Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 1918

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER, 1918.

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

QUESTIONS.

STRIKE BALLOTS UNDER INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"How often since the coming into force of the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 have the results of ballots, held in connection with the strikes that have since occurred, been communicated to the Registrar as required by section 65 of the Act"

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

"The Registrar has received official cognisance of strikes, or notifications of results of ballots, in connection with disputes which actually occurred in twenty-nine instances. The Registrar also received five notifications of intention to strike where no strike subsequently took place."

BORING FOR COAL AT BARALABA.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*) asked the Premier, for the Secretary for Mines—

"1. In view of recent boring operations at Baralaba could he give any information as to whether a workable seam of coal had been located?

"2. If a suitable seam of coal has been found, can he indicate when operations are likely to be commenced in order to develop same?"

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

"1. A workable seam of coal was located by two shafts before boring was commenced, the object of the boring being to prove whether the seam extended over a sufficiently large area to warrant the outlay of capital in opening it up and to indicate the best position for development.

"2. Earlier bores proved only a small area of coal round the first shaft, but recent bores have indicated the likelihood of a fair area of coal round the second shaft, and boring is being continued with the object of proving the extension of that area and indicating the best position from which to open out the coal."

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The PREMIER (who was received, on rising, with Government cheers) said: I rise to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the amendment of "the Constitution of Queensland by abolishing the Legislative Council." Yesterday, in speaking on the introductory stages of the Bill, I referred to its contents, the only difference really between it and the Bill as it was

introduced and passed by this House on the last occasion being that provision is made for a revisory committee.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You have been doing a "think" since.

The PREMIER: I think it is a good thing to be always thinking, and I am inclined to think that the people should be given an opportunity on this occasion of thinking in the direction of passing this measure.

Mr. MACARTNEY: They are thinking, all right.

The PREMIER: The revisory committee that is provided for in the Bill is to consist of members from both sides of the House as nearly as possible representing, in proportion to numbers, His Majesty's Government and His Majesty's Constitutional Opposition. Their duty will be—

> "To take such Bill into consideration with the object of ensuring that the provisions of the Bill are a clear expression of the will and intention of Parliament, and that so far as such Bill deals with existing legislation it deals with the same clearly and effectively."

Their function is to report to the House on each Bill, and—

> "if deemed necessary, make such recommendation with respect thereto as will, in the opinion of such committee, ensure the objects aforesaid."

The Assembly shall thereupon take such report and such recommendation into consideration, and "make any such amendments in such Bill as the Assembly may deem necessary." If a report is not made within the time fixed, the Bill is to be presented to the Governor for the signification of His Majesty's assent thereto. It is fortunate that the people of this State—because eventually it must go to the people of the State for decision—will be able to approach the question without the legal difficulties that were thrown in their way on the last occasion by representatives of the Legislative Council. I was glad to hear the leader of the Opposition say yesterday afternoon that they were not going to rely upon the legal position.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I was speaking for myself and for this party.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman belongs to the legal profession himself, and he knows that he has got no law to rely upon. (Government laughter.) He is well advised to say that the Opposition and the Legislative Council will not rely upon the law. But I think it well that I should point out now that, because of the fear in the minds of the members of the Legislative Council, and more particularly in the minds of those outside whom they represent, on the last occasion they immediately took steps to prevent the sense of the people being taken on the matter. They issued a writ when we decided to hold a referendum, and had an injunction granted; and it was only on the eve of the taking of the referendum that the High Court of Australia in Sydney set aside that injunction, and allowed the referendum to be taken. In the circumstances, not only was it impossible to have a complete campaign having the issues clearly put before the people, but I know that I was personally prevented from taking the platform, except, I think, on one occasion. I think I was only able to address a meeting at Warwick in support of the Labour candidates, and incidentally on the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council. Now all that difficulty has been cleared away. The High Court of Australia, by a unanimous judgment, has held that the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act is a valid and effective Act of Parliament, and also it has held further that there is power to abolish the Legislative Council of Queensland by an Act passed by the Legislative Assembly and to refer the question to the electors in accordance with the provisions of the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908. That much is clear. The road is open to us. We need not expect to have any more obstructive tactics through courts which give decisions with some alacrity in favour of the position taken up by the Legislative Council. We are able to have a fair campaign, and I hope that the issues will be fully and clearly put before the people. I think it is the duty of the Government to see to it that an opportunity will be given to have a full and effective campaign, so that both sides of the question may be put to the people; and I think that such steps ought to be taken before the referendum is actually taken as will enable that to be done. I would just like to refer for a moment to the fact that there are many States which are governed by only one Chamber, and that there is really no logic in the position taken up by our opponents that a second Chamber is necessary. Indeed, they do not think that a second Chamber is necessary. What they do think is necessary is that there shall be a second Chamber where their interests are representative of the majority.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY interjected.

The PREMIER: It is an easy process. Fortunately, the electors of this State are intelligent enough to be able to see through the situation if they are given an opportunity of having it fully placed before them. Now, I would warn hon. gentlemen opposite not to have any overweening confidence in the matter. (Opposition laughter.) They feel that because they had a majority of 62,000 on the last occasion, they can therefore rest on their oars and sit back and say that the Council is safely entrenched there. I think they will find that when the next poll is taken they have somewhat miscalculated the position.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have a suspicion that you are with us.

The PREMIER: Of course, it is very easy for hon. members opposite to say that they have a suspicion that I am with them, but it is by their deeds that you know men.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

The PREMIER: I think the day is very far distant before we will be thinking together, and we can only think together when hon. gentlemen opposite change their views to the views held by me or by this party. (Hear, hear!) I was referring to single Chambers. In Canada there are seven States without a second Chamber, and two States only that have a second Chamber.

Mr. VOWLES: Are they sovereign States?

The PREMIER: Yes, they are sovereign States. The hon. member need not think that there is any magic about the word "sovereign." After all, the word "sovereign" only indicates that, to some extent, the particular State has direct communication with the Imperial Government, and enjoys responsible government. For example, Queensland is a sovereign State, but not completely sovereign, because there is an ambit which lays down the respective spheres in which they work. Queensland is not entirely a sovereign State; it is only a sovereign State to the extent that its powers are not curtailed even by the Imperial Parliament or by the Commonwealth Constitution. I was referring to the fact that there were seven States in Canada which had only one Chamber, and two which had a second Chamber. The second-Chamber Houses are the States of Quebec and Nova Scotia. Quebec has an area of 706,800 square miles, and a population of 2,002,000. Nova Scotia has an area of 21,400 square miles, and a population of 480,000 people. Against those two States, which have two Legislative Assemblies, we have the following States, which have only one legislative Chamber, namely, Ontario, with an area of 407,000 square miles, and a population of 2,523,000; British Columbia, 395,600 square miles in area, and a population of 539,000; New Brunswick, 27,900 square miles, and a population of 351,800; Prince Edward Island, 2,180 square miles, and a population of 93,000; Manitoba, 51,980 square miles, and a population of 451,000; and Alberta, 53,000 square miles, and a population of 550,000 people. "Keith," in his book, "Responsible Government of the Dominions," volume 1, page 518, makes the following reference to this fact, speaking of Canada. He says—

> "There are no second Chambers in the other Canadian provinces at the present day. In Ontario and British Columbia none has ever existed; that of New Brunswick disappeared in 1891 (it had twenty-three members); that of Prince Edward Island, elective from 1862 onwards, was merged in the Assembly by an Act of 1893, c. 21, and that of Manitoba was abolished by a local Act (c. 28) in 1876. The new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have a single Chamber only."

I would just like to read a quotation from "Temperley," a distinguished writer on the subject of Senates and Upper Chambers. He makes some observations that are somewhat appropriate on the matter of second Chambers generally. On page 47 of his book, "Senates and Upper Chambers," he says, speaking of South Africa—

> "It is quite clear that the Upper Chambers in the Transvaal and Orange River colony are only temporary ones in their present character, and it is by no means certain that it was not intended that they should be abolished altogether in the future. As for the Federal Senate of South Africa, the Constitution gives it no special protection after ten years; and furthermore (this is an open secret) there was a strong party in the convention in favour of doing without it altogether. Whatever may have been thought of a single-Chamber Government in a unitary State, it had always been previously considered that another Chamber was indispensable for a Federal State. If the collective wisdom of South Africa could for a moment seriously contemplate doing without one in the Federal Constitution, it is quite evident that it absolutely condemns the bicameral system for unitary States, and in this judgment we see the severest criticism that the two-Chamber system has hitherto received. But in any case the general testimony of our other colonies to the worth of the bicameral system must be regarded as a somewhat ungracious one. Nowhere is the Upper Chamber really imposing in the unitary colonies. In few is it actually powerful; in many it is regarded as a rather tedious relict of a bygone age."

(Government cheers.)

The PREMIER—

> "In Canada and South Africa, certainly, it is looked upon as an ancestral relative, whose death would not cause any particular grief to the colonies in question, though they do not care to terminate its existence by speedier means. The home Government stands by acting the part of the family doctor bidding the eager heirs to have patience, and meanwhile doing its best to keep the aged parent alive by cordials and by encouragement."

Mr. KIRWAN: That is pretty rough, is it not?

The PREMIER: I think it is a very appropriate quotation from a distinguished writer, and describes very well the position occupied by the second Chambers in the different Dominions. Now, apart from the question of States successfully governed by a single Chamber, and the tendency referred to in the writer from whom I have just quoted to have single Chambers generally, I would like to quote the analogy to the House and to the people—because eventually this question must be argued out before the people who will have to give the final decision upon it—between the situation which now obtains in Great Britain with regard to the House of Lords through the operation of a measure—or, at all events, a measure which can be operated if the Government desire to operate it—which practically does away with the power of veto of the House of Lords. I refer to the Parliament Act under which in the case of money Bills, if they are sent up from the Commons and rejected by the House of Lords, there is provision whereby they can be forthwith presented to His Majesty for his assent without the concurrence of the House of Lords. And with respect to other measures that they may be sent up three times in different sessions, which may be during the same Parliament, and if rejected by the House of Lords on those occasions such Bills may be then presented to His Majesty for his assent, having been passed only by the House of Commons. So that practically the power of the House of Lords has been taken away, and the House of Commons can prevail. (Hear, hear!) The Legislative Assembly of Queensland cannot. The Legislative Council has the power not only of revision—it is not a revisory Chamber at all—it has the power of rejection—which it exercises.

Mr. PETERSON: Of mutilation.

The PREMIER: And, as my friend the member for Normanby says, the power of mutilation. After all, power of mutilation is only a power which is used for the

purpose of destroying a Bill—of rejecting it—a means for preventing the accomplishment of the will of the people. And it is significant that, notwithstanding the fact that they have the Parliament Act in force in Great Britain, which destroys the power of veto of the House of Lords, the tendency is shown to go in for the complete abolition of that Chamber, as is indicated in a cable which I read when I was going to Melbourne the other day, in the "Courier" of 7th September, 1918—

> "It is significant that the Liberal programme prepared for the Liberal federation meeting at Manchester on 28th September makes winning the war the first plank of the platform. . . . The programme also contains the proposed abolition of the House of Lords."

Mr. KIRWAN: Fancy these chaps being behind the Liberal party in England!

Mr. SIZER: That is nothing new.

The PREMIER: I agree with the hon. member—it is nothing new; but our friends opposite would have the people of Queensland believe that it is something new. (Hear, hear!) That is exactly what I have been trying to prove—that it is nothing new, that it is something that has been adopted by other parts of the world, that it is something that the British people——

Mr. SIZER: They have never adopted it.

The PREMIER: It is quite evident that public opinion there is being educated to a great extent, because, notwithstanding that they have destroyed the power of the House of Lords to veto a measure, we have a great party like the Liberal party finding it necessary to include in their programme a plank which will provide for the abolition of the House of Lords altogether. But why should the position be as it is? What merit is there in having two Chambers? We have an illustration in the Government of the Commonwealth at the present time. We have a National Government, with a large majority in the House of Representatives, and also a large majority in the Senate. What is the difference, in effect, between having one and having two Chambers? They can do what they like—what they can pass in the House of Representatives they can also pass in the Senate. Was it not also so when the late Labour Government was in power in the Commonwealth Parliament? They had a majority in the House of Representatives and also a sweeping majority in the Senate, and it was never said that because they had such a majority as that, and they could do what they liked, therefore, they would do something which would destroy the stability of the community. No; whether it is a single Chamber or two Chambers that you have governing with a majority for one party in each, the ultimate responsibility falls upon the party in power—upon the Government in power. They have to be strong enough and courageous enough to do what in their opinion is in the interests of the people—what is the right thing. On the one hand they must not be frightened by the bogeys of those who are opposed to them in front. For example, here we have the I.W.W. theory trotted out by hon. members opposite in an endeavour to frighten the people. They say that we stand for I.W.W.-ism and go-slow-ism. The people do not believe it, and that is why they have placed us here.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: But while they do not believe it, still we must make it clear that we do not stand for those things. I have never hesitated to make it clear, and the party have never hesitated to make it clear, that we do not stand for go-slow-ism. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MACARTNEY: Only when it comes to action.

