

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 1916**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER, 1916.

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

## QUESTIONS.

## MUSTER OF CATTLE ON MOUNT HUTTON STATION.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*), in the absence of Mr. Morgan, asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“The number of stock actually mustered on Mount Hutton to date?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. M. Hunter, *Maranoa*) replied—

“Owing to the reckless and misleading statements made by the honourable gentleman and one or two of his colleagues in respect to this matter, it would be injudicious to give any figures until the muster is completed.”

## COST OF BORING FOR OIL AT ROMA.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Chief Secretary, for the Secretary for Mines—

“What amount of money has been spent to date on the boring for oil at Roma—(1) machinery and plant; (2) actual cost boring; (3) depth of bore?”

The PREMIER (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*), for the Secretary for Mines (Hon. W. Hamilton) replied—

“1. £12,140 14s. 7d.; (2) £2,787 5s. 8d.; (3) 1,460 feet.”

## ROCKHAMPTON TO BRISBANE MAIL TRAIN.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*) asked The Secretary for Railways—

“1. What was the number of passengers for whom there was insufficient accommodation on the mail train running from Rockhampton to Brisbane on Monday last, the 13th?”

“2. Is it correct that an additional large carriage was put on at Gladstone to relieve the overcrowding on the train, and still some passengers were not able to get berths?”

“3. Was any other alteration of the train subsequently necessary to cope with the passenger traffic between Gladstone and Brisbane?”

“4. In view of the alleged insufficient accommodation on this train, will he make inquiries and advise the Railway Commissioner to restore one of the recently cancelled mail trains to the timetable on this run or otherwise make better provision for the travelling public by providing sufficient carriages and sleeping accommodation?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*) replied—

“1. The exact number, if any, cannot now be ascertained.

"2. A carriage was added to the train at Gladstone, and all passengers were comfortably seated from there. Three passengers were unable to get berths. An extra sleeping-car could not be run for only three passengers. At the present time New South Wales and Victoria are only running one sleeping-car on each mail train, and when it is full, other passengers have to do without sleeping berths.

"3. Another carriage was added at Bundaberg for Bundaberg passengers, and at Maryborough additional carriages were added, and the train run in two divisions from there.

"4. The question of restoration of one of the recently cancelled mail trains will have consideration when the coal strike is over."

#### AREA OF WHEAT IN EACH ELECTORAL DISTRICT.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*), in the absence of Mr. Barnes, asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. What is the area under wheat in the different electoral districts of the State?"

"2. What is the estimated yield in each electorate?"

"3. On what date was the estimate made?"

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

"1, 2, and 3. Statistics are not collected by electorates, but by petty sessions districts. If, however, the honourable member will call at the office of the department, probably information that would meet his purposes could be compiled for his use."

#### CONSTITUTION ACT OF 1867 AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION.

The PREMIER, in moving—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to further amend the Constitution Act of 1867, by disqualifying for membership of Parliament persons who are directors or attorneys of, or solicitors for, monopoly companies or alien companies."

said: I might say in reply to the leader of the Opposition who has called "Not formal" to this motion, that the proposal proposed to be brought before the House, after agreeing to it in Committee, is one which I have long advocated.

Mr. MORGAN: Will it include barristers?

The PREMIER: I have long advocated that such a measure should be placed on the statute-book, and certainly since this Government have been returned to power I have referred to the matter on more than one occasion. I find on looking through the Press report of an interview held with me in October that I used these words—

"I am inclined to think that the Government may have to seriously consider the introduction of legislation to prevent persons holding seats in Parliament who

occupy positions in connection with corporations and foreign companies, which must make their interests conflict with their duties. Such legislation will have the effect of opening the eyes of the country to what are the real interests that the Government are fighting."

The nature of the proposal is to disqualify from membership of both Houses of Parliament directors, solicitors, and attorneys of monopoly or alien companies, and included in "solicitors" are "barristers practising as solicitors, and barristers who hold retainers from monopoly companies."

Mr. MACARTNEY: Does "solicitor" cover "barrister"?

The PREMIER: There is a definition clause which provides that "solicitor" will cover "barristers practising as solicitors, or barristers who hold retainers from such monopoly or alien companies."

Mr. MACARTNEY: Then the lesser includes the greater.

The PREMIER: The measure is proposed to be confined to a limited class of corporations of a sinister nature. It is proposed to give this House the power of declaring what are monopoly companies and what are alien companies. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, it has been amply demonstrated, particularly in the United States of America, the great evil that has resulted from the formation of large corporations which have become trusts and combines, and who have certain persons, called "lobbyists," who bring before members of Parliament in the lobbies the interests they wish to promote in connection with these particular corporations. In some cases they have members actually in Congress who are directly connected in some way with trusts or combines, and who further their interests from the vantage ground in the House. This measure proposes, at all events, to prevent the directly paid agents of such monopoly companies from having any voice in the formation of our legislation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hon. members can understand that it is bad enough to have a "lobbyist," but it is much worse if you have actually in the deliberative Chamber representatives who are given an opportunity of furthering the legislation which will benefit the interests they represent when they are in a position to actually assist to formulate the proposals and put them into the shape they desire. I notice a remark which Lord Bryce made in his work, "The American Commonwealth." As hon. members know, Lord Bryce was the British Ambassador at Washington for a long time. I find these words on page 160 of the second volume of the new edition of his work—

"Hence the doors of Congress are besieged by a whole army of railroad commercial or railway men and their agents, to whom, since they have come to form a sort of profession, the name of Lobbyists is given. Many Congressmen are personally interested, and lobby for themselves among their colleagues from the vantage-ground of their official positions"

It will also be observed at a later page in the same volume, page 318, Lord Bryce said—

"He who considers the irresponsible nature of the power which three or four men, or perhaps one man, can exercise

*Hon. T. J. Ryan.]*

through a great corporation, such as a railroad or telegraph company, the injury they can inflict on the public as well as on their competitors, the cynical audacity with which they have often used their wealth to seduce officials and legislators from the path of virtue, will find nothing unreasonable in the desire of the American masses to regulate the management of the corporations and narrow the range of their action."

Now, we propose by this measure to take such steps as will tend to avoid the evils which have grown up there. (Hear, hear!) I am satisfied that the people of Queensland want it, and I am satisfied that they will not be content with a Government that has not the courage to tackle it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The people of Queensland, too, will want those people who support such a state of affairs to get up and declare themselves so that they may know exactly where they are. It is not confined to the paid agents of monopoly companies, but it applies also to those of alien companies. The alien companies are such companies as will be declared to be such by resolution of the House as being wholly and solely, or substantially, composed of shareholders who are not subjects of His Majesty the King. That is briefly the manner in which I can describe what an alien company is within the meaning of this proposal. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have had a very sad experience since the outbreak of the war, in finding that the whole of the metal trade was in the hands of Germans under the guise of anglicised names which would lead one to believe that they were really British companies. The post-war problems with which we will be confronted when this great conflict is over, makes it necessary to take steps—because prevention is better than cure—to prevent such paid representatives of alien corporations having any opportunity of having a voice in the legislation that we will pass to deal with these great problems.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: We have been warned, and it is our duty to take heed to the warning and to act accordingly. This proposal goes to the very foundation of democratic government. (Hear, hear!) It is a proposal that we, at all events, will say that we are determined to prevent these paid representatives of such monopoly companies or alien corporations from having a voice in our deliberations in this Legislative Assembly. I am satisfied that the people of Queensland desire it and I hope, and expect, that the debate on the question will not partake in any way of a personal nature. It is a subject which is quite above that sort of thing. (Government hear, hears, and Opposition laughter.) It is not a laughing matter, and it behoves hon. members to treat it seriously, because it is a serious question, and one in regard to which I am sure the people of Queensland are looking to have State legislation passed.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. TOLMIE (*Toowoomba*): The Premier, in his best police court style when addressing a trembling witness—because he would not venture to address those remarks to His Honour sitting on the bench in the style he did—indicated what should be the

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

opinions of hon. members on this side of the House. I do not know that he is justified in taking up that attitude. Perhaps he may think he is, but all the same we intend to discuss this question in the way it ought to be discussed. An amendment of the Constitution is at all times a matter of the very gravest importance to the people of the State. There is nothing that affects the wellbeing of the whole of this State to the same extent as does an amendment of the Constitution, and when the Premier comes down to this Chamber in the very last hours of the closing year with an amendment of the Constitution so far-reaching in its consequences, then we imagine he is doing so because he has behind him the bulk of public opinion in regard to the very grave and very important question.

The PREMIER: So I have got the bulk of public opinion behind me.

HON. J. TOLMIE: So grave is the matter and of so much importance that the hon. gentleman did not think it worthy of finding a place in the Governor's Speech. Probably at the time he forgot all about it, and it was only within recent times—probably during the month of October, as he stated himself—that the question has become one of so great importance to himself. It may be due to the fact that in his hurried visit across the continent of America he was brought into relation with all those great evils that he says are occurring in that great land because of monopolies, and it was because he was so impressed with what he saw there of evil doing that he comes to the conclusion that it is desirable to amend our Constitution. That being so, we would have thought he would have taken the earliest opportunity of introducing this measure. But it is one of those belated acts of his, just the same as the copper proposition that was put before this Chamber not very long ago. It had been in the hon. gentleman's mind for some time and he had effected certain arrangements with the Home Government in regard to the matter, but he did not think they were worthy of being put before this House until some months had expired. Just so in this matter, and it is only at this particular moment that he comes to the conclusion that it is a very desirable thing that the Constitution should be amended in the direction in which he proposes. He ought to have shown that there was a necessity for an amendment of the Constitution in that direction, but he has made no attempt to do that. He has not shown that there are those persons in this Chamber who are acting to the injury of the State as he says is being done in America where the evils are rampant. He ought to be in a position to show that undue influence, an influence of a bad nature, is being brought to bear upon hon. members in this Chamber before he insults it by bringing forward such a resolution as he has submitted this afternoon. I think it must be taken by every hon. member present, at any rate by any person who has any honourable feelings at all, that the Premier has put the greatest insult that it was possible for him to put upon this Chamber, and that he has done so for the gratification of his own personal ends in regard to this matter. I know of nothing more despicable than a resolution of this kind being submitted for the reason, I believe, that he is antipathetic to some hon. members in this Chamber, and perhaps in the other Chamber, because he may have

found that he has been thwarted in some of the plans he proposed to carry out, and he has come down with a resolution of this kind for the purpose of eliminating from this Chamber an hon. member who has done as good service to the country as has been done by the Premier.

Mr. GILLIES: You admit they are here.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I admit that there are certain individuals in this Chamber that, for reasons of the most despicable kind and for the gratification of party spleen, there is a desire on the part of members on the other side to see put out, and not because of any wrong-doing in this Chamber. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KIRWAN: What are you afraid of?

HON. J. TOLMIE: I am afraid of injustice, I am afraid of everything that is mean and paltry, and I am afraid of everything that is contemptible being done in this Chamber. If hon. members on the other side approve of a resolution of this kind, then my vocabulary finds a lack of words to adequately describe them.

The PREMIER: Do you believe in a director of an alien company having a seat in Parliament?

HON. J. TOLMIE: I believe that the alien company has absolutely nothing to do with this matter. I believe that the other reasons set forth have nothing to do with this matter. I believe only the gratification of personal spleen has originated the matter that has been put forward. I think it will appeal, not only to this Chamber, but to the outside public as well, that the Premier has degraded his high position in introducing a measure of this kind.

The PREMIER: You are a poor judge of public opinion.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Does the hon. gentleman for one moment think that the great public that we have outside this Chamber, who are an educated public, are not able to discern facts, are not able to read for themselves and draw conclusions from those things which they have heard and from those things which they have read, and that they cannot form their own conclusions without any assistance from this side or the other side? If we are doing a wrong thing then we stand before the public in exactly the same position as hon. members on the other side, and if they desire to condemn us they will condemn us; but so long as we are free agents, and so long as we have the right of free speech, and can give utterance to our opinions in this Chamber, then hon. members on this side will absolutely repel any action of this kind to the fullest possible extent.

The PREMIER: You are bound to support your friends—the monopolists and alien companies.

HON. J. TOLMIE: There is no reason for the hon. gentleman to endeavour to make my speech for me. I am stating the position I take up broadly and clearly, and making it as well defined as it is possible for me to do so, that there may be no misconception in the public mind or in the mind of any individual in regard to the position I take on this matter, and of the reason for which I take it. I believe that it is aimed at individuals sitting on this side of the House, and it is aimed at individuals, not because of high public grounds, but because of personal reasons, and at individuals who have

rendered good service to the State and have conducted themselves as gentlemen on all occasions and as honourable citizens.

Mr. CORSEER: And who has two sons at the front.

Mr. McMINN: Where you ought to be.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Believing as I do in regard to this matter, I shall oppose the motion to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. MURPHY (*Burke*): I desire to briefly deal with the motion introduced by the Premier. He said it was a democratic motion, but in my opinion it is a purely fireworks motion. (Hear, hear!) He says it is necessary for Parliament to deal with monopoly companies and alien companies. Well, if it is necessary in the interests of the public that these companies should be dealt with, why does not the Premier come down with a specific Bill dealing with those companies? He referred to the metal question. The metal question was decided by Mr. Hughes. He did not want to introduce a motion or a Bill to prevent the director or agent or attorney of any of the metal companies sitting in Parliament. That hon. gentleman came down and dealt with the companies themselves.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He expropriated the shareholders altogether.

Mr. MURPHY: The interjection of the Minister proves clearly the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that this proposal is submitted for the purpose of getting at one hon. member of the Opposition, and not in the interests of the community at all. He evidently does not want to see alien shareholders expropriated, but he wants a Bill passed through this Chamber to hit a member with whom the Government is at variance.

The PREMIER: Do you want to see them expropriated?

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier referred to the lobbying system followed in America. We know that the system in America has done evil, but the fact that we pass a Bill preventing a director of an alien company sitting in Parliament is not going to do away with the question of lobbying, and, so far as Australian politics are concerned, I think it is to the credit of the Australian politician that there has been very little lobbying in Australia.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: What about the Daniels case?

Hon. W. D. ARMSTRONG: Whose party did he come from?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MURPHY: I was just going to refer to that case. As far as I have been able to gather, in the whole history of the politics of Queensland, there has only been one case, and that is where Mr. Daniels, who was member for Cambooya at the time, and a member of the Labour party, was offered £200 if he would support a certain syndicate railway proposal that was submitted.

Several GOVERNMENT MEMBERS interjecting.

Mr. MURPHY: I am going to tell the facts, if hon. members will give me an opportunity. One would imagine [4 p.m.] from the number of interjections that one was trying to deal with the question of conscription at a public meeting. (Laughter.)

Mr. McMINN: Don't worry about that.

*Mr. Murphy.]*

Mr. MURPHY: As I say, Mr. Daniels gave particulars to the Chamber regarding the proposition which was made to him, and Mr. Philp, who was then leader of the Government, immediately dropped the proposal. It was the Cloncurry Railway proposal, and he immediately took it off the business-paper altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION interjected.

Mr. MURPHY: Well, Mr. Daniels seemed to be the only member who said anything at all about it. I am not going to say that the others who did not say anything about it took £200. I would not say anything like that at all. The mere fact of introducing legislation to prevent directors of alien or monopoly companies from sitting in Parliament is not going to do away with the American method if it will act with the Australian politician, but I do not think it will, because, as I have already said, Australian politics are very clean. The Premier has stated that the House will have the privilege of saying what a monopoly company is. That is to say, a majority sitting behind the Government will be able to say what an alien company is and what a monopoly is—

The PREMIER: Following the Income Tax Act.

Mr. MURPHY: So that if any hon. member connected with a purely Australian company happens to fall out with the powers to be in politics, all they have to do is to declare that that particular company is a monopoly company, and that member has got to get out of Parliament.

The PREMIER: You are wrong in that. They must have the fact of alien interest in them as well.

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier is talking about an alien company.

The PREMIER: You already have that provision in the Income Tax Act.

Mr. MURPHY: The proper way to deal with monopolies is to follow the advocacy of hon. members of that party during the late election campaign. They said they would introduce legislation to clip the wings of monopoly companies so that the people could not be exploited by them. (Interruption.) It is a very feeble method of attempting to deal with monopolies. They did not adopt this method in New Zealand, and the Federal Government did not propose to adopt this method either.

Mr. FOLEY: We want to go one better.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes. They simply do not want to deal with the matter at all, or if they did they would come forward with a specific Bill dealing with the whole matter.

Mr. CARTER: This is a specific Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: I quite agree with the Premier that it is very desirable that our politics should be kept clean, and during this session I have listened to speeches delivered by hon. members sitting on the other side, and I have come to the conclusion that I am in a position to aid the Premier in making this proposal of his more drastic. If he believes that the only method of keeping Queensland politics clean, if he believes that the only way to enable the people to rule effectively is to introduce such a proposal, I am going to show him from speeches delivered by members sitting on his own

[Mr. Murphy.]

side of the House that perhaps it is desirable to add to the motion which he has moved. Now, first of all, we know that there has been a good deal of criticism in this Chamber during the present session and past sessions with regard to the legal profession. It was only the other day that the hon. member for Bowen, Mr. Collins, made some scathing observations regarding the legal profession, and I propose directly to move an amendment in which I will give that hon. member an opportunity, as they say on the racecourse, of backing his opinion.

Mr. COLLINS: Don't you worry about the hon. member for Bowen. He is not going to be dictated to by you.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In other words, you are getting down to the ridiculous.

Mr. MURPHY: Well, if I am getting down to the ridiculous, I am only getting on a par with the proposal which has been submitted by the Chief Secretary.

Mr. McMINN: You are getting on to your usual plane.

Mr. MURPHY: I would not like to be as solemn as some people. (Laughter.) Then, again, we hear not only the Chief Secretary, but also other hon. members sitting on the Treasury benches, dealing with the question of fees which have been paid to barristers. They have pointed out the evil of the Attorney-General drawing huge fees. When they were on the other side of the Chamber they said that the Attorney-General should receive a stated salary for the year, and that he should do the law business for the Crown for that particular salary. I think that if we are going to indulge in the cleansing process we might also include that in the motion. Then, again, there has been a proposal for quite a long time that secretaries and organisers, and other officers or agents of trade unions should not be able to jump the claims of the sitting Labour members. I know that some organisations have tried—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting outside the motion, I shall be glad if he will connect his remarks with it.

Mr. MURPHY: I shall read the amendment that I propose to move, and you will see then that I am able to connect my remarks.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Who framed the amendment for you?

Mr. MURPHY: It does not matter. I did not go to the hon. member to get it framed.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: No; I would not have done it for you.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably there was a time when the hon. member would have assisted me.

Mr. McMINN: He did not know you then.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: The man who posed "as good as a Labour member"—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MURPHY: There are a lot of men who became good Labour men when they sighted a chance of getting a seat in Parliament. The amendment which I propose to move is as follows:—After the word "companies," where it last appears, add the following words:—

"or any barrister or other servant or agent of such companies or barristers

receiving fees from the Crown, including any barrister who may hold the office of Attorney-General for the time being, or persons being secretaries, organisers, or other officers or agents of trade unions, or who have held office as such at any time during the preceding twelve months; or persons being members of the organisation known as the Industrial Workers of the World."

That is the amendment, and as it is a revolutionary amendment, I have typed it in red ink. (Laughter.) I was dealing with the question of trade union secretaries and organisers.

Mr. COLLINS: They shifted you.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member did not shift me, anyhow.

Mr. COLLINS: I did not get down to your dirty methods.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MURPHY: I am not going to enter into a controversy with the hon. member about an election that is passed, because I know that I am just as likely to get beaten as the hon. member.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MURPHY: It was in reply to an interjection, Mr. Speaker, but I admit I am getting away from the subject, and I always like to obey the ruling of the chair. I said that a number of organisations suggested that the officials of trade unions should not have an opportunity of contesting a plebiscite with the sitting member.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know why they suggested it, except, I take it, that the members of the organisations believe that the sitting member being in Brisbane for a considerable portion of the year had not an opportunity of placing all the facts of his position before the organisation, while the union official was in a position to undermine his comrade and to get ready for the plebiscite. That was the position which has been placed in front of quite a number of organisations in Queensland, and I say that, if we are going to indulge in the cleansing process, it would be desirable for Parliament to come to the assistance of the sitting Labour man by adding to this proposal which has been submitted to the Chief Secretary, because doing so would enable the Labour member to discharge his duties in a thoroughly honest manner. He would deal with questions from the national standpoint more than from the party standpoint, and I think it very desirable that that proposition should be included. The Bill forecasted by the Premier may, later on, lead to retaliation—the Government of to-day is the opposition of to-morrow—and I have submitted this amendment in order to show the electors the direction in which such retaliation may move.

Now, as to the question of the Industrial Workers of the World. The other day, Mr. Barber, the hon. member for Bundaberg, dealt very scathingly with that organisation. He said that the Labour party were not connected with it at all; that it was a disloyal organisation, and was an off-shoot of the Liberal party. That being so, I do not see why the Chief Secretary and the members sitting behind him should not object to members of the Industrial Workers of the World becoming members of this Chamber, because we have it on the authority of the hon. mem-

ber for Bundaberg and the present Prime Minister of Australia, and of other hon. members sitting on the other side of the Chamber, that the Industrial Workers of the World are not respecters of law at all.

Mr. KIRWAN: They do not believe in political action.

Mr. MURPHY: No; they believe in direct action. They have no desire for political action, but some of these members of the Industrial Workers of the World may be very anxious to come and get a seat in Parliament.

