

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

THURSDAY, 6 JUNE 1918

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, 6 JUNE, 1918.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. W. Hamilton) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPERS.

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

Regulation, dated 9th January, 1918, under the Slaughtering Act of 1898.

Regulation, dated 28th February 1918, under the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts, 1915 to 1917.

Regulation, dated 7th March, 1918, under the Diseases in Plants Act of 1916.

Regulations, dated 5th April, 1918, under the Farm Produce Agents Act of 1917.

Regulations, dated 7th and 14th February, 1918, under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1917.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.**NOTICE OF MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT.**

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones): In view of the fact that the President has called the attention of the Council to a certain Standing Order, and as the Council has made no provision at the commencement of this Parliament for the election of a Chairman of Committees, I would like to say that the seeming delay on the part of the Government was partly due—

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: To the caucus not agreeing.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No; due to the fact that the position is a very important one, and that we have many hon. members who are well deserving of the position and who could fill it with honour to the Council. (Hear, hear!) It is very difficult to select a nominee from so many able members on this side of the Chamber. However, I ask leave to move a motion, without

[Hon. A. J. Jones.]

notice, having reference to the election of the Chairman of Committees. Other hon. members may have a nominee to propose, and I would say that the same courtesy should be extended to them.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the wish of the Council that the hon. gentleman be allowed to move a motion without notice?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Before we are asked to "go blind" like that, I think the Minister ought to tell us what he proposes to move.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I said that it was a motion for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I shall certainly object, if no one else does, to that, because I do not think we should be treated in that way. The Government have had the last week or ten days to give notice of motion, and they have not done so; and now they want, without any notice at all, to ask us to vote on the question. I certainly think such a suggestion is altogether out of the question. I would ask the Minister to give notice for Tuesday so that we may have an opportunity of considering the matter. I may tell him that we will have a nominee. The Government nominee, of course, may be acceptable to us. I do not know whom the Minister has in view, but I certainly think we ought to have an opportunity for consideration and be given a chance of putting up our nominee.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I am sorry the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn has not read the Standing Order dealing with the appointment of the Chairman of Committees. The Standing Order is quite clear, and I maintain that, under it, the motion the hon. gentleman wants to submit cannot be put. The Standing Order reads—

"The Council shall, after notice, at the commencement of each Parliament, appoint one of its members to be Chairman of Committees of the Whole, and he shall hold office until his successor is appointed."

It says most distinctly and emphatically "after notice." We cannot violate that Standing Order unless we are prepared to violate all our Standing Orders to suit the convenience of the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was done in the last Parliament, so that there is a precedent.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: The question is, are we prepared, without notice, to elect someone on the nomination of the Minister?

HON. T. M. HALL: If any hon. member objects we cannot do anything.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Well, I object.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Brentnall is wrong in his contention that it is impossible for the Council to take the course suggested by the Minister without infringing the Standing Orders. On 23rd July, 1902, the course now contemplated was followed. I have given some study to the procedure to be adopted, and I find in the "Journals" of the Council for 23rd July, 1902, the following minute:—

"APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

"The President explained to the Council the mode of procedure adopted

[Hon. A. J. Jones.

in the House of Commons for the election of Speaker, and stated that he would, with the approval of the Council, follow that course to-day in the election of Chairman of Committees.

(1.) Mr. Barlow moved, pursuant to notice—That the Hon. Boyd Dunlop Morehead be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament.

(2.) Mr. Murray moved, pursuant to notice—That the Hon. F. T. Brentnall be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament.

(3.) Mr. Moreton moved, without notice—That the Hon. Albert Norton be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament.

Debate ensued."

On the motion that the Hon. Mr. Morehead be appointed, there was an equality of votes, and the President, Sir Hugh Nelson, gave his casting vote with the "Not-Contents." The motion for the appointment of the Hon. Mr. Brentnall was then submitted, and was resolved in the negative. Then the question was put that the Hon. Albert Norton be appointed Chairman of Committees—he had been nominated without notice—and the question was put and passed. There is a further precedent to be found in the election in the last Parliament of the Hon. Dr. Taylor, who was elected without previous notice having been given.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: By consent.

The PRESIDENT: By consent of the Council. The Council has the power to regulate its own procedure, but, if there is one objector to a motion being submitted without notice, the motion cannot be put.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to give notice that at the next sitting of the Council I will move—

"That the Hon. Lewis McDonald be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole Council during the present Parliament."

The PRESIDENT: In view of the impasse which seems to have arisen during the last few days, I have given a considerable amount of thought to the procedure to be adopted in connection with the election of the Chairman of Committees. There are several courses which might be adopted. I would point out that a great injustice may be done to candidates whose names have been submitted upon notice given. Supposing, for instance, there are three members nominated for the position after notice. When the first nomination is submitted to the Council, an amendment may be moved for the omission of the name of the candidate proposed, and the Council may decide to omit that name. Some other hon. member then moves the insertion of the name of another hon. member. The Council may decide not to insert his name, and the names of other hon. members may be submitted in turn. It may happen that the name of every hon. member in the Chamber may be submitted in turn, and the hon. members whose names are submitted upon notice given cannot be brought forward until the names of all the other hon. members are exhausted. That would be unfair to the hon. members whose names have been submitted by way of notice of motion. In order that justice may be done to every hon. member whose name may be submitted

to the Council, the procedure will be that the names of all candidates shall be submitted by way of notice of motion, and every notice of motion will be dealt with in turn. It will, therefore, be necessary for notice of motion to be given to-day with respect to all nominations. It may be necessary to amend the Standing Orders to provide that what has occurred at the commencement of this Parliament shall not occur in the future.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: In what order will the names be submitted to the Council?

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose they will be submitted in the order in which they are received. That will be the order in which they will appear on the business paper. It is certainly my opinion that, if the names of several members are to be submitted, notice of motion should be required in each case, so that no injustice may be done to any of the candidates. I shall put the first motion, and, if it is decided in the negative, I shall go on to the next, and so on. I can foresee that a very complicated position may arise, and injustice may be done to the hon. members whose names have been submitted by way of motion unless I lay it down that no name shall be submitted unless notice has been previously given, and that no amendment to the motion be accepted. I hope the Council will uphold me in the course of procedure I have indicated.

HON. R. SUMNER: Supposing only one nomination is made to-day, will a vote be taken only upon that nomination on Tuesday?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. All nominations should be put in to-day.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I presume they can be put in at any time before the close of this sitting?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, at any time.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do it now.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: Lay your cards on the table.

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT: Order! There is no question before the House at the present time on which discussion can take place. I merely made a statement for the guidance of members in the matter of the election of Chairman of Committees, which is to take place on Tuesday next. I laid down a mode of procedure which I thought would be fair to everyone, and I think, if hon. gentlemen will consider the cases I mentioned, they will see that the course I propose is the fairest one that can be adopted.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I ask you, Mr. President, if it is a ruling you have given?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I lay that down as a ruling for the election on this occasion only. I have a precedent for that in what Sir Hugh Nelson did on a previous occasion, when he adopted for that occasion only the procedure followed in the House of Commons.

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: Seeing that the President quoted a precedent laid down by some former President, I should say that he could deviate from that precedent and create a new precedent to-day. It is not necessary that he should take any notice of the procedure followed by a former President.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: What is the good of precedents if you do not follow them?

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: The present President could create a precedent to-day. I am entirely unaware of what is in the minds of hon. gentlemen present in regard to this matter, but I think the motion moved by the representative of the Government this afternoon should receive the serious consideration of hon. gentlemen, and that there should be no opposition to his proposing that motion.

THE PRESIDENT: That motion cannot be debated. The Minister asked the leave of the House to move a motion without notice, and there has been an objection to that being done. Therefore the motion must go by the board. The House has power to regulate its own procedure. The President has power to lay down the mode of procedure to a certain extent, and the late Sir Hugh Nelson did that on the occasion to which I referred. I only propose to lay down the mode of procedure for this occasion. The new Standing Orders Committee can later on make provision against such a state of affairs arising in future as has occurred on this occasion, and I can only lay down the mode of procedure with the support of the majority of the House.

