are going to take it away and use it for another purpose."

Mr. STEVENS: Here our Government will not even accept voluntary offers of assistance.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: It is absolutely useless to accept voluntary offers under present conditions. Had the Government proposals as contained in the powers to the Commonwealth Bill been put through, or had the Meatworks Bill been allowed to go through, all offers of assistance would have been availed of; but, until both of those measures are passed, it is useless for private enterprise to come along, because it would only make confusion worse confounded.

At 10 p.m.,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Coyne) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Mr. Bonar Law, in the concluding part when that Bill was going through, said—

"He did not agree that this country was not quite ready for mobilising the industry on outbreak of war. If the Government had asked for these powers six months ago they would have had them as readily as now."

That Act gave the executive Government power to take over everything in the United Kingdom and without arranging any compensation. It was in the hands of the Treasurer afterwards to pay compensation, but the vital thing about it was that he was able to take over the industries quickly because private enterprise had broken down. That Act went through, sweeping and all as it was, without amendment, and it went through in practically two sittings of the House of Commons. Among other things that Act provided for the prohibition of lockouts and strikes in certain cases, and all the differences of wages and that sort of thing. Do hon. members opposite recognise any similarity between that proposal and the proposal contained in the Commonwealth Powers Bill? They are almost absolutely identical with this exception, that this Act was far more drastic in its application. Here is one clause which is intended to limit profits. Clause 4 of Part XI. of the Defence of the Realm Act says—

"If the Minister of Munitions considers it expedient for the purpose of the successful prosecution of the war that any establishment in which munitions work is carried on should be subject to the special provisions as to limitations of employers' profits and control of persons employed, and other matters contained in this section, he may make an order declaring that establishment to be a controlled establishment, and on

such order being made the following provisions shall apply thereto—

(1) Any excess of the net profits of the controlled establishment over the amount divisible under this Act, as ascertained in accordance with the provisions of this Act, shall be paid into the Exchequer."

It goes on to refer to the application of profits, and if there is a surplus it shall go to the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom. Do hon. members opposite recognise any similarity between that Act and the Commonwealth Powers Bill? With regard to the Meatworks Bill I do not think that hon. members opposite realise the importance of one or two clauses of that Bill or they would never have allowed it to be mutilated as it was on the first occasion when it was returned from the Legislative Council. Among other things, it provided for powers to get information from employers as to the manufacture of certain articles. It was empowered to bear against strikes and lockouts, and all that sort of thing. In fact it took over the whole industry. As Mr. Bonar Law said, it was the organisation of industry, not the dislocation of industry. If Queensland is going to take her part as she should do in the prosecution of this war, this Government and the people of this State have got to consent to all industries throughout the State and the Commonwealth being administered by the Government in the interests of the people themselves, their honour, their safety and the wellbeing of the Empire. I noticed on reading the amendments proposed in a certain measure from the other place that it showed clearly why they were put there. It showed in whose interests they were legislating—it showed it in an unmistakable way when they attempted to force upon this Chamber an alteration of a certain clause which dealt with the control of certain establishments, and they wished to replace the Land Appeal Court with one person nominated by the Governor in Council, one nominated by the United Pastoralists and Graziers' Association, and one by the owner of the meatworks. That would have been a fine combination to administer and adjudicate on what the value should be paid for certain establishments. It was all in the interest of vested interests, and not in the interests of the Empire. This Chamber is absolutely justified in going to the people and saying, "We are legislating in your interests. Are you going to have this Legislative Council or the Assembly? You have your choice." I have not the slightest doubt as to what their choice will be. The hon. member for Mirani asked some questions the other day about certain offers to make munitions which were not accepted by the Munitions Executive Committee. Does he not know that it would be impossible to carry out the manufacture of munitions at the present time by private enterprise? You would run immediately into all sorts of complications as regards price, number to be turned out, and as regards preference to more remunerative manufactures being carried on in private works who would not undertake munition contracts. We have had examples of what happened in South Australia when it was attempted to make certain articles there when men were patriotic enough to realise the situation and lay aside their private contracts and put

Mr. H. L. Hartley.]

their plant on to that work. When they did that the other unpatriotic grabbers collared the orders of the private and more remunerative work that these firms had been getting. It is impossible to carry on the manufacture of the articles so earnestly and urgently required under our present competitive system. If we are going to do what we should do then the competitive system has got to step aside and profits have got to go. That is what is the matter in the rejection of these two measures. It is recognised in other places that profits will have to go. In spite of the war we know that the profits of many companies are greater this year than last year.

Mr. STEVENS: Do you call men grabbers when they offered to make them at 5s. less than the Government price?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: That is absolutely incorrect. The hon. gentleman has not the slightest knowledge of the subject. No offer was made to make the shell required at that price. The Commonwealth Government allowed a price of £1 1s. 6d. per shell, and one private tender was offered, but it was impossible to accept it under present conditions. Even if a private firm offered to make them at 10s. it would be almost impossible to carry it out on account of the complications that would arise under the competitive system. So that Government control of all industries engaged on war material or supplies must come in Queensland if we are going to do what we should do in this great struggle, and it is absolutely useless for men who have always looked for their profits and their pound of flesh to attempt, with the assistance of the Council, to prevent it, because the people of Queensland are determined to see this war carried through to a successful conclusion, or else go under as the British Empire for ever. It is useless for hon. members to put in a plea for their miserable little profits. They put their profits before the lives of the men in the trenches, because at the present time they are asking us to supply them with meat. It is absolutely useless to try to draw wool over the eyes of the people of Queensland at the present time. This is a time for sacrifice in every particular, and not a time to stick out for the last penny, or to fight over a question as to whether meatworks shall be taken over by the Government on "just terms," or on the absolutely definite and fair terms proposed by the Government in the measure rejected by the other Chamber. It is absolutely useless to contend that the amendment made by the Council in that measure was made in the interest of justice and fair-play. The measure submitted by the Government was quite definite in its proposals, and the companies would not have suffered any injustice had those proposals been accepted. Hon. members seem to forget that the Bill giving the power to the Government to take over meatworks contained a clause which provided for the taking over and working of other enterprises. Do hon. members recognise that certain difficulties arose in the coal industry, and should not the Commonwealth have the right to deal with those difficulties? It is useless to say that this State or the State of New South Wales have power to deal with such difficulties. They certainly have the right to deal with matters of that kind within their own borders, but they cannot deal with industrial matters in other States, and it is much

[Mr. H. L. Hartley.

better that the Commonwealth should have control of all such industrial matters throughout Australia. Do hon. members opposite forget that there was a strike in a woollen mill which was engaged in making cloth for uniforms, and there is a woollen mill here that is not working twenty-four hours in the twenty-fours of the day, and that men are delayed in getting away because of the shortage of equipment? If the Commonwealth Government had the power to take over those mills, would they not be able to work them more effectively than they are worked? In the old country they are closing some establishments, and sending the skilled workmen employed in those establishments to other factories which are more up to date and better equipped, so that production may be increased. I do not think hon. members recognised the seriousness of the position when they rejected the Meatworks Bill. There are other powers asked for by the Commonwealth. Has it slipped the memory of hon. members opposite, has it never dawned upon the high intelligence of members of another place with their great administrative ability, that because the Commonwealth had not the power to control corporations the whole of the metal trade of Australia, the whole of the export of metals and minerals, was in the hands of Germans? There is every ground for believing that for many months after the war began, under contracts which there was no power to annul, copper and molybdenite and other metals produced here were supplied to our enemies the Germans to make shells with which to mow down our own men. What man would hesitate a moment to safeguard the men who are shedding their lifeblood in our interest in that way? The Council, whether willingly or unwillingly, whether knowingly or unknowingly, have stood in the road of progress and of our doing what is right at the present time in order to give the greatest assistance to the people who are prosecuting the war in our behalf. The leader of the Opposition said that it is not right at this time to bring forward contentious measures when the hearts of mothers and relatives of men who have gone to the front are bowed down in pain and sorrow. Will it be any solace to those hearts, will it be any recompense to them to tell them that the very Government that asked for their sons, their brothers, and their sweethearts, to go across the sea refused to take over the control of the meatworks in their interests when asked to do so by the Imperial Government? I say that when this measure is submitted to the people of Queensland, they will give an emphatic verdict in favour of this Government, and will say, "As the Council has stood in your way, we will trust you alone with power to guard the destinies of Queensland in this troublous time."

Mr. BOOKER (*Wide Bay*): I do not intend to delay the House more than a few minutes. The hon. member who has just sat down indulged in a good deal of heroics. If he had not taken up that line of argument, I should not have been on my feet now. I just want to tell that hon. member and the House that there is no necessity to use heroics. The Premier has emphasised the statement that the Bills which have been dealt with by the other Chamber are war Bills. We accept the statement that he intended that they should be war Bills.