Mr. POLLOCK: Their best men have refused to run for seats in Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not going to contradict the hon. member, but I do know that in New South Wales those who have gone out as extreme socialists have not been able to obtain a very large vote. I may outline the amendment which I propose to move. I am in general agreement with the Chief Secretary that it is very desirable that we should keep politics in Australia as clean as we can, but if we are going to deal with one particular man in the House, or with one particular section in the community, why not let us go the whole hog, and really try to make politics in Queensland as clean as we possibly can?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Why not wipe out Parliament altogether?

Mr. MURPHY: I am in favour of wiping it out, because I believe in unification.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: What about the Council Chamber?

Mr. MURPHY: Well, it disappears with the Assembly.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MURPHY: It is very interesting to listen to all these interjections coming across the Chamber. I have endeavoured to deal with this subject without indulging in any personalities at all. I have dealt with it on what I believe to be absolutely sound lines. There may be other hon. members in the Chamber who can add to the list. I have mentioned in my amendment the names of others who should be excluded from Parliament. If we can add to the list there is a possibility that Parliament will be abolished without having to submit the matter to the people at all—(laughter)—because if we start to deal with an important question such as monopolistic or alien companies from the standpoint that the Chief Secretary chooses to deal with it; that is, in regard to one particular individual with whom he is not on the best of terms at present, and we extend that system, the time is going to come when there will be very few people who will be able to stand for Parliament at all. The director of a monopolistic or an alien company coming into this Chamber is not going to have very much power. First of all, the people of the electorate which he represents knows that he is the director of a particular company, and if they support him why should the general public object? All the general public look to Parliament to do is to pass laws that will protect them, not from the director of a monopolistic company, but from the alien company itself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: That is the position which Parliament should take up in a

*Mr. Murphy.]*

matter of this sort. As I say, the whole proposal submitted by the Chief Secretary is not a democratic proposal at all, it is a mere fireworks proposal, and though during the course of the general election the Chief Secretary may have made reference to it, such as he quoted this evening, those of us who know the Chief Secretary will realise that as a barrister he was probably trying to get out of an awkward position. When people were dealing with the question of food supplies, with the high cost of living, it was only natural that he would refer to monopolistic companies and alien companies, and the fact that the deputy leader of the Opposition was in his mind probably at that time would cause him to refer to a matter of this nature. But it would have been a bolder, a sounder, and a truer policy for any Labour Premier to deliver to the country, to say that if his party got back to power they were not going to deal with a single individual who might be a director of a monopolistic or alien company, but would introduce legislation that would give the people of Queensland full protection from such company.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: This resolution does not say that it will deal with one member.

Mr. MURPHY: That being so, I beg to move my amendment, and I sincerely trust that when it comes to a vote those hon. members whom I have quoted, and upon whose speeches the amendment is based, will support the contentions which they uttered in this Chamber during the current session.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I cannot see any necessity for the introduction of such a proposition as this.

The SPEAKER: Does the hon. member second the amendment?

Mr. VOWLES: Yes, I second the amendment. In the first place, one would expect that when we are amending the Constitution Act we should not deal with it lightly. It is the foundation for the whole of our statutes, the whole of our being and our legislation in this State. One would naturally expect that some grave charge of corruption had been made against a member or that some grave charge had been proved. Is there a suggestion or even a charge of corruption against any member on this side which would justify the introduction of such a motion as the Premier is bringing before the House? We have heard nothing.

The PREMIER: It is from that side of the House that such charges come.

Mr. VOWLES: Anybody who knows the procedure of Parliament will know that it does not matter what corruption is indicated on this side of the House, it could not have any effect, and that the only place where corruption could have any effect would be amongst the following of the Premier. We know that some of the members of his party must have either been "got at" or—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in charging any hon. member with being "got at." I do not intend to allow any hon. member to make insinuations against other hon. members.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: The motion, I submit, is to bring about a state of affairs by which certain persons should be no longer members of this House, for the reason that there has

[*Mr. Murphy.*

been lobbying going on; that is one of the reasons that has been suggested by the Premier. What does lobbying mean?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: He did not make that suggestion.

Mr. VOWLES: The Premier spoke about lobbying in America, and about corruption lawyers. We have read a great deal about those gentlemen, and I do not think we have had any instance of it in Queensland politics up to the present time. Is there a corporation lawyer in the form of a barrister who is bringing about the same tactics in Queensland politics as we have had for some time in America? The motion proposes that directors or attorneys of, or solicitors for, monopoly companies or alien companies are no longer eligible as members of either House. Why not include the shareholders? Why not make it sweeping? Why should a man be entitled to be a member of this House, and be a shareholder of a monopoly company or even of an alien company, while the professional man who does the technical work for the company is not entitled to the same privilege. There is no question that when there has been no suggestion that there is any good reason for this legislation as far as any individual member or members of this House are concerned, there must be some ulterior motive for the introduction of such a proposition. We know that there has been a certain amount of bad feeling and fireworks in the past few weeks, in which the Premier and a certain solicitor in this House has figured. They have not been on the best of terms, and there has been an exchange of compliments, and we can only come to the conclusion that this is a form of retaliation or getting square. The Premier knowing that, by virtue of the members he has behind him, he is in a position to subject a member of this House to an indignity, and that is what he is doing. It will not affect me; I am not a solicitor for a monopoly company or an alien company; I have nothing to do with it; but I say that as far as the question of monopoly companies is concerned—

The PREMIER: You are careful to say it is not you.

Mr. VOWLES: There is only one hon. gentleman in this Chamber—perhaps, hon. members will know to whom I am referring—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It makes me think of the saying, "Lord, save me from my friends."

Mr. VOWLES: So far as monopoly companies are concerned, the Government want to arrogate to themselves this position; that they can turn round and declare any company to be a monopoly company, and, as a consequence, any director of that company or any solicitor engaged by it can no longer continue to be a member of this House. We know there is one company in particular we have always heard hon. members opposite speaking of as a monopoly company, and that is the Brisbane Tramways Company, and we know who the solicitor for that company is. The solicitor for that company is a gentleman who happens to sit on this side, and if this is not an attack on that individual and his partner—well, I say it cannot be anything else. The whole thing is deliberate; it is smelly; and to my mind it is worthy of the source from which it has come.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Is that why you are going to support the amendment?



Mr. VOWLES: I am supporting the amendment because it makes the motion more comprehensive. We started off with an admission from the Premier that the word "solicitor" was going to include the word "barrister," and, as the hon. member for Toowong put it, the lesser includes the whole.

The PREMIER: Anyone listening to the remarks from that side would think solicitor was the greater.

Mr. VOWLES: We have heard a good deal about the relative positions of solicitors and barristers.

Mr. MURPHY: You are all pretty good in making your charges. (Laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: All barristers are not what they pretend to be. I remember a case not very long ago in the North of Queensland—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not discuss the relative positions of solicitors and barristers.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. gentleman asked me a question. I was going to give him a case of a barrister who got into very bad odour—the case of Reid—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: More vile insinuations.

Mr. VOWLES: We have had this matter brought up before, as to the relative position of solicitors and barristers. I see that, according to the Premier, the definition of "solicitor" includes a legal practitioner and a barrister.

Mr. POLLOCK: A 6s. 8d. lawyer.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not care what you call him, but, at any rate, a barrister is included with a 6s. 8d. lawyer.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: And he gets the 6s. 8d. lawyer to instruct him.

Mr. VOWLES: This amendment goes further; it not only includes that barrister, but it includes any barrister who is accepting fees from the Government as an Attorney-General, and being a member of the House. Whether that is desirable or not I do not know; but it appears to me that it ought not to be desirable, considering the amount of fees that are coming from the consolidated revenue that the person who receives those fees should be a person on a salary, or, at any rate, a person who is not in a position to write his own brief. One hon. member on the other side appears to have a good knowledge of the Industrial Workers of the World, as he told us who the respective members are, and he says some of them would not accept nomination as members of the House.

Mr. CARTER: He is not so ignorant as you are.

Mr. VOWLES: Thank you! I would not like to be as ignorant as you are. If we are dealing with alien companies and say that the directors who may be English persons resident in Australia are not competent to accept seats in the House because they have a seat on the directorate, why should we not exclude members of the Industrial Workers of the World who are proclaimed enemy subjects and who are out against all law and order, and against all existing institutions? Why, when we have an opportunity of amending the Constitution Act should we not seize the chance of preventing any man who

declares himself to be an enemy of existing institutions from getting into this Chamber? I think the amendment is highly desirable, and I intend to support it for all it is worth.

There is no question that this legislation originated during the last few weeks as the result of a little difference between two members of this House. The Premier told us that when he was on the hustings he advocated this for all it was worth. He said publicly that he was going to introduce this legislation, and that it was necessary. I do not know that it is one of the planks of the Labour platform; but if they are only carrying out the mandate of the people who sent them here, why was this legislation not introduced during the first session of Parliament, or, at any rate, at a reasonable time in the second session. Why is it simply brought forward after a passage at arms between two members of this House one of whom is going to be personally affected.

The PREMIER: These attacks were directed at me, because you knew such legislation was on the board.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Toowong was charged on Friday afternoon last by the Premier in his absence. The hon. member for Toowong made a personal explanation on Tuesday, in which he made a challenge to the Premier—and that challenge is still standing—that if the Premier likes to have a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the charges which he made against the hon. member for Toowong that hon. member is prepared to abide by the result of the inquiry, and if necessary to forfeit his seat in the House. Why does the Premier not accept that challenge if there is anything in what he says? Why does he not let a Supreme Court judge deal with it? We can only come to one conclusion, and that is he is not game. He knows that he is bluffing, and he is unable to prove any of the statements and insinuations made against the hon. member.

The PREMIER: I have stated nothing but facts.

Mr. VOWLES: Then, if the hon. member has stated facts, let him have the commission appointed to prove them. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that he has stated nothing but facts. We on this side make certain statements as facts, and we are told that they are miserable lies, in that "Buzfuz" style of the Premier—trying to make members on this side tremble, trying to intimidate them, and swallow them up as it were. That is what we have to subject ourselves to. The Premier, because he says it is a fact, declares it to the world as a fact. The gauntlet has been thrown down by the hon. member for Toowong, and if the Premier will not accept it we can [4.30 p.m.] only come to the conclusion that he knows that what he has said are not facts, and he is afraid of the consequences. I intend to support the amendment, and I trust that it will go to a division. Personally, I do not think that there is any business in the proposition. I think it is only fireworks brought forward for one purpose only. The inclusion of alien corporations in it is only a blind, so that when an election comes along, or when the question of the abolition of the Upper House is being discussed, the hon. gentleman can go around once more and mislead the general public. He will tell them that his great desire was

*Mr. Vowles.]*

to introduce legislation to affect alien companies, but he will not tell the general public that the real thing at the back of his head was that he wanted to get rid of one of the thorns in his side—the hon. member for Toowong.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I quite agree with the hon. member for Dalby, who expressed the hope that we will come to an early division so far as the amendment is concerned, because it is really reducing the sublime to the ridiculous. A more absurd amendment could hardly be submitted. It is an attempt to tack on to the important motion introduced by the Premier an absurd proposition which can hardly be conceded. According to the hon. member for Dalby, who seconded the amendment, he condemned the motion and supported the amendment. Could anything be more inconsistent than that the absurd part of the question should be supported while the most important part should be absolutely opposed. The motion before the House is one which I think calls for the most serious consideration of the Chamber.

Mr. MORGAN: It does not go far enough.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: One can hardly conceive anything that will affect the future of this country more than the possibility of corporations being represented in the Assembly, where their representatives can assist in framing and shaping the laws of the country. The history of the United States is evidence of that. I might briefly quote what might be regarded as a prophetic utterance by President Lincoln at the conclusion of the Civil war in America. President Lincoln, at the close of the Civil war, saw in the use of these great corporations a danger graver than the fierce internecine conflict from which his country had just emerged, and in prophetic words he forecasted the use of those great combinations of money and power which are characteristic of the age. It is well known that his prophecy has been fulfilled. We are to-day, or, I hope, shortly will be, emerging from the greatest war known in the history of the world. We recognise, and are realising more and more every day, that a combination of alien companies have been largely responsible for this war. By their acts and combination they have been able to use their money power in commerce and manufacture in such a way that the contending forces on the other side have been compelled to engage in a bloody conflict. That is what has happened through permitting this sort of thing to occur in America. We know that they have had legislation there, but the legislation has come too late. In Queensland we are going in for legislation to prevent rather than cure. So far as the United States is concerned, they are trying to cut out the disease—the cancer that is eating away the life of the country. We wish to legislate now and prevent anything of that sort happening. The Premier has made no charge. He has taken a high public stand in introducing this legislation. The question has been asked if this is a desirable state of affairs to exist in this country. If it is not existent, we should take every precaution to see that it is not possible to come here, and the proposal now before the Assembly will go a long way in that direction. The amendment, however, is an attempt to direct it

[Mr. Vovles.

into a lower, meaner, and more contemptible channel than what is desired. We say that what we should do is to prevent the possibility of it existing. If it is non-existing—and nobody has said that it does exist—then all we have got to see is that it does not happen. We have in our Constitution at the present time a provision that a Government contractor cannot sit in this Assembly. If he does, he is liable to a penalty of £500. If it is necessary to prevent public honesty so that a contractor shall not sit in this Chamber, it will be admitted that it is much more necessary in the interests of the public weal that no agent or party concerned in framing alien Acts, or having to do with monopolies, should be allowed to sit in any Legislative Assembly, and so promote the legislation of the country. I hope that we will come to an early vote on the amendment, and get back to the motion, so that it may be discussed in a proper manner. We have no desire that the public mind shall be diverted from the great question—that is, the question which the whole of the people of Queensland are concerned in. We want to see our legislation kept clean and above suspicion and above corruption. It is a proud thing for Queensland to know that up to the present Queensland has been freer than any State of the Commonwealth from anything of that sort. It is equally desirable for us to see that provision is made that such a thing shall not happen in the future. It is more necessary now because of the exposures that have been made in connection with trade and commerce and manufacture in Australia. Great Britain herself is taking action now to make it no longer possible for these alien people to get possession of the great commercial interests of the country, and we, as a people, if we desire to help Great Britain and her allies, will take good care that we will place on the statute-book a law which will make it no longer possible to Germanise or otherwise corrupt the commercial community or our manufacturing interests. I hope we will shortly come to a division and return to the discussion of the original motion.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Murrumba*): The hon. member who has just sat down has delivered the lamest speech I have ever heard delivered in this House. There is absolutely nothing in it. He states that Queensland is free from corruption, and has always been free. Why, then, the necessity for introducing this Bill? There is no necessity for this Bill at all if that is the case.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Your party says that that is not true.

Mr. FORSYTH: We are told about the corruption that has taken place in America. We all know that there is a great deal of corruption going on there, but everyone who has spoken has admitted that there is no corruption in Queensland. Anyone who has studied the politics of America will understand what lobbying means. It is infinitely more than waiting in the lobby. It means in America, actually putting members into the House to carry out the interests of the corporations who have huge sums of money at their back. These members are put into the Congress for the purpose of passing railway Bills. As a matter of fact, it is principally in passing railway Bills that lobbying takes place. These people have not only got large funds at their disposal,

but they spend hundreds of thousands of pounds if necessary to see that these railways are carried, and they also have their nominees in the Chamber put there for the purpose of carrying out their particular work.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do not you think that the same thing will happen here?

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman clearly stated that it did not exist here, and the Premier also hinted that it did not exist here.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition stated that it affected "members" over there. He did not say "member."

Mr. FORSYTH: I am surprised at anyone ever dreaming of bringing in legislation of this sort. I may say that we have had some remarkable legislation introduced into this House during the last few weeks. It is neither more nor less than legislation run mad. That is my opinion of it. At the present time I might say that I am shaking myself because this Bill proposes to deal with directors of alien companies, and the Premier has told us that the definition of an alien company is the definition given in the Income Tax Act. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Income Tax Act he will see what the definition of an alien company is.

The PREMIER: I did not say that at all. I said monopolies.

Mr. FORSYTH: You said that the definition of "alien company" is the same as in the Income Tax Act.

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman states that I said that the definition of "alien company" was the definition in the Income Tax Act. I said no such thing. I referred to monopoly companies. I hope that he will accept my statement.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Murrumba must accept the statement of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. FORSYTH: I have no desire to say that the hon. gentleman said a certain thing if he did not do so, but I was under the impression that he said that the definition was the same as in the Income Tax Act, and I noticed that "alien company" there means a foreign company.

The PREMIER: I did not say that at all.

Mr. FORSYTH: The question of foreign companies comes into the Income Tax Act. I would like to know what an alien company really means.

The PREMIER: It does not mean foreign company in the sense that you refer to. It must be wholly or substantially alien to the British Empire.

Mr. MURPHY: Those companies have been wiped out by Federal legislation.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. FORSYTH: If an alien company means a company which has not got its head office in Queensland, then I know many such companies whose shareholders are purely Australian and are not German or foreigners at all.

The PREMIER: The "Courier" suggested something like that this morning and mentioned the Bank of New South Wales.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes; the Bank of New South Wales is a foreign company under the Income Tax Act.

The PREMIER: You have been reading the sub-leader in the "Courier," but it is misleading.

Mr. FORSYTH: In the opinion of the Commissioner for Income Tax the Bank of New South Wales is a foreign company.

The PREMIER: But it is not a foreign company under the definition of this Bill.

Mr. FORSYTH: If this particular Bill referred to a director of a company whose head office was not here, it would affect me personally straight away, because I have been a director of an Australian company for many years, and I do not believe that a single shareholder of that company is either a German or a foreigner. If this Bill applied to a case like that then I would not be able to hold the position of director any longer. It would mean that it would not take me five minutes to decide what position I would take up, whether I should remain a member of this House or whether I should retain my position as a director.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is an "Aunt Sally."

Mr. FORSYTH: There is no "Aunt Sally" about it. In any case the whole question is one which should not have been brought forward at all. The whole of the arguments raised have proved most conclusively that Australian politics have been particularly pure.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Don't you think it is a good thing to keep them pure?

Mr. FORSYTH: The inference is that Australian politics have not been pure. It will be quite time enough to bring forward legislation of this sort when we have specific instances of corruption. There is not the slightest doubt that this Bill is brought forward for a specific purpose, and that is to vent spleen on a particular member of this House. The hon. member told us just now that we have had politicians in Queensland for the last fifty years—that we have had responsible government in Queensland for fifty years—and what has been the result? According to the hon. gentleman's own statement politics in Queensland have been particularly clean and pure, and that being so why should he introduce a Bill of this sort? If it is intended to curtail monopolies, then why not bring in a specific Bill to deal with them? Why bring in a Bill to deal with directors, or solicitors, or barristers having dealings with any companies. That is not going to cure the evil. If you want to tackle this business why not tackle the monopolies themselves? If that were done I could understand that there was some honesty in connection with the matter, but instead of that the Government are trying to do their level best to vent spleen on certain individuals. Then again, if it is to apply to directors of monopolies, why not make it apply also to shareholders? There may be members of this House who are shareholders of foreign companies, or who are shareholders of German companies for all we may know. The Bill should apply all round, so that any man holding shares in an alien company or a monopoly company could not become a member of this House. The whole thing is neither more nor less than a piece

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

of fireworks. It is legislation run mad. The commercial people of Brisbane look upon it as the most ridiculous and asinine proposal that has ever been brought before the House. The argument that a solicitor or director or representative of a monopoly who may be in this House can influence other members or try to bring about corruption is utterly absurd and not worth considering. If every single member on this side of the House were a director or solicitor it would not have the slightest effect so far as legislation were concerned on any Government that has a large majority as they have on the other side. The hon. gentleman said it was the monopolies who caused this great war. Where did he get that information from? Surely as a member of this House he must have received a copy of the White Book issued by Sir Edward Grey giving full particulars. Surely hon. members have read that book, and if they have not read it they should have read it. To say that monopolies caused the war is so utterly absurd and so utterly untrue that I cannot understand how any person could use such an argument. If it is necessary to exclude directors, or representatives of foreign or alien companies in order to have pure politics, then it is necessary to add all the various items that were mentioned by the hon. member for Burke. As a matter of fact, it is a very difficult thing to arrive, in connection with contracts, as to how far it would apply. You may be a shareholder of a company which has contracts with the Government. It might be said that there was corruption there. Everyone has dealings with the Government in one way or another, and yet the Government say that because certain people have dealings with the Government they have no right to be in this House because they might use their vote in the House in a corrupt manner. I do not believe in that principle at all. Hon. members also say that because lobbying has been a great curse in America we want to make it impossible for such a thing to happen here, and yet the hon. members who argue in that way have distinctly stated that so far as politics in Queensland are concerned they believe them to be absolutely clean and pure. The very fact of introducing a measure of this sort is neither more nor less than an insult to every honest man in the House. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that corruption is carried on in Queensland politics? I have not heard of a single case of corruption in connection with Parliament except the case mentioned by the hon. member for Burke. We can be perfectly sure that if hon. members knew of any particular case that they would immediately bring it forward in this House. They absolutely own that politics are clean and pure, and when they own that they condemn every argument in favour of this Bill. We believe politics in Australia are pure, and I hope that politics will always be pure. It will be time enough for the Government to introduce a Bill of this sort when politics are not pure and when members use their influence for improper purposes. If corruption can be proved even to a small extent there certainly would be some reason for introducing a Bill of this kind. But we do not require huge corporations for building railways here. All the railways in America are built by private people, while here the railways are built by the State, and there is no need for corruption in connection with our railways unless

[*Mr. Forsyth.*

an individual member wants a particular line of railway, and then he will go round to every member of Parliament and try to induce them to vote for it. Therefore, corruption, as it applies in America, cannot apply here at all. All these huge corporations in America have members who are their own nominees, who are put in Parliament by them, who are supported by them and paid by them, but such a thing does not exist here at all, and, therefore, to bring forward a Bill like this is simply absurd. This Bill is brought forward for a purpose which is utterly contemptible, and not only contemptible but it is disgraceful for any man to bring in a Bill which is aimed at somebody we all know. I am surprised that any Government would introduce such a Bill unless they had proof of corruption.