HON. R. SUMNER: I think that while the matter is under consideration we should have the names of any candidates it is intended to propose given to us, or else we may go on for ever nominating one candidate each day.

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: Do I understand, Mr. President, that the nominations have to be in to-day?

THE PRESIDENT: Notice of motion must be given before the House rises.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: You won't have time to have a meeting.

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: I am not a candidate. (Laughter.)

JOINT COMMITTEES.

MESSAGE FROM ASSEMBLY.

THE PRESIDENT announced the receipt of the following message from the Assembly:—

“Mr. President,—

“In answer to the Legislative Council's message, dated 4th June, notifying the appointment of certain members to serve on joint committees to be appointed under Standing Orders of the two Houses, the Legislative Assembly beg to intimate that they have appointed Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Dunstan to be members of the Joint Library Committee; Mr. Speaker, Mr. Corser, and Mr. Kirwan to be members of the Joint Committee for the management of the Refreshment-rooms; Mr. Speaker, Mr. Petrie, and Mr. Payne to be members of the Joint Committee for the management and superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings.

“WM. McCORMACK,
“Speaker.

“Legislative Assembly Chamber,
“Brisbane, 5th June, 1918.”

Hon. W. Hamilton.]

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I had no intention of saying anything on this subject until some few hours ago, but I have been looking over what has been said in the course of this debate and the contents of the Governor's Opening Speech, and considering the general position of things, and I have failed to find in the speeches delivered the references that I think ought to be made with regard, not only to the Speech itself, but also to the condition of things which now exists, and which ought to be taken into consideration by every Parliament in the British Dominions. To me it seems to be a grave and serious matter that we should be giving our attention to a series of suggestions and proposals such as we have in the Opening Speech at a time when the enemy have got a grip of the national throat, and we do not know what is going to happen. We know very well now that the wolves of devastation have got their fangs at the heart of the Empire, and that they are not going to be beaten off easily, and we also know that at the present moment the soldiers of the Empire may be engaged up to their very throats, and more, in bloodshed, and conflict, and sanguinary devastation all round. Under such circumstances it seems to me that it should be the duty of any House of Parliament in the British Dominions to give serious consideration to the national and international aspect of things. If we want to get the attention of our people concentrated upon it, it is most important that we should do our utmost to place it before them, and call their attention to it, and not to treat it as if it were a trivial matter, a second or a third rate matter—a matter of comparatively little consequence to us, because in our good fortune we happen to be in a part of the Empire which the war cannot reach or touch very seriously. The war has touched us in more ways than one; it has touched our commerce and the cost of living. It has touched very seriously the whole peace of many families in Australia. It has brought tears to the eyes of many, and sighs and sadness of heart to many a father and mother and husband. Yet, apparently, we have nothing to do but to consider a Speech in which we are told that the Government have a mandate from the majority of the electors to do little things to help on the prosperity of this country.

What does the series of Bills mentioned in the Speech propose to do for the prosperity of the country?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They all mean the production of wealth.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: They all mean production out of the pockets of the people who have been industrious and frugal enough to save a little money, but where does economy come in? There is any amount of extravagance. There is expenditure of money right and left and all round. There are proposals which have been rejected because of their extravagance in a previous session, and they are to be brought in again to mock us and to mock the country, because the people supported us when the referendum was submitted to the electors for the abolition of this Council. I am referring now to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor, because it seems to show a lamentable insensibility to the jeopardy in which the Empire is standing

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

at the present time. There is no doubt whatever that the Empire is in jeopardy, and has been in jeopardy, and we read in the cables to-day how grave the position was last week, not only for Great Britain, but also for France and Italy. Let us be thankful that we had enough brave soldiers there; enough physical courage there, and enough coolheadedness there in the commanders of those armies to drive back the invaders of France, who were making for our own country as rapidly as they possibly could. I am speaking now of the fatherland on the other side of the world. Yet we sit here without any anxiety, and do nothing in the matter.

HON. R. BEDFORD: There are 300,000 Australians there now.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I do not care who stands in opposition to my remarks. I say that the man who tells me that I am now talking against the British Empire is no loyalist, and he will get as much as he gives if I can only hear what he says. We have, week by week, long lists of wounded or sick soldiers coming back here after being over on the other side of the world and fighting for their country, their country's interests, their country's credit, and their country's honour, as well as for the safety of their families. They are coming back here, shipload after shipload, and all we can find to do in the interests of the country is to consider a programme like that which is before us. There are thirty-one Bills enumerated in the Opening Speech. I do not know whether any hon. member has really analysed these Bills. I am not going through the Bills seriatim, but I am going to pick out the most salient measures. There are here thirty-one Bills mentioned in the Speech, and sixteen of them are amending Bills, three of them resurrected Bills, and five of them renewals, making a total of twenty-four out of thirty-one, so that all the united genius of the present Government can find to ask Parliament to legislate upon in the way of new legislation are seven subjects. Boiling it down, that is what it comes to. It is not worthy of the Government. We are asked to come here to repeat the work which we have conscientiously done before, and to go over again the measures that we refused to pass last year; and we did not refuse to pass a single measure without returning it to the place it came from and giving a full and sufficient reason, as we thought, at any rate, for rejecting it. I am not going to enter much into that subject, but I know what hon. members have to say, as they had said it here time after time. They say we have no right to deal with some of these Bills because we are not elected by the people. I do not care whether we are elected by the people or not, if we are appointed to this Chamber in the proper and constitutional manner. The people have declared that we are representing them, and on all sides they tell us we are just doing the duty we are expected to do, and that everybody is looking for us to do, and that it is a blessing to the country that there is somebody here to revise the legislation that comes up from another place, and somebody with moral courage enough to reject some of these measures, even though it may bring again the threat, as it brought before, of the abolition of this House. That is the position we are now taking up. I might ask if the Meatworks Bill is a new measure, or an amendment. The Health Act Amendment

Bill, the Brisbane Tramways Purchase Bill, and the City of Brisbane Bill, we put down as important measures, and these are three out of the seven to which I have referred to as new measures. Then we have a Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill. I wonder how often that unfortunate spectre is going to be resurrected from the grave.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You are afraid to trust the people.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Then we have a Bill to amend the Technical Instruction Act of 1908, a Bill to amend the Land Acts, a Bill to amend the Closer Settlement Acts, and a Bill to amend the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act of 1917. These are all resurrected measures. There is a Police Superannuation Bill. Is this new? I know that a good many years ago we had this subject before us, and the Government spent a great many hundreds of pounds in having a Bill very carefully prepared by a most competent draftsman. What become of it I do not know. Then there is a Chillagoe and Etheridge Railways Purchase Bill. That is not a new Bill. It is a resurrected measure, and so is the State Iron and Steel Works Establishment Bill. I would like to say for myself that I do not know of any member on either side of the Chamber who has any objection to an experiment of this kind; but when people in other parts of the British Empire are half starved and are suffering from the most exacting taxation, and when they scarcely know how to feed themselves or their children and are enduring hardship all the time, we thought that it was unnecessary to vote last year an extraordinary large sum just to start that experiment. If the Minister had gone on and proved that the experiment was worth while going on with, I am sure that he would have found no great difficulty here in getting more money. But he wanted to have the whole thing he had put his hand out to grasp, and, because he could not have that, then in some sort of a fit of disgust he would have nothing.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Don't you think it is a good thing to produce metal that the British Empire requires at the present time?

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: That is what I am saying, and I do not know any member of this Council who would have objected to it last year if the hon. gentleman had been content to start in a comparatively modest way, as became the then financial condition and prospects of the country, and, if he had needed more money this year or next year, he would only have had to come and get it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: But you say ours is not a constructive policy.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: No; but do not, in such hard and perilous times as these, come and ask for £500,000 when £150,000 is enough to start the project—I do not say to complete it. Then, a Land Tax Amendment Bill, a Diseases in Stock Amendment Bill, and a Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill are also mentioned. There are sixteen of them. There are also those three resurrected Bills and those five renewals. When we deduct twenty-four from thirty-one it only means seven new Bills. I thought that matter needed a little more attention being called to it.