The PREMIER: We stand for efficiency, and we have the courage to stand up and say that we stand for efficiency. We do not stand for speeding up, but we do not stand for going slow. There is a reasonable medium; we expect the fair thing. Any community which does not is going back, losing its stamina and its virility, and, therefore, it must be for parties and for Governments to have the courage to do what is the right thing. That is the only safeguard for the good government of the country, and any Government that is in power, and any party that is in power, which suffers from dry-rot or lacks courage to say and do the right thing, the people can soon deal with—and will soon deal with.

I would like to remind hon. members opposite of the fact again—I have reminded them previously this session on the matter—that, notwithstanding the majority of 60,000 that was cast against the referendum on the last occasion, there has been a decision of the people since then, a decision of the people on the 16th March last.

Mr MORGAN: Not on that question.

The PREMIER: On that question—I say upon that question—a decision of the people on the 16th March last, and when the referendum is finally taken during next year on this matter, I think it will be shown that my conclusion that the issue was decided on the 16th March last is correct. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. VOWLES: If it is not so, will you resign?

The PREMIER: We made it an issue. The leader of the Opposition made it an issue. It was made an issue by their representatives outside—the National Political Council.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Where in this speech did you make it an issue?

The PREMIER: I made it the issue, the whole trend of the issue. I said that we were out to accomplish what the people sent us to accomplish—and I say we propose to do it again—and in a speech at the Centennial Hall I said that it was within our power to take a certain course if those measures were rejected. We have decided to take the course which we took before. We rely on the good sense of the people. We have once asked them for a decision on the matter, and we are not afraid to ask them for another decision on the same matter.

Mr SIZER: If you do not get it will you resign?

The PREMIER: Well, if we do not get it—the hon. member need not expect to get the same answer as he got from the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—if I cannot accomplish the purposes for which I am sent here, well then, someone else can carry on the government of the party. (Opposition laughter and Government "Hear, hears.")

Mr. VOWLES: That is what your party want.

The PREMIER: I want to quote in this speech remarks made by me on the

question of the abolition of the Council in a speech delivered here recently, and which appear at pages 2017 and 2019 of "Hansard" for this session, in order to complete my argument that the question was clearly made an issue by both parties at last election, by the National Political Council, and also by the Press, and the people gave an overwhelming decision in favour of the abolition of the Council. I would ask leave to have that inserted in my speech.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member's previous remarks be inserted?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr MACARTNEY: I would like to hear what they are.

The PREMIER: I do not wish to prolong my speech by going over all the quotations, which the hon. member has, and can see for himself.

Mr MACARTNEY: I have not.

The PREMIER: He can get them. I will send them over to the hon. member.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have got to keep my eye on you. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER—

[Extract from speech of 4th September, 1918, pp. 2017-2019.]

"The PREMIER: They (i.e., hon. members opposite) told us that if the Government were returned to power the Legislative Council would be abolished. They said that was the issue. What do they say of the issue now? Do they say that was the issue now? So soon as we were returned they ran with memorials to the Governor. They endeavoured to get his ear to tender advice.

"Mr. Vowles: Did you get his ear?

"The PREMIER: I do not discuss in this Chamber matters that are properly only between the Governor and his responsible Ministers. I am now dealing—and I want to keep entirely to it—with the attitude of the party opposite in the country. I can give illustrations from the last election campaign to show that the issue according to hon. members was whether the Upper House was to go. Do they say that is the issue now? Do they say that we have the right to say that the Upper House shall go? They say, 'Oh, dear no, that has nothing to do with the matter at all.' I just want to say a word on this matter, because several matters were specifically put before the people in the policy speech at Townsville, and specifically approved of by the people, with regard to which the people were specifically told that a certain course would be taken in order to secure that passage. Those measures were the Chillagoe Railway, the Land Act Amendment Bill—raising the bar of 50 per cent. upon the Land Court—the State Iron and Steel Works, the Public Works Commission, the Workers' Compensation measure with reference to industrial diseases, such as miners' phthisis, the Initiative and Referendum, the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill, and an amendment of the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act. Those are amongst the measures which were specifically put to the people. We specifically put it to the people during that campaign that the issue was that those measures were to go on the statute-book We won easily.

"Government Members: Hear, hear!

"The PREMIER: The people said, 'They are to go on the statute-book.' I ask this: 'Is it to be that we shall not find a means of placing those measures on the statute-book?' The people have asked that they go there, they have deliberately expressed their will that they shall go there, and yet we have a Chamber that attempts to stand in the way. If I liked to refer to speeches of individual Ministers and other prominent members of the party, I could show that they specifically referred to the issue with the Legislative Council. I refer to a speech of my colleague the Treasurer at Toowoomba, delivered on the night of 18th February; to a speech delivered by Mr. Weir at Maryborough, on 4th March —I am quoting now from Press cuttings —to my own speech in the Centennial Hall on the night of 4th March, when I said this, as reported in the 'Courier' of 5th March—

> Mr. Ryan cited the various ways in which he alleged the Government had assisted the primary producer. He said the policy he was now submitting he was now asking the electors to approve, and if the Legislative Council was obdurate, it was open to the Government to make recommendations to the Governor of a suitable number of appointments to that Chamber to see that the recommendations were carried out. The Government stood for a single Chamber.

"The 'Daily Standard' of 5th March also contained a report, perhaps a little fuller even than that. The report was as follows:—

> THE UPPER HOUSE QUESTION.
>
> Mr. Ryan went on to refer to the many great issues that had arisen during the terms of office of the Government, and which were not before the people when the Barcaldine policy speech was laid down. All he could say with regard to that speech was that the Government carried out that policy in so far as it was allowed to do by the Legislative Council. For the policy which the Government was now submitting to the people, it was asking their specific approval, and the Council, it was to be hoped, when the measures were put before them, would allow them to be placed on the statute-book as having received the approval of the people. (Applause.) Of course, it was open to the Government if the Council did not do so to make a recommendation to the Governor with a view to making a suitable number of appointments to see that these measures were carried. Moreover, the Government stood for a single Chamber, but if a measure was introduced to abolish the Council, and twice rejected, just as on the previous occasion, the people would have the final say under the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act as to whether they were going on with one Chamber

or two. He wanted that position to be perfectly clear.

"What is the attitude of the leader of the Opposition? In his policy speech delivered in Toowoomba, he is reported in the 'Courier' of 22nd February to have said—

> But the Ryan Government and party are still advocating the destruction of the Council, and are hoping to again secure a majority which would give them a chance during the currency of the next Parliament of obtaining a majority also in the Council, and then to pass an Act abolishing the second Chamber.

"That is the speech of the leader of the Opposition, when he was endeavouring to have us defeated. We will take another one—that of Mr. R. M. King, who stood for Logan, reported in the 'Courier' of 2nd March, 1918. He said—

> If the Labour party got back into power—and he hoped it would not—it would swamp the Upper House so that it could vote for its own abolition.

"Very plain language! Mr. Macgregor, as reported in the 'Courier' of the 4th March, said this at Merthyr—

> He strongly urged electors to maintain their second Chamber, and that could only be done by voting National.

"Mr. Elphinstone, the hon. member for Oxley, according to the 'Courier' of the 15th March—

> urged the electors to retain the Upper House, which the caucus party was so anxious to abolish."

"Mr. Roberts: He won his seat.

"The PREMIER: I know that, but I am arguing that that was the issue. He won his seat, but we won a majority of the seats. (Hear, hear!) That is the point. According to his interjection, the hon. member would argue that because one man won a seat over there, the Council would have to remain. (Hear, hear!) Mr. Macartney, in a speech delivered on 5th March at Gladstone—he was getting out into the country and was putting the real issue—said this—

> If Labour was returned, in its blindness, it would remove the Upper House.

"Here is an extract from a manifesto to the electors of Queensland issued by Mr. Macartney, and published in the 'Courier' of 16th March, the day of the election—

> A Government which is pledged to do away with the Legislative Council—the only safeguard against the dictatorship which spells the wiping out of all those institutions and provisions which stand for honest Government and that freedom which is the right of every citizen.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> EDWARD H. MACARTNEY.

"The 'Daily Mail,' a prominent organ of the opposite party, on 21st February, winds up its leader in this way—

> There is, let it be repeated, no room for misunderstanding. Between the people and a complete one-Chamber domination stands the barrier of the Legislative Council. Which is to prevail will be determined on 16th March.

"That is very plain—

> Which is to prevail will be determined on 16th March.

"The 'Courier' on 27th February, in a leading article, said—

> One result of a caucus victory at the polls will be a stiffening of the party resolve to emasculate the legislative system. Representative candidates have stated explicitly that a favourable verdict will be regarded as a mandate from the people to proceed with the abolition of the second Chamber. Electors, therefore, will do well to remember that whatever their wishes may be, if they vote for Ministerialists, they will help to place Queensland and all its varied interests at the mercy of a single Chamber Legislature dominated by an irresponsible outside organisation.

"Further on they say—

> The probabilities are that there are many electors inclined towards other planks of the caucus platform who are strongly opposed to a one-Chamber system. Such voters must choose between the Ryan Government and the Legislative Council. They cannot have both. If the Ryan Government continues in office it will not rest until it has destroyed the Council.

"A very good tip there. (Government laughter.) The 'Courier,' on 6th March, in a leading article, stated—

> Some questions for Mr. Ryan—The Premier says the caucus party stands for a single-Chamber system of government. That is a plain and definite statement. Taken in conjunction with a more explicit declaration by the Treasurer, it means that if the Government secures a majority on the 16th instant, it will regard its success as a mandate to proceed with the abolition of the Legislative Council.

"I am quoting this because I think it will be very helpful to the people of Queensland in making themselves conversant with the situation which now exists, where this Government are not able—up to the present, at all events—to have the will of the people expressed on 16th March put into execution. The 'Courier' of 14th March, 1918, sets out—

> Most of those German descendants are producers. They know how the caucus has treated them during the last three years, and they know that if the Ryan Government be restored to office, the Legislative Council—the one brake on the caucus machine—is to be removed, and the party can run its Bolshevik 'whole hog' riot without let or hindrance.

"Here are some of the advertisements paid for by the National Political Council—

> AN ELECTIVE COUNCIL.
>
> The Ryan 'Labour' party if returned to power intends to abolish the Legislative Council in spite of the fact that sixty out of seventy-two electorate voted last May that it should

not be abolished. The National party intends to carry out the people's own wish and to keep the Council in existence, but it is going to make it elective, so that the people can have a say in the choosing of its members. Isn't that quite a fair thing?

Vote National.

"In the 'Courier' of 11th March, 1918, there is another big poster—

The Ryan Government has declared that if it is returned to power it will take it that the people wish it to abolish the Council.

If you are prepared to run the risk of this it is your own lookout.

But the issue is so grave, the danger is so great, that we urge you to think earnestly as to what your vote may mean to you.

If you vote the Ryan Government into power; if it then abolishes the Council; if it takes over your home and your Savings Bank account;

Don't say you were not warned.

"They were warned, and still they said abolish the Legislative Council."

"Hon. W. H. Barnes: What did they say when they were directly appealed to with respect to the Legislative Council?

"The PREMIER: Then, on 12th March, another advertisement in the 'Courier,' signed by the representative of the National Political Council, states—

KEEP THE COUNCIL—KEEP YOUR HOMES—KEEP YOUR SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS.

If you vote for the Ryan party in this election you will be voting for the abolition of the Legislative Council. Once the Legislative Council is abolished the Ryan party will be able to do exactly as it likes.

It will, for instance, be able to put into operation the mad scheme of the Labour convention, which is to take everything you own; to make it 'common property' and to abolish wages so that you will be entirely at the mercy of the Ryan party.

If you are inclined to think this is a laughing matter read the speech of Mr. Demaine, president of the Labour convention, as reported in the 'Daily Standard' of 29th January last, and you will change your views.