Mr. MURPHY: And we must recollect that this same Government who introduced this Bill has bought the Chillagoe Railway.

Mr. FORSYTH: Quite so. In any case there is no reason why this Bill should be brought forward, and I sincerely hope hon. members on both sides of the House will vote against it.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I, for once, am in accord with some hon. members opposite who said that they desire a division on this matter. I want to see a division, and I want to know which way members of this House are going to vote on this matter. I remember that during the course of the conscription campaign certain hon. members opposite, as well as a majority of Liberal members throughout Australia, accused the anti-conscriptionists of having been bought with German gold, and with having been corrupted by alien influences. I want to know exactly how those hon. members are going to vote when this motion goes to a division. I want to know if they are in favour of having as members of this Parliament men who are being paid with the gold of German companies. This Bill is going to find out those who have German or alien sympathies, and those who have not, as that will be the effect of the division. It has been stated by the hon. member for Murrumba that there is no corruption in Australian politics. I do not know of any corruption, but I know of a tremendous number of charges that have been hurled from both sides of the House since I have been here, and if there is any corruption it is hardly likely that those guilty of it will go out of their way to advertise it. Then, we are told that there is no lobbying here. It will be remembered when the Workers' Compensation Bill was going through last year that the lobbies of this House were chock full of insurance agents and managers of insurance companies.

Mr. McPHAIL: What about the Gas Bill, too?

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes, in connection with the Gas Bill also, and yet we are told that there is no lobbying in the Queensland Parliament. It may be that we have no members in this Parliament who are guilty of lobbying other members in connection with certain Bills, yet I have my doubts in that matter. Although I cannot mention any names, still I have a tremendous amount of suspicion and this Bill is going to do a good deal to clear the air in that direction. The hon. member for Burke moved an amendment, portion of which I can quite understand when coming from him. He wishes

to include "Persons being secretaries, organisers, or other officers or agents of trade unions." I know that the hon. member is aware that there are one or two secretaries or organisers of trade unions up his way who are going to get his seat at the next election.

Mr. MURPHY: I have belted them all so far.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member has beaten them all so far, because up to the present they were unable to show that he had voted against the Labour party in division. Now, that he has taken part in the Liberal caucus and has voted against us in division perhaps these organisers will be able to fix him up.

Mr. MURPHY: Last year they had a long list of my delinquencies in that respect.

Mr. POLLOCK: They had no division list in which the hon. member voted against the Labour party. The opinion members opposite have in regard to the secretaries of unions is somewhat remarkable. They think that it is everything that is good, provided that it is conducted properly, yet here we have an amendment which sets out, as the hon. member for Burke said, not to prevent men who are organisers or secretaries from opposing the sitting member of Parliament, but which absolutely disqualifies them. How does he reconcile those arguments with his amendment? I want to know if he is prepared to go into those portions of his electorate which are composed mainly of unionists and tell them that he has an objection to those men sitting in Parliament?

Mr. MURPHY: I am not afraid to go into any electorate. I have been there. I have given my opinion of them, and they have given their opinion of me.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Burke referred to the fact that there was a likelihood of Labour members being undermined by organisers and secretaries. On occasions we might find organisers and secretaries who would undermine—human nature I suppose is the same all the world over—still I do not think the danger is very great, but this amendment would not prevent that to any great extent, because if they wanted to undermine a sitting member they could easily put in some other man than an organiser.

Mr. MURPHY: You know that that has been proposed.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not know that it has been proposed, but if it has been proposed by one organisation in Queensland, that does not say that it has the sanction of those who are responsible for the selection of candidates in Queensland. I know that there is going to be trouble over this matter, if those hon. members who have told us continually that they believe in unionism go out to their electorates and say that men who are selected by the organisations are not really capable of sitting in this House, or should not be entitled to sit.

Mr. MORGAN: What did the Australian Workers' Union do when they sacked Theodore?

Mr. POLLOCK: That is another of the hon. member's misrepresentations, because they never sacked Mr. Theodore. I was one of the members of the conference who received Mr. Theodore's resignation with the greatest regret. Some reference has been made to the Industrial Workers of the World. This is a most ridiculous attempt to keep

Industrial Workers of the World members out of Parliament, when, as a matter of fact, they would not touch Parliament with a long stick. The hon. member for Dalby intimated that I had some past connection with the Industrial Workers of the World, or knew certain of the officials, because I said they would not accept selection as Labour candidates. I am one of those who take care, when I hear of any new policy or any new organisation, to understand what it stands for, and for some time I attended the Industrial Workers of the World's meetings in the Domain in Sydney, and listened to what they had to say, and I understand what their policy is. While I do not hold any brief for them and do not agree with them in the most of what they do, I cannot help thinking that this is a most foolish amendment which proposes to exclude them from sitting in Parliament, because King, one of the Industrial Workers of the World's leading men, refused £600 a year when he was asked to go organising for the Red Federation of New Zealand. That is a greater monetary temptation than a seat in Queensland Parliament at £500 per year. He said that he would not under any circumstances organise for anything but the Industrial Workers of the World. Again, there is Grant, who would sooner have starved on a crust around Sydney than take on organising for an organisation that he did not believe in. It is well that credit should be given to those men for refusing those jobs.

Mr. CARTER: For being honest.

Mr. POLLOCK: We do not want the Industrial Workers of the World's policy in Australia, and the least we can do is to refuse to advertise it. An amendment of this sort is only advertising an organisation that none of us agree with.

As far as alien or monopoly companies are concerned, I am one of those who have continually opposed the holding of a seat in Parliament by any of the representatives of that type of company, and I think the majority of hon. members on this side have been in the same position. It is no new departure for this party to introduce a Bill which aims at that objective.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I am supporting the amendment, because I think it is a good thing to broaden the motion to the fullest extent, so as to make possible the exclusion of anything which it is desirable to exclude. I would remind the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that Mr. Hughes has already dealt with all German and foreign companies, and also with shareholders of such companies. It is generally known to us all that this motion is merely brought forward to enable the Premier to vent his spleen on a member of the Opposition by stabbing him in the back, because that hon. member has been able to show the bluff and bluster that sometimes comes from the Premier. The Premier comes along and introduces a motion like this. It would have been far better to have put the hon. gentleman in question on the mat.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: You will get all you want before you are done.

Mr. CORSER: I am quite prepared for all I get, and to give hon. gentlemen opposite more than they can give. We might make insinuations about real property business and other business just to lend colour and make insinuations, but it is not my desire to make

*Mr. Corscr.]*

any inferences of that kind. If I had any charge to make I would not infer by a motion of this kind, or leave a colour or a tint on the shoulders of a hon. member who is not guilty of any sin to his country or false to the oath that he has taken in this House. The hon. gentleman against whom this charge is directed sits here and represents a constituency which gave him its confidence, and if there is anything in his actions that is not to the credit of Queensland, the people will deal with him and give him a fair summing up and judgment. But can we expect a fair judgment from the bludgeoning party we have in power at the present time, who bludgeon any hon. member on this side who wishes to do his duty to the country? The Government bench, on all occasions, try to oppose our desire to amend legislation, and are now getting down in the dirt to try and cut out from the Opposition party one of our best and ablest men. Are they afraid that they might be induced to listen to the hon. member and be induced to bring forward amending legislation? It is cowardly for the Premier and the majority he has behind him to try and steal from the Opposition by foul means a member on this side. They want to throw an inference throughout the country that we have here a man who is not loyal to his country and who is representing some great German trust, and acting possibly to the detriment of the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is quite in order in making reference to a certain member or members of the House, but I trust he will not base his whole speech on the statement that this motion is directed against any particular member. The motion is clearly stated, and mentions no hon. member.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORSER: That is where the cunning of the Premier lies. It is loaded, like most things are from the hon. gentleman. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat referred to the lobbying that might be going on while Bills were going through.

Mr. CARTER: Was going on?

Mr. CORSER: Certainly, there is any amount of lobbying. As soon as a Bill is introduced by the hon. gentleman we have agents from the Trades Hall, and lobbying continuously. Every hon. member in the House has taken an oath of allegiance to the King. I will not say whether the representatives of the gentleman who dictates to hon. members on the other side would take an oath of allegiance to the King. There are some of them, I believe, who would not take an oath of allegiance, and when they clean their own ranks from those who dictate to them, it will be time to cast insinuations on hon. members on this side who have not only done their duty, but whose sons are doing it also. We know perfectly well that the Hon. the Minister for Public Lands made a great speech, in his own mind, as to what he would do to alien companies. But we know perfectly well he would be very pleased to supply an alien, insure an alien, or do anything with him in his line of business, and why should we not look at every section from the same standpoint and in the same light? Hon. members must admit, and they do admit, that there is nothing that any single member of the Opposition can be charged with that is disloyal. But just to try and stain the minds of the people outside they are forcing this business on as a

[*Mr. Corser.*

catch vote, because they are disheartened and frightened at the result proved to them on the 28th. (Government laughter.) We know perfectly well they are greatly disappointed—so disappointed are they that they are going to stand out in a new light, and try to recover the confidence of the people that has been lost. (Great laughter.)

Mr. COOPER: It would be interesting to hear you appealing to the workers after this.

Mr. CORSER: My appeal to the workers has always been an honest appeal. And I do not want to use insinuations and motions and amendments to try and gull and deceive them. If there is any real danger, why should hon. members not include the shareholders and all those provided for by the amendment, and if there is a real necessity—something that has not been covered by Mr. Hughes' proposals—why does not the Premier make it clear to the House, and we would then be quite prepared to support him in anything that would bring about greater security?

The PREMIER: Why is the Liberal party putting the cap on; I did not refer to anybody.

Mr. CORSER: Putting what cap on? We want to make the cap large enough to fit the hon. gentleman, and those who dictate to him, and he does not like it. Because he sees there is a place for him in the amendment, that there is room for his head and the heads of those that run him, he does not like the cap that we show him. He claims that the motion he brings forward goes to the foundation of democratic legislation; I think it goes to the very veins and heart pulse of blackmail and slander. I do not think in any State Parliament, or in any independent Parliament in the world, we ever found such a disgraceful insinuation coming from a man who claims the confidence of the people as its first citizen. I say the hon. gentleman should be ashamed of his actions, and the meanness of his motion—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: I had not intended to speak upon this motion, because I thought it was one that would have recommended itself to the good sense of the House and to their idea of the best means of government. I should have thought it would have found immediate acceptance, and it is somewhat surprising to find it has been fought in the hostile spirit it has been up to the present time. It seems to me that, as far as the criticism or objection to the motion has gone, while hon. members opposite are protesting their love of all that is noble and pure and their high regard for everything that goes to make for good government and the keeping of the Legislature of the State pure, they are simply attempting to throw the motion aside as something unnecessary. Admitting that up to the present time Australian politics have been to a certain extent of rather a higher order than in the older countries, surely the history of the day as it is unfolding itself at the present time, and the revelations that have been caused by the war must have laid open to hon. members things that were previously unseen, undreamt of, in our national life; and, while such things are occurring in a greater degree in England, surely there is cause for a measure that will still keep the political life of Australia as clean as it has hitherto been. (Hear, hear!)

It seems to me that in protesting so much members opposite have shown that this Bill has inadvertently touched more than one sore spot, and it seems a very poor substitute to put up the hon. member for Toowong for the purposes of defence, when it seems that inadvertently the Bill has touched other interests. I cannot understand, if hon. members are sincere in their protests against legislation that is going to make for the purity of public life in Australia, why they are protesting so hard. At the same time, while the public life has been pure in Australia to a certain extent, I do not think any hon. member will deny that there are at times influences about that would attempt to wrest public men from the straight paths and lower the standard of our national life.

Mr. MURPHY: John Wren.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Yes, and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, and the American Meat Combine and others.

Mr. MORGAN: And the liquor party.

Mr. MURPHY: And the 6 o'clock closing party.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Yes, and it seems to me that if people object to this Bill they are objecting because they are afraid that their interests will be touched, and they do not want that. If they assume a spirit of hostility to this measure, it is simply because they are afraid of something. Any man whose life is open and untouched will not object to being subject to examination by this measure.

The SPEAKER: It will nearly abolish the Upper House.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: I am going to show that in one instance at least there is ground for belief that alien interests are represented in Australia—perhaps not in this Assembly—and that a gentleman who has shares in that company sits in the Legislative Council. I want to say while he is a shareholder in that company, in the matter I refer to, he did not vote on any division. I refer to the Meatworks Bill. It is a remarkable thing that when that Bill was going through the House, every one protested that there was enemy capital or alien capital involved. The Hon. A. J. Thynne admitted he was a shareholder of the company, and he claimed his right to speak on the Bill, although I do not think he did so. The point I want to get at is that, while we were discussing that Bill here, there was a prize court recently concluded in England, and the cargoes of certain vessels were found to consist mainly of meat, munitions, and other material necessary in the prosecution of the war, and the decision of the president of the prize court was that those materials were being consigned through Denmark not only to German territory, but for the naval and military forces. And further, that the man who chartered the ships to carry those cargoes was a German, and I have not the slightest doubt he was one of the secret agents of the great German Empire, and that meat came from the great Chicago Meat Company that has meatworks here. The register of the Supreme Court shows that at least one member of the Legislative Council was a shareholder in that company. When these things are revealed, surely hon. members will see there may be graver things in other directions. I disassociate the hon. A. J. Thynne altogether from that part of the transaction, but, when

it is known that the German secret ramifications go through all countries, surely hon. gentlemen can rise sufficiently high in the interests of their country to accept a measure of this sort on its face value for the betterment of the public life of the country. (Hear, hear!) Then you want to look a little further, at some of the other legislation that has been introduced into this House at different times—the Insurance Bill, the Gas Bill. The other night they wrangled over amendments in the Gas Bill in the Legislative Council between the company on this side of the river and a company on the other side—as to whether certain amendments should be put in. Is that a good state of things to have in a Chamber like that, that gentlemen consider interests of companies like that, instead of the pure object and aim of the Bill to better the gas supply of the country? Why is there any objection to legislation that would eliminate that sort of thing? In taking up an attitude of hostility to the Bill, I say either hon. gentlemen do not recognise the possibilities of adverse influences working in public life or there are ulterior motives. It is rather a significant fact—the treatment that was meted out to the Premier in connection with a certain matter. It was rather remarkable that the gentleman I have quoted as being a shareholder in that American company was also the Chairman of the Recruiting Committee, and that certain information that should have been confidential to that committee should have been divulged.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: The hon. member for Burnett spoke about the metal business being controlled. It is controlled as far as Mr. Hughes can control it, but he has not been able to control it altogether. In the same prize court report published in the "Times" of July, hon. members will see that Australian metals were shipped to Germany, and that one boat left Australia and was unloading in a German port on the outbreak of the war a cargo of Australian metals. There were two ships which had on board metals that came from the Australian Metal Company shipped in Adelaide. Mr. Hughes certainly brought in the Metal Exchanges Bill, but over in the old country enemy [5.30 p.m.] companies have not altogether been eliminated. About four days ago a cable which appeared in the "Courier" showed that Merton and Company had been merged into an English company, but there is no justification for saying that those men are purely Englishmen acting in the interest of the British Empire. As a matter of fact, some of them who were previously interested in the cargo of these ships were British firms, and claimed the right to send that cargo on, and they also claimed compensation for freight and insurance. If they have Englishmen in England who are poor spirited enough and traitors enough to their country to indulge in transactions of that sort there is not the slightest doubt that German power can get a few poor renegade men in this country to do the same. With things like that in view, this Chamber should be ready to welcome this Bill, not only in the interests of public life and the keeping pure of public life in Queensland, but also in the interests of the Empire to which we belong.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): In connection with this particular matter in the speech

*Mr. Morgan.*]

just delivered by the hon. member for Fitzroy, he failed to tell us that the meatworks companies which are supposed to be operating in Queensland at the present time, got permission to erect their large works down the Brisbane River from a Labour Government.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: What Labour Government?

Mr. MORGAN: The Fisher Government. It was a Labour Government that gave that meat company permission to carry on its operations in Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No!

Mr. MORGAN: We know that the Premier has entered into an agreement with the present meatworks company.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will connect his remarks with the amendment

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat was allowed to refer to these things, and members of the Opposition should be treated in the same way.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member makes reflections on the Chair he will not be allowed to speak at all. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MORGAN: It is a matter for you to say whether I should be allowed to speak or not, but I was just pointing out that other members have referred to this question. The introduction of this Bill may be looked upon as nothing more nor less than an attempt by the Premier to get even, as it were, with a certain firm of solicitors who do business in Brisbane. We realise that certain events have taken place during the last two or three months which were not to the liking of the Premier, and he has endeavoured on every occasion to retaliate on that particular firm of solicitors. In doing that he has been guilty of spite, and he accused that firm of blackmail.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has not yet connected his remarks with the motion or the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: I will connect my remarks if you will give me time. I was just dealing with the attitude of the Premier, who introduced this Bill.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Bill is not before the House yet.

Mr. MORGAN: Well, we are dealing with the resolution which proposes to introduce a Bill. This resolution only deals with the disqualification of certain individuals, and the hon. member for Burke wishes to widen the scope of the Bill so that others who may bring corrupt influences into this House may be dealt with as well. As mentioned by one hon. member, it is proposed in the amendment that the Attorney-General should not be able to brief himself and write his own cheque.

The PREMIER: The Attorney-General does not write his own cheque.

Mr. MORGAN: He says what amount of fees he is to receive.

Mr. KIRWAN: You know that is untrue.

Mr. MORGAN: It is common property in Brisbane to-day among the legal profession that in regard to the Premier's trip home,

[*Mr. Morgan.*

that so far as the Premier himself is concerned, he benefited to the extent of over £5,500.

The PREMIER: That is absolutely untrue. I wish it were true. This is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. MORGAN: It is so difficult for members to obtain reliable information from members of the Government, but that is what is said in Brisbane to-day. We know that he received £1,800 expenses from the Government, but in addition to those expenses he received fees amounting to over £5,500.

The PREMIER: That is an absolute myth.

Mr. MORGAN: We cannot find out really the amount the Premier did receive.

The PREMIER: If you said that it is worth £5,500 it would be quite correct.

Mr. MORGAN: It was once said by the present High Commissioner for Australia in London, Mr. Andrew Fisher, that no man in Australia was capable of earning £500.

Mr. KIRWAN: He never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MORGAN: The Premier himself referred to the enormous amount of money made by certain companies in Queensland. He referred to the profits made by the squatters. I would like to know the squatter who has no more money invested than the Premier has in his personality, who is capable of making a profit of £5,500 in so short a time.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You are persisting in making misleading statements.

Mr. MORGAN: I would like to refer to the fact that this Bill does not deal with persons who may be representing interests here such as the liquor interest. That is a body which has large sums of money at its disposal. We know that the money of the liquor interests is being spent for political purposes.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the Temperance Association.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not know if the Temperance Association have got large sums of money, but we know that the liquor party have got enormous funds which are used for certain purposes. It has been said that the funds of the liquor party are being used in this House. If their money is going to be used for corruption and for the purpose of influencing members in their votes, we have a right, now that we have a Bill before us, to endeavour to do away with all that kind of corruption. We know that at the present time the Premier is like the worm in the claws of the eagle, and he is squirming and wriggling, and that is the reason for the introduction of this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: We would like to see this measure debar others beside those the Premier has mentioned. We know that the Premier has shown a certain amount of distrust to and is not friendly with a certain firm of solicitors in Brisbane, and in my opinion is using his power, as Premier, in introducing this Bill to display his personal spleen.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition referred to "members" on that side.

Mr. MORGAN: We know that the Hon. the Premier volunteered for active service,



and certain remarks were published throughout the whole world saying that he was the only Premier who had volunteered.

The PREMIER: I never suggested any such thing.

Mr. MORGAN: It was stated that he was doing his duty in volunteering, but we saw in a letter published in the Press the full particulars of what took place so that the public could know exactly what happened.

The PREMIER: His own secretary, Mr. Wilde Ball, contradicted him.

Mr. MORGAN: That letter was not to the liking of the Premier, and now he is using his power as Premier to try and intimidate those two members who have been mentioned in the Chamber to-day and to blackmail them.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "blackmail."

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw it at your request. I do not know whether you were in the chair the other night when the Premier made use of the same word.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: When the Premier was dealing with this particular matter the other night, the hon. member for Toowong issued a challenge and the Premier accused him and his firm of blackmailing him. The Premier was not asked to withdraw the word "blackmail" on that occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can assure the hon. member that if any hon. member in this House accuses another hon. member of blackmail, he will have to withdraw it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: I quite agree that it is your duty to see that that is done, but I was present when that speech was delivered, and I can assure you—and if you look up "Hansard" you will discover it for yourself—the Premier made use of the word "blackmail" in respect to the firm of Thynne and Macartney, and both those gentlemen are members of the different Chambers. The Premier was not asked to withdraw the word on that occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are asked to withdraw it now, and that is enough for you, anyway.

Mr. MORGAN: I withdraw it out of respect to the Chair. The people of Queensland will recognise this fact that, so far as this Bill is concerned, the Government were not serious when they introduced it. We recognise that in respect to the amendment there is more protection necessary from those who are associated with the greatest monopoly we have in Queensland to-day. That is the Australian Workers' Union. That association must be looked upon as the greatest monopoly that exists in Queensland to-day. We must recognise that Mr. Theodore was Treasurer in the Government and he also occupied the dual position of president of the Australian Workers' Union as well as Treasurer of Queensland. Eventually he discovered that he could not possibly serve two masters, and according to an hon. gentleman opposite whose word I accept, the Treasurer decided to resign from the position of president of the Australian Workers' Union.