I am not going to detain hon. gentlemen very long, but I will refer now to one or two of the things I do not like in the Speech. The Governor has been induced to say—

“The expectations of my advisers as outlined in the Budget of last year with

regard to the finances of the State have proved correct, and early action will be necessary to meet the anticipated shortage in consolidated revenue. An interim statement of the financial position will be made, if possible, before the end of the financial year; subsequently certain of the finance Bills rejected last session by the Legislative Council will be resubmitted.”

I have said enough about resurrected Bills. Then there is another very short paragraph in the Speech—

“It is the intention of my advisers to submit for your consideration measures providing for social and temperance reform.”

I wonder whether that is really honest, because we had promises of that sort before last year. Neither the arguments given in Parliament, nor all the speeches delivered outside Parliament, by advocates of temperance reform had any effect whatever on the Government. I was up at the Executive Buildings myself, and saw large crowds of people who had formed themselves into deputations to the Premier to put the case on this subject before him, but it produced no effect upon him whatever. He had closed his ears, and had resolved to take no action. I think that, as other parts of the British Empire and other countries have introduced such reforms, it would be no degradation or dishonour—and it might not be very much serious loss—if this country were to follow the good example in that respect.

Another paragraph upon which I wish to say something is this—

“Much of the useful legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly in the last Parliament was rejected, or seriously mutilated, by the Legislative Council. My advisers consider it their duty to take such steps as will in the future prevent such flouting of the expressed will of the people.”

I never saw such a dishonourable paragraph in a Governor's Speech before during my long connection with this Council, and I have been here a good many years.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It is a fact, though.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I never saw anything which cast such a disgraceful reflection upon the action of this Council as that paragraph. The words, “seriously mutilated,” are not correct words, and they are not polite words. The words, “seriously amended,” would be more appropriate. Some of the Bills were so amended that they were cast out. They were so completely unjust, in our opinion, that the only thing to serve the public interests was to cast them aside and have done with them. They say we “seriously mutilated” these things. “Mutilation” is a very ugly word to put in the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament. Then we are accused of “flouting the expressed will of the people.” We can be told that; it will not hurt us—“Hard words break no bones”—and I do not suppose any of us will sigh or groan very much even if we have the same treatment again.

One of the Bills mentioned is a State Enterprises Bill. Does it refer to some new

Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

legislation, or is it a Bill intended to be brought in to whitewash the Government for the State enterprises which were inquired into by a Select Committee of the Council last session? If it is intended to whitewash those measures, it will have a hard task to get through; but, if it is a new Bill, and something which can be dealt with moderately, it will receive the attention it deserves.

There is just one more point, and then I have finished. There has been a great deal of exultation in certain sections of the community over the result of the last general election; but, if anybody will look very carefully over the returns from the different electorates, they will find that there is less to exult over than at first sight appears. I need not detain hon. gentlemen by going over the whole of them; but take this comparative statement for 1915 and 1918, just for the metropolitan districts, without going into country electorates at all. I will not detail the figures over to you, but the list comprises Brisbane, Bulimba, Buranda, Enoggera, Fortitude Valley, Ithaca, Kurilpa, Maree, Merthyr, Nundah, Oxley, Paddington, South Brisbane, Toombul, Toowong, and Windsor. There was considerable exultation over the caucus majorities in those places. Someone connected with this newspaper added up the totals. In 1915, the caucus total was 46,519, and in 1918 it was 48,893, or 2,300 more. The National total in 1915 was 37,078, and in 1918 it was 46,429, or an increase of 9,400 on the previous number. The caucus majority altogether in 1915 was 9,441, and in 1918 it was 2,464. It has come down 7,000 during the three years of the Government's administration. The Nationalist gain was 6,977.

Hon. H. C. JONES: What is the hon. member quoting from—"The Worker"?

Hon. F. T. BRENTNALL: No. The hon. member may go to "The Worker," I go to the "Courier." Probably, the two things would not agree, but I am taking the one I believe in and trust. I have other figures here. I tried to follow them all through the country, but I have not had time to get them all. But right through the country the result is very much the same. There are numerous electorates where the majority for the caucus candidate has been very small indeed, and it would only have required a very few thousand more to have voted for the National party to have given hon. members opposite an inferior number of members and an inferior position, and to have placed a totally different aspect upon the current politics of this country. I assert that without the slightest hesitation. In nearly all the localities where the Government got their majorities, both this year and three years ago, were places where the German farmers preponderate.

Hon. H. C. JONES: Hear, hear!

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I had to leave the Chamber to consult with the Premier regarding the advisability of adjourning over next week, and I am rather surprised to learn on my return to the Chamber that no arrangement has been made, and that there has been no communication with the hon. member acting on my behalf while I was out of the Chamber regarding the adjournment of the debate. It seems to me rather a farce that the Council should

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall,

be called together at half-past 3 o'clock and the business taken entirely out of the hands of the Government, and a motion made for adjourning the debate at twenty minutes past 4. I do not know the reason for this, and I am not inclined to agree to the adjournment of the debate. I think I should have been consulted, especially as I was out of the Chamber endeavouring to meet the convenience of hon. members on both sides regarding next week's sittings. I think there might be a common understanding between us on a matter of the kind. I am very desirous at all times of meeting the convenience of hon. members.

Hon. T. C. BEIRNE: It was a mere accident.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am glad to learn that it is a mere accident, but it does seem a farce to sit for less than an hour. I left the Chamber to ascertain whether there was a likelihood of any business coming before the Council next week, and I have not yet found out the state of business in the other Chamber. If the debate were continued to a reasonable hour, say, till 6 o'clock, we might then be in a position to adjourn until the week after next, because there is no use calling members together if there is no business. It is no use bringing members down from the country to sit for one or two hours a day. The Hon. Mr. Dunn comes down from Maryborough, for instance, and I know he desires, when he comes down, to do the work right off and even to sit in the evening. I think it is something of a farce to sit only from half-past 3 till 6 o'clock. We ought to sit in the evening as well, and then get away for a few days. I think it is my duty to take a division, if necessary, on this question.

Hon. T. J. O'SHEA: Adjourn when it suits you. What is the good of being obstinate over it?

Hon. P. J. LEAHEY: Are you finished?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No. There is a way to keep hon. members here until 6 o'clock even on this motion.

Hon. P. J. LEAHEY: I was going to make a few remarks which might possibly solve the difficulty.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If I were to accept this motion, the business would be taken entirely out of the hands of the Government. That would be bad enough, but it is not so bad as having the business taken out of my hands without being consulted about the matter. The Hon. Mr. O'Shea has said that we can adjourn when it suits us. Well, it does not suit hon. members on this side to adjourn at the present time, and we will divide the Council on the question, and divide it on another matter, and we will talk on another motion and keep hon. members here till 6 o'clock, whether they like it or not. I say that by the way and not as a threat.

Hon. P. J. LEAHEY: I am opposed to the adjournment of the debate, too.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, I hope the Hon. Mr. Fowles will withdraw the motion. If he is agreeable to do that I am willing to sit down.

Hon. P. J. LEAHEY: I sympathise a good deal with what the Minister has said. I do not see any necessity for adjourning the debate.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am quite aware I have no special privileges

and no rights that every other hon. member does not possess; but to move the adjournment of the debate now without consulting the representative of the Government is rather out of place. If it were done purely by accident, I am willing to forget and forgive, and to go on with the business.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I can assure the Minister that there was nothing whatever preconcerted about the motion. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall usually speaks in a very interesting manner for three-quarters of an hour or an hour, but he was unexpectedly brief. It was understood that the Hon. Mr. Fowles, who is suffering from a rather severe cold and is not in his usual form, would speak at a later stage, if he felt well enough; but no other hon. member rose to continue the debate, and, when the President put the question, there was no time for anyone else to do it, and the Hon. Mr. Fowles immediately moved the adjournment of the debate. Personally, I did not see any reason for adjourning the debate, and I immediately went round to several hon. members to see if they would continue the debate. The Hon. Mr. O'Shea, and probably others, are prepared to speak, and I would ask the Hon. Mr. Fowles, under those circumstances, to withdraw his motion.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: If I may interpose a few words, without losing my right to speak afterwards on the original motion, I desire to say that one reason why I moved the adjournment of the debate was that there was no Government business before the Council, and I understood negotiations were being carried on with a view to the Council not meeting next week, but resuming on Tuesday week. In that case, it would be very easy to finish the Address in Reply on Tuesday week, and there would be some other business brought before us on that day. If we are to conclude the Address in Reply at the present time, there will be nothing at all on the business-sheet for Tuesday week except the appointment of the Chairman of Committees. One other reason for asking for an adjournment of the debate is that one or two country members were here last week, expecting to speak on the Address in Reply, but we were busy listening to a torrent of eloquence from several quarters, and those hon. members had no opportunity of speaking.