Keep the Council—Your homes—Keep your Savings Bank deposits.

Vote National.

"(Government laughter.) Here is a real beauty on 14th March, on the eve of the election."

"Mr. Collins: A whole page.

"The PREMIER: A whole page; previously they were given a quarter page—

If, therefore, you vote for the Ryan Government nominees, remember that you are voting to create a Parliament which will as surely as night follows day (Messrs. Theodore and Fihelly, two of Mr. Ryan's colleagues, have said it) try to accomplish by Act of Parliament the abolition of the Legislative Council which you have said shall not be abolished.

If the Ryan Government's candidates are elected, you will then be faced with one-Chamber Government, which means in plain and simple language absolute and unfettered control by the agitators of the unions.

"The Treasurer: They made it the issue.

"The PREMIER: They made it the issue. Then, on 16th March, the 'Courier' has a column headed 'Most Momentous Issues,' in which it endeavoured to influence electors as they went to the polls. What was it they endeavoured to emphasise—

A caucus victory to-day means the abolition of the Legislative Council.

"That was their last note to the people."

Notwithstanding the overwhelming majority which we received at the polls on the 16th March last, giving us a majority of two to one in the House, the Legislative Council has persisted in a definite policy of obstruction. They apparently have made up their minds to give just as little as [4 p.m.] they can—to just give away as little as possible—in order to try and retain their position as a second Chamber. For example, the Land Act Amendment Bill, which proposed to place the big squatter in the same position, as far as the rental of his holding was concerned, as the ordinary selector, was thrown out most unceremoniously; cut to pieces, for a start, leaving the title, and then even the title was cut out. The Initiative and Referendum Bill was mutilated in such a form that it was practically destroyed. The Wages Bill and the Meatworks Bill were seriously mutilated. The Valuation of Land Bill was thrown out on the second reading. Our taxation measures were held up for quite a considerable time, and they eventually backed down because they felt that if they did not, that was the end of them.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: During the previous session the State Iron and Steel Works Bill failed to pass owing to drastic amendments by the Council. Again, the Industrial Diseases and Miners' Phthisis Act was limited to two years in its operation. The Workers' Compensation Act was allowed to go through by accident—which they admitted. It is a very important thing to remember that, because hon. gentlemen opposite claim credit for having had the Legislative Council agree to the Workers' Compensation Act. We all know that it was a mistake on their part.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And they call themselves a revisionary chamber!

The PREMIER: Exactly—they call themselves a revisionary chamber. They sent down to this House, as you will remember, and asked to have the Bill taken back there to amend it into a different form. We know the great advantages that that Act has conferred upon the worker, how the benefits have been increased by 75 per cent. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. PETERSON: Also the employers.

The PREMIER: To both employers and employees, which Act we got through by an accident against their will. We all know the litigation which followed in the Supreme Court of Queensland and finally in the Privy Council, when they were again defeated, as they were defeated in their legal proceedings with regard to the abolition of the Legislative

Council. The people should be reminded of these things.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: They should be reminded that it was against the will of that Chamber that they enjoy these advantages. We should also point out to them that, if that Chamber is removed, those advantages can be increased.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And similar additional advantages conferred upon them at the expense of the big capitalist: because, after all, what are the measures that they are most concerned about? They are measures that concern the big capitalist—the Tramways Bill; something dealing with the pastoralists, the shipping companies, the gas companies, the coal and copper kings, the meat companies, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. These are the interests that they are concerned with, and they are the interests for which they stand. That is the revision they do, not a revision in the interests of the people of Queensland—a revision which could take place under the Initiative and Referendum Act—but a revision in the interests of the big capitalistic concerns.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The public know how untrue that statement is.

The PREMIER: The public will have an opportunity of pronouncing again upon the matter. Again I would remind the hon. member that he need have no overweening confidence in this matter.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You are not very confident.

The PREMIER: I have had the experience of several campaigns in Queensland, and I am satisfied that if the people of Queensland get a fair opportunity of hearing the issues put properly they usually do the right thing.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I am not going to them with any bribe or bludgeon. We come to them with full confidence in the logic of our argument. (Hear, hear!) We come to persuade them, and I am satisfied that we will be able to persuade them that the proper course is to remove that Chamber. If revision is wanted—if they want to be very sure upon that point—it is provided by a revisory committee; and also, do not forget, by the people themselves, who are given an instrument by which they can initiate and pass new legislation themselves, or by which they can repeal legislation that is objectionable to them.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Now, those are the two safeguards of the people. The Legislative Council is not a safeguard for the people, but a safeguard for the capitalistic concerns that hon. gentlemen in that Chamber represent.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Everybody knows that the large majority of hon. members who have seats in that Chamber have been placed there by a long series of Tory or Liberal Governments; that, in the past history of Queensland, no matter what Government sat on the Treasury benches, they were able to command a majority in that Chamber. In a sense, when a Liberal or a Tory Government were in power, they could say they were a revisory body; but when, in 1915, the people of Queensland decided to place the Labour Government in charge of the affairs of the State, we had an Opposition in that Chamber which was able to control the whole actions of the Government. The Opposition were a majority. We have added thirteen to that Chamber, but still we are in a minority of about two to one, or they are in a majority of about two to one, and it is impossible for the Government to pass anything through that Chamber against the will of the nominees of former Tory or Liberal Governments.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Some of them have been there for over thirty years.

At a quarter past 4 o'clock p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair as Deputy Speaker.

The PREMIER: Some have been there for over thirty years. I do not want to make any personal references to those gentlemen, but many of them were defeated candidates. It was a kind of consolation stakes for defeated candidates. The people of Queensland know that, and they want to be reminded of it.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: And some of yours are defeated candidates.

The PREMIER: Now those gentlemen were placed there, as I say, not to revise our legislation, but to mutilate it and to reject it. Of course, when the people decide—as I feel sure they will decide, by their votes, when they get the opportunity—on the abolition of that Chamber, it is not the intention that the individual members should suffer any personal detriment. I do not see that there could be any objection to their retaining, if they want, the little privileges that they have.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: That is not the question we are fighting at all. It is not a question of a railway pass for any particular hon. member there. Of course, there is no intention of doing any personal detriment to anyone who is there. The officers connected with that House, of course, will be provided for in some other way. But we must remove the obstacle; the people must remove the obstacle that stands between them and the accomplishment of their will. (Hear, hear!) Now, I hope that, during the campaign, the question will be fully and clearly put; because this is a question that ought to be debated before the people from both sides; and the more it is debated, the more confident I am of success.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Will our side get a hearing?

The PREMIER: Well, if I can give them a hearing, they will have a hearing; and the more they are heard, the better I will like it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr KIRWAN: No. 1 uppercut.

The PREMIER: It will be suggested—as, indeed, it has been suggested—that the expense of holding a referendum will be very great. Someone mentioned £30,000.

Mr. MACARTNEY: £13,000.

The PREMIER: Well, £30,000 I heard mentioned. Supposing it were £30,000, it is a bagatelle compared with the amount that is held in the pockets of the rich—of those who can afford to pay—by the action of the Legislative Council. Take the case of the squatting interests alone, in connection with this Land Act Amendment Bill, which

has been rejected, which proposed to remove the barrier of 50 per cent. placed upon the power of the Land Court in fixing the rents of pastoral holdings. We estimate to raise from that source alone £100,000 a year. That is only one source that will be tapped, and a source which, everyone will admit, can afford to pay. (Hear, hear!) What is £30,000 to be spent in removing a barrier that stands between us and that amount? If it cost £30,000 a year, what would it matter, if you get £100,000 a year from it? I only mention that as an illustration so that the people may fully understand that this question of expense is only being put up to deceive them, to mislead them as to what the true issue is. The question will be put to the people in a plain way. It has been suggested that on the last occasion there might have been some misunderstanding on account of the form in which the question was put. Well, I am prepared to say that if the vote then recorded represents the actual will of the people—assuming that it does, and that they were not misled in any way by the legal difficulties placed in their way by the action of the Council; assuming all these things in their favour, still I have confidence that if the case is properly put before the people and they are not allowed to be misled, that 60,000 majority will be turned into a 60,000 majority the other way. (Hear, hear!)

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I think you protest too much.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman may say that I protest too much, but he has had experience of campaigns conducted by this party before. There was no campaign on the last occasion. But on this occasion we will go out and put our case fully and fairly before them, confident in the intelligence of the people. The hon. gentleman will go out and put his case, confident—not in the intelligence of the people, but in the power of the purse behind him to be able to deceive the people, and think his party will get the verdict they got before. But I am certain that when the issues are properly put before the people, the verdict will be very different. If every member of this House will go out into the country and show the arguments in favour of the Upper House being abolished; if they show that there is no logical basis for the existence of the Upper House; if they show that there are single Chambers governing larger populations than we have in Queensland and a larger area than Queensland; if they point out that there is no difference between a single Chamber and two Chambers in which there is an overwhelming majority supporting one party; if they point out that the legal difficulties placed before them on the last occasion have been removed; if they point out that any beneficent legislation that is on the statute-book is only there by accident; if they point out what is the action of the Council on all occasions, how full are the attendances of members and how keen is their interest when anything concerning capitalists, such as shipping companies, beef trusts, tramway companies, and so on, is under consideration; if they show that the only concession the Legislative Council give to the people's House is just as much as they think they have to give in order to save their skins; if they remind the people of the circulars issued by the Pastoralists' Association and the insurance companies with regard to the raising of funds to keep this party out of power—why, I was told the other day that as soon as the Legislative Council was threatened money poured in on the last occasion, and, no doubt, it will pour in again—but I am quite confident, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the power of money—I do not care how much money pours in, as long as we get the opportunity of putting the case to the people, and of representing the situation as it is, and of showing that there is no fear of hasty legislation, that there is absolutely no possible chance of having errors in draftsmanship if we appoint such a committee as is provided for in this Bill, and especially in view of the fact that the people themselves will be the safeguard and check upon Parliament, if any safeguard or check is required, when we pass the Initiative and Referendum Bill: if all these things are made clear, I have every confidence that the people will fully understand the issue, and that they will remove that Chamber, which I say is an anachronism and a reproach to a virile and self-reliant democracy, and which is a hindrance to the achievement of their aspirations. I move the second reading of the Bill. (Government cheers.)

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): The Premier, in a very short speech, has moved the second reading of what is a very important Bill. It is a Bill which has been before Parliament before. It has been fully discussed by both sides of the House on more than one occasion, and it has been discussed in "another place." I do not know whether the hon. gentleman regarded it as unnecessary to cover the whole ground in the speech he has just made, but I think it would have been an advantage if the matter had been fully discussed, in order that the measure could go to the country just in the way it has been put to this House. The time allowed the Opposition to consider this important Bill has not been very great. At 9 o'clock this morning I saw a copy of the Bill for the first time, and I am called upon at this period to make what must be a more or less important speech on the second reading of the Bill. This hardly affords the time which is necessary to give full consideration to the subject. The question which this Bill covers has already been submitted to the country. It has been suggested by the hon. gentleman in his speech that the question was not understood by the people when it was put before them, and that the question was not put in a plain form. I should like to ask who is responsible for that? Was the question not put with the full knowledge and formal approval of the hon. gentleman himself? I must say that at the time I felt that there was a certain difficulty in the way the question was put. There was another referendum taken at the same time—a referendum on the liquor question, and it was the opinion, not only of myself, but of many others, that that question was submitted to the people in a form which was in favour of the liquor traffic. And one can realise that, having put that question in that particular form, the Government had to follow pretty well the same form in connection with the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council. At the same time, I think it is a serious reflection on the Government that it should be possible that the great Labour party should shield themselves behind an excuse of that sort. It is also a reflection on the people

of Queensland to say that they were unable intelligently to understand the question submitted to them.

The PREMIER: You know I did not say that, but you have made up your speech in anticipation that I would say it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman suggests that my speech has been prepared in anticipation of what he was likely to say. Cannot we see through the hon. gentleman sometimes? There cannot be very much question about that matter. Reference has been made to the issues before the people at the last election, and the hon. gentleman has quoted a couple of pages of the "Hansard" report of a debate which took place during the present session. It is quite contrary to our Standing Orders that that debate should be referred to in that way. However, the hon. gentleman has done it, and I presume that the speech to which he referred will be reproduced in "Hansard" for the delectation of the people. I have been unable to read it, but glancing at it, I say the hon. gentleman was at considerable pains to apologise, practically, for his own attitude in connection with that question during the last general election. The hon. gentleman made his opening speech in Townsville, and he was particularly careful to avoid raising the issue of the Upper House at that time.