What was the position of that hon. gentleman when he occupied both offices? That was an anomaly. No member of a Cabinet should occupy a position as president of the Australian Workers' Union. The Premier himself knows that no matter how he may desire to do certain things or how his conscience may dictate in certain directions, he is not able to carry out the dictates of his conscience if the Australian Workers' Union decide against him. In proof of that I will read a few remarks made by Mr. Hughes only yesterday, and appearing in the "Courier" this morning. This is what Mr. Hughes said—

"Of late, however, this system has been encroached upon by attempts by outside organisations to control members, so that they were no longer free agents but merely registered the opinion of the outside organisations who were not responsible to the electors, who never came before them, and over whom the electors had no control."

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Mr. Hughes made a lot of wild statements.

Mr. MORGAN: That is a statement made by Mr. Hughes in connection with the members of the caucus in Parliament.

Mr. LAND: He was a member himself.

Mr. MORGAN: That shows that members opposite are responsible to men outside. They are allowed to occupy seats in this Chamber, and they can receive certain fees, and nothing can be said against them in any shape or form. It has not been shown by any speaker, who has addressed himself on this matter of an alteration of the Constitution, that at any time corruption has existed in the Queensland Legislature, and the only reason given for the introduction of this measure is that on some future occasion something may take place similar to the corruption that exists in America to-day. Queensland for the last fifty years, with the exception of the last few months, has been governed by a Liberal Government, and corruption has not been able to live here during that period, which shows that, so far as the Liberal Administration was concerned, that it was powerful enough to prevent corruption in any shape or form. If there is any necessity for legislation of this sort to-day, it is only because the Premier and his party are liable to be corrupted. He himself is evidently afraid that something in this direction may occur during the period that he rules in Queensland. That is the only conclusion one can arrive at.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Then, why oppose the Bill?

Mr. MORGAN: If you will stop that jargon, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will use parliamentary language.

Mr. MORGAN: There are only two reasons why this Bill should be introduced. One is that the Government fear or see some reason that corruption is likely to creep in during the next few months, and therefore the Premier seizes the opportunity of striking at some hon. members who have opposed him in certain matters.

Mr. LAND interjected.

Mr. MORGAN: If my friend with the large stomach and the weak voice will only

*Mr. Morgan.]*

stop his interjections I will tell him that so far as Germans are concerned, the only party who has a naturalised German in their party is the Labour party.

Interruption by Government members.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. CARTER: What about your own party?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: While this Bill is going to prevent Britishers who may represent alien corporations or monopolies—and a monopoly is practically to be decided by the Government and its friends—if it happens that the Opposition has a strong member who is acting for a company, the Government can decide that the company is a monopoly, and thereby prevent that member from occupying a seat in Parliament. Why does the Bill not go further, and prevent natural-born Germans from becoming members of this Assembly? Is there not a greater danger to Australia and the Empire in having native-born Germans sitting in this House than in having Australian or British born subjects who are acting on behalf of certain companies? Blood is thicker than water, and if the people of Queensland desire to elect a German or a Bulgarian, or a Turk, or an Austrian as a member of Parliament, they may do so.

Mr. CARTER: Or a mongrel.

Mr. MORGAN: They elected a mongrel when they elected the hon. member.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "mongrel."

Mr. MORGAN: It was only because of the interjection that I used the word "mongrel," but I have pleasure in withdrawing it. Nevertheless, if my friend interjects, he must take what he gets. When I interject I take what comes to me without in any way being offended. I think I am able to protect myself in that direction. If we wish to prevent the Parliament of Queensland becoming influenced by Germans or others of enemy origin, then we should go as far as to say that natural-born Germans, Austrians, Turks, or Bulgarians should not sit in this House, and I would be prepared to say that we should not allow a descendant of an enemy subject to take a seat in this House.

Mr. CARTER: You would be shut out.

Mr. MORGAN: There is not one drop of foreign blood in my veins. All the members of my family can be traced to good, noble, British blood, and I am not in any way connected with the enemies of Great Britain. Some of my friends opposite will recognise that they cannot say the same of themselves. I am proud to say I am of Welsh descent, and at the present moment the Welshmen seem to be ruling the world. (Laughter.) If this Bill is necessary, I recognise that it will be greatly improved by the amendment, as it will show that we are making a true effort to keep certain people out of this House who, perhaps, should not be allowed to sit here. The Bill as it now stands is only a direct charge aimed at certain individuals in order to satisfy the personal spleen of the Premier because they have dared to criticise his administration and to endeavour to do their duty as members of the Opposition, to do which they were elected by the people of Queensland.

[Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I notice that the hon. member for Burke in moving the amendment made special reference to some remark I made on the Financial Statement. I want to tell the hon. member that the member for Bowen is not in this House to take any dictation from the member for Burke or any member sitting in Opposition or on this side. The hon. member for Murilla made mention of the fact that we have had fifty years of Liberal Government in Queensland, and the hon. member for Murrumba also made a similar statement. Those hon. members want to realise that we are not living in a state of primitive industry to-day, but are living in a form of industry that has developed considerably during the last fifty years. Fifty years ago trusts and combines were practically unknown. Monopolies were only commencing to be thought of fifty years ago. Things have changed since then, and what might have suited Queensland, even five years ago, is not going to suit us to-day. If we take the census returns dealing with the wealth of Australia we will find that a very few people in Australia already own the greater part of the wealth of Australia. That proves that evolution is taking place, and that the wealth of this country is getting into fewer and fewer hands, and, therefore, it is necessary to introduce such legislation as is outlined in this motion.

Reference has been mentioned of the United States. It is admitted by most hon. members that corruption does exist in the United States. This country is progressing industrially on similar lines to the United States, which might be termed the classic home of industry, as that is the place where industry reaches its highest development. The result has been that corporations have come into existence in that country, and I take it we wish to avoid the same painful process that they are going through in the United States. There are other parts of the world where corruption has come into the political life apart altogether from America.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Canada.

Mr. COLLINS: Not only in Canada, but in South Africa. I have in my hand a book called "The Evolution of Modern Capitalism," by John A. Hobson. It is just as well to let the people of Queensland know what is taking place in other parts of the world, and what may take place here, because the money power is a most powerful factor. The reason such legislation was not so much required in the past is owing to the fact that we never had a Labour Government in power, and the money power in Queensland is roused to-day owing to the legislation that this Government is placing on the statute-book, and they are out to fight us. I will prove, from this quotation that I am about to read, that they are seeking to control everything that has a tendency to enable them to control the political machine. We saw the result lately in connection with the conscription campaign when practically the whole of the Press of Australia was opposed to the anti-conscriptionists. Mr. Hobson on page 266 says—

"The most distinctive feature of South African finance, however, has been the skilled use which the financiers made of political machinery to assist them in improving and marketing investments. The actual lands which form the material

basis of industrial and speculative exploitation, Kimberley, the Rand, Rhodesia, have in each case involved in their acquisition the application of a medley of non-economic forces, legal treachery in the case of Kimberley, the dupery of 'concessions,' riveted by armed force in Rhodesia, bribery and diplomatic coercion followed by war in the Transvaal. The financiers worked 'politics' and the coercive machinery of the State at every turn in their career; to obtain special legislation for the diamond industry, to promote railroad facilities, and to secure immunity from taxation they required influence in the Cape Government; the flotation of the Chartered Company and the 'protection' of its properties against native risings involved Imperial influence; the management of Mr. Kruger's Government in the Transvaal kept them incessantly dabbling in the internal politics of that country, seeking concessions and other privileges, planning raids and ultimately organising a catastrophe which was worked on their behalf and by their express machination at the prodigious expense of the British Government."

That is what they were able to do in the Transvaal, and there is a danger in allowing people to keep seats in this Parliament or in other Parliament who represent these particular interests. Further on, Mr. Hobson says—

"In new, unsettled countries the financier is in constant need of political assistance; he needs political control in order to mature his financial operations, and he is able to obtain it. The power of the little group of men who wield the finances of De Beers and the Rand is virtually absolute in the politics of South Africa."

Their control over the finances of the country and public finance enables them to wreck every political scheme antagonistic to their interests. That is what they are aiming at in Queensland. I have been watching them for some considerable time. It is like a chain, they are forging link after link right up to the Legislative Council. It is just as well to emphasise the point about South Africa. While it seems to be

[7 p.m.] claimed that the corruption is insidious in the United States, some people seem to think that corruption does not exist in the British Dominions. I am going to show that it exists in a very high form indeed in South Africa. Hobson goes on to say—

"To realise the fullness of this power to paralyse effective opposition, we must remember that not only are the mining industries under their control, the only solid sources of riches the whole country possesses, that upon them depend the success or failure of the trading interests at the ports and in Kimberley and in Johannesburg, of the public and private railroad and telegraphic companies, banking and insurance businesses, the collieries and iron mines, irrigation, and all other manufacturing and agricultural works demanding capital. Not merely are all these industries economically dependent on the mines, but the mineowners supply their capital and appoint their officers."

1916—5 x

I want the House to particularly take notice of the next quotation—

"Nowhere in the world has there ever existed so concentrated a form of capitalism as that represented by the financial power of the mining houses in South Africa, and nowhere else does that power so completely realise and enforce the need of controlling politics."

I say that what is true of South Africa is also true of Queensland and the Commonwealth in general. It has already reached a form of development here in Australia higher than some people seem to think. It is up to the Labour party to block that controlling influence, and we are commencing to do so by the introduction of this measure. It goes on to say—

"The newness of the country and the absence of any earlier growth of strong vested interests have enabled these financiers, drawn from all the European countries, to develop the latent powers of pure finance more logically than elsewhere; the immensely rapid possibilities of financial exploitation has attracted thither not a few financial intellects of the highest order, men who have known how to adapt finance to the particular environment and to operate at once upon the racial and economic antagonisms within their area of industrial operations, and upon the patriotic sentiments in Great Britain need to secure for their investments the political and military assistance necessary to mature them. Their strategy has been large and masterful. Recognising that the success of their financial operations and of their political adjuncts was dependent upon the movement of public opinion and public sentiment in South Africa and Great Britain, they bought the leading organs of the South African Press, subsidised political parties in Africa and Great Britain, and organised a moral propanganda among the churches and the philanthropic bodies. By thus creating a volume of public interest and confidence in South African 'development' they secured an atmosphere favourable to investment; by playing upon fears, suspicions, and sentimental aspirations they produced an agitation of public mind reflected in the share-market; by a concentrated exertion of all their moral and intellectual influence they engineered a catastrophe, from the ruins which they have emerged with a firmer grip than ever upon the substantial resources of the country and its government, which implies a more profitable handling of the share-market."

I am quoting from an English author, from a man who is acknowledged in the economic world as being one of the leading thinkers of Great Britain. Let no one tell me that the same forces are not at work in this State. What alarms me at times is the simplicity of some of my colleagues in connection with the evolution of capitalism in this State and the Commonwealth. I am not finding fault with any particular individual, as I realise that they are creatures of the capitalistic system, but these people who represent monopolies and trusts and combines should not occupy a seat in this House. I claim that I understand the working class movement, and it is not in the interests of the workers that the people who represent

Mr. Collins.]

these powerful combines should be the law-makers of Queensland, or any part of the Commonwealth, if the workers are going to procure their own. They have not hesitated to make war when necessary. They at all times seek to control the political machine, and when they cannot get direct representation in Parliament, they seek by other means to control the political machine. Is there anyone who can say that we control the political machine in the State of Queensland? No; it is controlled by the Upper House, by the money power, by gentlemen who represent the different companies and financial institutions in the Legislative Council, and who block every useful piece of legislation which we introduce in the interests of the people. Some people claim that we have not reached that form of development in Australia mentioned in the book I have quoted. I am going to quote from a pamphlet entitled, "The Kingdom of Shylock," by Frank Anstey, M.P., page 8. It states—

"SHYLOCK AND 'SHENTAGE.'

"The little clique of 'financiers' who control the banks, insurance societies, trustee and loan agencies of Australia, are going to make a fine harvest out of the 'war loans.' Their 'shentage' will be their patriotism, and all they can make will be their 'sacrifice.' We are cutting the road wide and smooth for the passage of our own grown Morgans, Vanderbilts, and Schneiders.

"James Burns, Robert Philp, Adam and James Forsyth, J. T. Walker, J. R. Fairfax, of the Burns, Philp combination; Levy, Cohen, and Moses, of the Sydney Gaslight monopoly; W. C. Watt, Knox, Kater, Mackellar, Binnie, Buckland, Cowley, Reg Black, and Onslow Thompson, of the Sugar squeeze; control the 250 branches of the Bank of New South Wales, the 200 branches of the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney, the Bank of North Queensland, the Australian Mutual Provident, and nine-tenths of the life, fire, trustees, and loan agencies that operate in the two States of New South Wales and Queensland."

Then, hon. members opposite state that we have had fifty years of Government, and these things have not been brought about in Queensland. Of course, they have not been brought about, because the conditions are not favourable. As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, it is the evolution of industry. Imagine all these people controlling all the things mentioned in this pamphlet by Frank Anstey. They say they should be lawmakers, and allowed to take their seats in this Chamber. We know that, unfortunately, they occupy seats in the other Chamber.

Mr. MURPHY: The Adelaide Labour Convention did not take much notice of Anstey on that question.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: They did not take much notice of Hughes either in Adelaide.

Mr. COLLINS: It does not matter to me in what direction other countries are legislating; it is a question as to what direction we are going to legislate.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: We are one of the youngest countries of the world, and it is for us to lead the way in this direction. Hon. members opposite are alarmed about it. Last night they talked for hours about the owners of the various insurance com-

panies, but we did not hear them talking about the mass of the people. I have just got one more quotation dealing with the United States. We do not want to pass through the same painful process that the United States has passed through. I have no desire to see the public life of Queensland become corrupted in that way. If it has been pure as hon. members opposite say in the past, let us see that it is pure in the future. I do not know whether the hon. member for Murrumba is the James Forsyth mentioned when I was quoting from Mr. Anstey's pamphlet, but I will show him the pamphlet later on if he wishes to see it. Quoting from the work I have already referred to, on page 205 it is stated—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to point out to the House that it is very unusual for a debate like the present to take place at this stage of a Bill. I have allowed a good deal of latitude in the discussion, because it is an important motion. The debate that has taken place has really been a second reading debate on the Bill. At this stage—the resolution asking for leave to introduce a Bill—it is only usual to allow the mover of the motion to explain the Bill so that hon. members will know exactly on what lines it is drawn. I hope that hon. members will keep as closely as possible to the motion, and not make second reading speeches. I do not intend to block the debate now, as hon. members have spoken so fully on the matter, but I hope, at any rate, that it will result in a good deal less debate on the second reading of the Bill.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: I quite agree that a good deal of this could be said on the second reading, and I do not propose to deal with it at any greater length, as I shall be able to deal with it more fully on the second reading of the Bill. I was going to make reference to this quotation, where he says—

"Thirdly, the corrupt domination of politics by business interests, stronger in the United States than in any great industrial nation of Europe, enables the great railroad and business corporations to procure municipal and State charters and other profitable privileges, to override many laws with impunity, and to avoid their fair share of contribution to the public purse."

I notice that one hon. member made reference to the Industrial Workers of the World. I want to say here that the man who is in the political life of this State or the Commonwealth, and who does not make himself acquainted with the different schools of thought, no matter by what name they may be known, is, in my opinion, not fit to be a legislator. I believe there was a raid made on certain premises during the conscription campaign, and I am satisfied that if there had been a raid on one particular active conscriptionist there would have been more works found dealing with the Industrial Workers of the World than in connection with any man I know of in Queensland. I will mention no names, because I am finding no fault with him at all. I am not here to defend the Industrial Workers of the World. Their doctrines have been denounced by me in various parts of the State, because they do not believe in political action. One school of the Industrial Workers of the World does not; others do. There are several sections of the Industrial Workers of the World,

[Mr. Collins.]

and I am not here to defend them; neither am I here to sneer and jeer at them. Many people sneer at things they do not understand. The hon. member for Burke introduced the Industrial Workers of the World in his amendment, but at the same time I am not going to vote for his amendment, because I am not going to be sidetracked or pulled by the hon. member for Burke or any other hon. member. As I said at the commencement of my remarks, I am not looking for any dictation from the hon. member for Burke as to how I shall vote. I am responsible to my own party and the people who put me into Parliament, and I am quite content to be responsible to them.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): After listening to the last speaker, one would wonder how we have attained our present state of liberty under the system he mentions. The fact that under that very system he and his friends hold the reins of Government is sufficient disproof of the assertions he has made in regard to the system he has condemned. He dwelt extensively on the efforts of capitalism to control the political machine and with the influence used in regard to conscription. If he has nothing worse than that to urge against them—the mere fact that they did their best to insure that the thousands of young fellows should be compelled to do their duty to their country, as every man should be compelled—I think his charge largely falls to the ground. We are told that the ostensible object of the Bill will be to prevent corruption and disloyalty in the Queensland Parliament, but I think anyone who followed our proceedings during the last few days will know that only quite recently—since a member of the Opposition has proved himself rather a thorn in the side of the Government—that this was brought along. It is worthy of note that nothing was heard of this measure at the beginning of the session. I think I may say it was sprung on the House yesterday. As regards the amendment, and the object of the Bill as far as preventing corruption and disloyalty in Parliament, I think we will all agree that the object is a praiseworthy one. In supporting his arguments for the Bill, the hon. gentleman spoke about the state of things in America, more especially in connection with railway business. As far as Queensland is concerned, there is no scope for such action. Our railways, thanks to Liberal Administrations, are the property of the State, and as far as any scope for lobbying in connection with our railways, it does not exist.

The PREMIER: You know there are some private railways in Queensland.

Mr. SWAYNE: Before I go further, I would like to remark, in regard to the hon. member at whom this legislation is aimed, has been returned and enjoyed the confidence of a large metropolitan electorate for something like five or six elections. I really think, if there is any reason whatever for such a measure as this, the hon. gentleman's constituents would have discovered it long ago, and the mere fact that they have endorsed him time after time is sufficient guarantee to us that he is a desirable member of our Legislature.

The PREMIER: This proposal does not refer to individuals. It refers to monopolies and alien companies and their representatives.

Mr. SWAYNE: If it were mentioned to the House at the beginning of the session

it would be all right, but anybody who has watched the course of events in this Chamber in the last few days will realise that there is quite another reason.

The PREMIER: I spoke of it years ago, when I was leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SWAYNE: Regarding the alleged purpose of the Bill—to eliminate as far as possible the disloyal members of this House—I think, if such a thing is desirable, the amendment goes a great deal further than the Bill that is to be introduced by the Government, and gets at what are really a disloyal element. As far as monopolies in Australia in the present time are concerned, many inquiries have been held. There was a Royal Commission in regard to a monopoly that is said to control the sugar industry. The result of their investigations, as far as any charge of wrongdoing was concerned, utterly fell to the ground. With regard to the meat trust we hear so much about, it will be remembered that Mr. Justice Street, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, held an inquiry into the transactions of those meat companies, and that charge also fell to the ground. As far as any evidence regarding ill-doing was concerned, it was found to be entirely wanting. I think I am right in saying the hon. gentleman spoke about German influences having to be guarded against, and I must say when you deal with that aspect of the question, there is at the present time in Australia, unfortunately, some ground for thinking such influences are at work. We know, as far as monopolies are concerned, that the strictest monopolies in Australia are the industrial unions; we know there are bodies of men who claim—and I think have had conceded to them—the sole right of employment in certain branches of industry. Those are very great privileges, and it will be easily seen that considerable powers are put in the hands of the members of those bodies to work injury to the rest of the community. We know that during this time of stress—during this great war that the Empire is engaged in—there has been one constant succession of strikes, holding up such important works as munition making, the small arms factory, and now there is a strike in the coal trade by which transports are unable to get away; and, even during the last few hours, the coke that was partly supplying the need of the locomotives on the State railways has been interfered with by one of those monopolies. However, the more important aspect is in regard to war matters. I think anyone who followed the course of events in Australia during the last few months—I will not say anything with regard to the influences, but the effects most certainly are in the way of assisting our enemy. You cannot hold up the supply of meat to the Imperial troops, as it has been held up, and the transport of troops, as has been done, and you cannot interfere with the shipping trade, as is being done, without playing directly into the hands of our enemies, and therefore a reason to suspect German influence is behind such action. (Hear, hear!) Not a member on the other side has justified the motion to introduce the Bill.

The PREMIER: Do you think that anyone who is a paid agent of a monopoly should have a seat in Parliament?

Mr. SWAYNE: If you are going to deprive monopolies of the right to be repre-

*Mr. Swayne.]*

sented in Parliament, then you should include all, and more especially such monopolies as I have been alluding to—monopolies that certainly work detrimentally to the well-being of the community and the very existence of our nation itself, because there is no getting away from the fact that this constant interference with the progress of operations in war matters must have a detrimental effect. If those actions were dictated in Germany itself, they could not be more effective on behalf of our enemy than they are. I leave to hon. members and the country what the influences have been in this matter, but if we are going to deal with this matter I say we should include all such bodies as that. At the present time, if I am not very much mistaken, there are members in the House that represent the monopoly that is depriving Australia of its coal supply, although there is a court to which these people can refer their disputes, a court that is especially appointed to deal with these industrial matters. But they have chosen to take the law into their own hands, to resort to brute force, to put the whole community to considerable loss, to put thousands of their fellow-workmen out of employment, and if we are going to prevent evil combinations and monopolies that are detrimental and injurious to the community at large from having representatives in our Legislature, then most certainly I think the amendment should be carried.