HON. T. NEVITT: There were only two speeches last week.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There are questions of national importance, such as sugar, referred to in the Address in Reply, which should certainly receive a little more comment than they have received so far. The three hon. members who are acknowledged to be sugar experts are not here today—Hon. C. F. Nielson, Hon. Angus Gibson, and Hon. F. Courtice. Those three hon. members could easily claim and secure the attention of the Council on the subject of sugar. The Council has always extended a considerable amount of generosity and fair play to country members, who cannot be running here every afternoon. When an hon. member comes from Maryborough or Rockhampton, he has to let his own business go, and it is only fair for us to leave the door open for country members until Tuesday week. I can promise that I will not detain the Council more than a quarter of an hour then. It is purely with a view to allowing

some of the country members an opportunity of speaking that I have moved the adjournment of the debate.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It is a silly debate, anyhow.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is only an act of courtesy to hon. members who live 500 miles or more away that we should leave the door open until Tuesday week.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 12.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. P. J. Leahy
„ F. T. Brentnall	„ C. F. Marks
„ A. Dunn	„ T. J. O'Shea
„ B. Fahey	„ A. H. Farnell
„ E. W. H. Fowles	„ H. Turner
„ T. M. Hall	„ A. H. Whittingham

Teller: Hon. T. M. Hall.

NOT-CONTENTS, 13.

Hon. R. Bedford	Hon. P. Murphy
„ A. A. Daye	„ T. Nevitt
„ W. H. Demaine	„ G. Page-Hanify
„ A. J. Jones	„ E. B. Purnell
„ H. C. Jones	„ W. J. Riordan
„ L. McDonald	„ R. Sumner
„ F. McDonnell	

Teller: Hon. L. McDonald.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Hon. gentlemen—

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman having spoken in moving the adjournment of the debate, I take it that he is out of order in again addressing the House.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: You gave him leave.

The PRESIDENT: Yes; when the Hon. Mr. Fowles got up to move the motion, it was understood that he would not lose the right to speak on the main question. Standing Order No. 118 says—

“When a motion made without comment for the adjournment of the debate upon a question has been negatived, the member who moved the adjournment shall not thereby be debarred from addressing the Council on the original question.”

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: My remarks will be very brief on this occasion, because the Address in Reply has been debated at considerable length by several members. I

trust that hon. members will put [4.30 p.m.] up with any inconvenience I

myself feel in speaking under the circumstances under which I do speak this afternoon. We must, all of us, regret that the matter of recruiting has not been mentioned in the Governor's Speech. His Excellency stands as the representative of the Crown, and when the representative of the Crown speaks at a time of great stress like the present, we might naturally conclude that we should hear something in the Governor's Speech about the all-important question of recruiting. Most of us have noted with considerable pleasure the fact that the subject has been taken more generously to heart throughout the Commonwealth during the last two or three months than it was previously. I think that if Australia were treated in the right way, and the politicians had the grace of silence for some months, and an honest, genuine appeal was made to the people at the present time, the result would be a good response. We can congratulate Mr. Orchard on the altered complexion of things during the past two or

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

three months. Reference is made in the Opening Speech to repatriation. I do not know whether any Government in Australia is yet au fait with the methods which should be adopted in dealing with our returned soldiers. It seems to be taken for granted that every man who returns from the front is practically helpless and in need of vocational training, and must be taught a new trade, whereas the fact is that what they need is to be placed in positions for which they are suited and which they have occupied previously.

HON. R. SUMNER: A man may not be fit for his previous work.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: In that case we should find some special employment for him; but every man coming back should have a job waiting for him on his arrival. There ought, certainly, to be some differentiation made in the certificates of discharge which are given to soldiers. I understand that the men always receive the same form of discharge, no matter whether they have been only in Egypt or in Gallipoli, or on the Western front.

HON. P. MURPHY: I think that in the majority of cases employers promised their men when they were going away that they would be reinstated on their return.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Exactly.

HON. P. MURPHY: Have they been reinstated?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I do not know of any case where that has not been done.

HON. R. BEDFORD: I know of an instance where an employer cut down the award rate and made it up by the pension.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The conditions in a man's business may have changed completely.

HON. H. C. JONES: The whole trouble is that an employer must have his pound of flesh now, irrespective of his liability to carry out his obligations.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I do not think that is so; I believe there is a spirit of fairness in the community, and those who seek to set one class in the community against another are simply trying to set fire to their own houses. We do not want to do that. The day of the sheer agitator is rapidly passing. There is common sense coming over all workers, and they find that their interests are bound up with the interests of those who employ them.

HON. P. MURPHY: But if the employers made a promise they should adhere to it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Yes; but I can easily understand that there may be a case in which the war has knocked a man entirely out of business.

HON. R. BEDFORD: The A.M.P. Society, with its £50,000,000 of funds, has to limit the insurance on soldiers.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: That is a pure myth of the hon. gentleman's mind.

HON. T. M. HALL: An insurance company has to work on actuarial lines, not on haphazard lines.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: When a company makes dividends it does not put those dividends in a bag in the back yard. The money is in circulation all the time. If a man is making £1,000 a year, he will, if he is wise, live on less than £1,000 a year,

[Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

and the rest of the money will be in circulation, being used in the payment of wages and in other ways. However, we cannot expect any State Government to handle the question of repatriation in a proper way at the present time. Every State Government has a good deal to learn in this respect. If we had had our present knowledge at the beginning of the war, no State Government would have gone on in the manner we have done. There is no doubt the State Governments have a more intimate knowledge of local conditions, and have a better opportunity of repatriating soldiers. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government should find the money and the State Government should spend it. With regard to the efforts made in Queensland, no one in this Council is eager to discredit anyone in the slightest. The Government has made honest attempts at Beerburrum and Stanthorpe, and also in the Cairns district, although the land selected there did not meet with the approval, I believe, of anyone who knew anything at all about it; at all events, the local papers seem to be up in arms against the choice of the district. It must not be thought that every soldier who comes back can be put on Crown land, and, even if he is put on Crown land, we must provide him with capital for two or three, or even four years, before his fruit farm comes into bearing. May I throw out a hint to the Treasurer—that the Government are lending money to a perilously high proportion on the value of buildings and farms at the present time. I do not suppose any bank in Australia would lend more than two-thirds of the value.

HON. R. SUMNER: You mean to returned soldiers?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Yes.

HON. R. SUMNER: I agree with you, but I do not think it matters much if they lose a little, because they are doing good work.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: They are running a high risk. Take the case of a man who comes from the front and is practically presented with a farm and house. I am referring to an actual case which took place.

HON. R. BEDFORD: I thought the Government had done nothing for the returned soldiers.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Oh yes, they have done something.

HON. R. BEDFORD: They have done more than any other State in Australia.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I think Victoria has done more, and New South Wales has a harder task than Queensland.

HON. R. SUMNER: They sent a man up to Queensland to inquire into our methods.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Most of the men gravitate towards Sydney—those who have no settled place of abode. New South Wales is mostly the goal of those who are not born, or have no ties, in the other States. We make a present of a farm and house to a returned soldier. There is nothing to prevent that farm and house being sold, and the very object which we have of anchoring the soldier to the land is defeated. Surely no more money should be lent upon a farm and house than three-fourths of the value. As a matter of fact, it goes up almost to the entire value at the present time. Now, however, I believe an alteration is being made, and that, instead of the house

belonging to the returned soldier, a charge of 1s. 6d. or 2s. per week is being made for rent, and it belongs to the Crown. That is much better, because, if at any time the returned soldier makes good, the Crown can say that it then belongs to him. But it is no good making a present to anyone, returned soldier or not. The returned soldier has to be put on his mettle, and be continued a good citizen, rather than to be spoonfed, which will deteriorate him. I hope that the fruit cannery which is being established at Bulimba will be expedited. If the Government are going in for a long resumption law case in regard to that, the fruit cannery will not be there very soon.