The PREMIER: I raised it all through the speech.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It is quite true that during the election campaign the hon. gentleman sitting beside him, the Treasurer, raised the question on the Darling Downs, and other irresponsible members of the Cabinet —(Government laughter)—also allowed that the question was an issue, but no one for a moment dreamed that the Premier, whose duty it was to state the policy of the Government, had ever raised the question at all.

The PREMIER: I specifically raised it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman, in dealing with the State Iron and Steel Works Bill, said the Upper House unfortunately had, encouraged by the Opposition in the Lower House, made modifications in the Bill which had compelled its withdrawal, but when the hon. gentleman was referring to the legislation of the Government, what were the hon. gentleman's words? The hon. gentleman said, referring to his policy—

> "That policy, I am glad to say, was accepted by the great majority of the electors, and the history of Queensland since has been a record of honest, determined, and in the main, successful endeavour to realise it by legislation and administration. The career of the present Government has been unique in that it has almost completed three years of office without incurring the charge of breaking its promises or leaving its pledges unfulfilled."

What is that but a frank admission that he has attained all the legislative assistance from the Upper Chamber that he felt that he was entitled to, and which practically, and in substance, gave him, through the help of the Upper Chamber, a fulfilment of the pledges which he had made to the people? The question of the abolition of the Upper House was submitted, as the hon. gentleman said, to the country, and it was turned down by a particularly heavy vote. It was turned down by a vote of 179,105 to 116,190. It might be wise to accentuate the meaning of that big vote. Twenty-nine thousand electors more than the number who voted at the elections of 1915 voted on that referendum, and out of the seventy-two electorates only twelve showed a majority for abolition. The highest majority for the abolition of the Upper House occurred in the electorate which the hon. member for Flinders represents. That majority was 727, and I should say that perhaps the electorate of Flinders, being about the most remote electorate from the seat of Government, was about the least able to judge of the issue that was involved. Against that there were two majorities exceeding over 3,000. One of those majorities was in the electorate which I have the honour to represent, and the other was in the electorate of Murrumba. In addition to that, eight other electorates provided majorities exceeding 2,000. In the sixteen metropolitan electorates the majorities approximated 26,000 against abolition. If ever there was a decision clear and substantial, the decision on the 5th May, 1917, was that decision, and for the life of me I cannot see any justification for an attempt to submit it to the people at the present time. The hon. gentleman, however, for some reason of his own, has brought forward the Bill, and the expense is to be incurred. The expense on the last occasion approximated something like £14,000. The hon. gentleman makes light of £14,000 at the present time.

The PREMIER: I do not make light of it, but it is not much compared with the issue at stake.

Mr. MACARTNEY: £14,000 would give to Government members, forty-eight in number, the £500 per annum they so ardently desire, and a little more. £14,000 would go a long way towards helping to balance the revenue and expenditure. In these days, in a time of war, a time of uncertainty, a time when money is a consideration, one would expect the Government would not unnecessarily incur such an expense in submitting to a referendum a question that the people have so clearly and definitely turned down. It is strange that, at the present time when the Empire is engaged in war—when Australia, as part of the Empire, is engaged in war for protection against a foreign yoke—we find the responsible representatives of the people, who might be at least assisting the Commonwealth in the direction to which I have referred, making war upon our cherished Constitution; making an attempt to destroy the Constitution; to practically perpetuate partisanship war at a time when the mind of our people might be otherwise directed. We know, of course, that the abolition of the Upper House finds a special place in the Labour platform. It is one of the attractive planks, and really the introduction of the question at the present time might almost suggest camouflage, or at least suggest the idea of drawing the minds of the people away from the mistakes and errors which the Government are committing from day to day. I have a very grave doubt, after hearing the very definite views from the Premier, whether that hon. gentleman is in earnest. I really doubt it, but hearing him speak, reading his words, and taking them with a liberal meaning, there can be no question about it. I realise that the hon.

gentleman knows just as well as I do where the road leads to, and the warning he has given to hon. members on this side as to the danger that rests with the referendum, is a suggestion to us, that although he is compelled as a political slave to introduce the measure, and to carry it through its formal stages—he is really giving us a warning that we have to be up and doing lest the injury which will result will fall on the State. (Government laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: Twisting.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We know what the position of the Upper House is. We know that the hon. gentleman himself has nominated a number of members for appointment to the Upper House, and a number in excess of the number ordinarily forming the Upper House has been appointed at the hon. gentleman's request, and if the Upper House were not satisfying the hon. gentleman we quite understand that he has the right to make representations to His Excellency the Governor for more. He himself has denied through the Press, during the last few days, that he has made any such representations to His Excellency the Governor with regard to the failure, that he alleges, of the Upper House to do what he calls its duty.

The PREMIER: You may be sure that anything you see in the Press from me is true.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We must accept the statement, but it gives, at least, some evidence of the want of sincerity on the part of the hon. gentleman, because we must take it, if he has not done that, that he is prepared to conform to the Upper House as it is, and the introduction of this measure is only a formal introduction to satisfy some of the more energetic spirits that sit behind him. We must recognise that the question before the House is one that deserves very much consideration, as it involves a very serious and far-reaching change in the State's Constitution, which has provided good results, I think it must be acknowledged on every hand, for a period of something like sixty years. Not only is the matter of far-reaching importance to the State of Queensland, but the question involved is one of Imperial importance—a fact which was accentuated when the matter of the last referendum came before the Lords of the Privy Council. Viscount Haldane there made some remarks which I think are worthy of [4.30 p.m.] quotation. I might say that the Premier has not been altogether candid or fair when he made reference to what he calls the legal position. I had said that we on this side are not going to spend our time in arguing on the legal technicalities of the position, and the hon. gentleman has told us this afternoon that the question is free of any legal doubt. When he says that it has been decided once for all by the High Court of Australia by a unanimous judgment, he is not placing before the House the whole position. As a fact, an attempt was made to appeal from the judgment of the High Court to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council, in view of the fact that the referendum was over and had been decided in the negative, expressed the opinion that it had become a purely academic question which they were not prepared to consider; but they left the way entirely open for the future to go into the subject and decide it according to its importance. I assume the hon. gentleman has made what you might term a cheap sneer at the highest judicial authority in this State.

The PREMIER: Oh, no! You misunderstood me.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He said that it was a court only too ready to lean to the Upper House, and he hoped that on this occasion these difficulties would not be again created. I take it that the court we have here is a court of justice, acting on ordinary rules, and that the court will be bound by the judgment of the High Court.

The PREMIER: I suggested no impropriety—only an imperfect knowledge of the law.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I only know the words used by the hon. gentleman so far as they go; but I take it that, if this matter does go before the Full Court again, the judgment will be given in terms of the judgment of the High Court. This court will feel bound to follow the High Court. But in that case the persons who appeal to the Full Court of Queensland will have the right, I take it, to go direct to the Privy Council, and the question will then come up for review again.

The PREMIER: Is that the move?

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am only talking about what the legal position is. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, who is going to England shortly, if the move is that he is to remain in England until the appeal in the case we have heard about to-day comes on and until the possible appeal in this matter comes before the Privy Council. If that is so, the hon. gentleman's Privy Council practice is going to be a very remunerative one. I am reminded that, as senior counsel, so to speak, the hon. gentleman has opened this very important case for his side, and, in doing so, has said that if the people of Queensland have the facts properly placed before them, and are not allowed to be misguided, the result of the referendum will be in favour of the Labour Government; and, after having made that prodigious statement, the hon. gentleman will probably leave for the other side and leave it to his junior counsel, the Hon. Mr. Theodore, to prove the case. (Laughter.) I think it might be just as well to place on record the remarks of Viscount Haldane during the argument which took place before the Privy Council. On page 195 of the "Queensland Law Reports" for September, 1918, will be found the report of the argument. His first remark was—

> "That is only a theoretical declaration."

That is referring to the judgment of the High Court—

> "It is a declaration of the court no doubt, but—so far as this matter—it is a thing at present pure and simple, if the referendum rejected the Bill."

Viscount Haldane later on said—

> "There passes through my mind a long vista of awkward situations, which exist everywhere in the Empire, and which we leave till they turn up."

Later on he said, referring to the Colonial Laws Validity Act—

> "That is another thing; and if that applies, then you may be right or you may be wrong, but there is a question which affects the entirety of the Empire: there is not a Dominion, there is not a

Crown colony to which that section does not apply. That Act was passed, a very remarkable thing, I think, without much discussion, but it is a tremendous charter, and the tribunals have refrained from expressing an opinion upon the extent to which that section has given Legislatures abstract powers to alter their own Constitution by virtue of the section. If that section applies to that case, all I can say is—I do not know what my friends who are with me will say—that it is a 'sleeping dog' which I am very reluctant to awaken."

The PREMIER: That is rather against you.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He further said—

"You know, if this question really were to be argued, it should not be argued in a litigation affecting only one litigant, the Legislature, and only a State Legislature. There is a procedure which is open to the Crown, which is under the Act, 3 and 4 William IV., to refer to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council a general question of this kind, and, when that is done, the advantage that the Judicial Committee possesses is that it can advise the Crown to mould the procedure. If that question was raised in an abstract form, we should probably direct that we should be attended by the Attorney-General of England as representing the Empire, and we should take care to secure that there should be a representation of the other parts of the Empire, so that this tremendous question which affects every one should not be determined behind their backs; and we are most reluctant, speaking for myself, at any rate, to interfere now."

Later on he remarks—

"The electors of Queensland appear to have said that they are not going to let it arise in a practical form. It may be that this Act is a nullity. That is not a question we wish to determine in the abstract.

"Of course, I presume if your Lordships do not grant my petition, there will be nothing said—I mean to say, it cannot be said that I should be precluded from raising this on another case?"

And it was made clear by their Lordships of the Privy Council that nothing that took place then would prejudice the determination later on of the question involved; so that it is quite clear, notwithstanding the statement made by the Premier, that it has yet to be decided in a formal way what the legal position is.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Then, if the people carry the referendum, you are going to do your utmost to prevent its being given effect to?

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman is trying to introduce the personal equation. I am only stating the position. At the same time, I do not mind saying, if it will please the hon. gentleman, that, rather than see Queensland suffer, as she would suffer under a one-Chamber system, if it were in my power—unfortunately, it is not—I would use every effort that the law allows to stop it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr MACARTNEY: An attempt has been made by the Premier to attack the bicameral system. The hon. gentleman was bound, of course, to give some authorities; but I am sorry to say that he did not attempt to give very much authority. He confined himself practically to the Provincial Legislatures of Canada. Now, we know that the Canadian system differs from the Australian system. In Canada, the Federal Legislature has full powers, and the Provincial Legislatures derive their powers from such authority as the Federal Legislature chooses to extend to them. In Australia, the position is entirely different. The Federal authority derives its power from that authority which the States have specifically surrendered to it; the States remain sovereign States. The hon. gentleman has not made reference to the fact that the bicameral system is known practically wherever the British language is spoken—that wherever there is a sovereign Legislature the system or Constitution is bicameral. He knows that the bicameral system obtains in all the great European countries, and he also knows that it has been followed even by the Eastern communities. The hon. gentleman, I notice, omitted to tell us as to what is the proposition for a Constitution in a country we hear so much about—I refer to Ireland. I suppose the constitutional question has been considered in Ireland, probably at the most recent date of any, and we find that the convention representing all interests in Ireland recommended that the bicameral system should be embodied in the Constitution, and that a nominated Senate of sixty-four members, including archbishops, lord mayors, representative peers, and representatives of trade, commerce, and labour, should constitute the Senate. As a matter of fact, we find that the Senate recommended in that case was partly hereditary. There are minor exceptions, we know. The hon. gentleman has stated one or two, the circumstances of which, to my mind, offer no application. We find that in Bulgaria, Greece, in minor German States, and, perhaps, some minor States of America, there are examples of single-Chamber Constitutions. But we have also the knowledge to guide us that in the past there have been many single-Chamber experiments. The United States Constitution is one itself. I will read an extract from Professor Lecky later on which will develop that point. It is generally known that in France the experiment was tried, and then in democratic France they found it necessary to revert to the two-Chamber system. In England we also have the example furnished by the days of Cromwell, when a single-Chamber system prevailed, but it was found impossible to carry on under it, and a subsequent reversion to the two-Chamber system was the result. I think we can say that Russia, which is said to have been a one-Chamber country, is, perhaps, a dreadful example through the condition which exists to-day in that country of a single-Chamber Government.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: I propose to read a perhaps somewhat lengthy extract from Professor Lecky, which I think puts the case pretty clearly. It may be that the book was written a few years ago, but the statements are as capable of application to-day as

when the book was written. In Chapter IV., page 299, of Professor Lecky's book on "Democracy and Liberty," he says—