Mr. BOOKER (*Wide Bay*): When the Premier was delivering his diatribe this afternoon against the firm of Thynne and Macartney, it was a most striking object-lesson to watch the faces of the members of his Cabinet. (Government interjections.) I do not want any offensive interjections, and if I get them I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to protect me. The occasion is one that wants every honest man in Queensland to state his case and his views as a man. [7.30 p.m.] That did not apply to the Premier's attitude when he delivered his diatribe against the firm of Thynne and Macartney. While the Premier was delivering his diatribe it was interesting to any man on this side of the House, or in the gallery, to observe the mental attitude of his own Cabinet, to see their facial expression. The Premier would not perhaps then have taken to his unctuous soul that unctious which is so characteristic of him at this particular time. I start perhaps with the Hon. Mr. Huxham, then the Hon. Mr. Hardacre, and perhaps the Secretary for Public Lands, and the Hon. Mr. Coyne. I do not refer to any other member of the Cabinet, but every one of those gentlemen indicated by their facial expressions, their abject contempt for the attitude taken up by the Premier. (Government laughter.) Make no mistake about it. The Premier himself cannot hide his feelings at any time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. BOOKER: The slightest thrust changes the placid aspect on the Premier's face from absolute ugliness to perhaps a charming smile.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will obey my call to order. The motion before the House has nothing to do with the expression on hon. members' faces. I cannot allow the hon. member to deal in personalities during this debate. I hope he will take notice of my call to order.

[*Mr. Swayne.*

Mr. BOOKER: The personal attack the Premier made the other night upon the absent hon. member for Toowong indicated the mental change of the Premier, and immediately the following night, after the hon. member for Toowong rose to make an explanation, the Premier almost got out of the leash to move that this motion be dealt with to-night. Every indication of the Premier the other night when he made that personal attack on the hon. member for Toowong was shown this afternoon when he was dealing with the motion. It was patent to every member of this House—it was patent to every person under this roof—that the motion this afternoon was made for one specific purpose, and that was to discredit a reputable firm of solicitors in the State of Queensland. I just make this analysis. If there is one man in the public life of Queensland who has sacrificed his time, his means, and a great deal of years of his life to the public interests it is the Hon. A. J. Thynne. Then I might deal with his partner, Mr. Macartney, the hon. member for Toowong. I have known Mr. Macartney for many years. Mr. Macartney holds, in the social, professional, and commercial life of the community, a high place in the trust and affections of the people.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: What does he want to hide behind you for?

Mr. BOOKER: I am not concerned what the canaille of Parliament considers about me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOOKER: I am dealing with the motion which the Premier has introduced this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "canaille."

Mr. BOOKER: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted—

The SPEAKER: Order!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. BOOKER: May I not be permitted to say a word—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw the word "canaille" as applied to members of the Parliament.

Mr. BOOKER: I am here to express my views on a great public issue—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. CARTER: Why don't you withdraw like a man.

Mr. BOOKER: I wish to discuss this question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw the word "canaille" as applied to an hon. member.

Mr. BOOKER: Mr. Speaker, if it is offensive to the interjector, I withdraw it. This motion is one of the basest proposals that has ever been submitted to an Assembly of decent people. I can only put it that way. If, while I am discussing that aspect of it, an interjection of an irrelevant or offensive nature is cast upon myself, then I ask for your protection. We can only get ordinary conditions in this House by suppressing interjections. Only last night, Mr. Speaker, you suggested to myself that interjections were disorderly, and I hope that you will continue to take up that attitude right through. The

point is this: When that attack was made by the Premier the other night upon Messrs. Thynne and Macartney—I must repeat again—it was made on a man like Mr. Thynne. There is no public man in Australia and no public man in Queensland who has done such good work as the hon. Mr. Thynne has done in the public interests. Take the Agricultural and Stock Department. Who was the public man who organised that department on workable lines? It was the Hon. A. J. Thynne. Right for the last thirty years that hon. gentleman has taken a high stand in the public life of the State and has done great work for the people of Queensland. As far back as I can recollect the hon. member for Toowong, Mr. Macartney, his life as a professional man and as a public man has been without reproach. It is proposed to prevent these gentlemen from sitting in Parliament for certain reasons. I am not going to quote the reason that the Premier has some ill-feeling towards a member of the Upper House, but it is patent to every member of this House, and it is patent to every person in the community who reads the daily Press, that the hon. member for Toowong has been right through this Parliament a thorn in the side of the Premier of Queensland.

The PREMIER: You make me smile.

Mr. BOOKER: No one knows the Premier better than the men who sit opposite to him.

The PREMIER: That is why they are squealing so much. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BOOKER: I rather enjoy, at times, just observing the Premier's general state of temper. When the hon. member for Toowong deals at any time with the Premier of Queensland, you at once see the venom showing through the thin veneer. It is for that reason that the Premier has felt the thrust from time to time when the hon. member for Toowong has shown the Premier up to the people of Queensland in his proper light. This proposal to-night is the outcome of nothing more nor less than personal spleen, and this Assembly has been forced this afternoon and to-night to listen to the diatribes of the Premier and the meek and lowly attitude of the Minister for Lands.

Mr. KIRWAN: And the fulminations of the hon. member for Wide Bay.

Mr. BOOKER: Don't you agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this House could be better employed to-day and for years hence, in dealing with the codification of our industrial laws and in putting in our time in dealing with some business that has business in it? To-day, what do we find? We find the industrial life of Queensland held up by a strike. What attitude has the Premier or his Government taken up to help to settle that strike?

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: Why didn't you pass the War Powers Bill?

Mr. BOOKER: Mr. Speaker, don't you think that this House could be better employed to-night in dealing with that great issue, to bring general peace, industrial peace, amongst the people of Queensland? What do we find primarily in the Railway Department? I am quite sure the Minister for Railways is feeling the gravity of the position. It is no pleasure for the Minister for Railways—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the question.

Mr. BOOKER: It has a great bearing upon my argument.

Mr. FOLEY: You are too personal.

Mr. BOOKER: My remarks have a great bearing upon the issue at stake. We are asked this afternoon to deal with a wild cat scheme. The Premier himself knows well enough that it will never pass into law. He knows that as well as any member of this Assembly.

Mr. FOLEY: Your friends will not allow it.

Mr. BOOKER: I repeat again that the Minister for Railways knows that at this particular time, instead of dealing with this academic proposal, if we were dealing with the issue of industrial peace it would be much more interesting to the workers of Queensland than the discussion which the Premier started at half-past 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The PREMIER: You are dealing with the biggest issue in politics to-day.

Mr. BOOKER: The Minister for Railways knows the gravity of the position, and he himself would be happy if we legislators to-night were dealing with the codification of the industrial laws and the simplifying of the whole system under which our industries are to carry on their work of production. If we were doing work of that nature we would be earning our salaries and we would be doing more good for the worker of Queensland. And that is the position, and that is one of the reasons why I have risen to deal with the issue. Right since the opening speech of the Premier we have been simply playing the fool.

The PREMIER: You are. I quite agree with you.

Mr. BOOKER: We are wasting the people's money and we are bringing the Assembly into ridicule and contempt. Ask the people outside what they think about us, and they will tell you pretty definitely what public opinion is. It is a reflection upon the integrity of hon. members on this side. This motion is for no other purpose than to endeavour to bring discredit upon men on this side of the House who are carrying on the industrial life of the State. If this proposal is carried, what is to stop the Government from accentuating the position. What is to prevent them from bringing in legislation to prevent a member from sitting in this House if he is a director of any trading company in Queensland? If a majority on the other side can carry this proposal through the Upper House, what will we find next? We will find that no man through his capacity of general common knowledge will be able to hold a seat in this Chamber if he has any responsibilities whatever in the State. This reminds me of a story I heard in the train when the Russian-Japanese war was on. There were some Japanese officers visiting Australia for the purpose of buying remounts for the Japanese army at that particular time, and I happened to be travelling with these men going up on the Northern train. An election was pending and these Japanese officers were chatting in the commercial end of the train amongst several commercial travellers. As there was an election pending, the discussion became political. One of the commercial travellers

*Mr. Booker.]*

asked one of these Japanese officers "What is the distinction between your Constitution in Japan and that of Australia?" The Japanese officer said, "Well, sir, I have not been in your country long enough to understand your Constitution, and I have not had the privilege of studying it to find out all about it. I know my own country, and I can tell you of Australia as I find it. The distinction politically between the two countries, is that in my country the educated and industrial people are the governing classes, and in Australia the coolies." (Government laughter.) If this sort of legislation should continue to rob your leading citizens of taking their place in the Legislature the Premier may go further still and may prevent a director of a company or manager of a company, whether it is Australian or British or anything else, from sitting in this Chamber. All the leading citizens who have been trained to manage big concerns primarily, and big undertakings, and are able to handle large numbers of men and keep them in employment will find that they will be refused the right to represent the electors in the Chamber. The men who have had no experience whatever in affairs outside in the management of any concern will be the only people allowed here. The amendment includes leaders of industrial undertakings in a community, and suggests that they shall be debarred from entering Parliament. I do not agree with that at all. My own opinion is this, that we should have had the debate on the clear cut issue. Those who support the amendment may perhaps feel otherwise, but I say emphatically and directly that the industrial people of the community should have direct representation here, but not the kind of representation, perhaps, that they have at the present time. We see in the Federal Parliament that the split is as clearly defined as a thunderclap. Then we find in New South Wales that the thinking men, the men who have grown up in the industrial life of the federation, and the men who have grown up in the State life of New South Wales, are passed out of the political life of that State. I can only brand them to-night as the Industrial Workers of the World. (Government laughter.) That is the position. I will put the case like this, and it is not the first time I have put the case: If I had been in the last Parliament, and in this Parliament, the member for Maryborough—which I represented for a full term—Maryborough being a great industrial centre, and one of the industrial workers—a man representing the industrial workers in the true sense of the word—was put up against me, I would withdraw my candidature. I recognise that great industrial centre should have its representation just as every other great centre should have its representation. Take the pastoral industry of Queensland to-day. What representation has it? None whatever. The pastoral districts of Queensland to-day are represented by men who have no identification whatever with the pastoral industry. The majority of members who represent the pastoral industry of Queensland are supported by a nomadic body of men who are there in the Gregory for two months, and then they are in the Barcoo, and then down into the Warrego, and so on, and possibly in the two months following they are in the north-west districts of New South Wales. That is the kind of representation we have

(*Mr. Booker.*)

of the pastoral industry. The motion has this baneful influence that is going to prevent men of experience, of high integrity, such as the representatives of the firm of Thynne and Macartney, from occupying a seat in this House. I do not for one moment think that there should be a preponderance of solicitors or barristers, but in every Parliament, on that side of the House or this side, it is absolutely necessary to have solicitors and barristers so that they can logically and technically deal with Bills that are submitted to us, and so enable us to frame our laws so that, when they are on the statute-book, the judges of our courts are not compelled to spend days and weeks worrying whether this is the law or that is the law. What do we find lately? Take the border case that the Premier was interested in. What do we find? Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir Edmund Barton were two eminent lawyers who framed our Federal Constitution. Those are the two men who were probably, as legal authorities, more responsible for the Federal Constitution than any of the other members who were identified with that great movement, and you find that the law is of such a complex nature that the Chief Justice makes one finding and Sir Edmund Barton another. It makes you feel that it is well to have lawyers and barristers in our deliberative Assembly, but sometimes I think it would be better for the State if we could do without them. Hon. members opposite, if they could disassociate themselves from party considerations, and I might say party advantages, and view this matter in a proper light, what would their attitude be? Their attitude of mind would be very similar to my own. They would take this view of things: That everything this Government has done has been in the direction of throwing people out into the streets. That has a particular bearing on this matter to-night, because, if you deny the right of the great masters of industry to sit in this Assembly, you reduce the merit and value of legislation to nil. You find chaos and disaster abroad. We find it to-day, and I will instance what I mean. This morning I went to the Central Station, and this will appeal to the Minister, and I have profound sympathy for him. What did I find? A senior guard checking the tickets of persons going on to the platform—doing a boy's work.

Mr. KIRWAN: He did it in 1912, and you praised him for it.

Mr. BOOKER: What does that indicate? That the railway service—

The SPEAKER: I have called the hon. member to order repeatedly for discussing railway matters.

Mr. BOOKER: I say that if you deny the right of the masters of industry to sit in this Chamber to help to carry on the great work of the development of our State, then you will find, as I found at the railway station this morning, men out of employment, and men reduced in rank. Take the feelings of the railway workers of Queensland. Take the feelings of many of the coal workers in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's remarks have nothing to do with the question. I ask him to keep to the amendment.



Mr BOOKER: It is all the outcome of legislation and administration by a body of men—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not discussing the outcome of legislation at all. The question before the House is the motion standing in the name of the Premier and the amendment, and I hope the hon. member will address himself either to the motion or to the amendment.

Mr. BOOKER: I am dealing very closely with the question at issue. I say again, and it will stand repeating—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not say it again when I say he shall not discuss that question.

Mr. BOOKER: If you disagree with my course of argument then I have no other course but to desist. It is most interesting to-night to read the "Daily Standard." It is not often that I read the "Daily Standard," because it is just of the type of the Premier. It makes assertions very often that have no foundation in fact, and it is a very remarkable thing that many of the insinuations that the Premier made the other night—it was an obligation on the Premier to substantiate those allegations—it is a most remarkable thing that the "Daily Standard" comes out this afternoon and endorses the Premier's attitude. The dictation has been there, because it is a notorious fact that the "Daily Standard" is the organ of the Government, and it is also the organ of the Turbot Hill oligarchy. It is true that we have arrived at that stage in our public life when it is not this House which governs, it is not this House which frames legislation, it is not this House which administers, and the "Daily Standard" puts the show away to-night as clear as day. It indicates what was behind the Premier, and this has a bearing upon the question that I raised some little time back, that this was a personal attack upon the reputable firm of Thynne and Macartney, and it also indicates the dictation to the Premier of his attitude in speaking to this proposal. The "Daily Standard" says—

"But where it punctures the public conscience is to find in honoured public positions, places of trust in the gift of the people, men who are the agents, the paid legal representatives, not only of local monopolies whose interests are palpably anti-public, but actually the agents, the legal advisers of foreign monopolies and trusts, even to the Beef Trust, of such peculiar American enormities, itself!"

That is identifying the firm of Thynne and Macartney with the charges made by the Premier. The "Daily Standard" further says—

"The 'Daily Standard' in past years has pointed to the direct representation in the Queensland Parliament of trusts and monopolies by men whose private interests therefore conflict sharply with their public duties. Messrs. Macartney, M.L.A., and Thynne, M.L.C. are two cases in particular point. Said the Premier. Mr. Ryan, who himself is a barrister, in the Legislative Assembly, last week—I am saying what I believe. They (Thynne and Macartney) are the solicitors for the American Meat Company; they were the solicitors in connection with the passing of the Chillagoe

Private Railway Act, with regard to the Etheridge Railway, with regard to the Mount Mulligan Railway, with regard to the Mount Elliott Railway, with regard to Mount Cuthbert, with regard to the Brisbane Tramways Company."

I want to draw attention to this:—When the Premier landed in San Francisco on that notorious—it is notorious from the fact that nothing resulted from it—the Premier had not been in San Francisco many hours before he told the American people that it was his desire, as head of the Government of Queensland, to do his best to establish a big international trade. Is that not true? He denies it, but that is in print. The Premier stated in San Francisco that on his return to Australia one of his primary undertakings would be to increase and develop the interchange of national commodities, and he particularly emphasised the transfer of meat from Queensland to the west coast of the United States. Is that not so? Of course it is. (Government laughter.) I do not want the House to forget this fact: That the American Meat Company that is carrying on extensive operations in Brisbane and at Townsville—and the workers are responsible for putting the member for Mundingburra here—(Government laughter)—was established in Queensland for one specific purpose, and [8 p.m.] that was to acquire stock in this State to help feed the people of the United States, and for no other purpose whatever. Then, in emphasising the fact that the meat business as between Queensland and the United States would be a very important factor, did he forget the fact that the channel through which that intertrade must be carried was through the Australian Meat Export Company.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY: No.

Mr. BOOKER: The Australian Meat Export Company is the channel through which the Premier emphasised that business was to be carried on. Then he comes here and talks about men who are the legal advisers of that company. That is like the Acting Minister for Justice; it is notorious that that Minister used the term "hypocrisy, cant, and humbug." It is not an original term, but it has been rather freely used lately. I do not like to give the Minister any notoriety, because he does not deserve it. (Government laughter.) Those terms could be used to-night, and also in connection with the Premier's statement at San Francisco and London. The whole position is hypocrisy, cant, and humbug. The Premier knew that in connection with the Australian Meat and Export Company, of which the firm of Thynne and Macartney are the legal advisers, that firm has no control as to the management of the company. It is a most striking circumstance that the man who is the manager of that great company in Queensland is a Queenslander—a Queenslander of Queenslanders—and the method of business of that company is above board. No one who does business with that company has any fear as to the company's prospect of establishing a monopoly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from both the motion and the amendment.

Mr. BOOKER: To come back to the question. A charge has been made against the legal advisers of that company.

The PREMIER interjected.

*Mr. Booker.]*

Mr. BOOKER: The Premier cannot get away from the onus of the charge. The other night he made one of the most disgraceful personal attacks on an absent man that I have ever heard in this Assembly. Then he comes with the power of his brutal majority, and brings in a motion for no other purpose but to penalise and discredit a firm which hold a position of high standing. The legal advisers of the company have no power in so far as the control of the company is concerned; they are there like the legal advisers of any other ordinary undertaking. Probably the Minister for Lands has a legal adviser to advise him in his wheat deals.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOOKER: The Premier when he landed in America—and the same thing applied when he landed in Great Britain—made the most definite public utterances as to his determination when he returned to Queensland to develop our resources, and more particularly with the proposition to convey meat from Queensland to the United States. Then, what do we find this afternoon? The Premier moved this motion to virtually ostracise the local legal advisers of that company, and also casting a base slur on that company and other companies? Take the directors of every British company here—and I might say the American companies, too; we have the American Tobacco Trust, the friends of hon. members opposite. Who can deny that every member of the Labour party in Australia is behind the American Tobacco Trust.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What has that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. BOOKER: Speaking of that corporation, I had the privilege a few days ago—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member not to give the history of every company that he mentions.

Mr. BOOKER: The American and British companies are doing a great deal of good in developing our resources, and that has a very close association with this motion. If you deny the right of any man who may be a director or a legal adviser of these companies to be a member of this Assembly, then you discount the possibility of these companies coming into the country and helping to develop our resources, and paying good wages and giving good conditions. Take the company that is dealing with the tobacco industry in Queensland. I saw the pay-sheets of the girls employed in one factory, from which it appeared that girls of fourteen years of age were earning anything from £1 5s. to £1 10s. a week, and young women of twenty-five were earning up to £4 and £5 a week. I cannot conceive how the Premier can bring forward this proposal which is going to discount the possibility of these companies coming to Australia and spending their capital primarily in the development of our State. The development has first to take place, and large sums are necessary in that direction. By the enactment which the Premier proposes you are going to deprive Australia from having capital to develop her resources, and from having employment round for the people under good conditions. Can any hon. member opposite tell me that any body of men were working under better conditions than when the works of the Australian Meat Export and Agency Company were going up? There is no reply.

[Mr. Booker.

There were no men who were doing their specific work who were better paid. Then when the works were erected, and Alligator Creek was taken over by the company they extended their operations, and to-day those two works are employing several thousand men.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOOKER: These are American companies.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the motion or the amendment.

Mr. BOOKER: These are American companies, and the Premier is endeavouring to discount their ability to employ Australian managers. Does the Premier intend that only Americans, Japanese, and others, should come to manage foreign companies in this country? Is he going to deny the right of the best brains of our country to take up the management of these great undertakings? I want to show the hypocrisy, cant, and humbug of the whole thing. The Premier mouthed the alien companies to-night several times. It is a notorious fact that an hon. member on the other side has endeavoured within the last few months to sell a mining proposition in the Burnett to a Japanese company.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is untrue.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. BOOKER: It is notorious, and the hon. member knows about it.

Mr. KIRWAN: You are not game to say it outside, or to make an attack like that.

Mr. BOOKER: As soon as the hon. member on the other side floats that company into a Japanese undertaking, will he lose his political job? The Premier suggests that he should.

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

Mr. SMITH (*Mackay*): When the Chief Secretary moved this motion this afternoon dealing with an amendment of the Constitution, I thought it was a motion which would commend itself to every right-thinking man in this House. (Opposition laughter.) I feel assured that I was right in my first thoughts, because it appears from the attitude taken up by Opposition speakers that they are not reasonably minded, and by their speeches have committed themselves to be the supporters and advocates of the large vested interests in Australia.