HON. R. SUMNER: They have taken possession.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: That may be so. At all events, if they are going to establish a fruit cannery, it might as well be done as soon as possible. It seems that when they can produce, for instance, asparagus in California at 4s. 6d. a dozen, and we have to pay 2s. here for a single tin of it, something is wrong with our fruit and our canning. That is only one instance of how the great fruit industry might be helped on. Go to the Tweed, or any of the Southern parts of Queensland where bananas grow, and ask them where they are sending their bananas to. They will tell you Sydney and Melbourne, and that they get better prices there than they are getting in Queensland at present, and yet we pay 6d. and 8d. a dozen here.

HON. H. C. JONES: They pay 1s. in New South Wales.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Why should we grow bananas here, and send them down to Sydney and Melbourne? It is simply because they get a better price there, and we cannot blame them. Why not carry such produce at much lower rates on the railways? Our fruit farmers on the Southern border find that it pays them better to send their bananas by sea 500 miles than to send them 69 miles by rail to Brisbane. That should not be. There should be the very lowest freights in cases like that, so as to attract the business to our own capital.

I say nothing, of course, about the State meat shops and fish supply; I only hope that they will be a success. But there is this to be said with regard to the State fish supply—that it has proved a melancholy failure in Perth, Western Australia. It has also proved a failure in Sydney. Unless there are fish in the sea, and those fish are caught, no buildings or administration, or anything else, will make a cheap fish supply. As a matter of fact, last week the price of mullet was 9d. for a small mullet, such as you could put into your waistcoat pocket, so that the cheap fish supply has not come so far.

HON. H. C. JONES: You did not get it from the fish markets last week.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: No, this was from a hawkker in the suburbs. There are people 5 miles from the fish market who cannot walk there every morning to get fish for breakfast, although it would give them an appetite.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Don't they deliver fish?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: No, the people have to go for it. Some hon. member on

the opposite side said they made the fish cheaper by not delivering it. Did he forget that they were cutting out the delivery man's living?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The whole fault is the distribution. The high cost of living is due to the bad system of distribution. You ought to know that.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There are several good things in the Governor's Speech, and one refers to afforestation. Most of us remember the Royal Commission's report in 1913, in England, where the subject received considerable attention. That report was founded upon action taken in Germany. When I was in Germany I was shown in the Black Forest three trees growing from the one hole. I asked why that was, and they said that a law had been passed that every tree that was cut down had to have its place taken by three other trees, which were supposed to be planted in three different places; but those who cut down the tree beat the Government in that way; they simply put three small stalks in one hole and got no result.

HON. R. SUMNER: You even see trees being cut up here 18 inches through.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have seen back verandahs in the Cairns district made from oak and cedar. I have seen fences made from cedar not far from Tolga, in North Queensland.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: And banana cases.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Yes. I hope there will be some very substantial business behind that paragraph in the Speech. With regard to the production of wheat, would it not be possible for this Government to guarantee a price of 3s. 9d., or even 4s., a bushel for wheat in Queensland?

HON. R. SUMNER: At the present time it would.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: At the present time it would be a safe thing. From here to Charleville there are extensive belts of country that should be yellow with wheat. There is nothing to stop this country growing wheat just as well as Victoria or South Australia.

HON. R. SUMNER: Cotton, too.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Cotton depends upon labour in picking, and, unless a man has a family of twelve, he cannot manage it.

HON. H. C. JONES: He can do it very well.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Not at the present price of labour in Queensland. Cotton got into the hands of the darkies in America, and they made it a success. It has been tried in Queensland, and, although the crop has been all that could be expected, the question of labour has invariably killed the proposition. However, it will surely be possible for the Government to stimulate the production of wheat. We talk glibly about post-war problems, and about the position of Australia after the war, but the country that is best prepared for production on a tenfold scale will be the country that will reap all the advantages after the war. Queensland has not yet felt the war, except that the shadow of a great sorrow has come over probably a thousand homes here, and we have felt it in our hearts, but we have not felt it at the breakfast table. The breakfast table has not yet been hit by

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

the war, except that the price of one thing or another has gone up from 5½d. to 7½d., and probably there is no very good reason for it going up. But compared with what they are feeling in England at the present time, our breakfast table has not felt the war, and so far as the majority of the people here are concerned with regard to environment, with regard to their needs, or going about here and there, their amusements, food, and clothing have certainly gone up a little bit, but with regard to the ordinary necessities of life the people have not felt a tenth part of the pinch of war that has been felt in England. So far as a number of people in Queensland are concerned, the war is only a newspaper war to be read about every morning. For those who have sent their sons to the front it is a war freighted with anxiety every minute it lasts. I do not know whether the Speech itself adequately sympathises with the unspoken thoughts and the wide anxieties that are felt in 10,000 homes in Queensland at the present time. They read the paper every morning and wonder what the next thing is going to be. If I may be permitted to give a personal reference, I travelled last Saturday with a lady and gentleman who came up from Murwillumbah to meet their son on Sunday night. It was three years since they had seen him, and he comes back suffering from shell shock, gassed, and wounded in nineteen places. The lady was the mother of eleven children, three of whom were at the front. One boy had just gone to Sydney and missed seeing his own brother coming back here. I talked with the father and the husband most of the way. No one in the carriage would have trespassed on the grief of the mother. That is the position in countless homes in Queensland at the present time. I feel sure that, had the Government known that, or were they seized of the feelings in the hearts of the people, they would have made much more touching reference to the sorrows of Queensland and the sorrows of those who have sent some of their sons to the front.

HON. R. BEDFORD: The speech is prose—not a poem. Everybody is sorry.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There is no need to have it callously put, at all events.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: You cannot cry on paper.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The Hon. Mr. Bedford made a great cry on paper the other day.

HON. R. BEDFORD: I am sorry you were not here the other day, when I told you about the dog Fido.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There is a paragraph in the Governor's Speech reading—

"Commonwealth interference, under the War Precautions Act, with the State grading of dairy produce is utterly without justification, and imperils that State system of dairying instruction to which the industry largely owes its present flourishing condition."

May I, with all due deference to His Excellency, suggest that it is unusual for such a paragraph to be found in any Governor's Speech. It is a question whether this Speech belongs to His Excellency the Governor or to the Government.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: Does it ever belong to the Governor?

[Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Absolutely, yes.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: Absolutely, never.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have seen speeches coming from a Governor after having been sent to him by the Premier of the day, and those speeches have [5 p.m.] been written over and almost obliterated in red ink. I have seen the caret mark used over and over again to insert these words, "My advisers consider," "My advisers state," "My advisers believe."

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: You must have been in the confidence of some Premier.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Not at all. It is within the common knowledge of anyone who has been in politics at all during the last ten years, whether in an official or a private capacity.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: How could anyone show you the Governor's Speech?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The original document has been there, and in red ink you will see the words, "My advisers consider." I have seen those words inserted three or four times in a single page.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Any Government was very despicable if they showed that to anyone.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Not at all. I have seen Bills leave this House, and they have been minuted as being perfectly correct by the Government of the day, and they have gone up to Government House and have come back here with a request that a certain amendment should be inserted.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Do you say that you have read the proof of a Governor's Speech after it has come back from the Governor to the Premier?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Yes.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Then, he must have been a contemptible Premier who allowed you to see it, because it was a breach of confidence, and you know it.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Not at all. That is common knowledge.

HON. R. BEDFORD: You are taking advantage of our extreme youth.