and I say that every member on this side of the House is just as anxious to see the war brought to a successful conclusion as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat or any other member on the Government side of the House. But, after listening to the debate, one cannot help coming to the conclusion that the question of war has been made an excuse to cover the determination of the Government to put through the planks of the Labour platform. The Premier told us that he is going to put through the policy he enunciated at Barcaldine. We know that one of the planks of the old platform of the Labour party was the abolition of the Upper Chamber. That was conceived many years ago, before anyone thought of any war. It has been stated that the measures the Council dealt with were war measures. They are not war measures at all. The Meatworks Bill was not a war measure when it was submitted to this Chamber. Then, again, the Referendum Bill is not a war measure, for the State of Queensland has all the necessary machinery to deal with the questions to be submitted in the referendum. The Premier did not show in his speech last night that any one point, if accepted by the Council, would help the nation in bringing the war to a close one moment sooner than it would otherwise be. Not one question raised by the Premier had any bearing upon the war whatever. The Premier has all the machinery to acquire all the foodstuffs and manufactured goods that might be required by the Imperial authorities or the Australian authorities. There is nothing that cannot be acquired at a moment's notice by the Imperial authorities or our own Australian authorities, and, therefore, there was no necessity for the Premier to take the action which he has done. Then, we are told about the voice of the people. There was an election in May, and the Labour party was put into power. I would ask hon. members opposite how many votes were secured by the Government as against the votes secured by those opposed to the Government? The difference is not worth talking about, and the majority gained by the Government is not material. Have the minority of the people of Queensland to have no standing in the community, even so far as their daily life is concerned? Have they to have no consideration whatever? I say that the Upper House was appointed in the first place to guard the interests of the people. The intention was, in the first place, to have a representative body of men to serve the interests of the people—that is one whole of the people as against one section of them. That is why it is necessary to-day to retain the Upper Chamber as a revising House. The leader of the Opposition put the matter well when he quoted the case of Washington. No one can get away from the fact that in this Chamber, day after day, the legislation submitted is on the face of it class legislation of a degree previously unheard of. Members opposite say that when the Liberal party were on that side they passed class legislation. I have been here seven or eight years, and I do not recollect that on any occasion was any measure submitted by the Liberal Government that had on the face of it class legislation at all. (Government dissent.) I recollect disagreeing with the party I was associated with in regard to some part of a proposal, and going across to vote against

the Government. None of the measures submitted by the Liberal Government had any semblance of class legislation about them, but the legislation which has been submitted to the House for the last three months is of such a nature, that it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of the people, that hon. members opposite pose as the representatives of—the great mass of the industrial workers of Queensland—that something should be done to improve it. The legislation introduced within the last few months, if put into operation without review, will not be in the interests of the people whom hon. members opposite say that they represent. That is why it is necessary, in the interests of the people, that there should be a second Chamber of men with calm and balanced minds. Some of the speeches I have listened to from hon. members opposite, from the Premier down, furnish the best arguments for the necessity of retaining a revising Chamber to induce members on this side to cast their votes against the measure.

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): I have listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the arguments put forward by the Premier and other speakers on this side of the Chamber in favour of the abolition of the Legislative Council, and I do not think that any stronger arguments can be put forward. Of course, on their side they have a clear case. I have listened with some interest, and a little amusement, to the efforts made by hon. members opposite to bolster up a very weak case. I am quite satisfied that they are divided amongst themselves. Some are for a nominee Chamber, and others have expressed themselves strongly in favour of an elective Chamber. Some are in favour of a nominee Chamber for life, and others for a short period of ten or fifteen years. I have heard nothing from the other side to justify the existence of a second Chamber. The hon. member for Murrumba made a long defence of the Denham Government, but he showed nothing to justify the continuation of a second Chamber. Anyone who has studied the history of parliamentary government must regard it as a purely evolutionary movement. It does not matter what we had 1,000 or 2,000 years ago, or even 100 years ago; that does not justify its existence to-day. Circumstances and conditions have changed, and we know that a Government which existed 500 years ago would be regarded with scorn by hon. members opposite, and yet they have had the effrontery to tell us that, because a second Chamber has been in vogue in some countries for many years, or because in Rome they had two consuls, and all that sort of thing, we should have it to-day. The thing seems absurd to me. I contend that there has been no one century that has been satisfied with the conditions which have existed in the preceding century. As the people become more enlightened they will demand a change; and to-day there is more enlightenment and education than there has been at any time. There is no time when the people have been so well versed in economics as the people of Australia are to-day. It is unreasonable to think that, because two Houses and a restricted franchise suited the people fifty years ago, they will be satisfied with those conditions to-day. It would be as well if hon. members on the other side contended that, because we had slaves in the British Empire 100 years ago,

Mr. Carter.]

we should tolerate that state of things to-day.

Anyone who stops to think will [10.30 p.m.] regard that as unthinkable, and if we are not satisfied with conditions of that kind that existed then, why should we be satisfied with the system of Parliaments that existed then? It is common sense to suppose that if a change is sound in one direction it is sound in another. All through, those who have been entrenched in power have always objected to reform. To-day, of course, it is only natural to suppose that the Upper House will oppose this measure, and those who are Tories at heart and in sympathy with the Upper Chamber will oppose its abolition, because they will see in the passing away of the Upper House the destruction of the last fortresses that is buttressing the Tory parties. We have only to study the growth of feeling in England to see something of the same thing. A matter of a few years ago, the House of Lords had the power of veto. The people becoming more enlightened, and seeing the unwisdom of giving such a power to a Chamber that was not elected by the people—a nominee Chamber, practically—an Act was passed to do away with the power of veto of the House of Lords. If the people in England—the great centre of the British Empire—think it necessary to amend the laws in that direction, and make the House of Commons all-powerful—that is to say, that, after a Bill has been thrice rejected by the House of Lords, it may be taken to the King for his assent—if they believe that there a second House is an excrescence, may we not think the same? Then again, look at the Federal Constitution. The convention which drew up the Federal Constitution was not a Labour convention. It was a convention chosen from amongst the anti-Labour bodies of Australia, and everyone on that convention was well versed in the politics of Australia. Nearly all of them were members of the State Parliaments, and, in spite of the fact that they knew all about the politics of the States, they were so dissatisfied with the nominee Chambers and Chambers elected on narrower franchises than the lower Houses, that they thought it necessary that both Houses should be elected on the very broadest franchise.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, but they proposed to make the Senate purely a State House.

Mr. CARTER: We know that they proposed to make it so that it would safeguard State rights, and so as to strengthen the weaker States as against the stronger States, but I am not dealing with that aspect of it. I want to point out that the persons who drew up that Constitution were so dissatisfied with the conditions under which second Chambers existed in the States that they were determined that a change should be made, and to that end an equal number was chosen from each State, elected on the broadest franchise, and in the broadest possible way—that is, each State being one electorate. Why on earth they had a second Chamber at all is a mystery to me. One would think that it would appeal to common sense that two Chambers elected on the same franchise would have the same opinions. Then, to show how the two Chambers are regarded by the Imperial authorities, we need only go back to the time when the Governor-General considered it necessary to dissolve both Houses of the Federal Parliament. The Senate had an overwhelming majority,

[Mr. Carter.

but in the House of Representatives the Government were hanging on by the casting vote of the Speaker, and as the Senate would not pass the legislation of the Government, it was held to be necessary to send both Houses to the country. Must it not be clear to every individual that the second Chamber under those conditions was regarded as a useless excrescence, and that a second Chamber that does not work in accord with the popular Chamber should be treated like a naughty child and sent to the country? That is a strong argument against a second Chamber. It must be evident to every hon. member that if the second Chamber obstructs the first, even in a case like that, it is an unnecessary obstacle, and how much more should it be the duty of any Government to send this second Chamber here to the country on a referendum, when it is a nominee Chamber, and is not elected by the people? Then, we have the remarks of the late Premier when the hon. member for Murilla brought in a motion to make the second Chamber elective. He said on that occasion that he would rather see it abolished than make it elective. He also inferred that if the second Chamber were not in accord with the Lower House, then it would have no place. He inferred that he only believed in it because it was in accord with the Lower Chamber. Those who are in favour of making the Upper House elective have some argument on their side: they think that if it is right to have a second Chamber, that Chamber should be elective and should come with a mandate from the people. But when we have the late Premier saying that he would rather believe in its abolition, I can only think that what was in his mind was that if the Legislative Council were returned with a mandate from the people it would come as a Labour party to that Chamber. We have an example in the Federal Parliament. The double dissolution was granted because the Senate was not in accord with the other House, and nothing could be done, and now we have the same party in power in both Houses, both strongly represented. It seems to me that if the second Chamber is not in accord with the first, it is a pestilence, and should be abolished, and if it is in accord with the first Chamber, it is an excrescence and also should be abolished—undoubtedly, as our friend, the hon. member for Drayton, would say. (Laughter.) Anyone who looks at the two Federal Houses cannot help but ask himself whether it is necessary to have two Chambers. It is only an unnecessary expense. What I would suggest is to substitute for a second Chamber a plank in our platform—the initiative and referendum. On every occasion the people should be masters of the situation. They should not only have the power of dealing with the members of the representative House, but they should have the power of reviewing what is done in Parliament and the right of veto, because it is they who have to submit to the laws. Why should they have to submit to legislation passed by a body of men some of whom are eighty years of age and have been there forty or fifty years and are completely out of touch with the political questions of the day. I do not suppose some of them read the newspapers. Yet those are the people who constitute our reviewing Chamber. Legislators should be people with fresh, bright minds, who keep themselves au fait with the politics and the subjects

of the day. Many of the members of the other Chamber are so feeble that it is difficult for them to help to make a quorum at times; and yet that is the reviewing Chamber that hon. members on the other side are fighting to maintain. The thing is an impossibility.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Shocking! (Laughter.)

Mr. CARTER: It is shocking to think that they should try to maintain a system of that kind. Of course, authorities can be got to support any view, but such authorities are, after all, but the opinions of individuals. You can find authorities to support the contention that a second Chamber is a good thing, and you can get other authorities to prove that it is not a good thing. But such opinions do not sway me in the slightest. I have my own powers of observation. I can see the effect of two Chambers. I know what the growth of public opinion is. In an enlightened community like this, where the people are so much better educated than in any other part of the world, and where they have better conditions to live under, it is natural that the people should want a better system of government, and for that reason they are asking us to abolish a useless second Chamber.

Mr. KIRWAN: And, when it is not useless, it is dangerous.

Mr. CARTER: I am very pleased to think that this measure has been brought forward. I assisted on different conventions to put on our platform the plank for the abolition of the second Chamber, and I anticipated that that plank would have been given effect to long ago; but it has not, and I am very glad that I am one of a party to assist in putting it into effect to-day.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I cannot understand the Premier introducing a Bill like this at a time when he claims that he desires to relieve the country from unnecessary strife by making arrangements with the Federal authorities to do away with the necessity for taking the referenda. Yet the hon. gentleman is now proposing a measure which involves the taking of a referendum which will cost, according to himself, £30,000.