The motion provides for the disqualifying for membership of Parliament persons who are directors or attorneys of, or solicitors for, monopoly companies or alien companies. I think that is very desirable, because we know that with the extension of the activities of the State it is becoming apparent that large interests will endeavour to interfere with Parliament in the carrying out of business. Various speakers have referred to the lobbying that takes place in America, where the large capitalistic and vested interests are not only able to control votes in Parliament, but are able to find their nominees seats in Parliament; therefore the Government is to be commended for bringing along a motion of this kind, so that the public life of Queensland will be kept pure and clean, and free from any extraneous influence whatever. I think that the Premier in introducing the motion dealt with it very fairly

indeed. He outlined its broad principles, and made it clear that the desire of the Government in introducing the measure was to keep public life clean. In the course of his speech he never attacked any member either of this House or in another place; yet we find that hon. members opposite have endeavoured to accuse this Government of directing this Bill against a particular firm, the representatives of which are in this House and in another place. I have nothing to say in regard to that matter, other than that if I were in the position of those particular men, and if I were in their place I would say, "God save me from my friends." The need for measures of this kind has been shown since the Government took office. This measure is directed not only against the representatives of trusts and combines and alien companies having representation in Parliament, but it is also directed to put a stop to their attempt to influence members of this House. Who will say that since the opening of this Parliament certain members have been free from that influence? I need only refer to the Workers' Compensation Act which passed through Parliament last session and became law. Members on both sides of the Assembly at that time received telegrams from places throughout the State asking them to vote against certain clauses. I think that some members got no less than sixty telegrams from outside companies, asking them to vote against that measure. Being particularly interested in that Bill I was curious enough to note how it was being treated in another place, and I saw the representatives of the large insurance companies who were fighting that measure in the lobbies of the Council, handing in amendments which were subsequently moved by members of the Council. Can it be said that that is a thing that ought to be allowed, in a democratic State such as Queensland where we pride ourselves on our democracy, and where we should pride ourselves on our purity of public life and our desires to see the proper thing done by the whole of the people of the State? I would just like to refer to one or two other matters. The hon. member for Wide Bay has spoken, and very ably too from his own point of view, on behalf of the large interests of this State. At the beginning of my speech I pointed out that the trend of legislation in all Parliaments to-day is in the direction of providing for the interests of the people as against the interests of a particular class. The hon. member for Wide Bay referred to the little story of a short conversation that took place between himself and members of an alien race, and he said that a member of that alien race told him that in his particular country the intelligent section of the community controlled legislative affairs, whereas in Australia they were controlled by the coolies. The hon. member for Wide Bay is entitled to whatever views he likes, but I, as a member of the working class, and as a representative of working class interests, must protest with the strongest feelings possible against the men of Queensland being referred to in flippant terms as coolies.

Mr. TOLMIE: And you voted for the Japanese the other night?

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member knows perfectly well that certain interests are behind certain things, and while, perhaps, he may be clean himself, some of his supporters are interested in getting those aliens allowed

to work in the sugar and other industries. (Hear, hear!) This Bill, you will remember, deals with any attempt to use undue influence in this Assembly, and deals with men who may or may not be representatives of vested interests throughout this State. We know that this Government have passed certain legislation, with a view to protecting the useful people of this State, and we know they have been met with endless litigation on behalf of vested interests throughout the State and the Commonwealth, and yet the hon. member who has just resumed his seat moved a certain amendment in this House. At that time the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—one of the largest monopolies in the State, a representative of which monopoly under this Bill would be debarred from sitting in this House—had a case before the court testing the validity of an Act passed designed to give an opportunity to farmers to get a fair deal in the marketing of their products. In addition to that, they also had a case before the court testing the validity of certain regulations instituted by the Minister for Agriculture with a view to protecting the farmers in certain particulars; and yet the hon. member for Wide Bay, while that case was still sub judice, got up in his place in this Assembly and moved that those regulations be disallowed, thereby—had he been successful with his motion—doing for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company what they were endeavouring to move the courts for. In addition to that, the members in another place also disallowed those regulations. Then, again, it might be interesting, during the course of this debate, to find out why certain members are so interested in certain Bills. We know that in this Chamber, following out the policy endorsed by the people at the last election, we have passed certain measures, or endeavoured to pass certain measures, and we know the fate those measures have received at the hands of another place. We have, for example, what might be described as a disgrace to Brisbane at the present time. We know that certain companies are operating in Brisbane in regard to whom certain legislation has been passed by this Chamber. Amendments have been moved both in this Assembly and in the Legislative Council dealing with the Gas Bill, and can any member opposite justify members holding large interests in the Gas Companies in Brisbane, directors of companies who will be dealt with under this measure, getting up and moving amendments which are not in the interests of the people of Queensland but are in the interests or are directed to protecting their vested interests in the community. I could go on for a considerable time and urge very many valid reasons in support of this measure. We know that as democracy travels towards its goal, the opposition towards democracy will become greater and greater every year, and members opposite, who are the slaves and tools of vested interests in Queensland, know what is being assailed. They are representative of interests who will fight for their privileges to the last ditch, but we are not going to be deterred by them. (Hear, hear!) We know they are prepared to spend large sums of money and to go to no end of trouble to protect their interests which are detrimental to the people, but we as party are not going to be deterred by them. This Bill is a Bill that everyone who believes in the purity of public life and who believes that politics

*Mr. Smith.]*

should be kept clean here in Queensland and Australia will welcome, and this party are not to be deterred by any sophistry or innuendoes or attacks from the other side. We intend to pursue this Bill, which will be welcomed by the useful people of Australia and will be a measure that will tend towards purifying the public life here in the interests of the people of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

At twenty-one minutes past 9, the Premier moved—That the question be now put.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
„ Bertram	„ Lennon
„ Carter	„ Lloyd
„ Collins	„ May
„ Cooper	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ McMinn
„ Dunstan	„ McPhail
„ Fihelly	„ O'Sullivan
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. McPhail and Mr. Kirwan.

NOES, 18.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Barnes	„ Morgan
„ Bayley	„ Murphy
„ Bell	„ Petrie
„ Booker	„ Stevens
„ Corser	„ Stodart
„ Forsyth	„ Swayne
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Walker

Tellers: Mr. Morgan and Mr. Corser.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.

Noes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Appel.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be added (*Mr. Murphy's amendment*) be so added—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 18.	
Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Macartney
„ Barnes	„ Morgan
„ Bayley	„ Murphy
„ Bell	„ Petrie
„ Booker	„ Stevens
„ Corser	„ Stodart
„ Forsyth	„ Swayne
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Walker

Tellers: Mr. Murphy and Mr. Grayson.

NOES, 32.	
Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
„ Bertram	„ Lennon
„ Carter	„ Lloyd
„ Collins	„ May
„ Cooper	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ McMinn
„ Dunstan	„ McPhail
„ Fihelly	„ O'Sullivan
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

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

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Pankin and Mr. Appel.

Noes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.

Resolved in the negative.

[*Mr. Smith.*

Original question put.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*), who was received with Opposition cheers, said: I would just like to offer a few words before this question goes through. I do [8.30 p.m.] not wish to say very much. I did not take advantage when the amendment was moved to say anything, because, since notice of this resolution was given on Tuesday last, I, at any rate, regarded it as a personal attack on myself and upon my partner.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: It may be a very honourable position for a member to find himself here to have action of this kind taken against him for doing his duty as a member of this Chamber. I do not, however, wish to enter into a personal discussion of the subject. The hon. gentleman, in introducing the matter this afternoon, said he wished to avoid personalities. For my part, I have no desire to enter upon personalities. During that statement the Premier called attention to the fact, as justifying this motion, that he had so far back as some day in October last announced the necessity of the introduction of this legislation by the Government dealing with a matter of this sort. It just so happens that that date very shortly succeeded a dispute which was raging over a certain recruiting matter in which my partner, who is also attacked by this motion, took a somewhat prominent part. It is very strange that that announcement should be made so very shortly afterwards. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that on Tuesday last, when I offered a personal explanation to this Chamber, that the moment I sat down the hon. gentleman rose, and in that bullying manner of his gave notice of the resolution we are discussing to-night.

Mr. MORGAN: He was quite dramatic.

Mr. MACARTNEY: There is no getting away from the fact, as the hon. member for Wide Bay has pointed out, that a reference to the motion in what is known as the Government organ will show that it is a personal one against myself and my partner. I claim that in my personal explanation I have denied categorically the charges made against me by the Premier, and I challenged the Premier to have those charges investigated by a Supreme Court judge. I have promised to abide by the result, even if it means my retirement from the public life of the State. I am not going to enter on any defence of my position to-night, but I may say that never in my life have I abused my position as a member of this Chamber.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Premier and the members of his Cabinet, sitting on the front Treasury bench, and those members sitting behind him, are unable to show that I have. I am content to leave myself in the hands of the public of Queensland, and in the hands of the people who know me. I defy the hon. gentleman and his action in introducing a matter of this sort for the purpose of disparaging and harming myself and my partner.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: A supporter of the hon. gentleman has cast out an insinuation that the company which my partner and I are honourably connected with—a company

that has done splendid work for Queensland, and has done splendid things in the interests of Queensland generally, has something to do with a shipment of meat that is alleged to have gone to the enemy.

Mr. H. L. HARTLEY interjected.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. member knows that it did not come from the company, and it is only his venomous attitude that makes him say it. I know that my partner, Mr. Thynne, would sooner cut his hand off rather than do anything to assist the enemy. That is more than I can say for the Premier and his friends on the other side of the House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Toowong has taken the view, no doubt—the view which has been put into his mind by hon. members who have spoken on the opposite side—that this motion is levelled against him and his partner. I have no doubt, from what I have heard this afternoon, and I have no doubt, from my experience in Parliament, that it is not improbable that perhaps he and his partner will come within the provisions of this measure. That is only incidental. This measure was advocated by me when I had my seat on the front Opposition bench leading the Opposition. I always contended that some provision should be made whereby representatives of monopolies should not be allowed in Parliament—that is, paid representatives of monopolies. We know that that is how the trusts and combines grow up in America, because they were allowed to have representatives, and, of course, instead of promoting the interests of the people they were supposed to represent they were merely forwarding the interests of those corporations they happened to represent. I have continually adopted that attitude. The fact that the hon. member for Toowong made some remarks with regard to me the other evening, and the fact that his partner made attacks upon me, have nothing whatever to do with the introduction of this measure. (Opposition dissent.) I will tell you, if the hon. member for Toowong and his partner want to know my views of the attacks which they have made upon me, both with regard to the matter of recruiting and with regard to the “stuff” that he referred to. It is because he and his partner have not been able to mould me to their wishes to incur the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of Queensland on certain ventures they were interested in. There will be ample evidence of that brought before this House before very long. I stated the other night that members belonging to previous Governments sitting on the Treasury benches here could tell you how those Governments were approached by the hon. gentleman and his partner, and that if certain requests which they made with regard to certain interests they represented were not granted, then the hon. member for Toowong took occasion to attack the Government for something else in order to compel them to do what he wished.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Did I ever see you in my life on any subject?

The PREMIER: The hon. member's partner has seen me on several occasions—

Mr. MACARTNEY: Why not tell the truth?

The PREMIER: In respect to the interests of certain companies that they represent.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You lie.

The SPEAKER: Order!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order! Withdraw! Withdraw!

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that expression.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I decline to withdraw it.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a misunderstanding.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will withdraw.

Mr. MACARTNEY (to the Premier): I asked you if I ever saw you about anything.

The PREMIER: I said that his partner saw me.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the hon. member makes that difference, I withdraw; not otherwise.

The PREMIER: I never said anything else, but I say that his partner has seen me again and again in order to get certain things done by the Government, which I have consistently refused to do.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I asked you a straightforward question.

The PREMIER: And it was only when he found that I was too strong in the attitude I was taking that these attacks were made on me. But these persons have met their match. They will find that I am not going to give way to their demands, and I am not going, because they happen to have made these attacks, to drop this measure. It would suit them for me to drop it. (Hear, hear!)

But to pass to the subject of the motion, that is, a proposal to provide that certain representatives, directors, solicitors, attorneys, barristers of monopoly companies or alien companies shall not be eligible to hold seats in Parliament—that is a proposal I am sure every reasonably minded person will agree with. (Hear, hear!) The leader of the Opposition, and almost every member of the Opposition who have spoken, have put on the “cap”; they say that this measure is aimed against them. The leader of the Opposition said, “It is aimed against members of this party.” Well, it is a good thing for Queensland that the people should know that the provisions of the measure fit hon. members opposite. (Hear, hear!) I say I do not care who the man is who holds a seat on that side of the House or holds a seat on this side of the House—if he is the paid agent of a monopoly or alien company, he has no right to be here.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And in making this proposal I am satisfied that I have the people of Queensland behind me. I have sat here during this session subject to the most bitter personal attack. Everyone sitting in this House to-night—in the gallery and elsewhere—has heard hon. members over there bitterly, personally attacking me with regard to the introduction of this measure. If they

*Hon. T. J. Ryan.]*

had been here throughout this session on other occasions they would have found the same bitter personal attacks. Because I was opposed to conscription, the one man who stood out and opposed conscription, I have been subject to personal attacks. The stronger those personal attacks, the greater is the evidence that the Government are doing their duty.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: The people will tell you that.

The PREMIER: That is conclusive evidence that we are doing something that pinches the interests of hon. members opposite. If they disclose to the people of Queensland that members of the Opposition are the paid representatives of monopolistic or alien companies, I have no doubt it will be a startling revelation to the people. When they see the report of the remarks of the leader of the Opposition on this measure—it was not suggested by me, because not one word fell from my lips that could have referred to hon. members opposite—

Hon. J. TOLMIE: Do you think that because you bury your head in the sand, we cannot see your body?

The PREMIER: When they read the speeches of hon. members opposite they have the most potent evidence, the most conclusive evidence that the Opposition and their friends in the Legislative Council are the representatives of monopolies and in some cases of alien companies. I do not intend to delay the debate any further. I hope we shall soon get a division, and have an opportunity of soon introducing this measure and of placing it on the statute-book of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—(*Mr. Ryan's motion*)—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
„ Bertram	„ Lennon
„ Carter	„ Lloyd
„ Collins	„ May
„ Cooper	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ McMinn
„ Dunstan	„ McPhail
„ Fihelly	„ O'Sullivan
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Hartley, W.	„ Smith
„ Hunter	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Wellington
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Wilson
„ Kirwan	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Pollock and Mr. H. J. Ryan.

NOES, 17.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Morgan
„ Barnes	„ Murphy
„ Bayley	„ Petrie
„ Bell	„ Stevens
„ Corser	„ Stodart
„ Forsyth	„ Swayne
„ Grayson	„ Tolmie
„ Gunn	„ Walker

Tellers: Mr. Barnes and Mr. Morgan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.  
Noes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Appel.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

## TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INTIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to further amend the Traffic Act of 1905 in certain particulars.”

I presume that the leader of the Opposition called “Not formal” to this motion because he desired information as to the nature of the amendment proposed in the Bill. One amendment in the measure deals with the regulation of dray traffic going to the wharves and other parts of the city, and has been introduced because the Government have been asked by the Mayor of Brisbane to pass legislation of the character proposed. We thought that in doing so we would take advantage of the opportunity to make provision with regard to brakes and tramcars. We are not bringing in any drastic legislation, but only such provisions as are necessary for the wellbeing of the country. The provisions of the measure may be extended to other districts where they are demanded.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I do not think any serious objection can be taken to the matter mentioned by the Home Secretary as having been introduced at the request of the Mayor of Brisbane, but it seems to me that this is one of those measures which the Government are continually introducing for the purpose of causing more trouble in particular industries. By this measure unfortunate draymen in the city are to be compelled to comply with certain conditions with regard to drays used in their ordinary avocations, and to swathe their wheels in order to prevent anybody being injured. This is legislation run mad. However, if the Government desire to take up valuable time in discussing such measures I have no objection to their doing so.

Question put and passed

## REGULATION OF SUGAR CANE PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INTIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Bertram, Maree, in the chair.*)

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act of 1915 in certain particulars.”

Last week he gave an explanation of the main features of the proposed Bill, and he did not suppose that the leader of the Opposition would require any further information at this stage, seeing that the Bill would presently be in his hands.

Hon. J. TOLMIE: I gathered that you gave us full particulars then.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No; he simply outlined the main features of the Bill, and stated that the measure was to some extent experimental in character. The hon. member for Maree wanted to know the other evening if the local boards would

be affected. The Bill dealt with some of the operations of the local boards, especially in regard to awards, and provided that information required by the boards should be furnished by the mills. He thought the measure would meet the desires expressed by various sugar associations, and meet most of the difficulties that confronted the department in the administration of the Act.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### MARSUPIAL BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE moved—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to further amend the Marsupial Boards Act of 1905 in certain particulars.”

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Committee had come to a resolution.

#### FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE, the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

##### RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to bring up the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on Wednesday, the 15th instant.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the resolutions were received and agreed to by the House.

#### INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### FIRST READING.

A Bill, founded on these resolutions, was introduced and read a first time. The second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### INSURANCE BILL.

##### COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2, put and passed.

On clause 3—“*Interpretation*”—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the word “Queensland,” after the word “any,” on line 22. Many of the companies might be carrying on insurance business in other parts of the world, and it was only

intended that the prohibition against carrying on general insurance business should apply to Queensland. He did not think the Minister wanted to prevent those companies from carrying on business in other parts of the world.

HON. J. A. FIELLY did not think that the clause as it stood was other than what was desired by the hon. member, but, if he anticipated any difficulty, he (Mr. Fihelly) was prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the insertion of the words “marine insurance business,” after the word “business,” on line 40. That would give some relief to the marine insurances companies operating in Queensland.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, after line 55, of the following words:—

“Managing agent”—An agent resident within the Supreme Court, Central district of Queensland, or the Supreme Court, Northern district of Queensland, appointed by the insurer under power of attorney to conduct and control the business of the insurer in such district or any portion thereof specified in such power of attorney.”

Companies doing business in Queensland had agents operating for them in the Central and Northern districts. It was quite understandable that a large company operating in the Central district was likely to have one man to conduct the affairs for the whole of that district. They had many agents scattered throughout Queensland, and it would be inconvenient for them if they had to deal with the whole of those agents from Brisbane. Consequently, they appointed an agent as managing agent for them with control over the agents in the Central district, and over the agents in the Northern district. In view of the fact that it was thought desirable to deal with those agencies in the Bill, it was necessary to have the definition inserted.

HON. J. A. FIELLY said he would accept the amendment. He had intended to move one of a similar nature himself, but the amendment appeared to cover the same ground so far as he could gather from a casual perusal.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the insertion, after line 56, of the following definition:—

“Marine insurance business”—The business of insurance for any voyage or period covering any ship, merchandise, or other interest against loss by shipwreck or other peril of the seas.”

The amendment was consequential on the amendment he had previously moved.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, after the word “individuals,” at the end of the definition of “person,” of the words, “The term includes the Commissioner.” The reason for that was that in many of the clauses the word “person” was intended to include the Commissioner, and the amendment might save a good deal of doubt and trouble in the administration of the Act.

*Hon. J. Tolmie.]*

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He could not quite see the force of the hon. member's argument. To all intents and purposes the Commissioner would be on precisely the same plane as the companies conducting business, and he could not quite see why the Commissioner should be included in that definition. Before he could accept the amendment he would like to hear some more satisfactory reason given for it. The Government were giving an undertaking that on the broad plane the Commissioner would carry on business precisely in the same way as the companies, and he would have no privileges that were not also enjoyed by the companies.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Under the Railways Act the Commissioner for Railways was described as a corporation. The Commissioner under this Bill was not a corporation, and it was doubtful whether he could be described as "a body corporate or unincorporate" or as an "individual." The amendment was intended to clear up the point.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: If the hon. member could give a more satisfactory explanation later on as to why he wanted the Commissioner to be included in the definition, he might be prepared to meet the hon. member, and frame an amendment which would attain the same end.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He would not press the amendment if the Minister was not prepared to concede the point.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the omission, on lines 11, 12, and 13, page 3, of the words "and in the case of marine insurance goods shipped at any port in Queensland." The amendment was consequential.

Amendment agreed to: and clause 3, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4—"Power to carry on business"—put and passed.

On clause 5—"State Government Insurance Office"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission, on line 1, page 4, of the word "all."

HON. J. A. FIELLY said he would like to get some reasons from the hon. member for the amendment.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He subsequently intended to move the addition of some other words, and then to move the omission of subclause (a), namely—

"The Commissioner shall have and may exercise all the powers, privileges, rights, and remedies of the Crown."

Last night he had directed attention to the very considerable power which was put into the hands of the Commissioner under that subclause, a power which was not possessed by any other company doing business. What the insurance companies desired was that the Commissioner should not exercise the provision with respect to the application for licenses under Part III. of the Bill. Clause 5 was loaded. The Crown would possess powers greater than other persons doing business. He would quote the following decisions from authenticated cases tried in Great Britain—

"A trust cannot be enforced against the Crown."

[Hon. J. A. Fielly.]

But it could be enforced against the companies—

"A mandamus would not lie to perform a duty such as to issue a license since a mandamus will not issue against the Crown."

"The Crown is not bound by customs which bind the individual, but he may take advantage of such customs."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Are those legal opinions?

HON. J. TOLMIE: No; they are cases that had been decided—

"The Crown is not bound by statute unless expressly named. By-laws do not bind the Crown unless they are expressly or impliedly authorised to do so."

"Execution cannot be levied against the property of the Crown."

"The prescription Acts do not bind the Crown and no amount of negligence or laches bars the Crown."

"The Crown is further not liable to pay any taxes or rates unless these are specifically mentioned."

In any cause of action, where a malicious or fraudulent act was necessary to be proved, the Commissioner might allege that he had the right and privilege of the Crown, and no such action would lie against the Commissioner. A charge of false representation to another insurance company on re-insurance could not be brought against the Commissioner. A charge of conspiracy against him to unlawfully injure another insurer's business could not be successfully maintained. The Commissioner might cause some person to be falsely imprisoned; he might defame the character of the other companies; and he would have the full protection of the rights of the Crown. Surely hon. members did not think the Commissioner should be placed in such a position as that, and it was with a view to curtailing his powers in this direction that the amendment was moved, and he trusted that the Minister would see his way to accept it. The omission of the word "all" which he had moved was not the important part of the amendment; the crux of it was the omission of subclause (a). The Minister had indicated that all he wanted was that the Commissioner should be on the same plane as the companies who were doing business.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Speaking broadly; but you cannot put them on exactly the same plane.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was not saying that the prospective Commissioner would go about defaming the character of those who were associated with him, but changes might take place, and it was quite possible that another Commissioner might be there, and some of these things might occur, in consequence of which companies would be seriously hampered in their business if not altogether ruined. He hoped the Minister would see his way to accept the amendment.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: The arguments of the hon. member would be convincing if they were real, but the hon. member would notice that subclause (b) provided—

"All legal proceedings may be brought by or against the Insurance Commissioner in his official name."