> "Of all the forms of government that are possible among mankind, I do not know any which is likely to be worse than the government of a single omnipotent democratic Chamber. It is at least as susceptible as an individual despot to the temptations that grow out of the possession of an uncontrolled power, and it is likely to act with much less sense of responsibility and much less real deliberation. The necessity of making a great decision seldom fails to weigh heavily on a single despot, but when the responsibility is divided among a large assembly, it is greatly attenuated. Every considerable assembly also, as it has been truly said, has at times something of the character of a mob. Men acting in crowds and in public, and amid the passions of conflict and of debate, are strangely different from what they are when considering a serious question in the calm seclusion of their cabinets. Party interests and passions; personal likings or dislikes; the power of rhetoric; the confusion of thought that springs from momentary impressions, and from the clash of many conflicting arguments; the compromises of principle that arise from attempts to combine for one purpose men of different opinions or interests; mere lassitude, and mere caprice: all act powerfully on the decisions of an assembly. Many members are entangled by pledges they had inconsiderately given, by some principle they had admitted without recognising the full extent to which it might be carried, or by some line of conduct they had at another period pursued. Personal interest plays no small part; for the consequence and pecuniary interests of many members are bound up with the triumph of their party, while many others desire beyond all things a renewal of their mandate. They know that a considerable part of the constituencies to which they must ultimately appeal is composed of fluctuating masses of very ignorant men, easily swayed by clap-trap, by appeals to class interests or class animosities, and for the most part entirely incapable of disentangling a difficult question, judging distant and obscure consequences, realising conditions of thought and life widely different from their own, estimating political measures according to their true proportionate value, and weighing nicely balanced arguments in a judicial spirit."

Later on, he continues—

> "There is certainly no proposition in politics more indubitable than that the attempt to govern a great heterogeneous empire simply by such an assembly must ultimately prove disastrous, and the necessity of a second Chamber, to exercise a controlling, modifying, retarding, and steadying influence has acquired almost the position of an axiom. Of all the many parliamentary constitutions now existing in the world, Greece, Mexico, and Servia are, I believe, the only ones in which independent and sovereign nations have adopted the system of a single Chamber, and, among these, Servia is only a partial exception. According to the Constitution of this little country, legislation is, in ordinary times, conducted by the king and a single national assembly, in which one out of every four members must be nominated by the king, and which exercises strictly limited and defined powers; but the sovereign has a right of convoking when he pleases a second and much larger assembly, which alone is competent to deal with grave questions affecting the Constitution and the territory of the State."

Later—

> "The experience of the past abundantly corroborates the views of those who dread government by a single Chamber. In the English Commonwealth such a system for a short time existed; but the abolition of the House of Lords was soon followed by the expulsion of the Commons, and when Cromwell resolved to restore some measure of parliamentary government, he clearly saw that two Chambers were indispensable, and he revived on another basis the House of Lords. In America, Franklin had strongly advocated a single Chamber; and in the American Confederation, which was formally adopted by the thirteen States in 1781, and which represented the United States in the first years of their independent existence, the Congress consisted of only one branch. It was invested with very small powers, and was almost as completely overshadowed by the State rights of its constituents as the Cromwellian House of Commons had been by the military power of the Commonwealth. But the very first article of the American Constitution, which was framed in 1787, divided the Congress into a Senate and a House of Representatives. In all the separate States the bicameral system exists, and it also exists in all the British colonies which have self-governing powers."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And yet the Liberal party propose to put in their programme for the next election the abolition of the second Chamber.

Mr. MACARTNEY—

> "In France, Turgot, and Sieyès advocated a single Chamber, and in the French Constitution of 1791 all power was placed in the hands of such a body, the result being one of the most appalling tyrannies in the history of mankind. In 1848 the same experiment was once more tried, and it once more conducted France through anarchy to despotism."

Attempts have been made in England to do away with the House of Lords. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the power of veto has been taken away. He pointed out that in connection with financial measures it has been provided that on the rejection of a Bill by the British Upper House it may be submitted to the King for the Royal assent; and that in connection with other measures they must be rejected three times in three successive years before they can be presented to His Majesty for the Royal assent, and it is left to His Majesty to say whether or not he will give assent to it. But the conditions there are very different from the conditions which are

suggested by this Bill. The proposal of this Bill is a very much more dangerous proposition. An attempt has been made, as I have said, to show that the people of England so realise the wisdom and need of the Constitution as they have it that they have on all occasions resisted any attempt to wipe out the House of Lords—I am talking now of more recent days. An attempt was made in 1895, and at that time there was any amount of representation made to the people of England that the House of Lords had interfered with industrial legislation and reform.

Mr. COLLINS: Part of the people of England, you mean.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Lord Rosebery, who was a Radical Premier, was the leader of the Government at the time, and yet Lecky tells us—

> "On the eve of the election Lord Rosebery clearly and emphatically told the country that the real and supreme question at issue was the House of Lords, and that Home Rule and all the other Government measures were involved in the destruction of what he somewhat absurdly called its 'legislative preponderance.'
>
> "The country had now the opportunity of expressing its opinion about these men, their objects, and their methods, and it gave an answer which no sophistry could disguise and no stupidity could misunderstand."

Those remarks apply to the 5th May, 1917—

> "The complete, crushing, and unequivocal defeat of the Radical party in 1895 is certainly one of the most memorable events in the present generation. No circumstance of humiliation was wanting. The majority against the late Government was greater than any which had been seen in England since the election of 1832. In addition to several less important members of that Government, four Cabinet Ministers, including those whese attacks on the House of Lords I have quoted, were defeated at the poll. In nearly every portion of the kingdom and in town and country alike, the verdict was the same."

and a Tory Government was returned.

Now, the very measure which we are discussing to-day provides internal evidence of the necessity for a bicameral system—(Hear, hear!)—the necessity for a revising Chamber. This Bill has been before this Chamber on different occasions before, and yet it has been found necessary to revise it again and insert a very large number of amendments—showing the need for carefully revising the measures which are attempted to be dealt with under our present system. And the very fact that in the measure it is found necessary to establish a committee which is to take the place of a revising Chamber provides further substantial evidence that a revising Chamber—a bicameral system—is an absolute essential. And I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman, in putting that clause in, has given information to the public, information which will weigh with them, as to the necessity of a second Chamber. And when you come to look at it, what is the committee that is suggested? A committee merely of representatives, proportionately to numbers, of the parties on either side of the Chamber—a partisan committee, both sides fighting for the view which they respectively take, with no real desire to revise or alter or protect the country against hasty legislation. What a substitute to suggest for a revising Chamber!

Now, there are two sides to every question. For the moment the Labour party is in power, and if the second Chamber is done away with the Labour party will rule; the proposals of the Administration for the time being will be carried through this Chamber just in the same way as they are being carried through now—without discussion. The real debates of Parliament will take place secretly in some other place. What safety have the public got under legislation carried out in that way? But, without going into that for the moment, what will be the position when a Liberal Government is in power? What has been the attitude of the Upper House in days gone by to legislation fathered by Liberal Governments, or Tory Governments, if you like to call them such. Their attitude has been one of caution, it has been one of moderation, and the Governments of the days gone by have received just the same checks from the Upper Chamber that the present Government may have experienced at any time during the last two years—very common-sense checks, too.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: Do you expect anybody to believe that?

Mr. MACARTNEY: And if a proposal was made to alter the franchise or do one of those other things which might be likely to improve the position of a Liberal party, could we not hope, or would we not hope, from the Upper House the same protection of the interests of Labour and the interests of the country which they are offering to the country at the present time?

Mr. FREE: No.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Of course, the hon. member's prejudices are such that he can only see that it applies to the present moment. The hon. member is unable to look ahead, unable to look at the matter dispassionately, and I say that that is a point of view to which the members on the other side of the House ought to give careful consideration. It is quite possible that in the course of time a Liberal Government may find itself on the other side of the House, and it is quite possible that that Liberal Government may be led by men who see the necessity for reform, and might proceed with their views, and if there were not a second Chamber hon. members need not think very long to see that there would be a possibility of danger to those institutions which they claim so continually and emphatically are important.

The Upper House has tried to reform itself. The Upper House has realised, since as far back as 1896, that advantage might attach to reform. No doubt, some of the men there have been there for very many years, no doubt some of those men are approaching their allotted span of life, and no doubt that was the reason for the suggestion of 1896 of that far-seeing, cool-headed Scot, Sir Hugh Nelson, that the time was arriving when something should be done to put the Upper House on a basis of something like continuity, and provision was therefore made for the gradual retirement of some members and the election of others. Unfortunately, for reasons I am not aware of, the measure was not proceeded with, but at that particular

time—and I quote it only for that purpose—the Upper House itself was prepared to grant a measure of reform so far as the constitution of the second Chamber was concerned.

Now, there is another reason why this Bill is unnecessary. The hon. member has quoted the fact that the power of veto has been taken away from the House of Lords. That is practically the position here, because under the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908, a special means is provided of submitting to the country questions on which the Chambers differ. And I am reminded of something else by the reference to that. The hon. member referred to the failure of the Upper House to pass the Land Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), which would permit the Land Court to increase rents over and above the limit included in a statutory contract which exists between the Government lessees and the Government itself. In that other House the other side are represented by their nominees or men who vote with them, to the number of eighteen. There is a slightly greater number of what is termed, or what the hon. member is
[5 p.m.] pleased to term, the Opposition, but if you run through the proceedings of the other Chamber you are astonished to find that the representatives of the Government do not vote in accordance with the numbers that represent them in that Chamber. Taking this particular Bill in question, you will find that the second reading—or the third reading, which ever it was—was rejected on a vote of something like thirteen to eleven.

The PREMIER: There is no use of their attending; they can accomplish nothing.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I want to point out this: We know the composition of the Upper House. We know that some of the gentlemen who occupy seats in that Chamber are approaching the allotted span. We realise that, if the Government were anxious to carry their measures—if they were not more anxious to obtain a plaint against the Upper House, and their members attended the Upper Chamber in numbers, some of their proposals—if not all—would be carried by the weight of numbers.

The PREMIER: Oh, no! Your party has two to one.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Here is the Land Act Amendment Bill to which I have referred—one of the measures upon which the hon. gentleman lays great stress—and we find that it has only been rejected by, I think, thirteen to eleven.

The PREMIER: Yes; but there is no use our men attending, because your side brings just one or two more. That is part of the game.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I would like to say it is somewhat pleasing to notice that there are some of the hon. gentleman's nominees who, since their appointment to the Upper House, have realised by experience the good work which the Upper House do, and the need for a revising Chamber.

The PREMIER: That is a savage attack upon someone.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Who are they?

Mr. MACARTNEY: I just take the facts as far as they are necessary. I think what I have said will be borne out. It has already been borne out by a publication which I have not by me at the moment, but which I do not think it is necessary to quote. We must all realise that the Upper House has been really the bulwark of true freedom, and it has been the bulwark also of the true interests of Queensland.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: We must realise that. The hon. gentleman knows that, too. The hon. gentleman knows that, if this question goes to a referendum and is turned down, his window-dressing still remains; that he can still fulminate in rounded periods against the Upper Chamber; that they still have a case to go to the country on. I do not think for a moment, as I said at an earlier stage, that the hon. gentleman is truly sincere in regard to the wiping out of the Upper Chamber. The hon. gentleman must know that if the Upper Chamber were wiped out, the occupation of the hon. member for Bowen would be almost gone; he would have nothing about which to complain. Just fancy what the position would be, with a Government on the other side led by the hon. member for Bowen, and only one Chamber!

Mr. COLLINS: I am inclined to think that your occupation will be soon gone.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Is that what the hon. gentleman would have us believe he seriously suggests to the country? I do not think for a moment the hon. gentleman suggests that. Now, we realise that the Upper Chamber is a deliberative assembly; that it is a revising body. It is better constituted to study the questions which come before it. Its members are not responsible to the votes of the constituents to the extent to which members in this House are. The Minister for Education knows that he is unable to express his honest opinion in this House, because he is dependent upon the votes of his constituents.