Mr. KIRWAN: Why don't you get your friends in the other place to agree to the Bill?

Mr. CORSER: The members of the other Chamber are not part of our party.

Mr. KIRWAN: Everyone of them, except two, are supporters of your party.

Mr. CORSER: They have no parties in the other Chamber. (Government laughter.) They do not sit with us in our meetings as a party, and it is not for us to instruct them as to what they should do. I hold that, if the Government had thrown aside party politics since the election, they would have found the other Chamber would have assisted them to the same extent as hon. members in this Chamber.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Your Government did not bring in party measures last session when the war was on, did they?

Mr. CORSER: They did not bring in party measures such as the present Government are endeavouring to place on the statute-book. If I were sitting behind the present Government and found the other Chamber objecting to their measures, I would not object and say: "Let us go to every limit of our powers to wipe the obstruction away and enable us to get our

platform on the statute-book." In the interest of the Empire I would contend, this is no time to bring forward the legislation that the Government have been placing before us?

Mr. COLLINS: Is this the time to have an election in Wide Bay?

Mr. CORSER: It is not a time to have a referendum over the abolition of the Upper House—to do away with a part of our Constitution that has enabled Queensland to put such good measures on the statute-book. New South Wales and Queensland are the two most democratic States in the Commonwealth; both have Labour Governments. Both have a liberal franchise, and both have nominee Upper Houses. Can it be said that those Chambers have interfered with or blocked the passage of the democratic measures in the past which have brought about such a democratic state of affairs as we find in those two States to-day? And yet we find the Government, at a time when they should be doing everything possible to assist the country, proposing a measure which will have the effect of dividing every element in the country against itself, and bringing about war in Queensland which will be more bitterly felt than the war on the other side of the world by the people of the State. This is a time when we should endeavour to the best of our ability to bring about peace within the community for the one purpose of assisting our friends who are fighting on the other side.

Mr. COLLINS: Withdraw your candidate for Wide Bay.

Mr. CORSER: Our candidate for Wide Bay might well be withdrawn if the Commonwealth Labour party would also withdraw their candidate, and come to some arrangement. One side is causing the election, and the other side have just as much right to have their candidate. The seat was held by the late Prime Minister because the Liberals and farmers of Wide Bay withdrew their candidate before the last election.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is untrue.

Mr. KIRWAN: You did not withdraw your candidate. He ran.

Mr. CORSER: To avoid a contest and prevent strife, we withdrew our candidate—we could not withdraw his nomination—and that is the reason why Mr. Fisher was returned without a contest. We caused no strife at the last election. But since then Mr. Fisher has attempted to force his referenda proposals on the people, and he has expended a good deal of money in initiating those proposals, and now he is putting the country to the expense of an election by taking the position of High Commissioner, and it is he who is forcing on an election on the electorate that returned him without a contest at the last election.

Mr. KIRWAN: You are great patriots—£ s. d.

Mr. CORSER: Yes, £5,000 a year to Mr. Fisher. Is it for us to say that we should again hand over this seat to the Labour party? Is it not a time when we might say that it is for the Labour party to do as we have done on a previous occasion? By abolishing the Upper Chamber, as is proposed at the present time, it is making it possible for the Labour Government to put in its proper place the Trades Hall of Queensland. The Government claimed that the Upper Chamber should be abolished, and

Mr. Corser.

they are bringing about the possibility of giving to the Trades Hall that place which they hope and trust it will receive. We know perfectly well that the first plank in the Labour platform is the removal of another place.

Mr. KIRWAN: What are you objecting to, then?

Mr. CORSER: We object to it because hon. members claim that they are abolishing the other place for a war purpose. They are abolishing it simply because it is a plank of their platform, and yet they are saying the other place should be abolished because it is interfering with certain legislation or obstructing certain legislation necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have only brought about their own destruction.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentlemen are bringing about their own destruction by proceeding in this matter. The Premier distinctly stated that the Legislative Council was deliberately obstructing the passage of a measure that the Government considered necessary for the prosecution of the war. That is what he claimed as the reason for introducing this measure, and yet we know perfectly well that the reason for introducing the measure is that it is a plank of the platform, and they intend to place their planks on the statute-book of Queensland. The first matter dealt with, on which the Premier hopes to defeat the Council, is the Meatworks Bill. The Premier right throughout his speech did not refer very much to the other measure objected to by the Council. What is the secret of the Meatworks Bill? The Meatworks Bill was introduced simply because a deputation from the Trades Hall waited on the Premier at the Trades Hall—the secretaries of the various associations and those people who have been put out of work by the meatworks—waited on the Premier and demanded that he should do something to secure work for them. They claimed that the works should be put into operation and that there were plenty of cattle in Queensland to kill, and, as a Labour Premier, they would compel him to take such action, and he promised them the Meatworks Bill. He promised to kill cattle which the Premier finds do not exist. The cattle are not in Queensland, and, therefore, they cannot operate the meatworks as promised to that deputation. Yet we find that this Bill is used not only to try and obliterate the Council, but is also used as a war measure. I contend, without a great knowledge of the Constitution, that we should not first of all attempt to tamper with the Constitution Act of 1867. That is the crux of the situation. I claim that we can tamper with what the people put there in 1867. But what was placed there in 1855? By an Order in Council in 1855 we were able to build our Constitution, and instead of being a Bill, should it not be a petition that the Premier was presenting at the present time? A petition to alter that Order in Council? The Premier deliberated for a long time saying that the Meatworks Bill was a war measure, and that it was impossible for the Government to bring about successful assistance to the Imperial authorities without that Bill. What did the Council do? When the Council first amended that Bill they amended it on the lines of the

Munitions Act of Great Britain. They inserted clauses in the Bill to give to the Queensland Government the very same powers as those handed to the Imperial authorities in the Munitions Act.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: That is not a fact.

Mr. CORSER: That is an absolute fact; and surely powers that are sufficient to operate the great munitions factories of Great Britain would be sufficient for the Government of Queensland to operate the meatworks! What do we find? When the Assembly objected to the amendments of the Council—when they sent the Bill back to the Council without accepting the amendments, what did the Council do? They did not insist that the Government should only take those powers that are held by Great Britain, but allowed the Bill to go through as the Government wanted it, with one exception; they asked that compensation should be paid on just terms.

Mr. KIRWAN: Did the Munitions Act say that?

Mr. CORSER: No. If the hon. member had followed my argument he would not have made that interjection. I stated that when we refused to accept those amendments and sent the Bill back to the Council they only asked for one amendment, and that was that compensation be paid on just terms. Yet we find the Premier coming along with a measure to abolish the Upper House, and claiming that he is doing it because the Council rejected a proposition to make it possible to supply meat to the Imperial authorities. Is that the case? Can hon. members say that the Council's amendment would prevent the Government doing something that would assist the Imperial authorities?

Mr. McMINN: It would open up a big field for litigation.

Mr. CORSER: It contained no obstruction, and further, if they object to the term "on just terms," we might remind them that the words "on just terms" were taken from the Bills passed by their own Labour Government in the Commonwealth. The referenda proposals contained the words "on just terms" and the Legislative Council of Queensland proposed to insert the very same words in the Meatworks Bill. The Meatworks Bill was not for war purposes; it was simply introduced for the sake of carrying out their platform; carrying out what they said they would be securing to themselves—monetary assistance by commandeering that which belongs to others.

At 11 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. CORSER: All that was asked for here was that compensation on those lines should be paid. Yet we find the Premier coming down and saying that the Council obstructed measures which were necessary for the effective prosecution of the war. Where did the Meatworks Bill interfere with the effective prosecution of the war? The Premier cannot object to the Council's amendments in the Meatworks Bill as it came back to us the second time. If it goes to the country, then the true facts of the case must be made known to the people. They will not be made known by hon. members opposite. The present Queen-street Ministry will not make them known to the people. It will

[Mr. Corser.]

not be made known by the people who seized the wealth of the people outside and commandeered their foodstuffs in order to enrich their own friends of Brisbane. This Government is not going to make known the true facts to the people. The people will know that they have been once bitten. They were taken in once by the battle-cry of cheap food and shorter hours. Hon. members opposite will not be able to stack their cards again. They will not be able to rig their case to suit themselves. It has been claimed by the Government that the people authorised them to carry out certain propositions. When the people returned them they knew perfectly well that there was a revising Chamber, which would revise all the matters which these hon. members brought forward. They knew that there was a safety valve which would check the experimental enactments passed by the constitutional representatives of the people in another place. I have never said that I believe in a nominee Upper House. It should be elected on a reasonable franchise. (Government laughter.) I do not say that we should not uphold the Council for some things that they have done for the benefit of the people of Queensland. No member of the Government can say that they secured their present positions at the hands of Labour supporters in Queensland. They know too well, and we know also to our sorrow, that many Liberals voted against the past Government, and with good reason. They had good reason for voting against the late Government, and they also remembered that there was a revising Chamber, which would revise all legislation until the new Liberal Government would have its say. We know that the bicameral system exists in Canada in two out of the nine States. But they are not sovereign States. They have not got the power which Queensland has got to-day. They have the powers which Queensland will have if the referendum proposals which are proposed to be ceded to the Commonwealth by the Labour Government be carried. If we agree to these powers being handed over, we will have a miserable State Parliament, having no more power than those small Parliaments in Canada at the present time. We have got a constitutional Government at the present time and a revising Chamber that has enabled us to build up a democratic British Empire. We have a Parliament of two Chambers, which we have always been proud of in the past. It was given to us by the motherland of which we are so proud, when we became colonies under the British flag. Hon. members opposite have said that there is not much that they can commend the Council for. They say that the Council is there to obstruct business which is for the betterment of the people of this State, and that they have done it on this occasion. It is my intention to support the Council right through for their action.

Hon. J. A. FHELLY: They cannot form a quorum.