HON. F. McDONNELL: It was not a Labour Premier that did that.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The question is whether this Speech is a pronouncement by the Government, or whether, when His Excellency puts his name to a document, he must be considered to be in harmony with everything that appears in that document.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: He certainly endorses it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I do not suppose it is quite within the rights of this Council to criticise His Excellency in any way, but it would certainly appear that, after His Excellency has read the Speech, and has made that Speech in person in this Chamber, he must be responsible for everything that appears in it.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: He endorses it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The day may come, as it came in the United States, when the State Government is at drawn swords with the Federal Government. We do not wish to see that day.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: The day may come when both will be abolished.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Well, it may be a question of which of the two should be abolished. With all due deference, I would suggest that the words, "Commonwealth interference . . . is utterly without justification," should not find a place in the Governor's Speech. It is a document which lives, and its tone should be moderate. Those words must have missed His Excellency's eye, or he would have inserted there the words, "My advisers consider that Commonwealth interference is utterly without justification." I say that, because it is just as well for everyone to play their own parts properly.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: You ought to apply for the job of Lieutenant-Governor.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have not put in an application yet, and I shall be glad to get a testimonial from the hon. member.

The next two paragraphs in the Speech deal with mining. I should like to congratulate the Secretary for Mines upon the fact that mining seems to have taken an upward leap in Queensland. It has been pointed out by a previous speaker that every hon. member of the Council was entirely in favour of the Iron and Steel Works Bill. It did not matter a snap of the fingers whether we put in £100,000 or £150,000. The Government would have been very quick off the mark if they had been able to spend £150,000 in establishing the iron and steel industry up to the present time, especially when their own Royal Commission only asked for £5,000 to make a start. This House was prepared to give them thirty times that amount.

Hon. T. NEVITT: That was for an experimental plant, and you know it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Is that plant established yet? However, I have no doubt that the Government now see that it would have been wiser if they had accepted the Bill in the form in which it passed this Chamber, and had accepted the £150,000 and gone on with the work.

Hon. W. H. DEMAINE: You know you had no right to fix any limit at all.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It would be well for the Secretary for Mines to hurry along a little with the bore at Roma. It seems to be a kind of "world without end" business. I know the great difficulty there is in boring to a depth of 2,000 or 3,000 feet. I have had the privilege of having a good look at that bore. At the surface the bore is about 1 foot 4 inches in diameter, but when you get down 3,000 feet it is probably reduced to 3½ inches. It will be as well for the Minister to take some steps, even if machinery is a little dear, to expedite the work at Roma. Everybody knows the price of petrol at the present time.

Hon. H. C. JONES: Kerosene is more important than petrol.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is great difficulty in getting steel tools.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I know that, and, if one breaks, it takes about three weeks to mend it.

Hon. R. BEDFORD: There are no "spares" in the country.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I know that, but I think it would pay the Government to spend £10,000 or £15,000 in getting additional plant in order to hasten matters.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You are quite right there.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have seen three derricks in one yard in Southern California, and all of them producing oil from different strata.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We are near the gas now.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I am afraid you are about 1,000 feet off.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No; another 500 feet and we will get the gas.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: And it will take eighteen months. One paragraph in the Speech is of interest to all of us. It refers to awards and agreements in various industries. Might I suggest to the Government that it would be of considerable value if they could tabulate and print in parallel columns in the "Industrial Gazette," which I have the pleasure of reading month by month, the various awards in the different industries? If one wants to know the exact position with regard to any industry, he has probably to search as many Acts and amendments as if he wanted to find out his legal position with regard to any Crown Lands Act. It would be much better if the different awards in the different industries could be published in parallel columns so that we would know at a glance exactly where we were. At present, when an award is made, it is published in the "Industrial Gazette" without any reference to previous awards, and you have to look back for those previous awards, and have a considerable amount of difficulty in finding them.

It is probably early yet to speak of the joining up of secondary and technical education. But I certainly would like to have some information from the Government with reference to what is being done by our own University in connection with the Institute of Industries which has been established by the Federal Government. There was a great flourish of flags about two years ago, and representatives from our University were associated with the institute. We were told that, as a result, all sorts of industries were going to be established here; they were to spring up like mushrooms and be of great benefit to the Commonwealth; but we have not heard a word about the part that our University has played in the matter, or whether the whole scheme has petered out. We have been led to expect a great deal from the conference which is now meeting in Melbourne, to which two representatives from our University have gone.

I now come to a question which will interest everyone in the community, and that is the absolute wastage of child life which goes on, not only in Queensland, but in the whole of the Commonwealth. Later on I shall be in a position to give some figures on that subject that will be new to some hon. members, and will certainly provoke astonishment. I think the number of

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

children under twelve years of age who die every year in the Commonwealth is something like 7,000, and 80 per cent. of those deaths are due to preventable diseases. That is the verdict of medical men. If there is any toll that the war is laying upon the world, it is the wastage of manhood—the absolute loss of human life. Everything else can be made up except that, and the question is where are we to get immigrants for Queensland from when the war is over.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: From nowhere, for a very long time.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There are 300,000,000 of our fellow subjects in India just about three weeks' sail from Australia. What is going to happen to them?

HON. E. B. PURNELL: I hope they stay there.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We cannot keep the communities of the world in water-tight compartments. You can no more yard off humanity in these days than you can yard off pigeons in the air. When an aeroplane service is established, it will land you in India before you know where you are. We cannot put a ring fence round Australia and say, "We, and we only, shall live here."

HON. R. BEDFORD: Who wants to put a ringbarked fence round Australia?

HON. E. B. PURNELL: We only want white people here.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Does that agree with the Labour doctrine of the brotherhood of man?

HON. E. B. PURNELL: Yes, absolutely.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Australia first. Let the brotherhood of man go upstairs.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We must not forget there are 400,000,000 of people in the Chinese Empire, which is just in its child stage, and is waking up at the present time.

HON. R. BEDFORD: They haven't got the trick of walking on the water.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: There is plenty of work for them in their own country if they are only properly organised.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There are 65,000,000 of Japanese at the present time confined in a few miniature islands—the British Isles of the North-west Pacific. Do you think they will be willing to stay there after the war is over?

HON. R. BEDFORD: They can't walk on the water either.

HON. H. C. JONES: You will make us believe that it is foolish to fight as we are doing.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Do hon. members know that there are 400 commercial travellers from Japan at the present time in Sydney?

HON. R. BEDFORD: If there is a danger of them coming here, why do you want us to send our men away?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I am just pointing out that it is both impossible and impolitic to try to put a fence round Australia.

HON. H. C. JONES: Do you suggest that we should let these people in?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. E. B. PURNELL: You try to open the door, and see how you get on.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

[Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I say nothing about the colossal selfishness of attempting to put a fence round Australia or of the right of every man to breathe the air above us.

HON. H. C. JONES: We don't want any cheap labour here.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have no doubt that, if 1,000,000 Japanese tried to get into Australia, the Hon. Mr. Bedford would be found down at Cape Moreton with his rifle trying to keep them out, and no doubt he would be able to keep them out. (Laughter.)

HON. R. BEDFORD: I should like to know what man on that side wants a nigger for a brother-in-law.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I do not think my hon. friend would refer to the Japanese as niggers.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Not quite.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I am just pointing out that, if they like to come here, anything my hon. friend could do would not prevent them. Closely intertwined with the saving of child life is the question of social and temperance reform, which is mentioned in the Governor's Speech. I am sure that reference must have provoked laughter wherever it was read by anybody who has followed the actions of the Government.

HON. R. BEDFORD: We get our drinking habits from England; we should drink like the Latins—the French and the Italians.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is worth while to speak of these things lightly, lest we touch depth too profound.

HON. H. C. JONES: Why don't you be serious about it, then?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I think if this statement in the Governor's Speech were read in a certain place Beelzebub and his companions would laugh on their gridirons. The Labour party have not cut off one single hour from the time allowed for the sale of liquor in Queensland.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The PRESIDENT said: Order! I must ask hon. members to keep order. This running fire of interjections is disorderly. Each member has an opportunity of speaking when his turn comes, and these interjections should be discontinued. The hon. gentleman who is addressing the House seems to be inviting interjections, but I hope they will not be continued.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We read with very great interest the statement in the opening Speech that—

"It is the intention of my advisers to submit for your consideration measures providing for social and temperance reform."

HON. T. NEVITT: They were considering you there.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is not for myself that I ask consideration; it is the people of Queensland who require consideration.

HON. T. NEVITT: If you were sincere in your efforts there might be something in them.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I trust I am sincere in this matter; I have seen enough of the ravages of drink in any community to make me sincere about it, and I believe that members of this House are absolutely

sincere with regard to this question. I believe that if the question were put to Parliament to-day there would be a reduction made in the hours allowed for the sale of liquor in Queensland.