The PREMIER: That is an argument against our having constituents at all; it is an argument against an elected Chamber altogether.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Premier himself knows that that is so. It shows the counterbalance that it is necessary we should have—a Chamber working in calmer circumstances, able to deliberate and revise, apart from the more bitter partisanship that exists in the representative Chamber. Now, it has been a check for years on hasty legislation and of dangerous proposals—and that, irrespective of the Government in power. The history of the Upper House has shown its willingness to at all times pass legislation when it has been shown beyond question that it is the wish of the constituencies. We hear hon. members say that when a party succeeds at an election, the people have endorsed every issue which has been included, either on the platform delivered by the leader of the party or in the speeches which were made at the election. I say that that is an absolute fallacy. You cannot suggest that the minds of the people have been applied to the hundreds of questions which are discussed during an election. I say it is the duty of the Upper House to give consideration to a distinction between those issues which have been deliberately decided by the people and those which the people have not had an opportunity of definitely expressing themselves on. The Upper House has exercised that function. When a measure has been sent up, the Upper House, as a rule, has been found to be reasonable throughout.

The Upper House should be representative of all districts and interests and all classes. I think we can say that at the present time the House is practically so constituted. They have representatives of the various interests; they have representatives of most districts; and I think they have a number of representatives of both classes, although they are members of what the hon. gentleman styles the "Opposition side" of the House. Anyone who reads the proceedings in that Chamber for the last five or ten years will recognise that there is a division of opinion there; they will realise that there are a number of members on the Opposition side of the House, so called, who are ready and willing at times to vote with their friends on the other side. It is practically a non-party House, in the best sense of the word. We see that they have rejected violent proposals of the Government. They have temporarily rejected proposals which I have no hesitation in characterising as an abuse of the taxing powers of the Government—proposals which are designed to extinguish, so to speak, a limited class in the community—a class which are entitled to the consideration of the Government in common with all other classes in the community. They have also rejected proposals which would damn any country in the eyes of outside peoples.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: Proposals which would dishonour the State; proposals which would, in the course of time, prove a difficulty in the way of the State's obtaining those funds which are necessary to adequately proceed with its development. I say the Upper House could fulfil no higher function than they did when they rejected such measures. We need only refer to our statute-book from year to year to see that, with the concurrence of the Upper House, laws have been passed for the advancement of the interests of the working classes of the State—those humane laws which are assisting in improving the conditions and alleviating the hardships of the workers. There are notable instances to be found in our factory legislation, accommodation for workers, compensation for injuries, for the protection of children; the establishment of wages boards, the industrial courts, for the relief of the destitute, old-age pensions, for the establishment of charitable institutions and hospitals, for enabling the worker to provide his own dwelling. All those things were founded by Liberal Governments before Labour Governments attained to power. Anything that Labour has done in the last three or four years has only been in the nature of an addition to the foundations already so well and truly laid by preceding Governments, with the concurrence of the Chamber which the Government would abolish. It is not necessary for me to refer to individual representation in the Upper House. We know that in Mr. Kidston's time, he being then leader of the Labour party, a large number of appointments were made to the Council, and we know that recently the present Government nominated Labour men as members of that Chamber, and that those men are exercising their voices and influence on all the measures submitted to the Council. It may be well to refer to just what was the position of legislation during the last Parliament. The record of Bills dealt with by the Upper House during the first session of the last Parliament is that thirty-six of the Bills introduced in this House by the Government were passed by the Council, and only three were rejected. In the second session thirty-two Bills were passed, and nine were rejected. In the third session twenty-one Bills were passed, and seven were rejected. A total of eighty-nine Bills were passed in those three sessions, and nineteen were rejected. During the same period there were six Bills introduced in the Council, and four of those were rejected by this Chamber, which leads one to the conclusion that this Chamber was very much more harsh in its treatment of the proposals of the Upper House than the Upper House was in its treatment of the proposals of this Chamber. The Upper House is not a wanton destroyer of legislation. It may not agree with the caucus attitude which is to be seen in the attitude taken up by the Government ever since they have been in power. Business has been introduced here after having been privately discussed in a secret caucus. The Bills have been thrown on the table of the House, and have been hurriedly rushed through the Chamber with very little debate, or with only such debate as proceeds from the Opposition. The public have no opportunity of learning from the representatives of the different constituencies on the Government side of the House the views which operated with them in supporting legislation, and yet we are asked to do away with the only Chamber which does fairly and properly discuss legislation, and provide the necessary safeguards. The Premier objects to the rejection of a Bill which he calls an urgent war measure. I refer to the Meatworks Bill. The only difference between the two Houses in regard to that measure has been the two simple words "just terms." That Bill, I suggest, is representative of that fraud which the Government of this State have tried, from time to time, to impose on the legislature by calling it a war measure, though beneath it is hidden the collateral intention of promoting the socialistic schemes of the Government. I say that in the rejection of such measures the Upper House is perfectly justified, and that it is just as well that the country should know what the nature of that measure is. There is another Bill which was rejected by the Council—a Bill which was designed to hand over certain of the State rights to the Commonwealth. What do we find now? We find that the very Government who introduced that Bill are not in favour of its provisions, so that the Upper House, in rejecting the Bill, acted in accord with the desire of the Government themselves. During the last Parliament Acts were passed with the concurrence of the Upper House dealing with trade unions, workers' accommodation, and workers' compensation—Acts which were an extension of the provisions of existing Acts—a Factories and Shops Act, which was a measure of a similar character, and that huge measure, the Industrial Arbitration Act, which contains provisions that are not to be found, perhaps, on the statute-book of any country. All those measures were passed in the interest of Labour, and they were passed with the concurrence of the Legislative Council. As I have said, it is only when the Government prostitutes its platform and fraudulently uses legislation, that the Upper House intervenes. I refer to such measures as provide for the imposition of improper taxation, the repudiation of a solemn contract, and other practices of the

Government, which the Upper House have undertaken to check, and I say that in the doing of that they should have the support of every honest member of the community. To pass this Bill is to give power to the caucus to do that which is the converse of true democracy. It will hand over to a minority the right to rule. To illustrate what I mean, I may remind hon. members that it is a well-recognised caucus method that when a matter is submitted to the caucus by the Government, under the rules and regulations under which they carry on, the decision of the majority must prevail. If the party are forty-eight strong, as they are at the present moment, it is possible that twenty-five of those forty-eight may dictate to the other twenty-three; whatever the conscience of the twenty-three may be, whatever opinions they may hold, or whatever fear they may have as to the danger of any proposal submitted, they have to concede their point of view to the majority.

The PREMIER: That is quite a misapprehension.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Instead of the majority ruling, which is said to be the principle of democracy, the minority practically ruled.

The PREMIER: I have seen this party divided again and again on railways.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman may say that, but it is too thin. Even railways, so discussed and voted on, are an exception. The matter I have referred to is one which the constituencies should appreciate—twenty-five members of the Caucus overriding the other twenty-three. Those twenty-three added to the twenty-four members who sit on this side of the House would make forty-seven. The result is that twenty-five members of the caucus may override the studied opinion of forty-seven members. That is a danger which the country should not submit to.

The PREMIER: What is the rule of your caucus?

Mr. MACARTNEY: All I can say in reply to the hon. gentleman is that we do meet and discuss matters in a way, but no member of our party is deprived of the power of expressing his conscientious opinion or of voting as he pleases.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: That applies to members of this party.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I do not believe it. I have never yet seen any appreciative sign in proof of that statement. The proposal places in the caucus party power to do those things which may not only be disastrous to the few but destructive to the many. I do not know that I desire to take up the time of the Chamber at any greater length, but I say that the elements which are covered by the proposal which has been placed before the Chamber by the hon. gentleman this afternoon are of a truly dangerous character. I, perhaps, may feel it wise to restrain my remarks in regard to what may happen in the time to come. It may be as well, perhaps, when the matter comes to be discussed before the country, to state those things which one can easily imagine. Proposals may be made from the other side that would go far to reduce this country to the condition in which we find Russia to-day, having regard to the elements which are existent in the community, and having regard to the elements which hon. members on the other side, including the Premier himself, allow to influence them in connection with the government of the country. It is no use for the hon. gentleman to disclaim the I.W.W. The hon. gentleman says this is a bogey used for frightening the people. We know there is an I.W.W. element existing here, and we know that it exists to a greater extent in the North perhaps than in other parts of Queensland. The hon. gentleman, it is true, has said that he does not approve of it. The Treasurer has said that he does not approve of it; but we realise that in party politics they take advantage of all the help they can get from all the disintegrating elements in the community, including the I.W.W. A little action is much better than good words, and I would like to see some action taken by the Government that would prove their bona fides—would prove the truth of the statements that they make.

The PREMIER: What about the funds provided for fighting the Australian Workers' Union?

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have no knowledge of anything of the sort.

The PREMIER: You ought to make inquiries.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the hon. gentleman would give me the information, I will be very glad to have it. As far as this party is concerned, they realise that there is the greatest possible danger in the proposal before the House, and they deem it their duty to oppose it on every occasion.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I listened very attentively to the speech delivered by the Premier, and also to the speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition, and I feel certain that if those two speeches were placed before the electors of Queensland side by side that the decision would be in favour of the arguments put forward by the leader of the Opposition. I hope, should a referendum be taken on this important question, that when the Premier, who has control of the public purse, is dealing with the matter, and is sending literature throughout the length and breadth of this State in favour of the abolition of the Upper House, that he will also see that the arguments against the proposal are treated in a similar way so far as public expenditure is concerned. When the Federal Government decided to take a referendum of the people those in favour of the proposal were asked to submit their case, and those against were likewise asked to submit their case, and side by side the cases for and against were submitted to the people of Australia in pamphlet form. On this occasion, no doubt, when the referendum is being submitted to the people, the Government will have at their disposal special trains for the purpose of carrying the Premier and other Ministers, as well as the rank and file of the Labour party, throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. The Premier distinctly stated that he was desirous of seeing both sides of the question placed before the people, and I ask, if it is the intention of the Government to use public funds, in order to try and bring about the abolition of the Upper House, that he will consider any application that may be made to give the Opposition an opportunity of placing

their case before the electors of Queensland free of expense.

The PREMIER: I am prepared to consider any such suggestion.

Mr. MORGAN: I am pleased to know the hon. gentleman is prepared to consider any such suggestion. The Premier said that money is likely to flow into the funds of this party, but I am quite satisfied, from the experience of the last elections, and of other elections, that the Labour party have the handling of a greater amount of money than the party on this side of the House. That is borne out by absolute experience. There is a large amount of money obtained one way and another towards the support of the Labour party.

The PREMIER: You want to talk to the National Political Council.

Mr. MORGAN: I know, so far as my own electorate is concerned, and speaking for other hon. members on this side of the House, that not one-fourth of the amount of money is spent in connection with elections by hon. members on this side as is spent by the Labour party. The Premier, by introducing this Bill at this time, is overriding the will of the people as expressed only a few months ago, as, naturally, one comes to the conclusion that the people have not changed their views since May, 1917. The electors, in the last general elections, did not vote in favour of the abolition of the Upper House. The Labour party went to the country with numerous planks in their platform, and simply because the party were returned with a majority, it does not say that a majority of the electors of this State were in favour of every plank in the Labour platform. They may have agreed with twelve out of fifteen planks in the Labour platform. A large number of the electors who voted against the abolition of the Upper House voted for the Labour party at the recent general election. They said, "We believe in a majority of the planks of the Labour platform, and owing to that fact, we are prepared to give our votes to the Labour party," but they were not prepared to vote for the abolition of the Upper House, and I feel sure, notwithstanding what the Premier has stated, that they will again vote against the proposal. In fact, I look upon his suggestion that this side should be alive to the situation as a sign of weakness on his part. He recognises the fact, and the moderate section of hon. members opposite recognise the fact, that the people of this State will do as they did recently, and turn down the referendum. Although matters may be discussed in caucus by the Labour party, we know things leak out, and we know that quite recently there have been some very boisterous meetings of the Labour party. We know that only by three or four votes was it decided to submit this question again to the people. Some hon. members were desirous that a general election should take place, as they thought the Government had more chance of carrying their proposal if they placed the whole of the Labour platform before the people, instead of one item only. I ask hon. members on the front Treasury bench can they deny that what I say is correct? It may not be correct so far as the number of votes were concerned, but we do know that this question has been a very debatable point. It has been debated with much heat, and there was a very close shave in connection with the voting. The Premier told us what, of course, we already knew—that certain powers have been taken away from the House of Lords. Well, in Queensland, if a Bill is twice passed by this House, and twice rejected by the Legislative Council, the hon. gentleman has power, under the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act, to submit that Bill to the people, and, if a majority of the electors vote in the affirmative, then that Bill becomes law in spite of its rejection by the Legislative Council. What could be more democratic than that?