Mr. CORSER: They can form a quorum whenever they want to object to something. (Loud Government laughter.) That is the only time that counts. We are told that the legislation which hon. members propose is only for the period of the war. It is going to extend far beyond the period of the war. Take the Meatworks Bill, for instance. It

was introduced as a general measure and afterwards amended and made a war measure. By means of the regulations they practically hold what they seize. The Bill goes out of operation six months after the war, but the regulations do not go out of operation. They will continue like the brook. They will continue there until the Liberal party get into power and obliterate them. We know that many other details can be exposed to the same extent that the Premier says he exposed the Meatworks Bill. We find the same thing in the Workers' Compensation Bill, the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Workers' Award Bill, Industrial Arbitration Bill, Workers' Accommodation Bill, and other burgling Bills which will seize the freehold of the people and compel them to pay land taxes. These are the people we want to protect, and our objection to the Trade Union Bill is that it will force the people who are too poor to pay a poll tax to contribute blood money to the unions in order to keep the present party in power.

Mr. KIRWAN: At the last general election you got dished badly.

Mr. CORSER: Things have altered since then. Would it not be better that the £30,000, which the reference of this question to the people will cost, should be devoted to the production of shells than to spend it on a referendum?

Mr. KIRWAN: The members of the Council are responsible for that.

Mr. CORSER: They are not responsible. The members of the front Treasury bench are responsible by bringing in class legislation and forcing it through ever since they secured office at last election by false pretences.

Mr. MCPHAIL (*Windsor*): I have listened to the speeches of members opposite, who belong to a party which in the past has had many privileges, and am not surprised at the line of argument they have followed. They realise that there is now on the Treasury benches a party which, for a number of years, has had a definite platform that they intended to put into practice when power was conferred upon them by the people. And now that we are setting about the business in a way which portends trouble to them, they are trying to bolster up a House which in the past has always been against progressive legislation. The opposition shown to this measure is evidence that, even to-day, there are men who cling to old traditions, and to whom the breaking down of old customs is sacrilege. It seems to be their idea that the Constitution of the past should be continued, no matter how enlightened we become as the days go by, and that an institution which has manifested its conservatism during the last decade should never be broken down. But education is giving men a better understanding of their own position than they formerly possessed. Especially is this the case with working men. I believe that working men are giving more serious consideration to these matters now than they have ever done in the past, and that they are realising that they have in their own hands the means whereby they can receive more of what they have produced than they have received in the past. And because the working man is realising this, the Opposition are taking alarm, and making every effort possible to prevent the abolition of a

Mr. McPhail.]

Chamber which has always been against progress. What are the reasons for the introduction of this measure? They are these: This party has realised the utter uselessness of the Legislative Council, and its retrogressive nature. We have made in our platform provision for the abolition of that Chamber, because we feel that it is not necessary. The hon. member for Port Curtis put the case concisely when he stated that the Council is not wanted for two reasons—if it is a block to legislation it should go, and if it is not a block to legislation, but simply a reflex of this Chamber, it is not necessary. I maintain that a Chamber which represents the people is quite sufficient, without a revising Chamber. The desire for the abolition of the Council is emphasised by the action of that Chamber during the present session of Parliament. Every democratic measure that has been brought forward has met with strenuous opposition there. There are men in that Chamber to whom the mention of democratic legislation, such as we have had before us, is like putting a red rag to a bull. There are men in that Chamber who have never in their lives done anything to better the condition of the working classes. And because of these things, we feel that we are on solid ground in supporting this measure for the abolition of the second Chamber. Much has been said about the bicameral system, and it has been urged that it has justified itself by its revision of legislation. What revision do we get of Bills which go from this House to the Council? The composition of that House is such that its members cannot view anything except from a biased standpoint. We find that it consists of gentlemen who have been appointed by past Liberal Governments. There are practically only four men there at the present time who are doing anything to assist the Government to pass their measures. No less than seven members of the Council are gentlemen who have been rejected by constituencies—some of them two or three times—and they are most bitter in their opposition to legislation proposed by the representatives of the people. Two of those gentlemen are political Labour renegades, who have changed their opinions in a way that has made them more acceptable to the Liberal party. Then we have no less than five gentlemen who have been appointed to seats in that House because they are connected with newspapers which in the past have rendered material assistance to the Liberal cause. I also find that one gentleman was the sponsor for bringing the late Premier, Mr. Denham, into political life, and that was his reward. I find that another member of the Chamber was a member of the last Liberal Executive. Then, another gentleman in the Chamber is a solicitor for some companies with a very monopolistic tendency. Then, again, we have a member of that Chamber from Charters Towers, who is a well-known mining magnate; another who is a sugar magnate; and another who is a “pure merino” from the Darling Downs. Then we find that another is the father-in-law of one of the Liberal Ministers in the last Parliament. I am quoting this to show that these gentlemen are not in a position to criticise the legislation that goes up to them from any but a biased standpoint; and that is another reason why we should see that the Council is abolished. The very fact of the men being appointed for life by one particular side of the House who may be in power at that time is one reason why the whole system should be condemned. It is a

[*Mr. McPhail.*

House of Liberal principle, and, therefore, it is not in a position to give what has been called a fair, unbiassed, and reasonable criticism of the measures that go up to it. The hon. member for Wide Bay had the audacity to say—

“I say emphatically and distinctly that the members of that Chamber do truly represent the aspirations of the people and the desires of the people and the interests of the State in the truest sense, because they understand its interests and they understand the people.”

And he went further than that, and said—

“In this Chamber, every night and every afternoon every hon. member says that he gives a vote according to his own knowledge and his conscience. I give the reply, and I say emphatically ‘No.’”

If the members of this Chamber have not come here with the wish of the people, then no one in either Chamber has a right to speak at all on behalf of the people. Members can sit there for life and have no responsibility to the people, and can snap their fingers at anything that is said or done, yet hon. members opposite will uphold the Council and say it is a Chamber which has more right to exist than the Chamber the members of which are directly responsible to the people. Anyone who speaks like that is most biased, and simply desires the Chamber to exist because it stands for those interests which he is afraid will be interfered with if democratic legislation is introduced. Even the English Liberals have had at times to protest against the attitude adopted by the English House of Lords. I would just like to quote one or two expressions of opinion by English statesmen with reference to this matter. When the Commons have at times come into conflict with the House of Lords, members have had occasion to protest against the attitude of a Chamber which was not directly responsible to the people. Mr. Asquith, in 1909, made use of these words—

“We are told that there is a possibility that the House of Lords, whether by mutilation or by rejection, may set aside the provision which the House of Commons has made for the financial necessities of the State. Talk of revolutions, this would be indeed the most formidable and the most fundamental since the days of the Long Parliament. I assert with confidence that there is no rule more deeply ingrained in our Constitution, more solemnly hallowed by precedent, more plainly sanctioned alike by the traditions of the past and by the requirements of to-day, than that in matters of finance the Commons, the representatives of the people, have an absolute, an unquestionable, and a decisive voice.”

Then William Pitt, while he was still in the House of Commons, in 1767, spoke thus—

“The taxes are a voluntary grant and gift of the Commons alone. The concurrence of the peers and the Crown to the tax is only necessary to clothe it with a form of law. The gift and grant is of the Commons alone.”

And finally, Mr. Balfour, speaking in 1907, said—

“We all know that the power of the House of Lords is still further limited by the fact that it cannot touch these money Bills, which if it could deal with, no doubt it could bring the whole executive machinery of the country to a standstill.”

The opinions of statesmen such as these show clearly that even gentlemen who are pronounced conservatives have a fear of the wielding of the great powers which have been granted to an irresponsible Chamber. From our experience of the attitude of certain members with reference to legislation which this Government have been entrusted by the people to carry out, we have reason to fear that these men who are irresponsible will exploit the people, and we believe it is necessary for the Chamber to be abolished. The leader of the Opposition discredited all the States with single Chambers, and referred to the States of Canada as glorified shire councils, with only insignificant power, but the powers of those States are more considerable than the hon. gentleman would have us believe. We find that the States of Canada have power to legislate on property and civil rights, the borrowing of money for provincial purposes, direct taxation, public institutions, licenses, the incorporation of provincial companies, and the solemnisation of marriage. So that they have very wide powers, and are not small institutions with practically no power. We are faced to-day with a fight between vested interests and the rights of the people. The vested interests are represented in the other Chamber, and the rights of the people are represented here, and I believe that when this question is submitted to the people in a few months' time they will endorse our attitude, and say that the Council, having failed in its duty, shall be wiped out, as it is an inefficient body. I believe that the people realise that we have stood for the abolition of that Chamber for many years. All the revising of measures that needs to be done can be done in this House. I believe that the seventy-two members of this Chamber are as competent, if not more so, to give fair and reasonable consideration to every measure brought in as are members in the other Chamber. I base my remarks on what has happened in the past when this Chamber has come into conflict with the Upper House, and that was the cause of the Kidston Government bringing in a measure to provide for a referenda. Every measure that has gone to the Upper House with any democratic proposal in it, which would bring relief to or widen the opportunities of the working class, has had those proposals removed, and that will continue to be so while we have an Upper Chamber constituted as it is at present. Why is it that we find such inattention to duty on the part of members of the Opposition that, since the time the House has been called together, we have never yet seen in the divisions a full list of hon. members opposite? Why is it we find [11.30 p.m.] that the average number of members on the Opposition side in a division works out at something about fifteen? Simply because they are satisfied that the Upper House will do the work that their numbers will not permit them to do, and therefore they are relying on the other Chamber to throw out measures which they