HON. T. NEVITT: You had an opportunity of doing it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: No; I had no such opportunity. Seven large deputations waited on the Premier and asked him to take action in that direction, but he refused to do so.

HON. T. NEVITT: You are one of the members who refused to pass the Referendum Bill.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We passed that Bill, and it became a Popular Liquor Referendum Bill, but the Government placed it at the end of the business-paper, and kept it there. We also passed a Six o'Clock Closing Bill, and that, too, was put at the end of the paper. We know how anxious the Government got that evening when a number of items of business were dropped out of the business-sheet—it was the night of Mr. Hughes's meeting in Brisbane. They had to hurry up members of their own side to speak, so that the House would not get to those two items on the business-sheet. The Government have attacked almost every class in the community, except the liquor trade, and they have been three years in office. If this Government can make the pastoralists squeal, as they say they can, and did—

HON. R. SUMNER: Who said so?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The Premier, and everybody knows when he said it. The Hon. Mr. Sumner must have been down South when that was said by the Premier, or he would remember it. If the Government can attack and coerce every class of the community, is it impotent when it comes to cutting off a single hour from the time allowed for the sale of liquor in Queensland?

HON. H. C. JONES: There is more liquor sold down South now than there was before early closing was introduced.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: If there is more drink sold under the 6 o'clock closing system, why is it that publicans object to closing their hotels at that hour? If it is urged that the less the number of hours hotels are open, the more drink is sold, I suppose the argument will be that if they are shut up altogether there will be still more drink sold. How does that agree with the fact that in Sydney every licensee asked for a reduction in his license fees because trade had fallen off 40 per cent.? I have no doubt that some of them made that an excuse to get a reduction in the license fee, but that was the chief reason given by those who applied for a reduction. I have received this week a letter from the North, in which the writer says there are—

“an enormous number of unnecessary hotels living on their bar trade, often refusing to provide meals—e.g., Cooktown has twenty-nine public-houses to a population of 700.”

Los Angeles is the biggest saloonless city in the world; they get along there without a single gin saloon.

HON. T. NEVITT: Is there that number of licenses in Cooktown to-day?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The letter is dated the 6th May, 1918, and is from a gentleman of high repute. I will show it to the hon. gentleman later privately if he cares to see it. The writer further says—

“New licenses appear to be granted without any difficulty at all.”

Of course, that refers to the administration of the Act. I am preparing 100 drink facts, and will take an early opportunity of submitting them to hon. members. They are facts that will make the ordinary man stagger, and make him wake out of his dream, and say, “I will close down hotels, except between the hours of 9 a.m. and 6 p.m.”

HON. R. SUMNER: Why don't the Federal Government do it under the War Precautions Act?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is easy to make excuses of that kind, but that is not a sufficient reason for the State Government neglecting its duty in this matter. The writer of the letter refers also to—

“the unhappy condition of returned soldiers who are always being made drunk,”

and he says—

“Some public-houses contrive to have returned soldiers or men on leave in the bar most of the day, and encourage the public to treat them, thus increasing their trade enormously.”

I am afraid it is true that rations of rum are served out in the trenches to the detriment of the soldiers. The gentleman who writes this letter further refers to—

“the desire for the early closing of bars by all decent hotel-keepers,”

and says—

“It is a great scandal that our Government refused to have a referendum on the 6 o'clock closing question. It would, of course, have been carried by a vast majority.”

HON. R. BEDFORD: You don't expect men to go to war and come back singing hymns, do you? Is not war a filthier thing than drink?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: War is, no doubt, a barbarous thing, but I do not see why we should entertain soldiers with a false hospitality and drag them down. If I had a motor-car I would not put bad petrol into the car tank, and I think more of my inside than to put “booze” into it. Why should a man give more attention to his motor-car than he gives to his own petrol tank?

HON. E. B. PURNELL: Why didn't your Government deal with this matter in the past?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We can always get excuses for the inaction of the present Government, but I would point out that they have been in power for three years, and have not cut off one single hour from the time allowed for the sale of liquor in Queensland. The Kaiser has said it is the temperance army that is going to win this war. I think the Hon. Mr. Heydon, of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, was one of the finest champions of 6 o'clock closing in New South Wales. Unfortunately, he died about a fortnight ago, but I am glad that he lived to help to bring that reform to a consummation. I referred just now to the desire for the early closing of bars by all decent hotel-keepers. That is the opinion of

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

a gentleman whose work necessitates his travelling about the whole of North Queensland. The Government can spend £25,000 on a State groggery at Babinda, but they could not find £4,000 for baby clinics in Brisbane. They rushed on the establishment of baby clinics just before the election, but they did not delay the establishment of a State hotel at Babinda. The hotel trade gives absolutely the least return in wages to the worker of any trade in the State.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It returns a large revenue.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: If it returns any revenue to the State, that revenue is the price of blood, and I, for one, do not want to take it. If my hon. [5.30 p.m.] friend will go to the records, he will see that a telegram was sent from Queensland about three weeks ago. He will find the case of one man who committed suicide here—just one week's record in Brisbane—when drunk, and of one who walked off a veranda and was killed. I rejoice to think that the Labour movement has stood for temperance. We remember the Hon. Thomas Glassey, for instance, and the late David Bowman.

HON. R. BEDFORD: So it does; but temperance is not total abstinence.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: The Labour party have stood for prohibition.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I am glad we know what they do stand for. I hope they are aiding the efforts that are being made in the South at the present time. Perhaps they are pushing the Government to give a little more definite reply than was made yesterday to a petition representing 100,000 women of Sydney and 50,000 of the womanhood of Melbourne. Those petitions were presented to Mr. Watt yesterday, and his reply was that the matter would be considered. As a sop, we are told that every man in the hospital now at Rosemount has to wear some blue cloth on his arm. That is an outrageous regulation. It was a great scandal that our Government refused to have a referendum taken on the 6 o'clock closing question. I feel confident it would have been carried by a great majority.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: You were mainly to blame for that.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I did not get any help from the hon. gentleman, at any rate. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is swifter at finding excuses for not doing things than he is at finding reasons for doing things. As a matter of fact, if I cannot get the whole loaf, I will take half a loaf.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: If I had not done more than you for temperance, I would be ashamed of myself.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is ashamed of himself.

HON. R. SUMNER: If the Liberal temperance people were opposed politically to a man who was against the publican, they would not support him. You can prove that by Senator Reid's case. When he was a Labour man the Liberal temperance people opposed him.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The hon. gentleman is probably as strong a temperance advocate as I am myself, and is

[*Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.*]

willing to do everything he possibly can to bring about the social reform that has been needed for many years.

HON. R. BEDFORD: But you would not vote for a Labour temperance man, as against a Liberal who took his whisky. (Laughter.)

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: As a matter of fact, the liquor question is becoming so prominent, that if this Government wished to cut off a single hour from the publicans' hours for the sale of liquor, they could do it in five minutes. Why do they not do it?

HON. R. SUMNER: They could do it under the War Precautions Act.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: My hon. friend knows that the administration of liquor is purely a State affair, and, if the Federal Government had intervened in purely a State affair, there would have been a tremendous outcry from every Premier. The hon. gentleman knows that two other gentlemen and myself went down to Mr. Hughes to ask him to do it. I trust that that will be done, even at the present time, although I think the right thing is for each State to manage its own liquor trade.

HON. R. SUMNER: I do not think so. It should be done under the War Precautions Act.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The 6 o'clock closing movement was taken up in New South Wales and carried there by a two to one majority—a purely State matter. (Interruption.)

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Will the hon. gentleman be seated. I must ask hon. members to obey the call of the Chair. There has been conversation continually going on across the Chamber during the debate. The hon. gentleman is almost as bad as those who are interjecting, as he is inviting the interjections. I must ask hon. gentlemen to obey the ruling of the Chair. I shall have to take certain action if they refuse.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I beg leave to say, with all due respect to the Chair, that I do not invite interjections. If hon. gentlemen are athirst for information, I am very glad to supply it, if I possibly can. The writer of the letter I have quoted says, "Why does the Ryan Government refuse to do its duty in this respect? Are they thinking of the success of their State hotel? Are they afraid of offending the public loafers of the Labour party?"