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: Look at the expense!

At half-past 5 o'clock p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is associated with a party which has tried to push the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill down our throats, and, under that Bill, a vote could be taken every other week. Has the hon. gentleman thought of the expense involved in connection with that?

Mr. GLEDSON: No; there must be a petition of the people asking for it.

Mr MORGAN: That is so, but under the Bill a referendum could be taken every other week, provided a certain number of people presented a petition asking for the submission of the particular question they were interested in. We have a Constitution that any country might well be proud of. Personally, I believe that the Upper House should be an elective body. I submitted a resolution in 1914 in favour of an elective second Chamber, when I was sitting behind the Liberal Government. When I spoke during the campaign last year against the abolition of the Legislative Council, on every platform I advocated the retention of the Upper House, but suggested that it should be made elective, and every time I spoke my remarks in favour of an elective House were received with applause. It seems to be the almost unanimous desire of the people to retain a House of review, and it seems also to be their almost unanimous desire to have that House of review an elective House. The Premier evidently expects this Bill to be rejected by the Legislative Council, and that, ultimately, it will have to be submitted to the people by a referendum, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, when submitting the matter to the people, to allow the people the choice of three questions:—"(1) Are you in favour of the abolition of the Legislative Council?" "(2) Are you in favour of a Nominee Upper House?" and "(3) Are you in favour of an Elective Upper House?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: On what franchise should it be elected?

Mr MORGAN: That is a debatable question. I am not prepared to suggest what the franchise should be, but that is a matter that could be arranged.

The PREMIER: Do you think it would be fair to put three questions like that?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. I think the people are intelligent enough to answer three questions.

The PREMIER: If that were done, I would win by a street, because your side would be split up and mine would not.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not so. I am sure the vast majority of the people of Queensland are in favour of an elective second Chamber. We could allow the electors to exercise a contingent vote, just as they do when there are three candidates in

a State election. They could put the cross against the question they preferred, putting the figure "1" against their second choice, and then, when the ballot-papers were being counted, the votes which were given for the question which secured the smallest number of supporters could be counted for whichever of the other two they indicated as their second choice. That would enable the will of the people to be clearly ascertained, and, I have no doubt that, if there was a majority of 62,000 last year in favour of retaining the present nominee Chamber, there would be a majority of 162,000 in favour of an elective second Chamber.

The PREMIER: Which are you in favour of?

Mr. MORGAN: I have already said that I am in favour of an elective Upper House, and that in 1914 I submitted a resolution in this House in favour of an elective second Chamber, and I may say that the Premier spoke against that resolution, and, when it came to a division, he and the other members of the Labour party crossed the floor and voted with Mr. Denham for the present nominee Chamber, and against the seventeen or eighteen Liberals who voted with me in support of the motion.

The PREMIER: You wanted an elective Chamber with a narrow franchise—about the worst form of second Chamber

Mr. MORGAN: In my motion there was no mention of a franchise at all. I left that open as being a debatable question.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Victoria has an elective Legislative Council of forty-eight rich landlords.

Mr. MORGAN: Victoria has absolutely the best second Chamber in Australia. Its members are directly responsible to the people, and that is what I want to see I am quite satisfied that the Legislative Council of Victoria is the most intelligent Upper House in Australia.

The PREMIER: Would you pay them?

Mr. MORGAN: That also is a debatable question. That is a matter that the people could decide. The hon. member for Bowen and other hon. members on the other side are continually talking about "the will of the people." That is a very fine phrase when used on the platform or from a soapbox in the street. But it is not very long since the people by an overwhelming majority decided against the abolition of the Legislative Council, and yet, notwithstanding that fact, we have the Premier coming forward with this Bill to refer the question again to the people. We know that the hon. gentleman is being forced to do this by the extremists in his party. They are shoving him along and compelling him to submit the question again to the people. I feel sure that, if we could see the hon. gentleman's ballot-paper at the last referendum, we would find that he had voted against the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The PREMIER: What is the use of talking rubbish?

Mr. GLEDSON: What is the good of talking slander?

Mr MORGAN: I do not know that the Premier voted at all. The hon. gentleman is just as much interested in the continuance of the Upper House, or in the existence of a House of review, as anyone in Queensland, because he is a large property owner and a man of wealth. He and the hon. member for Maranoa are both wealthy men. I am sure that, if riches were taken into consideration, we should find that some of the richest men in this House are sitting on the other side, and, naturally, they want to see the property that they have accumulated protected. The Bill provides for the appointment of a certain number of members from each side of the House in order to review Bills.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: That is democratic.

Mr. MORGAN: It would simply mean that they would meet together for the purpose of reviewing the phraseology of the Bill, as the principle of the Bill would have been already decided by the party in power—first of all by the Trades Hall, secondly by the caucus, and then by submission to the Chamber for a decision. As the leader of the Opposition mentioned, members of the Labour party have not on any occasion voted against any measure that has been submitted; they are consolidated in that respect. Although there may be objections raised in caucus to a Bill, and it may only be carried by one or two votes, when it is submitted to the House the party are so solid that they support the principles of the Bill, although in caucus they have opposed it.

The PREMIER: Will you give me an assurance to that effect?

Mr. MORGAN: We know what is happening to-day; there is no necessity for me to give the Premier an assurance. He knows that that has not only been the result during the period he has led the Labour party, but in connection with the Labour party since its inception. If a man walks across the Chamber and votes in opposition to the caucus, what is the result? He is dismissed from the Labour party. (Government dissent.) The late member for Mount Morgan kept a promise he made to his electors while contesting the seat, by walking across the floor of the House and voting for a particular measure. The next day he was brought up before the caucus to show cause, and was prevented from entering the caucus meeting——

Mr. GLEDSON: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Absolutely untrue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Murilla must connect his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. MORGAN: I am endeavouring to connect them by showing that, so far as the Labour members of the committee of review were concerned, they would come along with their minds made up, and it would only be necessary for the committee to dot "i's" or cross "t's," or make any alteration that might be necessary in the phraseology. As far as making any alterations in the principle of the Bill was concerned, the majority would rule, and the majority would represent the Government which had brought it forward. The committee of review would be useless, and would only be something with which to throw dust into the eyes of the electors. The Labour party would be able to go before the electors and say, "We provided for a committee of review," and the electors are not well versed in the rules of Parliament or parliamentary Government. That is what the Government are relying

on in order to reverse the majority of 62,000 against the Bill on the last referendum. They are relying on the fact that the Bill contains a provision for review, but any man of experience knows that it is useless and of no consequence, and might as well be left out of the Bill altogether. It would not have been included in the Bill had the Government not thought that by its inclusion they would obtain votes. I hope that when the matter is submitted to the people they will have an opportunity of hearing the position explained, and of being enabled to decide intelligently the question submitted to them. I suggest that before the questions are framed and the ballot-papers issued, the Premier should consult the leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members who may be appointed for the purpose of arriving at a conclusion as to the questions to be submitted. The Government said that the question submitted at the last referendum was put in such a way that it was not intelligent; in fact, a great number of Labour people claimed that the electors were not intelligent enough to know from the question whether they were voting in favour of the abolition of the Upper House or against it. The Premier says he desires that the people should have every opportunity of deciding the question upon its merits, and, if that is so, there will be no harm in submitting a draft of the question to the Opposition before its form is finally decided, so that the people will be in a position to give a correct answer to the question put before them. I feel sure that the result of the referendum will be similar to what it was previously. Notwithstanding the bombastic, bluffing attitude of the Premier, I feel sure that the people will reject this proposal. They will prefer to remain, like other countries, with a house of review. The Premier said that some of the small States in Canada had only one Chamber, but he did not say anything about the success of those States. We also know that some of the Balkan States have a single Chamber. But are we going to ignore the fact that right throughout the English-speaking countries of the world, with few small exceptions, we have second Chambers? As the leader of the Opposition pointed out, in Ireland, the convention which met to draw up a Constitution was in favour of a Senate, consisting of a certain number of nominees. Even in Ireland they have decided in favour of two Chambers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They did not have a plebiscite on the matter.

Mr. MORGAN: Those delegates were selected by the people. The people of Queensland have already decided that there should be some Chamber of review. We, as experienced members, know that when Bills have left this House Labour Governments have welcomed the opportunity of having amendments made in them by the Upper House, owing to the fact that they were in an imperfect condition. The same has applied ever since Queensland has been a separate State, and it will continue, and I say that simply because the constitution of the Upper House may be something of which the Government do not approve, that is no reason why the Chamber should be abolished. Evidently the Governor has not consented to the "swamping" of that Chamber, and so the Government have introduced this Bill.

The PREMIER: It is true that he has not consented because he was never asked to "swamp" it.

Mr. MORGAN: We are glad to have the Premier's word, at any rate, that he was never asked to "swamp" it, but there are some of us who are just a little bit doubtful about that particular question. But had the Premier been able to appoint sufficient men to carry this Bill, the question would never have been submitted to the people at all; the Council would have been abolished without the wishes of the people being taken into consideration at all.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: Perfectly right.

Mr. MORGAN: The Labour party are in favour of the people being consulted, provided they are in agreement with something they desire, but if the people, no matter by what majority, decide against the Labour Government, then they are prepared to place that particular proposal on the statute-book even against the will of the people. And that is what they are endeavouring to do by the second introduction of this Bill. They are endeavouring to place on the statute-book something which the people have already rejected, something which the people will reject again, and continue to reject. As I have already indicated, the Premier no doubt thought that an opportunity would arise whereby he would be able to have sufficient members in the Upper House of his own appointment to carry this Bill through without opposition from that Chamber, but, unfortunately for him, he has been disappointed, and that is the reason why at this particular juncture we receive this Bill and the country is to be put to expense, as the Premier said, up to £30,000.

The PREMIER: I did not say that. I said it was said by others.

Mr. MORGAN: The Premier did not say it, but he insinuated it. No doubt, he would like somebody on this side of the House to say that it would cost £30,000, so that if it does cost £30,000 he will be able to say that it was only what some member of the Opposition said it would cost. No doubt, when all the accounts are made up, and if they are all debited to the referendum, it will amount to £30,000 and more, but the Government are in that happy position, in which they were at the last elections, of being able to use the departments, and certain expenditure that was incurred in connection with the election—really side-issues which were used, nevertheless, in the election—are not debited to electioneering expenses.

The PREMIER: That is not correct.

Mr. MORGAN: We know that in regard to railway trains which were run in regard to the last election, instead of the true cost according to mileage being debited against the election or against the running of that particular train, when the accounts were made up only one half was charged which would have been charged to a private individual.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must connect his remarks with the question.

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, I will endeavour to do so.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has made no connection whatever.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not intend to pursue that argument so far as the trains are concerned. I have got in exactly what I wish to say. I do hope and trust that when the matter is being submitted to the people every opportunity will be given to the Opposition to place their case before the electors, so that a decision may be arrived at—I am with the Premier in that respect—without let or hindrance and in an intelligent manner, because I feel sure it is a most important matter—the most important matter that has ever been submitted to the people of Australia—the abolition of the Upper House, the alteration of the Constitution. It is experimental legislation, and before the people decide to cast a vote either for or against it, every opportunity should be given to them to understand it.

Mr. LLOYD (*Enoggera*): The main argument that has been advanced by the Opposition is based on their claim that the Upper House acts as a check on the Lower House. They ignore the fact that from 1888 until the advent of the Labour party in 1915 there was practically no checking; to all intents and purposes we had one Chamber, except for a very brief interregnum in the Morgan-Kidston regime, because the powerful interests which controlled the Government in this House had still more complete control of the Upper House, when it was necessary. Certainly, there were certain conflicts, which appear to have been prearranged things. It was something like that partnership joke which obtains in business. One partner is unapproachable and sits in an office at the back or upstairs; the other, who meets people, is an affable gentleman, as obliging as he possibly can be.

The PREMIER: Spendlow and Jorkins.

Mr. LLOYD: I forget the names, but it occurs in "David Copperfield." The affable gentleman is very desirous of doing all that he is asked, but there is that bear upstairs—he would not stand it. On one occasion, when Mr. Denham got his liquor legislation through, he was supported on the one hand by the hon. member for Bulimba, and on the other by gentlemen named Forrest and Welsby, and the Upper House at that time was very handy to take the blame for blocking certain things that Denham could not block himself.