know that the people have not allowed them the power to throw out. And therefore it is necessary for good government, for the advancement of democracy, that the platform which the Labour party has stood for, has worked for, and has spoken for for so many years should be carried into effect, and that that Chamber should go. Go it will, I believe. We have been told very bravely to-night that the only desire of hon. members is that we should go to the country. I am quite certain that the people, who will be the final arbiters, will give their verdict with no uncertain sound, and endorse the attitude that we, as a party, have taken up in this matter. We have been told that the whole thing hinges on the question of war measures. The Labour party have been told that this is not the time for the referenda to be taken—that the war clouds were obscuring every other issue, and that nothing should be done to cause strife among the people at this particular juncture. But when we find that an agreement has been come to whereby certain powers will be handed over to the Federal Parliament temporarily—only for the duration of the war and for twelve months afterwards—an agreement which will prevent the referenda being taken, they turn round, and the cry of ceasing strife has no weight, because they immediately say: “Go to the people with your referenda.” What are we to think? Are these men sincere, or are they simply political hypocrites? Gentlemen should stand by their colours—by their opinion—and the best thing for them to do, if they are prepared to stand by their opinion, is to be silent now. We are sincere in this matter. We desire to get on with the legislation that we have been put here to carry out, and we are prepared to do it, and we are prepared to stand by the result. We do not fear what the result will be, and I sincerely trust that, before the end of next year, not only will the war have ceased, but the Upper Chamber will have ceased in Queensland also.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCPHAIL: In conclusion, let me say that, when the Federal Senate was established, it agreed that it was intended to be a House to represent the States, but when the Labour party captured it, when the Liberals found that the people were electing men to it to practically overwhelm them, they found that it was a useless Chamber, and wanted it abolished. So far as the Federal Senate is concerned, it is useless, and should be abolished according to Liberal views; but, so far as the Queensland Legislative Council is concerned, a nominee body—a Chamber to which the members have been appointed because of past services rendered to past Liberal Governments and because of their political views, it is a useful Chamber, and should not be abolished. Surely, if any Chamber should be abolished, it is the one that is not responsible to the people? The people can turn out the members of the Senate; its members are responsible to the people, but the Legislative Council is not. I sincerely trust that the good sense of the House will carry this motion, and if the other House rejects the Bill, that eventually the people will carry it, and that the incubus of this nominee Chamber, which, at present, rests like a heavy pall on the political institutions of the State, will be cast aside, and the will of the people, freely expressed in a large majority on this side of the House, will carry out the wishes of

Mr. McPhail.]

the people, put planks of the Labour platform on the statute-book, give relief to those who are seeking relief, and eventually prove that the people themselves are the right people to judge. As has been pointed out by other speakers, we propose as another plank of our platform the initiative and referendum. By that means we get into direct touch with the people, and ascertain their will at once.

Mr. STEVENS: It has been a failure in the United States, where it has been tried.

Mr. McPHAIL: I am glad that the hon. member has introduced the question of the Constitution in America. America to-day is an evidence of a state of things we object to. We find that in America the trusts and other institutions of wealth are growing stronger and stronger, simply because they have allowed their Constitution practically to be annulled. They have allowed the whole position to be twisted and turned, and the result is that the money interests can snap their fingers at the rest of the community. We do not want to see that happen in Queensland, and I am quite convinced that the good sense of the people will prevail and eventually, before very long, the last stronghold of vested interests in this State will disappear, and the people will come into their own—those rights which have been withheld from them for very many years.

Mr. BARNES (*Warwick*): I think it is distinctly regrettable that perhaps the most important motion that has ever come before this House should be rushed through in one sitting. Many hon. members would have liked to give their best to this matter, but the weight of the evening is pressing on them, as is evident, and it is manifestly unfair that a momentous matter of this sort should be forced through in such a way. Simply because I do not desire that a matter of such consequence should go without some expression of opinion, I rise to my feet. We have listened this evening, as for some days past, to many arguments which are simply repeats of things we have heard from time to time. We have been told that certain things have led to this action being taken, but other hon. members have been good enough to acknowledge that the abolition of the Upper Chamber has been in the minds of hon. members opposite for twenty years. Under those circumstances it is downright hypocritical for them to come along at this juncture and tell us, as we have been told by the Chief Secretary, that other considerations have led to this action. We know that the matters which he mentioned are no more war matters than any other thing that might have been named. It is all very well to trade upon a question of that character just now, but it is distinctly wrong—in fact, one might use stronger terms than that—to say that the war is the real reason why the dissolving of the Council is before us at the present time. I recognise the splendid work that has been done by the Council.

Mr. PETERSON: They have carried out your wishes.

Mr. BARNES: If they had carried out the hon. member's wishes he would now be championing their cause. It is not that they had carried out my particular wishes. So far as I am able to perceive from my observation and from my contact with the people, they have correctly interpreted the wishes of the people who form the bone and sinew of the country. They have studied

[*Mr. McPhail.*

the interests of those people throughout this session. At one time there was a feeling in the country that the other Chamber should be made elective, but the present feeling is that the other Chamber is an absolute necessity. What has given rise to that revulsion of feeling? I know, from rubbing shoulders with the people in the country, that they are now distinctly in favour of the preservation of the other House, and they are thankful to the members of that House for the stand they have made in connection with various matters. Two reasons have been given by the Premier why this Bill should be passed. First, because of the Council's amendment of the Meatworks Bill. That is a reason of the very flimsiest description. Now that it has been explained that that Bill is a war measure, it has been practically accepted by the other Chamber except in one small particular. And what man with any sense of responsibility can object to the amendment made in the Bill? It is unfair to do so. So far as the Commonwealth Powers (War) Bill is concerned, the feeling of the people in the country is distinctly in sympathy with the action of the other Chamber in rejecting that measure. The people of the country are not in favour of handing over all our rights and interests and simply reducing the Parliament of this State to the status of a local governing body. It is easy enough for hon. members opposite to give everything away—the other Chamber and everything else that we possess—but this side of the House takes a different view. We are in favour of preserving every right that we can retain.

The PREMIER: Those powers are necessary for war purposes.

Mr. BARNES: Reverting for a moment to the Meatworks Bill, might I ask whether we could by any possibility have sent away more meat than we did send?

Mr. BAYLEY: No.

Mr. BARNES: Did we even send away all the meat we possessed? Were we able to find freights for that? The thing is perfectly ridiculous. We were not able to find freights for all the meat that was offering in January last.

Mr. BOOKER: From January to May.

Mr. BARNES: I had cattle for sale myself, and just at the moment they were ready for inspection the buyers were called off because freights could not be secured. Many a man lost heaps of money in consequence. I myself was a loser. Cattle have died since. There is nothing in that argument. The Premier states that for war purposes certain powers were required.

The PREMIER: Yes; these powers to the Commonwealth are necessary.

Mr. BARNES: Is there anything in this world that the Premier would like to do in order to help the motherland in carrying on this awful war? The other day the hon. gentleman formed one of a number of Ministers who decided to commandeer the wheat stocks of Australia. They had power to do that, and what further power is needed now to enable them to do all they want in other directions? Nothing is apparent to the lay mind.

The PREMIER: It took a long time to do that. That conference had to be summoned, and it took some weeks.

Mr. BARNES: At any rate, it was done; and, whilst I am not going to refer to it,

what a bungle it is going to be, according to what we saw in to-day's "Courier"? However, let that go. The objections to the other House have been stated to be many. Why, the strength of the Government position to-day—if there is any strength at all in it—is because of a certain Referendum Bill that was passed through the other Chamber. The Government hope to succeed because of the passage of that measure. I do not think they will succeed, judging by the remarks of the Attorney-General of the time the Bill was passed; I do not think it has the slightest application to these proceedings. Still, the Government are building upon that Act to enable them to get this Bill through. It all comes to this—that the other Chamber has to go, although it has, on the whole, passed legislation that has been necessary for the good government of the country.

The PREMIER: Don't you admit that more powers are necessary for the Commonwealth to have?

Mr. BARNES: Not to the extent that it is proposed to hand over at the present time.

The PREMIER: But all the Opposition voted against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BARNES: It would be regrettable if we handed over all the powers that were asked for.

The PREMIER: You would not agree to hand over any.

Mr. BARNES: We might have made a mistake there; but I consider that, if it would be unwise to hand over permanently certain powers that we possess and that we prize, it is unwise to hand them over temporarily. I think that, on the whole, we would lose in standing, and it would be a distinct disadvantage to Queensland to abolish the other Chamber. And certainly no one could ask the other Chamber to help in their own destruction in the direction in which the question is being submitted to them at the present time.

Mr. DUNSTAN (*Gympie*): The political arrogance of the Tory minority is one of the most amazing things witnessed in this Chamber. We have the amazing spectacle of the party opposite—who have been thrown out of office, who have had their policy discarded by the people, and who only muster an average of about fourteen members in any division in this Chamber—seeking to regain part of the strength shorn off them by the people by relying on the autocrats of another Chamber. I do not propose to quote any authorities to justify the policy of this party in seeking to abolish the Upper House. The only authority that I pay any regard to is the authority of the people, and we had that in no uncertain way at the last general election. It is inconceivable that this party, which has a great majority of members and a mandate to carry on the Government of the country, should sit here powerless at the domination of men who represent the political opinions of forty years ago. I think hon. members opposite can hardly hope to raise to the level of a supreme political instrument, and make it the only real form of Government, a mere Order in Council of the Tory brand, so that this party, elected by the will of the people, with a definite commission to carry out a definite policy, should sit here practically impotent and powerless at the dictation of gentlemen in another place. It would be a

strange thing if the people of Queensland found that every mandate they gave and every commission they issued to any party was contingent on the gracious permission of men who are absolutely irresponsible to and unrepresentative of the electors of the State. I trust that this party, having the genius and capacity of government, having a definite mandate from a great majority of the electors of Queensland, and having won to the gates of administration, will not sit meekly by powerless and impotent and frustrated while the gentlemen in the Tory citadel entrench themselves across the pathway of reform. I trust that this party will go straight ahead and will hew a clear road of political progress, free and open to the realisation of the people's wishes and the establishment of the people's will. The Premier the other night said the time had come when the Upper House must go, and I also say that the time is rotten ripe for its departure from the political scheme of this State, so as to enable the electors of Queensland to translate their will into Acts of Parliament, and set their seal on the political progress of this State.