HON. R. BEDFORD: A lady, I presume?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The hon. gentleman is very presumptuous. We do not know, of course, what proposition the Government have to make with regard to social and temperance reform, or whether it is merely camouflage and nothing else; but there is this much to be said: it might be just as well for the loyal publicans of Queensland to exert their influence in certain directions and accept a 6 o'clock to 6 o'clock measure, which might meet with the approval of a large number of citizens in Queensland. Otherwise, the prohibition movement which has swept throughout Canada, which is going like a prairie fire through the United States, which has been a success wherever it has been introduced, which has been supported by Hearst, the newspaper king, who was once dead against it in Ontario and Quebec, may be carried

through here. It may be just as well to accept that modicum of reform, rather than to allow what will come in Australia as surely as it has come in Canada and in the United States—namely, a wave of prohibition.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: How many wet States are there in America now?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I think there are twenty-nine absolutely dry. I am not sure of those figures, and I want to be quite accurate in giving them. I believe there are eight or nine other States that have gone dry, but the proposal for going dry which was carried by referendum has to be ratified by the State Assemblies. There is no doubt it will be ratified, because every time it has been carried by the people it has been ratified.

HON. R. SUMNER: I believe we could carry it here.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We ought to carry it here. I do not know whether we could carry prohibition in Queensland.

HON. R. SUMNER: Pass the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill, and give it a trial.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: At all events, some curtailment of the hours of sale of liquor would certainly be carried. It is a matter of amazement in Queensland why the Labour party, which have always stood for shorter hours and higher wages, have been timid when it comes to cutting down the hours for the sale of liquor. They have cut off the 9 o'clock closing for the ordinary business community. They say that no man must start business before 8.30 in the morning, and they will fine a man if he is open at five minutes past 1 on Saturday. But with regard to the liquor traffic they walk very timidly.

HON. R. BEDFORD: It would be a good thing if they did not open the hotels till noon, because it is the morning drinking that is bad.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Would you support that?

HON. R. BEDFORD: I would.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: But with regard to the liquor traffic the Government have not cut off a single hour. What is the proposal of the Government with regard to liquor reform? Is the Minister going to tell us that he is going to smother it in a referendum Bill which covers a multitude of other questions; or is he going to say, "Just as we have attacked the iron and steel works question, the State Produce Agency, the fish and butchers' shops, so we will also attack the liquor problem." But no, when it comes to the liquor problem they smother the whole thing up in another Bill. They are afraid to come out in the open with regard to the liquor problem.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And you are afraid to pass the Initiative and Referendum Bill.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Nine-tenths of my politics are temperance, and I will make a present of the other tenth to the hon. gentleman. I do not think we could get prohibition at the present time, because the people are not educated on the matter in Queensland. There has been no campaign in regard to temperance on a wide scale in this State, as in the United States, where they canvass whole States. They will take

four States and say, "Next year these four States will go bone dry," and they go bone dry.

HON. R. BEDFORD: They are only bone dry publicly, but not privately.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: That is not the actual experience, and I will find the opportunity before long of giving the facts to the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt that his mind is open to receive facts.

HON. R. BEDFORD: I know all about the abuses of the traffic, and I would like to see it regulated as much as you.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Are the Labour party in favour of shorter hours for all trades? Then why do they allow forty-eight, fifty, and fifty-five—fifty-six is the maximum—for other trades—and allow the liquor trade to run 102 hours every week?

HON. E. B. PURNELL: That is curtailed, so far as domestic servants are concerned.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We are talking about the hours of closing. The trader has to close his shop at 6 o'clock, but the publican can keep his hotel open. What in the wide world is the good of a scene such as I saw at the corner of Edward and Queen streets two days ago, where three men—two policemen and one water police—were taking up one man who had been made drunk. The State will pay for three policemen; it will pay for a cab; it will pay for a magistrate to try that man to-morrow morning; it will pay for a cell to put him into; and it will pay all that to let the corner "pub" make 4d. out of 6d. I wonder that the conscience of the Labour party has not been stung into action with regard to liquor reform, and why they have not said, "Clear the decks! We will attack this octopus at once."

HON. H. C. JONES: You are on the wrong side of the House.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The people of Queensland expected the Labour party, when they came into office, not to start meatworks or anything like that, but to attack something that threatens the very best welfare of the community. What is the good of talking of a child's welfare association meeting in Brisbane next week? I do not say that that association is not a good and desirable one, but what is the good of meeting and talking of the welfare of the child when you have got public-houses everywhere which are responsible for the absolute wastage of child life?

HON. R. BEDFORD: When you have wiped out all the public-houses there will still be some people who will refuse to drink ginger beer.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: At the present time I am preparing 100 facts connected with the drink evil taken from Australian life. Those facts will be put before this Council. I do hope that during this session the Government will show their bona fides and their earnestness with regard to this matter, and will bring forward some radical temperance reform.

I come now to almost the last paragraph in the Speech. To that paragraph, with all due deference, I take absolute exception. There are times when the Council must see very clearly its own position, and, if necessary, must defend it, and, if necessary, in judicious and temperate terms, take the

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

opportunity to express its opinion. The paragraph to which I allude has been commented on very adversely in another place, and has also received adverse comment in this Chamber, and there is not an hon. member here who does not believe that that paragraph should not have appeared in the Governor's Speech. The paragraph in question reads—

“Much of the useful legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly in the last Parliament was rejected, or seriously mutilated, by the Legislative Council.”

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Isn't that true?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: No; it is largely a matter of opinion.

HON. H. C. JONES: The people decided that.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: They decided in favour of the Council.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is largely a matter of opinion, like all epithets or adjectives. Some hon. members may call some of that legislation useful, others may call it useless; it is all a matter of opinion. Some hon. members may say it was seriously mutilated; others may say it was vastly improved; it is purely a matter of opinion. It was my intention to move an amendment to this Address in Reply—to insert a paragraph reading—

“That this Council regret the unusual course—a course, it is respectfully submitted, that is contrary to constitutional precedent—adopted by His Excellency of reflecting upon the actions of this Council in the faithful performance of their public duty.”

HON. R. SUMNER: Isn't that a reflection on His Excellency?

HON. R. BEDFORD: You are disloyal.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The people do not agree with that.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: As a matter of fact, the people, by an overwhelming vote, endorsed the actions of this Council, and proclaimed to the whole world their confidence in the Council. If there is any man in Queensland who does not like to deal “on just terms,” then he must be branded as a man who prefers to deal “on unjust terms.” Not one of the Bills that we amended so substantially was put to the country. The Government dared not put them to the country. The Government very well knew that this Council had improved every one of those Bills. The country endorsed our action, and the Premier was not willing to run the risk of putting any of those Bills to the country. He certainly ran the risk of putting the Bill which proposed to abolish the Council to the country, and it was turned down by two to one.

I regret that the adverse vote given a little while ago prevents my giving more accurate figures. I am called on to speak unexpectedly and without notes, with regard to social and temperance reform, because I feel sure, if they had the figures, they would immediately take action in the matter. Parliament has become so sober of late years that we really do not know what is going on outside.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: Have it printed in pamphlet form and give it to us.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Of the Bills mentioned in the Speech 75 per cent. have been discussed in this Council before. I have an open mind upon the votes that may be given on those Bills by myself and by

[*Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.*]

other hon. members. It may be said that there is a mandate for us to pass the whole of the Government measures en bloc.

HON. R. BEDFORD: So there is.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: As a matter of fact, the decision of the country on 5th May only amounted to this, that this House is told, “You are still to proceed in your course and do what you consider to be the right thing.” We have to give the fullest discussion, the most patient investigation, to any proposal that the Government may bring forward.

HON. R. SUMNER: Something has taken place since then.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Nothing to override that.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We have been given a hint that we are needed.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: No.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Every one of the propositions brought before us will receive the very fullest consideration. I must thank the Minister and other hon. members for giving me this opportunity of speaking on the Address in Reply.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I did not give it to you. I was against you speaking.

HON. R. SUMNER: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the Council, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 18th June.

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.