In the original drafting of the Bill he had wondered why they were giving the Commissioner all the powers, privileges, rights, and



remedies of the Crown. It was more a matter of form; they were not by any means the rights of the Governor in Council. The Commissioner could sue and be sued. That was quite different to what was stated by the leader of the Opposition. If the facts were as stated by the leader of the Opposition he should give further consideration to the amendment, but he could assure the hon. member that they were not. Although the Commissioner would be pretty well on the same plane as the companies doing business in Queensland, there must be a difference. He could give the assurance that the companies would have proper remedies in case of any injury being done to them.

HON. J. TOLMIE was afraid that the hon. Minister's arguments were inconclusive. Did not the hon. gentleman see that it was one thing to bring proceedings against the Commissioner in his official name, and another thing to proceed against him. When the legal proceedings were instituted all he had to do was to plead that he had the powers of the Crown in regard to the matter.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: You are building up impossible contingencies.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Why were they giving him this protection?

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: It is very necessary.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Certainly proceedings could be instituted against the Commissioner in his official name, but he could go into Court and plead subclause (a). The Minister did not say that it was essential [9.30 p.m.] for the Commissioner to have these particular privileges over and above his competitors. It was like putting the Commissioner in a glass case so that no dust would fall upon him, and he was protected in every way from his competitors. The Commissioner was in a position to defame his competitors if they left the clause as it stood. He was dealing with the Commissioner as an impersonal factor just then, because, from his knowledge of the present Commissioner and from what he had heard of his reputation, he did not think he would do any such thing. There was a danger in allowing the clause to pass, and the legal decisions he had quoted would show that the amendment should be accepted, and should weigh with the Minister.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY: They would weigh if they had any application.

HON. J. TOLMIE: They did have application. All that was stated in paragraph (b) was that legal proceedings could be brought against the Commissioner in his official name. He thought someone should be set down who could be proceeded against, and then, if a verdict were given against him, the Crown would pay his expenses. If they left paragraph (a) in its present form then the court would hold that the plaintiff could not proceed.

HON. J. A. FIDELLY regretted that he could not accept the amendment. It was like straining at a gnat. Probably the insurance companies' lawyers thought that there was something dark hidden in the clause, but there was nothing of the kind. The cases quoted by the hon. gentleman had little or no bearing on the question. The Commissioner had no discretionary power like the Crown had. That was the prerogative of the Crown. They could not place the Commissioner as a Government servant in

the same position that a private man could be placed by his directors. It was all moonshine to say that the Commissioner would go careering round the country making defamatory statements about his competitors.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) thought that the powers of the Commissioner were arbitrary, because he had all the powers of the Crown behind him. The Commissioner controlled all the brokers and everyone else. The Commissioner should not have such arbitrary powers at all. He was dealing with the Commissioner in an impersonal way. He did not think such powers should be reposed in anyone.

Mr. MORGAN pointed out that if anyone sued the Commissioner, his lawyer would tell him to read subclause (a). The private firms would be subject to prosecution, but they could not prosecute the Commissioner at all. No harm could be done in accepting the amendment. He understood from the Minister that the Commissioner did not want any preference, and was prepared to stand or fall on his own merits, in competition with the private companies. If that were so, the Minister should accept a reasonable amendment.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Tolmie's amendment on clause 5*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Lennon
" Carter	" Lloyd
" Collins	" May
" Coyne	" McLachlan
" Dunstan	" McMinn
" Fidelity	" Melha
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Hardacre	" Pollock
" Hartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hartley, W.	" Ryan, T. J.
" Hunter	" Smith
" Huxham	" Stopford
" Jones, T. L.	" Wellington
" Kirwan	" Wilson
" Land	" Winstanley
Tellers: Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Stopford.	

NOES, 13.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Morgan
" Barnes	" Petrie
" Bell	" Roberts
" Booker	" Stevens
" Corser	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	
Tellers: Mr. Barnes and Mr. Morgan.	

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.  
Noes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Appel.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original question stated.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He did not intend to proceed with the other amendments he had circulated on the clause, because he recognised that they would meet with the same fate as the amendment on which the Committee had just voted.

Question put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8, both inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 9—"Insurers to be licensed"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "other than the Commissioner"

*Hon. J. Tolmie.]*

after the word "person" on line 44, page 5. The clause would then read—

"Save as next hereinafter provided, no person other than the Commissioner should carry on general insurance business in Queensland unless or until he has obtained a license to do so from the Commissioner."

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: I will accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIEHELLY, a consequential amendment providing for the insertion of the words "marine or" in line 45, was agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the word "Commissioner" on line 47, with a view of inserting "Insurance Board." On the second reading it was pointed out that in the interests of all persons concerned, it was desirable that there should be a board, which should license brokers and insurers, instead of the Commissioner. The hon. member for Murrumba particularly stressed the point, and if his memory served him correctly, the Minister by way of interjection indicated that he would accept it. There was just a possibility that the Commissioner might find a conflict between his duty to the Crown and his duty to insurance associations.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He was in a position to accept some of the amendments of the leader of the Opposition, but that was not one of them. There was really no need for it. Certain machinery was provided so that the final decision did not rest with the Commissioner. He understood that the leader of the Opposition, in his second reading speech, spoke particularly of the fact that there was a board in New Zealand. There was. It consisted of four members, two of whom represented the insurance companies, and the others comprised the insurance manager and the Minister, and the Minister had a casting vote. A more futile description of a board could not be imagined. What was the use of erecting a board of that kind—four members, of whom two were Crown votes, one of whom had a casting vote? It would be infinitely more satisfactory here to let the clause go as it was. He did not see that the amendment would be of any utility. He was perfectly satisfied that the companies would not gain any benefit, and the people might lose.

Mr. PETRIE thought the amendment was a reasonable one. Why should the Commissioner have these functions cast upon him? In the interest of the Commissioner himself, it would be better to have an Insurance Board, and he hoped the Minister would reconsider the matter, and accept the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: There was a clause in the Bill which gave the Minister power to override the Commissioner, and under this clause the Commissioner might act on instructions from the Minister and refuse to grant a license to a company. If the clause was not amended, it was quite possible that the Commissioner would have power to create a monopoly in the insurance business by refusing licenses, and that was too great a power to place in the hands of any official.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: Read subclause (3) of clause 10.

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

Mr. MORGAN: The clause read thus—

"On compliance with this section, the Commissioner shall grant to such applicant a license"—

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: "Shall grant."

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, on the applicant complying with that section. They did not want a lot of law cases under this Bill if it became law. Already too much money had been spent in legal fees during the past two years.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: And your friends have been responsible for that.

Mr. MORGAN: No; to a great extent the hon. gentleman was the cause of that expenditure. More legal expenses had been incurred under the hon. gentleman than under any other Minister in Queensland.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: Might he emphasise the provision in subclause (3) of clause 10? That provision distinctly stated that the Commissioner "shall grant" such applicant a license. If the company was a bonâ fide company, it was incumbent on the Commissioner to grant them a license, and he could not refuse to do so. Why should the Commissioner, who was a Crown officer appointed to do certain things under the Bill, disobey the provisions of the Bill? The thing was ridiculous.

Mr. CORSER thought it would be fairer and safer to accept the amendment, and place the power of granting licenses in the hands of an insurance board. It seemed to him that it was not absolutely in the discretion of the Commissioner to grant or refuse a license, as he would be subject to regulations over which he would have no control.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He has got to license insurance companies.

Mr. CORSER: Yes, provided they comply with the provisions of the Bill.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: Well, a board could not do any more than the Commissioner would do.

Mr. CORSER: An impartial referee would be a better referee than one who was tied up in the business himself.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: If a board were there, they would have to do exactly as the Commissioner will do, because they would have to do it; the clause says "shall grant."

Mr. CORSER: In the case of marine insurance, the Commissioner, having nothing to do with that kind of business, would give a fairer go than he would in the various branches of insurance business that he carried on.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He must grant a license.

Mr. CORSER: Under certain conditions he must grant a license, but he was governed by regulations. If it came to the same thing to have an insurance board, why was the Minister so determined to give all the powers to the Commissioner? The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that there was a big difference. The whole Bill was built on the fact that the Commissioner must have sole power

HON. J. A. FIELLY: The amendment merely wished to substitute the word "board" for "Commissioner," and the powers were there just the same. The Commissioner must exercise them in a particular way, as he had no option. There was no argument in the matter, and it reminded him of the famous poster "Nothing to argue about." The Commissioner must grant a license.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the insertion of the words "marine or" after the word "on," on line 48. He wished to say, for the information of the hon. member for Burnett, that he was making some slight alterations in connection with marine insurance, but at the same time he wished to remove from the minds of hon. members the idea that the Government at no time intended to enter into marine insurance. They did not intend to do so in the immediate future.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "other than the Commissioner," after the word "person," on line 52. This was a consequential amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the insertion of the words "marine or" after the words "carries on," on line 52.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "or being entitled to hold" after the word "holding," on line 53. The clause provided that any person who carried on general insurance business in Queensland without holding a license was liable to a penalty of £2,000. There might be some delay over which the individual had no control, and he did not think it was the intention of the Minister that a business should be closed up because there was some delay in obtaining the license.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: You are going to the other extreme. He may delay it for years under the amendment.

HON. J. TOLMIE said if there was any irregularity the Commissioner had full power to cancel the license. If a fine of £2,000 could be inflicted the company should have some consideration, more particularly as the individual was absolutely in the hands of one person.

HON. J. A. FIELLY said if a person was entitled to hold a license he could refrain from getting a license as long as he wished. The other extreme was gone to. The Commissioner was not going to be harsh in the exercise of his functions, and the insurance companies of some years standing were not going to be so dilatory that, although they were entitled to hold a license, they would not obtain a license. The abstract fact that they would be entitled to hold a license would, if the amendment were accepted, give them all the exemptions or immunities that companies had who took the precaution of fulfilling the condition under the Bill. The thing was not fair, and gave no protection to the licensed companies. The amendment would secure exactly the opposite to what the hon. member hoped to achieve.

HON. J. TOLMIE said he could quite understand a Shylock arguing like the hon. gentleman, but not the Minister in charge of the Insurance Department. The Commis-

sioner would have full power to deal with the individual. If he did not pay, the Commissioner could cancel his license and impose the penalties prescribed by the Bill—£2,000 for the first default and £500 a day.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: Until a company got its first license it was not entitled to carry on business at all; but, in the event of the Commissioner or his officers failing to renew the license at the due date, it was unfair that the company should be subject to the heavy penalties provided for in the Bill. If it carried on business for even twelve hours it was liable.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: You have an amendment proposing to abolish the annual license, and I intend to accept that.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Deposit of 10—"Form of application and deposit of £10,000"—

HON. J. A. FIELLY moved the insertion, after the word "on," on line 8, of the words "marine or."

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He had a most important amendment to move, and he trusted the Minister would accept it. The clause required the deposit of £10,000 by all insurance companies. That was all very well in the case of companies whose premiums amounted to hundreds of thousands or tens of thousands of pounds every year, but there were many small companies, and it was desirable that they should receive some encouragement. The clause, however, was calculated to cripple them rather than encourage them. For them to progress too large a proportion of their capital should not be locked up, and he therefore moved the omission of subclause (2), with a view to inserting the following:—

"(2.) The applicant shall deposit with the Treasurer a sum of money which shall be determined as follows:—

"Where the income of the applicant from premiums after deducting local reinsurance during the twelve months preceding the commencement of this Act—

Does not exceed £2,000 ...	£1,000
Exceeds £2,000 and does not exceed £5,000 ...	£2,000
Exceeds £5,000 and does not exceed £10,000 ...	£5,000
Exceeds £10,000 ...	£10,000

"The applicant shall make a return to the Treasurer, in each year on such day as may be appointed by the Treasurer, of his or their premium income after deducting local reinsurance during the twelve months preceding.

"If such premium income shall increase from time to time, the applicant shall increase his deposit with the Treasurer in accordance with the amounts set out in the scale before mentioned. If such premium income shall decrease from time to time, the applicant shall be entitled to a refund from the Treasurer of such portion of his deposit as may be in excess of the amount set out in the scale before mentioned."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He quite understood that this matter was important to the

*Hon. J. A. Fihelly.]*

companies, but he was afraid that the suggestion of the hon. member would be too cumbersome, and almost unworkable from a departmental point of view. To meet the case he would suggest that, where the premium income did not exceed £10,000, the amount of money to be deposited should be £5,000, and where it exceeded £10,000 the amount to be deposited should be £10,000. He might point out that in Victoria, under the Workers' Compensation Act, in connection with the transaction of accident business only, the minimum deposit to be made by the companies was £6,000.

Mr. MORGAN: Victoria has a larger population than Queensland.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: The leader of the Opposition was urging his amendment on account of the small premium income of some of the smaller companies, and he was trying to meet that view. If his suggested amendment was acceptable to the leader of the Opposition, he would move it.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He would accept the Minister's proposal, and withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CORSER pointed out that it would be more easy for the companies if the Minister made it 33½ per cent. of the premium income of the companies, and it would be more fair than the suggestion which the Minister had made.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: What is the good of getting less than £5,000? The deposit is to cover insurers. If a company had only a premium income of £3,000 only, what would £1,000, which was 33½ per cent., do in the way of covering insurers?

Mr. CORSER: Suppose the hon. gentleman made it 50 per cent. of the premium income? There should be some leniency shown to the smaller companies.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: They would be quite satisfied with the reduction to £5,000.

At 10.25 p.m.,

Mr. FOLEY relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Amendment (*Mr. Tolmie's*) withdrawn accordingly.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved the addition of the following new subclause, in lieu of present subclause (2)—

"(2) The applicant shall deposit with the Treasurer a sum of money which shall be determined as follows:—

"Where the income of the applicant from marine and general insurance premiums in Queensland, after deducting local reinsurances during the twelve months next preceding the date of the application—

Does not exceed £10,000	...	£5,000
Exceeds £10,000	...	£10,000

"In cases where a first deposit of £5,000 only has been made the applicant shall make a return to the Treasurer in each year on such day as may be appointed by the Treasurer of his income from marine and general insurance premiums in Queensland after deducting local reinsurances during the twelve months preceding and if and when such premium income after such deductions has increased so as to exceed £10,000 the applicant shall increase his deposit with the Treasurer to the sum of £10,000."

New subclause agreed to.

[*Hon. J. A. Fihelly.*]

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, after the word "applicant," on line 43, of the words "and the applicant shall be entitled to receive and hold"

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: Presumably the hon. member desired that there should be no doubt about a company being in a position to demand a license, and if the insertion of the additional words proposed would help at all, he was quite willing to accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved the insertion of the words "marine or marine and" after the word "Queensland" on line 45. This was a consequential amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of all the words after the word "business" on line 45 to the end of the clause, namely—

"for the year or period ending on the thirty-first day of December then next ensuing."

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: This was the clause on which he forecasted he would accept an amendment. The annual license did not matter provided they settled the [10.30 p.m.] question of the deposit. That was settled satisfactorily. As the company had sufficient stability and security and had given evidence of bona fides through lodging the deposit, he had no objection to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of subclause (4) relating to the renewal of the license.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 11—"Investment of deposit"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the words "on the issue or renewal by the Commissioner of a license to an insurer" on lines 1 and 2.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: It is merely consequential.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved the omission of the words "securities of the Government of Queensland" on lines 3 and 4, with the view of inserting the words—

"debentures of the Government of Queensland having a currency not exceeding five years, and bearing interest at four and a-half per centum per annum free of income tax."

The omission of these words from the Bill was an oversight. This was meeting a difficulty with companies who might wish to leave Queensland. He drew attention to the fact that the debentures would have a currency of five years. That would meet all the objections raised on that point.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of all the words after "charged," on lines 9 to 14, subclause (4). The subclause would then read—

"The deposit shall be charged."

If that amendment were agreed to, he would

then move a further amendment to add the words—

“with the payment and satisfaction of all final judgments given against the insurer in Queensland which are not otherwise satisfied.”

That would enable the insurance companies to close up their business. The deposit was there to make up for any payments not satisfied. The companies would prefer the clause to be left that way, otherwise it would be a slur on their business that the demands had not been complied with. It secured all that the Minister wanted, and at the same time gave satisfaction to the companies.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: The arguments of the hon. member did not appeal to him. The companies must be very sensitive if they objected to a clause which merely said that a company, when going away, should settle its just liabilities. It left it upon the company as a duty to satisfy the Treasurer that there were no liabilities, and when that was done it could go. What the leader of the Opposition proposed to substitute was very unsatisfactory. It meant that in every case the person to whom the company was indebted must get a judgment. What would happen if appeals went on and on? It might go to the Privy Council. If the leader of the Opposition scrutinised the wording of the clause he would find that although it might be a trifle direct still it was not unfair and cast no slur on the companies, whilst, at the same time, it supplied a much better and more expeditious and more reasonable way of settling the matter than any judgment could provide. He thought the Treasurer, for the time being, was in a better position to satisfy himself as to whether there were any liabilities without the necessity of any court procedure. He could not accept the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN: The Minister would be well advised to accept the amendment. The wording of the clause was altogether too wide. The Commonwealth Government had introduced an insurance Bill, and although it had not been passed, still a commission had recommended the same wording as the leader of the Opposition proposed. The clause meant that the company would never be able to wind up its business while a claim was outstanding, whereas if the amendment were accepted, it would be able to wind up its business so soon as the final judgment was obtained, and get its deposit.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: Do you think that the Treasurer—in a few years time it might be yourself—is going to quibble over a trifle like that?

Mr. MORGAN: He thought the wording of the amendment was much clearer.

Mr. CORSER: The Minister must admit that a little too much discretion was left to the Treasurer. If the amendment were accepted, every satisfaction would be given to the people who might have done business with the company. Every safeguard was provided by the wording of it. If there was anything lacking in it, or any flaw by which a company might get out of its obligations, the Minister might tell them what it was.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: I am sure that if the companies knew what it contained—that there must be a final judgment in each case—they would hesitate before asking for the amendment.

Mr. CORSER: There was no doubt that if the Minister could show them any flaw by which the companies would get any unfair advantage, it would be withdrawn. He thought it was perfectly safe.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He would point out that if there were no “final judgment,” there would be no obligation to pay.

Mr. MORGAN: You must get a final judgment before you can get any money.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: There might be an appeal, or anything might happen.

Amendment put and negatived.

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIEHELLY, a consequential amendment, providing for the insertion of the words “marine or” on line 15, was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 12 put and passed.

On clause 13—“Maximum rates of premium”—

Mr. MORGAN moved the insertion, before the clause, of the words, “Except as hereinafter provided,” on line 38, so that the clause would read—

“Except as hereinafter provided no insurer shall, without the permission in writing of the Commissioner, issue or renew any policy covering any general insurance risk in Queensland at any rate higher than the rate prescribed for such risk in the regulations.”

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: I accept it.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the words “without the permission in writing of the Commissioner” on lines 38 and 39.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved—That after line 42 the following words be inserted:—

“Every acceptance notice, interim receipt, policy, renewal notice, and renewal receipt issued by an insurer at a rate higher than as aforesaid shall have the following notification plainly written or printed thereon in red ink:—

“By special agreement with the insured, this policy is issued (or renewed) at a premium £            in excess of the maximum premium fixed for such risk by the Insurance Act of 1916.”

Certain risks from some points of view were less desirable than others, and if insurers were prohibited from charging higher rates for those risks it might be difficult to obtain cover for them. The amendment would give companies an opportunity of taking those risks by mutual agreement with the insurer.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: This was one of the matters on which the deputation approached him, and he thought they made out a fairly reasonable case. It appeared that there were many risks which insurance companies could not possibly take at the ordinary rate, and he thought that if the statement were printed on the back in red ink showing that the rate charged was higher than the maximum rate, the person who was insuring would be protected, as he would have the knowledge that he was paying a higher rate than the maximum which had been fixed. He would accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

*Hon. J. A. Fiehellly.]*

On clause 14—"Returns"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved—That the words "for the purpose of this section" be inserted after the word "returns" on line 44. That would make it clear why the returns were desired.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 15—"Maximum commission, etc."—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the whole of subclause (1), with the view of inserting the following:—

"(1.) Except as hereinafter provided, no insurer nor any other person except the Commissioner shall pay or offer or promise to pay, whether to one or more persons, any commission in excess of ten pounds per centum in the aggregate. Such commission shall be paid only to persons licensed to receive the same as brokers or agents.

"(2.) An insurer may pay to a director a fixed fee for his services not less than fifty pounds nor more than one hundred pounds per annum.

"(3.) An insurer may pay to one managing agent for the northern district of Queensland and to one managing agent for the central district of Queensland an additional commission of 5 per centum on the premiums collected by him from agents or policy-holders of the insurer in the district under his control.

"(4.) A professional adviser of an insurer, such as a solicitor, auditor, medical officer, or the like, may be remunerated for services rendered in accordance with the custom of the profession to which he belongs, but, unless licensed as an agent, may not receive any commission on insurance premiums."

It would be remembered that the Minister agreed to a definition being placed in the Bill covering the words "managing agent" in order to allow that clause to be [10 p.m.] moved subsequently. Some of the companies had special agents at Townsville and Rockhampton who had control over the whole of those districts, and they desired to pay those agents, and if the companies employed a doctor or special auditor or a solicitor in connection with their work they desired an opportunity of remunerating them for their services.