Mr. BAYLEY: This is a very important matter we are discussing, and, although the hour is late, I would like to say a few words in reference to same. We have all listened to what has been said by members on both sides of the House with a great deal of interest, but I cannot say that any very strong arguments have been adduced by members of the Government to show why the Legislative Council should be abolished. I do not think that the Premier even advanced any strong arguments in that direction. He certainly offered strong objection to the Council turning down the referenda proposals, and I think the Council acted well within their rights in so doing. It was stated by the Premier amongst other things that these proposals were brought forward as a war measure. As has been pointed out by different members on this side of the House the proposal was in the platform of the Labour party for years, and we know it is not a war measure at all. The Premier had no authority from this House to make the compact he did, in common with the other Premiers of the States, with the Commonwealth Prime Minister, and that being so, I do not think that this House or the Council could be expected to endorse what was done by the Premier on that occasion. Now, with regard to the Meatworks Bill, as has been pointed out by members on this side of the House, all the power required is already in the hands of the Government, and that measure was introduced by the Government simply as a blind. As to the validity of the constitutional powers claimed by the Premier, I am going to say nothing. I am not even a bush lawyer. It has been pointed out that in all the leading countries of the world the bicameral system of legislation obtains. If at the present time there was only one Legislative Chamber in Queensland, what would have happened? We would have found, as already pointed out, that twenty-three Labour members would be in a position to govern Queensland, although there are seventy-two members sent here by the people of Queensland to represent them and their varied interests. It would not be well for the prosperity of Queensland if that took place. According to our platform, the Country party is in favour of an elective Upper

Mr. Bayley.]

Chamber on a reasonable franchise. The Council is about the only bulwark [12 p.m.] which exists between the prosperity of Queensland and universal justice, and the Government, caucus, and confiscation generally. For this reason I think we should do very well indeed to consider the advisableness of retaining the Council in its present state. It is a very good thing for the people of Queensland that we have a Legislative Council. We who believe under ordinary conditions in an elective Upper Chamber are in the same position at the present time as the military authorities in Great Britain. They have been confronted with tactics by the foe which will not bear investigation, and much as they object to doing so they have been forced to adopt certain tactics. Owing to the methods adopted by the foe, the British authorities have been forced to adopt the use of poisonous suffocating gases, although this kind of warfare is very far from being in accordance with their wishes and ideals. Here in Queensland we have been brought face to face with the confiscatory methods of the Government, and we are only too happy to avail ourselves of all the help we can get from the Council, constituted as it is at the present time. What has the Council done? Why does the Council exist? What are the duties of the Council? The duties of the Council are to check over hasty legislation. We have passed a lot of hasty and ill-considered legislation during the past few months. Party feeling runs high in this House at times, and many hon. members do not weigh things as carefully and with as much consideration as these matters really deserve. It is a good thing that we have the Council to go through those Bills which are passed in such a hurry by this House. They consider them in a calmer atmosphere than obtains here. The Legislative Council is freer from party strife. Although hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised the personnel of the Council, still we must admit that the majority of the members in that Upper Chamber are men of mature experience.

The PREMIER: They are mostly rejects of the people.

Mr. BAYLEY: They are mostly men who have made good in their own professions and life. When we find that men have made a success of their own private undertakings, we can reasonably expect that they will manage the affairs of the country in the same way, and with the same degree of business acumen. The Premier has told us that the Government promised the electors of Queensland that certain things would be done. He claimed that the Council frequently refused to pass the legislation promised by the Government prior to the last election.

The PREMIER: Is not that right?

Mr. BAYLEY: No, I do not think it is so. The Government have far exceeded all their pledges and promises which they made to the electors prior to the last election. They brought forward many measures not outlined during the election campaign. The Government are in their present position because of the cheap-food cry and because they persuaded the people that the Liberal Government stood for all that was bad so far as the workers were concerned, that they stood for dear food, low wages, and bad conditions, and for this the Government are in power at

[Mr. Bayley.

the present time. The Government have far exceeded, so far as enactments and legislation are concerned, all that they promised to the electors. The hon. member for Bowen talked about the liberty of the down-trodden masses of the people of Queensland. He quoted from Carlyle at the time of the French revolution, and England during the time of Cromwell. Fancy comparing present conditions in Sunny Queensland, the paradise of the working man, with those times! Queensland is the happy hunting-ground of the working man. The masses of the people have the power now and they are the masters of the situation. If we want proof of that we have only to look at members opposite. Their presence here in Parliament in such numbers is surely ample proof that my statement is correct. The working men of Queensland have every liberty and every power that they can possibly ask for. A good deal has been said about the Upper House containing prosperous merchants and successful professional men. Is it a crime to be prosperous in these democratic days? I see on the front Treasury bench a highly successful business man and a successful professional man too, and I give them credit for it. Why decry in members of the Council what we esteem a virtue in hon. members opposite? Why should we abolish the Council? If the Government think that the Council should not be nominee, but should be elective, why do not they take steps in this direction? Why should they not take steps to constitute it an elective

[12.10 a.m.] Chamber instead of abolishing it altogether? At present we can look to the Legislative Council to protect Queensland, and we need all the protection it can give us. The Council deserves the thanks of the responsible people of Queensland, the people who have something at stake—something that can be confiscated—for the action they have taken during the past few weeks. For many years the Labour party have been fighting for the liberties of people who were down, and demanding better conditions and decent wages for men and women, and they deserve credit for the good they have accomplished in that direction. Now, generally speaking, men and women are well paid, have fair hours of labour, work under good conditions, and enjoy every liberty; and now the Labour party are trying to take away the liberties of other citizens of the State, and are attacking the rights and privileges of other sections of the community. For that reason we look to the Council for assistance, and I am glad to have this opportunity of raising my protest against the action of the Government in introducing this Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: For the last eleven or twelve years I have cheerfully voted for the abolition of the Council, and I think I should take the opportunity to-night to say a few words on the question. Some members on both sides of the House have referred to the fact that legislation is of a biased nature. Under the party system of government how are you going to escape from legislation of a biased nature? The legislation introduced by every Government is passed because it fulfils the promises which the Government have made to their supporters. Our system of government enables a party which obtains a majority of representatives of the constituencies to carry on the business of the country just as they think fit. That being so, how can anybody who believes

in the democratic principle of majority rule agree that any second Chamber should have power to block the legislation submitted by the Government? There is one matter to which no reference has been made in this debate. I have listened to members on both sides of the House making speeches in favour of the abolition of the Council on many occasions since I have been in this Chamber, and I have sat behind Governments and joined in the "hurrahs!" and "hear, hears!" when the Premier of the day thundered against the second Chamber; but I have heard none of those gentlemen say what is going to happen when the second Chamber disappeared to provide protection to judges and other high officials such as that which is given them under our two-chamber system. We pride ourselves that British rule is the cleanest in the world. Why has it been so clean? Simply because the judges, the Auditor-General, and other high officials of the State have been given their positions on the understanding that they could only be removed by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. That is a point which I am looking at from a non-party point of view, and I should like to have some information in regard to what will be the positions of those officers if the Council is abolished. I believe that when this matter goes before the people the second Chamber will disappear. We know that during the past ten or twelve years this House has come into conflict with the other Chamber on several occasions. In 1904, the present President of the Council—who was then Premier—thundered against the Council, and he afterwards became a member of it. Mr. Kidston, when he was Premier, also thundered against the Council; and I would point out that, although some members on the other side of the House have denounced that gentleman as having departed from his democratic opinions, it was he who passed the Act of 1908, which will give the people of the State an opportunity of taking action on the matter now before the House. The essence of the British Constitution is that the people should be supreme, and they can only be supreme if the majority are given an absolutely clear field to carry out the legislation they promise, and to conduct the affairs of the State in the manner they deem to be in the interest of the people. For six months of the year we have Cabinet rule, and not the people's rule about which hon. members talk so much. The Constitution Act Amendment Act gives to the people the right to say whether they will have a second Chamber or not. That Act was passed for the purpose of getting over deadlocks between the Assembly and the Council. It provides that, when the two Houses come into conflict, the matter shall be submitted to the people; and as this House and the Council have come into conflict in regard to certain legislation which has been passed by this House, it is right that the people should have an opportunity of saying whether the Council shall be abolished or not. It is desirable that some information should be given as to the position which will arise on the abolition of the second Chamber, with regard to those high officials of State who have been appointed on condition that they can only be removed from their places by a vote of the two Houses of Parliament. That matter should be explained, in order that the people may thoroughly understand the position of affairs when they are called upon to

vote on this important question. I consider that I have raised the most important point in connection with the abolition of the second Chamber. The people will decide whether the Legislative Council shall be abolished, and if it is abolished it will be for the Cabinet to take some steps in order that the fountain of justice may be as pure as it is to-day. The Auditor-General has the power, under present conditions, to criticise the Cabinet with regard to the dealings with the finances of the State, and he is absolutely free. The Government cannot dismiss him, as it takes the two Houses of Parliament to do it. With the abolition of one Chamber, the position may arise that the judges, the Auditor-General, and other high officials of the State may become absolutely subject to the dominant party in this House.

THE PREMIER: How do those high officials get on in the State of Canada, where there is only one Chamber?

MR. MURPHY: The Chief Secretary may be able to give us some information on that point. We know, in connection with American history, from reports published not only in papers owned by vested interests but in those owned by the Democratic party, that, as far as justice is concerned, it has been bought in America. It is the duty of a Cabinet which abolishes the Legislative Council to safeguard the interests to which I have referred.

MR. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I am sorry the discussion on this Bill to abolish the Legislative Council has to go through this evening, because there is a general feeling that there has to be a certain amount of limitation of speeches. I think it is a very unfair thing that we should be asked to put through such an important matter like this in one night.

THE PREMIER: The final decision does not rest with us; it rests with the people.

MR. VOWLES: We know that it is no use trying to convince hon. members opposite, because they are not open to conviction, and do not dare to vote against what they have been told to do. It is one of the planks of their platform, and they must at all cost support it; but what necessity is there to rush the matter on in this way? It has not been done in New South Wales, where it is a plank of the Labour party. The principle of two branches of the Legislature is adopted in the Federal Constitution, in Great Britain, and through every important part of the English-speaking world. It has been pointed out that some of the States in Canada have the unicameral system as against the bicameral system; but they are not States of the importance that Queensland is. They are not sovereign States—they are only glorified municipal councils. They are exactly what we would be, if the referenda proposals were accepted, as compared with the Federal Government.

MR. T. L. JONES: Is it wrong if the people want it? That is the issue.

MR. VOWLES: We are asked to give away our patrimony, but that is one of the things which, if you give away, you cannot get back. The electors were induced by a false story at the last elections to put the present party into power. They thought the Government were going to reduce the price of food, but they have discovered that they have not done so. If we give away our birthright, there is no getting it back by having another election. The Premier said that this was the most important and the

Mr. Vowles.]

most necessary motion moved this session. I submit that it is the most unnecessary, and I want to know what was the object of the introduction of the 1908 Act, if it was not for cases such as this. Is there any need to abolish the Upper House for the purpose of deciding whether a trifling amendment is to be included in the Meatworks Bill or not? The Act of 1908 gives the Government the power to submit that question to the people.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: How long will it take?

Mr. VOWLES: Just the same time as it will take to submit the question of the abolition of the Upper House.

The PREMIER: We would have to keep doing it on every Bill.

Mr. VOWLES: We are told that it is absolutely essential that the Upper House should be abolished, because they have blocked what is called "a war measure"—something that we understand is necessary for the carrying out of the war.

The PREMIER: That is the immediate reason.

Mr. VOWLES: And what is the immediate result? It is exactly the same as in 1908—let us send it to the people, and carry on under our Constitution as heretofore.

I have come to this conclusion, [12.30 a.m.] and I think that everybody else will come to the same conclusion, that this question of the Meatworks Bill is a blind to cover up something else.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: It is a popular cry. It is "meat," something like the cry at the last election. We recollect that when the Government introduced that measure, it was not introduced as a war measure, and it only was made a war measure because of the efforts of this side. We said, "If that is the intention, put it in the Bill," and we had to ask a hundred times before it was agreed to.

The PREMIER: And then the Upper House threw it out.

Mr. VOWLES: They interfered with it. Their amendments came back here, and they were sent back to them, and when we get to bedrock, what is the question at issue? The only matter of difference between the Government and the Upper House is that when the Government wishes to take advantage of the Act, wishes to confiscate the property of the companies, the Upper House wants them to do it "on just terms," and the Government will not accept that amendment. And they are going to make that the excuse for throwing out the Legislative Council—because they will not agree to take the meatworks over on just terms, because apparently they want to take them over on unjust terms.

The PREMIER: Can you be serious?

Mr. VOWLES: Of course, I am serious. It is a very serious matter, and I would like to have an explanation from the Premier himself as to why he will not accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not now discussing the Meatworks Bill.

Mr. VOWLES: I am discussing what is claimed by the Premier to be the whole bone of contention as to whether the Upper House should be abolished.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No.

Mr. VOWLES: I am asking the Hon. the Premier whether he can give us any other

[*Mr. Vowles.*

interpretation than the one I have just given of his refusal to accept those words. Anybody who knows the amendment about which the dispute is must come to the conclusion that it is a cloak, that it is an excuse to bring some popular matter before the people to gull them again, so that they will not give their attention to the one question—"Are you in favour of the abolition of the Upper House or not?" They are asked to vote "yes" because it is said that the Council have been interfering with war measures—and I must say that the Premier has been trying to trade a good deal on our sentiments. Every measure we are asked to consider is a "war measure." It is claimed that the Upper House is standing in the way of a war measure because they will not agree to this arrangement entered into by the Premier. Because they will not allow themselves to be dictated to, because they would not allow the Premier to go down there and bind us in something which we were not inclined to agree to, they are blocking a war measure, and the Premier turns round and tries to trade on our sympathies and says that we should do this because of the war. We are getting sick of that parrot cry. We want to deal with these things on their merits.

The PREMIER: Did you see what Senator Millen said?

Mr. VOWLES: Yes, and I saw that you said "The Times" expressed the opinion that the compromise was an eminently sensible one. "The Times," no doubt, did not know that one section of this House had not been consulted in that settlement. Had we been consulted and we had known exactly what we were doing it would have been a sensible compromise.

The PREMIER: "The Times" says that it was sensible. Had you been consulted, it would not have been.

Mr. VOWLES: It would not have been sensible if we allowed one section to dominate us, to ignore our official head and slight the Upper House. I have no intention of dealing with the constitutional question. We all know that the Constitution Act says that our Parliament is to consist of two Houses, and we also know that section 9 makes provision by which the constitution of the Upper House may be altered under certain circumstances, and we know that it is necessary to get validating Acts because seemingly the Constitution Act was ultra vires in certain respects. We know that in 1908 Mr. Kidston brought in a Bill to prepare the way for the Referendum Act, but there is one question on which I think there might be an argument. It is not one about which we can come to any finality here. It is the question whether the 1908 Act is properly on the statute-book, and if it was passed in accordance with the law, and it appears to me the more I look into it that it was not, that it is there wrongly. We are distinctly told in the Instructions to Governors and the Order in Council itself, that if certain alterations are made, the Bill which makes them has got to be referred, not to the Governor of the State, but to the King himself, through one of his Secretaries of State, for approval. We know that that was not done in connection with that Act. The dates themselves show that. It was passed here on 10th March, 1908; it was agreed to by the Council on 2nd April; and it was assented to on the 3rd April. The

question is whether the Governor did not exceed his functions in assenting to the Bill.

The PREMIER: Is not that only a quibble?

Mr. VOWLES: No; there is a great deal in it; and, if that was wrong, then the whole of this procedure is wrong also. Speaking last night, the Premier read certain cablegrams, and I asked the hon. gentleman to table all the cablegrams relating to the meat business. I do not know whether the Premier is aware of it, but the papers only go back to January last.

The PREMIER: They go back to August, 1914.

Mr. VOWLES: I am sorry I said that, but I took the word of the hon. member for Murrumba for it. The hon. member told me that certain papers were not among the papers that were produced. However, the Premier claimed last night—though I may say the statement has been disclaimed by Mr. Bonar Law—that the Imperial Government requested the Government of Queensland to take over the meatworks.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier made certain statements last night regarding the meat business, and I allowed the hon. member for Murrumba to-day to occupy the whole of his time in referring to the statement made by the Premier in connection with those cablegrams. They have nothing whatever to do with the subject-matter now before the House, and I do not intend to allow hon. members again to open up the question.

Mr. VOWLES: All right. I am sorry I have not the same right as has been extended to other hon. members. I think the right that is extended to one hon. member should be extended to every other hon. member.

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed the hon. member for Murrumba to occupy the whole of his time in referring to the matter.

Mr. VOWLES: That is no reason, why you should not allow me to refer to it.

The SPEAKER: I am not going to allow any hon. member to refer to the matter.

Mr. VOWLES: It appears to me, judging by the feverish haste with which all this class legislation that is being rushed on to the statute-book, that the Government are opening their eyes to the fact that the popular pendulum is swinging in the other direction, and they have to bustle and hustle these things—likewise the question of abolishing the Upper House—and get these measures through before the people deal with them again. The benefits of the Upper House have been shown by hon. members on this side; hon. members on the other side have declared that that House is unnecessary. I agree with what was said this afternoon that the other Chamber is a "cooling Chamber," where legislation is dealt with free from that party feeling with which it is regarded in this Chamber. That is evidenced by the fact that many of the amendments made by the other House have been accepted when the Bills have been returned here, although the same amendments were refused when moved from this side. That showed the reasonableness of the amendments, and I think it also showed the insanity of the other side in refusing to accept those amendments when we moved them. It shows that the Government cooled down when they had time for reflection. The object of sending Bills to the other Chamber is to give the Government time to cool down. We have had admissions made by Ministers in this

Chamber that, although they were advocating certain things, they did not personally approve of them.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is not true.

The PREMIER: Who said that?

Mr. VOWLES: The Home Secretary and the Secretary for Railways.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Home Secretary never introduced any Bill this session.

Mr. VOWLES: I refer to the Assistant Home Secretary. When we find admissions like that coming from the front Treasury bench, what position must ordinary private members be in when the whole Government party are being driven by a force outside this House? The object of having an Upper House is to prevent bullying such as that—to prevent coercion.

The PREMIER: The power outside is the people of Queensland.

Mr. T. L. JONES: What about the power that coerced the other House with reference to workers' compensation insurance?

Mr. VOWLES: I would like to hear the hon. member speak on this question, but he keeps discreetly quiet. He has the credit of being the most hypocritical member of the Labour party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. T. L. JONES: It is scarcely necessary for me to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to deal with that remark.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. VOWLES: I stated that the hon. member had the credit of being the most hypocritical member of the party. I did not say he was

The SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. VOWLES: I withdraw, but I must say—

Mr. KIRWAN: He has been a member of the executive of the party for over twenty years.

The SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw the statement?

Mr. VOWLES: Certainly I withdraw it, because I am obliged to withdraw it; but I say, notwithstanding, that that is the hon. member's reputation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BERTRAM: If you said that he was the least hypocritical member of the party, you would be about correct.

Mr. T. L. JONES: I will give you the credit of believing that you will be sorry for saying it when you think it over.