HON. J. A. FIELLY saw no great objection to the amendment, as he understood the insurance companies wanted to be more stringent than the Government were. That suited the Government policy and did not disagree with what they hoped to obtain by the Bill. He suggested several verbal amendments.

Amendment agreed to with verbal amendments suggested by the Minister.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "or any other person" after the word "insurer" on line 17. The subclause would then read—

"No person shall receive any commission from any insurer or any other person in any capacity whatsoever other than as a salaried officer, unless he has been licensed to act in such capacity."

That would prevent the evil of secret com-

[Hon. J. Tolmie.

missions, which were rampant and which they all desired to see stopped.

Amendment agreed to, together with a consequential amendment on line 21.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, after line 29, of the following subclause:—

"(9.) No person licensed under the next succeeding section of this Act shall be entitled to a renewal of such license unless he shall make a statutory declaration in the prescribed form, when applying for such renewal, that he has duly observed the provisions of this section during the period covered by the declaration."

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 16—"Licensing brokers, agents, directors, auditors, and claim adjusters"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, on line 33, after the word "annum" of the following words:—

"The Commissioner shall not be bound to grant any application for a broker's license unless he is satisfied that the applicant is competent to perform the duties of a broker."

The amendment was put forward by the companies and the brokers. Seeing that for the future the companies would be unable to exercise their customary discretion with respect to the appointment of brokers, they asked the Commissioner to exercise that discretion on their behalf.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He was inclined to accept the amendment, but it appeared inconsistent that, after having attempted to secure the appointment of a board earlier in the Bill because the powers of the Commissioner were too great, the hon. member now proposed to increase those powers.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, on line 39, after the word "director," of the words "or managing agent."

Amendment agreed to.

On the motion of the HON. J. TOLMIE, the words "five pounds" were omitted on line 43, and the words "one pound" inserted in lieu thereof; and a further consequential amendment was made omitting subclauses (4) and (5).

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, after the word "licenses" on line 6, of the words—

"and, subject to subclause one hereof, shall grant them on lodgment of an application in the prescribed form and on payment of the prescribed fee."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: The amendment was a reasonable one, which he would accept, if the hon. member would consent to the insertion after the word "hereof" of the words "in the case of brokers." He thought the amendment would then meet all the requirements.

HON. J. TOLMIE: I agree to that.

Amendment, as so amended, agreed to. Clause 16, as amended, put and passed.

At 11.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

On clause 17—"Cancellation of licenses"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved, as a consequential amendment, the omission of lines 22 to 25, namely—

"The Commissioner may, in addition, give notice of his intention to cancel the license of any claim adjuster whose settlements are in his opinion persistently unfair and unreasonable."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: They are superfluous as the Bill now stands, and I accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission on page 9, line 32, of the word "referee," with the view of inserting "police magistrate." It was considered desirable by the companies that the person who conducted an appeal, which might result in the cancellation of an insurer's license, should be a person who was capable of sifting evidence.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: While he had no objection to the appointment of a police magistrate instead of a referee, he would point out that no person could sift evidence better than a referee who was [11.30 p.m.] accustomed to inquire into these insurance cases. It was not the ordinary evidence on which a police magistrate was accustomed to decide a case. If the companies were anxious for it, they could have it, although it would probably help to pile up costs. Some means would have to be found to restrict legal expenses if they were excessive.

Amendment agreed to.

Consequential amendments were made in lines 34, 37, and 41 by the omission of the word "referee" and the insertion of the words "police magistrate" in lieu thereof.

MR. CORSER drew attention to the words on line 41, which provided that an appeal could be made by either party from the decision of the police magistrate on any point of law. He thought permission should also be given to appeal on a question of fact. If the man with the money could appeal on technical legal points, then the man who had the facts of the case with him should also be allowed to appeal. He moved the addition of the words "or question of fact."

HON. J. A. FIELLY suggested the omission of the words "on any point of law," leaving the subclause to read—

"Either party to the proceedings before such police magistrate may appeal from his decision."

MR. CORSER accepted the Minister's suggestion, and moved the omission of the words "on any point of law" from line 41.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He intended to move the addition of the following words to the clause:—

"to the Full Court, and such appeal should be by way of rehearing. The costs of such appeal shall be in the discretion of the court."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: The amendment was quite unnecessary. The next succeeding subclause read—

"Such appeal shall be made to the Supreme Court by way of special case in manner provided by the Justices Acts, 1886 to 1909."

He did not claim to have any extensive legal knowledge, but his recollection led him to believe that all the machinery necessary for an appeal was provided in the Justices Acts. He did not propose to accept it.

Amendment (*Mr. Corser's*) put and passed.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He did not propose to move the amendment he had outlined.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 18—"Adjustment of claims by independent adjuster"—

HON. J. TOLMIE: He desired that the Committee should omit the clause, but he did not want to go to the trouble of taking a division, if an arrangement could be arrived at. A clause of that nature would lead to a tremendous amount of expense.

HON. J. FIELLY: I will agree.

Clause put and negatived.

On clause 19—"Accounts"—

On the motion of the HON. J. TOLMIE, a consequential amendment was made on line 20, page 10, by the substitution of the words, "chief representative of the insurer," for the words "licensed auditor."

HON. J. TOLMIE: He proposed to move the omission of the words "on oath" in lines 22 and 23. At present the subclause (3) read—

"The chief representative of the insurer in Queensland shall lodge with each such account a declaration on oath in the prescribed form that the provisions of this Act have been fully complied with by the insurer during the period covered by the account."

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Make it a "statutory" declaration.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He was thinking of moving in that direction. He moved the insertion of the word "statutory" before "declaration," in line 22.

Amendment agreed to.

The words "on oath," in lines 22 and 23, were also omitted.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion, on line 29, of the words—

"for the purposes of this section."

There was a great deal of suspicion, when information was asked for, that it was required for private purposes, and if the amendment were agreed to, it would allay a lot of fears, and, at any rate, clearly define what the information sought by the Commissioner was.

HON. J. A. FIELLY said he did not intend to accept the amendment. The leader of the Opposition moved a similar amendment in a previous clause, but did not persist in it, and it really had no particular bearing on any particular question.

HON. J. TOLMIE regretted that the Minister could not see his way to accept the amendment, because unless it was made clear what were the powers of the Commissioner with respect to these inquiries, insurance companies might be put to very serious trouble. No business man liked to disclose the position of his business to a competitor, and that was what might be required under

*Hon. J. Talmac.* }

the clause as it stood, as it would allow the Commissioner to make any investigation he pleased, instead of confining his inquiries to information required for statistical purposes.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: He had had a talk with the Commissioner, and found that he was satisfied that the amendment should not be accepted. He (Mr. Fihelly) was also of that opinion, and he was confirmed in his opinion by the fact that the leader of the Opposition had an amendment to propose on line 37, which read thus, "relating to any breach or alleged breach of this Act." That amendment he proposed to accept, and it should meet all the requirements of members opposite.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Tolmie's amendment*), be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

## AYES, 10.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Corser
" Barnes	" Morgan
" Bayley	" Petrie
" Bell	" Tolmie
" Booker	" Walker

Tellers: Mr. Corser and Mr. Petrie.

## NOES, 28.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
" Carter	" Lloyd
" Collins	" May
" Coyne	" McLachlan
" Dunstan	" McElna
" Fihelly	" McPhail
" Foley	" O'Sullivan
" Hardacre	" Pollock
" Hartley, H. L.	" Ryan, H. J.
" Hartley, W.	" Smith
" Hunter	" Stopford
" Huxham	" Wellington
" Jones, T. L.	" Wilson
" Kirwan	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Lloyd and Mr. McPhail.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Appel.  
Noes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the words "licensed auditor," on line 33, with a view of inserting the words "practising public accountant."

Amendment agreed to, with a consequential amendment on line 36.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "relating to any breach or alleged breach of this Act," after the word "them," on line 37.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 20—"Issue of forms"—

Mr. CORSER asked what was the reason for submitting to the Commissioner the prospectus, proposal form, or policy of general insurance? Why should they [12 p.m.] have to be submitted to a competitor in the business? Was it because they feared the insurance companies might offer extra inducements, or was it that the Commissioner wanted to make use of the brains of the heads of the insurance companies throughout the State? That would be the result of the clause.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: All that the clause provided was that every proposal form,

[*Hon. J. Tolmie.*

prospectus, or policy of general insurance should be lodged with the Commissioner, and then the company could do what it liked. The form might be lodged with the Commissioner only five minutes before it was issued.

HON. W. D. ARMSTRONG: Why not make all forms uniform?

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY said that was a very good suggestion, but he understood there was some difficulty in the way. Later on in the schedule, they might have an opportunity of discussing the question.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 21—"Reinsurance business"—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of all the words on lines 44 to 56, with the view of inserting the following:—

"(1) Any insurer reinsuring, whether by treaty or otherwise, any portion of any Queensland risk accepted by him with any person not licensed under this Act other than the Commissioner shall pay to the Commissioner a fee at the rate of five per centum on the gross premium so paid by such person for such reinsurance. Such fee shall be paid by the insurer yearly when furnishing the returns referred to in section 18.

"(2) Gross premiums shall be calculated upon the basis of the premium actually paid by the insured to the insurer on the items the subject of reinsurance without deduction of any brokerage, commission, or other remuneration whatsoever.

"(3) Reinsurance business transacted within Queensland between insurers or between insurers and the Commissioner shall be transacted at the rate actually charged to the insured as shown on the policy or renewal receipt; and the commission thereon allowed by the person accepting to the person ceding such reinsurance shall not exceed fifteen per centum.

"(4) All fees received by the Commissioner under this section shall be paid into the proper fund of the State Government Insurance Office."

This was one of the most important clauses in the Bill, dealing, as it did, with the question of reinsurances. The clause as printed would inflict great hardship on insurers. Country insurers would be seriously affected, because a line of business might deal with a block of wooden buildings, which were always regarded as risky because of the lack of a good water supply and a well-equipped fire brigade. A very big line might be brought to the company at a late hour of the day. Under present circumstances the company could accept the risk, but, under the clause as it stood in the Bill, the first thing the company would have to do would be to ascertain whether the Commissioner was prepared to take any part of the risk, and then they would have to go round to the other companies to see if the business could be taken up in Queensland. The Commissioner and the Queensland companies would not be able to take all the risks of those persons who desired treaty insurance. The amendment, however, would give the Commissioner 5 per cent. of the premiums that would go to the treaty insurers, and that ought to be satisfactory to him.



HON. J. A. FIELLY regretted that he could not accept the amendment. The treaty business was one of the most important features in the Bill. No doubt the companies desired to maintain long-standing associations in connection with the treaty business, but they could not subordinate sound policy to mere sentiment. He did not think that insurers would suffer any inconvenience from the passage of the clause. The Aachen and Munich Company and other German companies had been doing most of the treaty business, and big profits had been made because the European rates were considerably lower than the Australian rates. The leader of the Opposition had not made out a good case for the amendment, and the fact that the companies were willing to disgorge 5 per cent. of the total premiums received for treaty business which was not kept in Queensland showed that that business must be profitable. They did not want to sever lifelong connections in the business, but they were entitled to do a fair thing by the public, and at the same time by the policy-holders, and, if possible, by the shareholders. At a later stage he might devise some scheme, in consultation with the Commissioner, under which no present business arrangements would be harshly dealt with. He had in mind the adoption of a sliding scale for a period at the end of which the Act would be in operation, and in the meantime the treaty business would be gradually wiped out, subject to a percentage charge on the annual premium.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Will the hon. gentleman leave this clause over for further consideration?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He would not recommit it.

HON. J. TOLMIE: This reinsurance business was a matter of very great importance, for the simple reason that in Queensland they could not carry all the risk. If the State insurance office said they would carry all the risk the trouble would be at an end.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: I think we can arrange almost to do that. In New Zealand the private companies would not co-operate with, or give cover to, the State office when it started, and Sir Joseph Ward cabled to London and got complete cover from Lloyds.

HON. J. TOLMIE: That was all right; he got exactly what the companies were looking for. All they wanted was that their interests should be conserved. An insurer who had not enough cover for the risk he took could, under the existing law, get rid of it automatically through the treaty arrangements; but under the Bill he would have to go to the Commissioner or the fifty other insurers in Brisbane, and get a statement in writing as to whether they would take part of the risk or not, and neither the Commissioner nor the companies might be able to say off-hand whether they could take the risk.

MR. T. L. JONES: The brokers know where they could place the risk at a moment's notice.

HON. J. TOLMIE: The companies could not go to New South Wales or overseas, but had to deal with the matter in Queensland, while the Commissioner had the right to get his cover in London or America, or with the

Aachen and Munich, which seemed to have got on the brain of the Minister in charge of the Bill.

The bell indicated that portion of the hon. member's time had expired.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: In order to remove any misunderstanding, he might inform the leader of the Opposition that the New Zealand Insurance Company—which was probably the biggest Australian fire insurance company operating in the Commonwealth—carried its own risks entirely in Queensland, and had no treaty at all. He did not think the State office would ever have such a crush of treaty business and ordinary business as to be unable to give cover. It would be as well to let the clause go as it stood. In this matter the companies had a fear not that Queensland would do too well out of it, but a sentimental fear that they would lose the advantage of their old arrangements in business, and also that the interlocking arrangements between the companies would be affected by keeping the Queensland business for our own people. There had been no big fire losses in Queensland. The figures showed that for every £100 that had been paid in premiums to the insurance companies in Queensland, practically 50 per cent. was eaten up in expenses. That was waste, and they wanted to minimise waste as much as possible. Queensland could stand all its own losses by fire, and still have a big profit.

MR. BARNES drew attention to the fact that the Commissioner was placed in a better position than other insurers, because he could enter into contracts with insurers outside Queensland.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: After he exhausts all his powers of reinsuring here, he must have power to reinsure somewhere else.

MR. MORGAN thought that the local companies should be allowed to continue the existing practice, which they had followed for forty years. No company could give cover for more than £5,000 on a building like Finney, Isles, and Company's, and they should be allowed to reinsure. If the amendment were not accepted, it would be included in the Upper House.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He was willing to move an amendment to provide that "the Commissioner nor any insurer" should reinsure with any person not licensed until the Commissioner, and every other insurer, had signified their inability to accept the whole or any part of the risk. He was not able to accept the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, but the present proposal would place the Commissioner in exactly the same position as private companies.

HON. J. TOLMIE: He had no desire to hamper the Commissioner in his business, and if they took away his treaty rights, they would be placing him in just as awkward a position as any other insurer was under the clause as it stood.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: He simply exhausts all the available reinsurance here, and the balance is reinsured elsewhere.

HON. J. TOLMIE: It depended on what hour of the day he got the business whether he was able to do that.

*Hon. J. Tolmie.]*

Mr. CORSER: The Minister now proposed to make it harder for the Commissioner as well as for the companies. He would rather take away from the Commissioner the power he had given him under the Bill originally than give to the companies the business which they had at the present time. The leader of the Opposition wanted to bring the companies up to the position in which he had placed the Commissioner, instead of dragging the Commissioner down to the position in which the clause placed the companies.

Mr. MORGAN entered his protest against members being kept in the House till 1 o'clock in the morning to deal with important public business of this character after they had done a good day's work. With regard to the amendment, he contended that as the Bill gave the Commissioner the right to reinsure wherever he chose, in order to protect the persons who insured with his office, it was a fair thing that the same right should be accorded to insurance companies. The reason why the Government were restricting local companies in this respect was that they wished the reinsurances to go to the Commissioner, and that was a parochial, not a national, policy.

Mr. PETRIE said if the Government did not allow private companies to reinsure outside Queensland then the Commissioner should not be allowed to do so. [1 a.m.] He believed in State insurance, but he did not believe in giving a monopoly to the State, and when the State entered into competition with the other companies they should all be placed on the same footing.

Mr. CORSER urged the Minister to accept the amendment, which only meant broadening the clause.

HON. W. D. ARMSTRONG asked whether the Minister would accept a compromise to the effect that reinsurance could be effected in Australia but not outside Australia. That was a Federal spirit.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: The suggestion was a good one, but he did not think it would meet the position without the co-operation of the other States. He would like to see the other States doing as Queensland was doing, but under present circumstances he did not think it would be workable. If the companies here were prepared to pay 5 per cent. on the premiums of the business they did not give to the Commissioner, then there must be something in it. The Commissioner informed him that every Australian company was represented in Queensland, so that the position was practically the same.

Question—That clause 21 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
„ Carter	„ May
„ Collins	„ McLachlan
„ Dunstan	„ McMinn
„ Fihelly	„ McPhail
„ Foley	„ O'Sullivan
„ Hardaere	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Hartley, H. L.	„ Smith
„ Hartley, W.	„ Stopford
„ Hunter	„ Wellington
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Jones, T. L.	„ Winstanley
„ Kirwan	

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. McLachlan.

[Mr. Corser.]

NOES, 10.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Corser
„ Barnes	„ Morgan
„ Bayley	„ Petrie
„ Bell	„ Tolmie
„ Booker	„ Walker
Tellers: Mr. Morgan and Mr. Walker.	

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Payne and Mr. Armfield.  
Noes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Appel.

Resolved in the affirmative.  
Clause put and passed.

On clause 22—“*Co-insurance*”—

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY moved the omission of the words “No insurer shall refuse to co-insure,” with a view to inserting the words “No insurer nor the Commissioner shall refuse to allow additional insurance.”

Mr. CORSER asked the Minister how he was going to deal with clause 7 of the schedule. Was it the intention to place the companies on absolutely the same grounds as the Commissioner?

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: We shall carry out a fair and just policy.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the addition of after the word “risk” on line 3, of the words—

“Provided that this section shall not be held to prohibit the cancellation of a policy by any person for prudential reasons, provided such person allows the insured a return premium, in respect of the unexpired term of the policy, calculated pro rata as to time and without reference to any customary short period ratings.”

Amendment agreed to; and clause as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 23 and 24 put and passed.

On clause 25—“*Offences*”—

HON. J. TOLMIE suggested that the clause be deleted.

HON. J. A. FIEHELLY: It might as well be deleted after what I have given to the Opposition.

Clause put and negated

On clause 26—“*Fire inquiries*”—

Mr. CORSER moved the deletion on line 32 of the words “a report to the Minister” and the addition of the words “should be submitted for trial.” If a police magistrate or justices found a man guilty, why should they not be able to deal with him, instead of having to submit a report to the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: There is really no sense in the amendment.

Clause put and passed.

1.30 a.m.

On clause 27—“*Offences*”—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of subclause (2) providing for a penalty of £100 on every director or chief representative of the insurer.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said he could not accept the amendment.

HON. J. TOLMIE: Very well. It will be amended elsewhere.

Amendment put and negated.

Clause 27 put and passed.

On clause 23—"Regulations"—

Mr. CORSER pointed out that subclause 2 provided a penalty of £20 for any breach of the regulations, and in clause 27 it stated that all penalties should be paid to the Commissioner. He thought the fine should be paid into the consolidated revenue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member may not refer to clause 27.

Clause put and passed.

On Schedule I.—

HON. J. TOLMIE moved that on line 17, after the words "The Commissioner," the following subclause be inserted—

"(a) Before commencing to transact any class of insurance business, the Commissioner shall declare, by notification in the 'Gazette,' the minimum rates which he proposes to charge for business of that class.

"(b) The minimum net rates to be charged by the Commissioner during the period ending 31st December, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, for marine and general insurance risks shall not be less than seventy-five per centum of the gross rates fixed for such risks by the regulations of the fire, marine, or accident underwriters' associations of Queensland actually current on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen.

"(c) The Commissioner may allow such discounts for fireproof construction, the use of approved fire appliances, and other means of reducing risk as he may from time to time declare by notification in the 'Gazette.'"

The insurance companies had been operating for years, and the amendment would give them time to make any necessary alterations in their business.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said the Commissioner did not think the amendment was desirable, and he could not accept it.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the insertion of the words "Subject to this Act" before the word "Commissioner" on line 33, page 14

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said he could not accept the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of all the words after "Insurance Office" on lines 37 to 39, to the end of the sentence.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said the State Insurance Office could dispose of its profits in any way it pleased, and for that reason he could not accept the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the words, on line 40, page 15—

"recommendations or any of them," with a view to inserting "report."

Amendment put and negatived; and schedule put and passed.

On Schedule II.—"Forms"—

On the motion of HON. J. A. FIELLY, consequential amendments were made in the

title and in line 58, page 15, by the insertion of the words "marine or"; also by the insertion of the words, after line 58, page 15—

"(5) The class of business for which the applicant desires to be licensed";

also by the omission of the word "general" and the insertion of "marine or general or marine and general" in lines 2 and 20, page 16.

HON. J. TOLMIE moved the omission of the words on line 21, page 16—

"until the thirty-first day of December, 19 ."

It was consequential on an amendment made in clause 10.

Amendment agreed to; and schedule, as amended, put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

HON. J. A. FIELLY: I move that the Bill, as amended, be now taken into consideration.

Mr. MORGAN: An amendment on clause 14 was circulated by the leader of the Opposition, but, owing to the hurried manner in which the clause was put to the Committee, he had not an opportunity of moving it. Will the Minister recommit the Bill for the purpose of considering that amendment?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: I have no objection to that amendment, and I will arrange with the representative of the Government in another place to have it inserted in that House.

Mr. CORSER: Will the Minister deal with paragraph 7 in Schedule I. in the same manner, and make the consequential amendment necessary on the amendment of clause 22?

HON. J. A. FIELLY: Paragraph 7 of Schedule I. has no association with clause 22, and I cannot agree to what the hon. member suggests. The paragraph referred to simply gives the Insurance Commissioner the same privilege as a private company possesses, that is, to refuse an insurance if he so desires in any particular case.

Question put and passed.

The third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 2 o'clock.