Mr. VOWLES: We will not prosecute that further. The more I think about it the more convinced I am. I will now give some instances of what the Legislative Council has done in the matter of passing democratic legislation which was brought in by Liberal Governments with which I was associated. Some of the measures sanctioned by the House that we are now told is so undemocratic are the old age pensions, women suffrage, early closing, one man one vote, and payment of members. (Government laughter.) It is all very well for hon. members opposite to laugh. They were not sitting on the Treasury benches when any of these measures were placed on the statute-book, and they would never have got on the statute-book if the Government of the day had not been willing to introduce them. They could never have got on the statute-book under our Constitution unless the

Mr. Vowles.]

other Chamber that we hear so much about had been willing too. It appears to me that this is an opportunity, and an opportunity that is not going to be missed. It is the desire of the Ryan Government to go to the people on a referendum on some subject which will be popular. If they want to deal with the Upper House, why not deal with it on its merits and ask the people, "Are you, from a constitutional point of view, prepared to abolish the Council or not?" They are going to the people on the popular cry of the meatworks—dear food again—and they are going to get the public to vote for the extinction of a very important part of our Legislature on a false issue.

Mr. KIRWAN: Do you see the writing on the wall?

Mr. VOWLES: I would sooner have seen the Premier do what he should have done. If he is being thwarted in the way he says he is he should have resigned and gone to the country himself. Had he done that, then he would have been genuine, and had he done that, then he would have been found sitting on this side with very attenuated numbers.

The PREMIER: What better off would we be if we came back and the other House still there?

Mr. VOWLES: They would have had this claim on His Excellency the Governor: that they could turn round and ask him to swamp the Upper House, because it was the will of the people. They know very well that that course is open to them if they are willing to take it. Their own scalps are in jeopardy, and they are risking somebody else's scalp.

The PREMIER: You people have been hoping to drive me to resign, and you have got no hope.

Mr. VOWLES: We know we have got no hope. Nothing in the world would drive him out. Look at the emoluments attaching to the office. They are not to be disregarded.

The PREMIER: The emoluments are not so great as they were when I was over there. You believe that don't you?

Mr. VOWLES: I will take your word for it. I have heard no argument adduced on the other side of the Chamber to show why we should alter the Constitution of Queensland, which is the Constitution of the Commonwealth and the Constitution of Great Britain. We are told that there are certain German States which only have one Chamber. Surely to goodness we don't want to work on German lines? We are asked to take the whole of their teachings, and we know a little about their "kultur." We will stand by the British system every time; it is good enough for us. Queensland wants to get ahead of the other States in the Commonwealth, and ahead of the Commonwealth itself and ahead of Great Britain, simply for political purposes. I think the most pertinent question that has been raised during the whole of this debate is the one raised by the hon. member for Burke; that is: How are the higher officials connected with the Justice Department, connected with the Land Court, the Auditor-General—a gentleman who can castigate the Government under the present Constitution—how are they going to be regulated in the future? Is it desirable that any Government should have the power to

sack the judges, particularly when we know that during the last month there has been friction between the Cabinet and the judges. We saw the opinion of the amateur Minister put up against that of Mr. Justice Lukin.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. VOWLES: When we find that sort of thing, is it desirable that we should alter our Constitution which will permit the Executive of the only Chamber to dictate to the Chief Justice. He should be beyond the control of Parliament. The Chief Justice, the judges generally, and all those high officials already referred to should be safeguarded, and the safeguard lies in the other place; it lies between the two Houses. Suppose the present Government could turn round and dispense with the services of any judge at their own sweet will, what security was there for good men taking such positions? We know that once a professional man gets out of touch with his clients and on to the bench, he has an understanding that he is there for the rest of his life, providing he behaves himself decently and his health and everything else permits, but if, after five or ten years, he can be told to get out, there would be no security. The fundamental bases of our Constitution is that the judges should be completely beyond political control; that their positions are secure, and that only by a vote of the two Houses can they be removed. It is my intention to oppose this Bill, and I hope there will be a division on it. Everybody who has the good of Queensland at heart, no matter on which side of the House he may sit, should consider very seriously before casting a vote in favour of this Bill. It is only a whim of a party; it is something that is popular. It has been in the New South Wales platform ever since Labour has been in power, and it has never been found necessary in New South Wales to alter the Constitution. They have not told us what they are going to substitute for this Chamber if it is abolished. According to the platform of the Labour party, they propose to abolish the Council with the view of substituting the

[1 p.m.] initiative and referendum, and notwithstanding that, the Government are now trying their hardest to dodge it. If they were genuine about abolishing the Council, they would accompany the proposal with the initiative and referendum. As they have not done that, we can come to the conclusion that we will hear about it when the next election is in view.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided:—

ARES, 38.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Kirwan
" Barber	" Land
" Bertram	" Larcombe
" Carter	" Lloyd
" Collins	" May
" Cooper	" McLachlan
" Coyne	" McMinn
" Dunstan	" McPhail
" Fibelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Free	" Payne
" Gilday	" Peterson
" Gillies	" Pollock
" Hardacre	" Ryan, D.
" Bartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Bartley, W.	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hunter	" Smith
" Huxham	" Stopford
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bertram and Mr. McPhail.

[Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Gunn
" Barnes	" Hodge
" Bayley	" Moore
" Bebbington	" Somerset
" Bell	" Stevens
" Booker	" Swayne
" Bridges	" Tolmie
" Corser	" Vowles
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Corser.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Armfield, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Gledson, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Theodore, and Mr. A. J. Jones.

Noes—Lieut.-Col. Rankin, Mr. Appel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Forsyth, and Mr. Stodart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The result of the division was received with loud Government cheers.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: You will be sorry.

COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Coyne, Warrego, in the chair.)

On clause 1—"Short title"—

Question—That clause 1 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 37.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Land
" Barber	" Lacombe
" Bertram	" Lloyd
" Carter	" May
" Collins	" McLachlan
" Cooper	" McMinn
" Dunstan	" McPhail
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Free	" Payne
" Gilday	" Peterson
" Gillies	" Pollock
" Hardacre	" Ryan, D.
" Hartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hartley, W.	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hunter	" Smith
" Huxham	" Stopford
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Dunstan and Mr. H. L. Hartley.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Gunn
" Barnes	" Hodge
" Bayley	" Moore
" Bebbington	" Somerset
" Bell	" Stevens
" Booker	" Swayne
" Bridges	" Tolmie
" Corser	" Vowles
" Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Bebbington and Mr. Swayne.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Armfield, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Gledson, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Theodore, and Mr. A. J. Jones.

Noes—Lieut.-Col. Rankin, Mr. Appel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Forsyth, and Mr. Stodart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 2—"Abolition of Legislative Council"—

Mr. MURPHY asked what would be the position of the Auditor-General and the judges when the Council was abolished? What protection would they have against the dominant party if they could be removed from office without a resolution of two Houses as was required at the present time?

The PREMIER replied that the protection of such high officials would be as great as it was at present. The judges of the High Court of Australia could be removed from office, under certain conditions, by a

vote of both Houses of Parliament. The Senate was composed of nearly all Labour members, so that a resolution of two Houses was practically the same thing as a resolution of one House. The members of the Legislative Council in Queensland were nearly all Liberals, and a resolution of both Houses would have practically been no more than a resolution of one House when a Liberal Government was in power. The offices referred to were usually held during good behaviour; the persons holding them might be removed on the ground of misbehaviour, and, unless the fact of misbehaviour was established, a right of action would lie against the persons who removed those officers from office. That was proved in South Australia in the case of Mr. Justice Boothby, where both Houses of Parliament endeavoured some years ago to remove him from the Supreme Court bench. He had no doubt that the hon. member for Burke had raised the question in all sincerity. The same argument that could be applied to Queensland could be applied to the various States in Canada—where there was only one Chamber—in regard to the judges or other high officials. There was no use in raising bogeys; because, after all, it was a bogey, although he did not think the hon. member for Burke raised it as such.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

The PREMIER: But it was seized on now by members of the Opposition who had not the initiative to raise the point itself. (Government laughter.)

Mr. SWAYNE trusted that the Government would substitute an elective body for the present nominee Upper House, and amend the clause in that direction. As the hon. member for Burke had pointed out, there was a certain amount of protection to the judges under the two-Chamber system, and with the abolition of one Chamber their position would be insecure, as they would really hold their positions at the option of the Government of the day. In the case of the Canadian provinces, their judiciaries had the protection afforded by the power of veto possessed by the Dominion Government, and, being subject to Dominion courts, were of less importance than ours.

Mr. MURPHY was pleased the Premier had dealt with the question he had raised, and he was satisfied, after listening to the hon. gentleman, that the interests of the officials to whom he had referred would be properly safeguarded.

Question—That clause 2 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 37.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Land
" Barber	" Lacombe
" Bertram	" Lloyd
" Carter	" May
" Collins	" McLachlan
" Cooper	" McMinn
" Dunstan	" McPhail
" Fihelly	" Murphy
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Free	" Payne
" Gilday	" Peterson
" Gillies	" Pollock
" Hardacre	" Ryan, D.
" Hartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hartley, W.	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hunter	" Smith
" Huxham	" Stopford
" Jones, T. L.	" Winstanley
" Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Peterson and Mr. Smith.

Mr. Murphy.]

NOES, 17.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Gunn
„ Barnes	„ Hodge
„ Bayley	„ Moore
„ Bebbington	„ Somerset
„ Bell	„ Stevens
„ Booker	„ Swayne
„ Bridges	„ Tolmie
„ Corser	„ Vowles
„ Grayson	

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Hodge.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Arnfield, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Gledson, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Theodore, and Mr. A. J. Jones.

Noes—Lieut.-Col. Rankin, Mr. Appel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Forsyth, and Mr. Stodart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 3 and the schedule were carried on divisions, in which the voting was exactly similar as the division on clause 2.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment. The third reading was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

PUBLIC CURATOR BILL.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council returning this Bill with an amendment, in which they invited the concurrence of the Assembly.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the consideration of the message in Committee was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

TRADE UNION BILL.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council returning this Bill with amendments, in which they invited the concurrence of the Assembly.

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIDELLY, the consideration of the message in Committee was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

The House adjourned at a quarter to 2 o'clock a.m.