The hon. member for Toowong made some extraordinary assertion that in the past the Upper House had blocked certain dangerous proposals. I do not think the public know of these. I could not doubt the word of the hon. member, because he said it very seriously, but I feel interested, and I hope he will take the House into his confidence and tell us what were the dangerous proposals which apparently his Government contemplated and which were dropped because they were afraid of opposition from the Upper House.

Hon. members have gone into history to attempt to prove that the single-House system has been tried and failed. They mentioned the case of Cromwell. Cromwell ruled in England for only a few years, and he altered the Constitution four times within that period, but whatever the changes there Cromwell was the whole of the Legislature and the Administration—that case proves nothing at all. And the case of Ireland proves nothing at all. The Constitution of Ireland was a compromise. When a political party have been fighting for forty years, trying to get something, and fighting against a heavy majority all the time, they are in a frame of mind to compromise very considerably. The political party which is represented opposite compromised a great deal at the time of Federation. I do not mean the party as a whole, but men like Sir John Forrest. Of course, Sir John Forrest has gone, but I think his best friends will admit that there was a great deal in the Australian Constitution which that gentleman regarded as extreme, and the same thing can be said of Sir William Irvine—these men compromised in order to bring about something which the majority of the framers of the Constitution honestly thought was for the benefit of Australia. Somewhat the same has been in the case of Ireland, and, consequently, they have a plan of a Senate there, which, if it is ever accomplished, will probably give Ireland nearly as much trouble as she has had from the Imperial Government itself. The leader of the Opposition spoke
[7 p.m.] as though repeated attempts had been made in the United Kingdom to abolish the House of Lords, and they had all failed. As a matter of historical fact, no serious attempt has ever been made. It is rather too big a matter to go into tonight as to what was the cause of the political reaction in 1895, but certainly it was not a question of the abolition of the House of Lords. The leader of the Opposition quotes a statement by Lord Rosebery, but anyone acquainted with British politics knows perfectly well that the British public never took Lord Rosebery seriously. On the other hand, when a serious and determined effort was made to render the House of Lords almost futile, the British public supported it by an overwhelming majority, and made an accomplished fact that Parliament Act by which the House of Commons is practically supreme. The argument that the Bills have to receive the Royal assent is no argument at all, because, in any case, when there are two Houses, the Bills still have to go to the King for his assent. Now, if this Upper House is such an important institution as to have stood the test of time and proved itself to be something that is indispensable——

Mr. GLEDSON: The only test they do stand is the test of time.

Mr. LLOYD: One would naturally find that there was something constant in its constitution, and the different new Upper Houses that are formed in connection with the new Constitutions would have something alike in their constitutional forms. But when we look at the different Constitutions of the British Empire, we find that there seems to be no uniform guiding principle at all. Take the case of South Africa. The Senate consists of forty members. For ten years after the establishment of the Union eight—four being selected mainly for their acquaintance with the reasonable wants and wishes of the coloured races—are nominated by the Governor-General in Council, and thirty-two are elected, eight for each Province. The first election was made prior to the establishment of the Union by the two Houses of each of the Colonial Legislatures sitting as one body, and a vacancy is filled by the choice of the Provincial Council in respect of whose province a vacancy occurs. The constitution of the Senate after

ten years may be provided for by Parliament, but if no such provision is made, the arrangements made in the South African Act are to hold good. Each Senator must be a British subject of European descent, at least thirty years of age, qualified as a voter in one of the provinces, and resident for five years within the Union; an elected Senator must be a registered owner of property of the value of £500 over any mortgage. Now we will turn to Canada. In Canada, the members of the Senate are nominated for life, by summons of the Governor-General under the Great Seal of Canada. The numerical representation of the Senate by provinces is as follows:—Prince Edward Island, 4; Nova Scotia, 10; New Brunswick, 10; Quebec, 24; Ontario, 24; Manitoba, 4; and so on. By the amendment of the British North America Act, 1867 (April, 1915), which comes into effect after the dissolution of the present Parliament, the Senate will consist of 96 senators—namely, 24 from the province of Ontario, 24 from Quebec, 10 from Nova Scotia, 10 from New Brunswick, and so on. The number of senators may not exceed 104. Each senator must be 30 years of age, a born or naturalised subject, and must reside in, and be possessed of property, real or personal, of the value of 4,000 dollars, within the province for which he is appointed. Take one more illustration—New Zealand. The Legislative Council consists of 34 members, who are paid at the rate of £200 per annum. Those appointed before September 17, 1891, are life members, but those appointed after that date hold their seats for seven years only. Provision has been made for an elective Legislative Council, the first election to be held three years after the next general election of members of the House of Representatives, which, in the ordinary course of events, should have taken place at the end of 1917. Of course, as we know, since then an unconstitutional usurpation of power has taken place by the politicians who hold office in New Zealand. Twenty-four members are to be elected at the first elections, and forty at subsequent elections. Even in the Australian States we find that the only uniformity exists between Queensland and New South Wales. The States of Tasmania, South Australia, Victoria, and Western Australia all have the Upper Houses differing very widely in their Constitutions. In fact, in place of what we might expect from an institution which claims to have stood the test of time, instead of finding even a trace of a settled logical principle, we find a chaos of fantastic makeshifts. In fact, these various makeshifts are simply devices of out-of-date politicians to try to dodge the inevitable. They will not recognise that the principle "the will of the people has ultimately to prevail" has come to stay, and the longer they delay it the more trouble there will be. A great deal has been said about the past. I do not mind hearing, in the form of a lecture on history, a little able sophistry in the matter of history. In that matter, I was certainly very pleased with what I heard from the leader of the Opposition this afternoon. It certainly was able, and it certainly was sophistry. But those who have studied the institutions of the past will not be led astray because the "two Houses constitution" is not a settled thing in British history. You will find in history that England began with one House, when there was one class. In the beginning the only class that really counted for anything was the nobility. The great mass of the people, sunk in ignorance and poverty, so deep that we have no conception of it at the present time, counted for nothing. The only class that did count was the class that was able to do the fighting. As long as there was only one class, politically, in the nation, they had only one House. It was only when the new middle class sprang up that it was necessary to effect a compromise and have two Houses of Parliament. There was a time in English history when England had four Houses, simply because there were four important interests which had to compromise with one another before matters of national importance could be settled.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Wouldn't it be a good thing to give the Government to the men who do the fighting now?

Mr. LLOYD: Thanks to this party, the men who do the fighting now have a share in the Government of Queensland, and if it had been left to the party who were in power when the war started they would not have had that share in the Government. England, I say, started with only one House, when there was only one class which counted politically. The time has come round again when there is only one class which should count politically, and that class is the whole people. We have reached a state of things when there is only one class, and that state of things is going to stay, and I am confident that the time is very near when there will be only one Chamber to represent that one class.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): Before this motion goes through I should like to occupy the time of the House for a few moments, because I realise that this is the most important measure that has come before the House. It is a measure which not only affects Queensland, but which is going to affect the whole British Constitution. I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition when he quoted Lord Haldane—that it will affect the whole British Constitution. I was surprised at the extremely weak speech made by the Premier in introducing this Bill, because no one will deny that he is a man of legal training, who is able to exploit a case to the utmost. But the case he put forward to-day in connection with this matter is certainly unworthy of him. When the Premier has to come down to holding out a sop that members shall retain their gold passes in order that this great constitutional measure may be put through, there is something particularly lame in his argument. With the hon. member for Murilla, I think the Premier is not in the position he would like to be in in connection with this measure, and that he is there because he has been pushed there, and I believe that he hopes and trusts that the vote which is to be taken on this referendum will be the same as it was on the last occasion. We know perfectly that while the Upper House remains the hon. gentleman can say to his friends when he is pushed into attempting to do things that he does not want to do that he is willing to do them, but the Upper House will not let him. Once that House is removed, the Premier will stand a very big chance of falling into disfavour with a large section of his own supporters, as he will have his stock argument taken away from him. Some of his supporters expect that the hon. gentleman will be able to give them the moon, and if

they do not get it the hon. gentleman will be in very bad odour. I am quite convinced that the hon. gentleman is not relishing this referendum. I should like to say that I agree with the Premier that when this campaign comes on it should be fought out in a straight and clean manner, and I hope that members opposite will adopt that policy, and place before the people the pros and cons in connection with the proposed abolition of the Council, apart altogether from State butchers' shops and other matters of that kind. If they take the speeches of the Premier and the leader of the Opposition, they will have something to weigh and consider when the question goes to the people, but I am very much afraid that directly the campaign opens we shall have the butchers' shops and other things held out to the people as a means to gull them into accepting the abolition of the Upper House. Another matter I should like to refer to is the remark the Premier made with regard to the safeguards provided in the Initiative and Referendum Bill. We know perfectly well that the Initiative and Referendum Bill proposed by the Government is only a sham, and that it is the most autocratic measure that has ever been introduced into this Chamber. It places in the hands of a Minister the absolute right to say whether a matter shall be referred to the people or not. Surely that is not the sort of safeguard for which you are going to ask the people to throw away their Constitution. Possibly there might have been something in the Premier's argument if we had an initiative and referendum worthy of the name, but the Bill brought forward by the Government includes a provision that gives absolute and complete veto to a single man, which is autocracy of the first order.

The PREMIER: You are misrepresenting the situation altogether.

Mr. SIZER: There is absolutely no need for this Bill. We have already had a decision on the matter with which it deals. I remember full well that when it was proposed by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth to take another referendum on a matter of far vaster importance than this, the hon. gentleman repeatedly told him that he had had his answer, and that there was no need for a second referendum. The Premier and those who support him criticised the Prime Minister for deciding to take another referendum.

The PREMIER: No; we criticised him for taking another referendum after he had said he would not do so.

Mr. SIZER: The Prime Minister did not say that. He said he would not foist conscription on the people without their consent, and he kept his promise. As the hon. member for Kennedy has interjected, the people never carry a referendum until the question has been before them five or six times. The Premier knows the people will not carry this referendum, so that the taking of the referendum will be throwing money away, which is a thing to be seriously considered at a time when we are in financial difficulties. It is simply wasting the people's money.

The PREMIER: Why worry if you think it won't be carried?

Mr. SIZER: I say it is not necessary, and the Government is not sincere, and it is only put forward to placate an unruly section which is beginning to make itself felt amongst the ranks of hon. members opposite quite early in the history of this Parliament.

Mr. HARTLEY: You ought to be glad about that.

Mr. SIZER: Whether I am glad or not, it is a fact.

The PREMIER: I have seen no evidence of it.

Mr. SIZER: In dealing with this Bill, we cannot argue the pros and cons of the Constitution or the personnel of the Upper House. We cannot argue whether it is a good House in its present form or whether it needs reforming. The only argument we can enter into is whether the Upper House shall be abolished or retained. Many people will admit that the Constitution of the Upper House is a debatable point, and it is a very big question which will have to be settled sooner or later. But we are not dealing with that question. We are dealing with the question as to whether or not we are going to make a further experiment with single-Chamber Government or whether we are going to stand by the Constitution upon which the British race has been built. This Bill is a straightout Bill of destruction. There is nothing constructive whatever in it. I say, also, that there is a need for a second Chamber.

The PREMIER: You have never given the single-Chamber system a trial.

Mr. SIZER: I hope, before I have finished, to refer to some places where the single-Chamber system has had a trial. Only this session we have had experience of the manner in which some Bills are put through this House. On some occasions even the Minister in charge did not know the interpretation of the Bill, and when these things happen there is surely a need for a revisory Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Privy Council disagreed with the decision of the High Court.

Mr. SIZER: I do know that the High Court knows, and the Government know, that they were wrong in proceeding in the way they were going, and that they cannot do what they intended to do——

The PREMIER: They do not! "There are hills beyond Pentland and streams beyond Forth."

Mr. SIZER: If they do not, then they must be very obstinate or very pigheaded. There is need for a revisory Chamber, particularly when there is a Government in power which claims to be the only Government which has the right to the name of a progressive party, and which many of its own supporters outside are beginning to condemn, and which certainly is a party which is leading the country to destruction and revolution. I say most certainly there is need for a revisory Chamber if it is only in order that public opinion may be moulded in some way on those measures. Public opinion is a thing of which all Governments are afraid.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It puts all Governments into power.

Mr. SIZER: All Governments are afraid of public opinion. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, it puts Governments into power, but it also puts Governments out of power. We know that no Government

will go on with legislation when they know that public opinion is against it. When matters are introduced into this House and passed which entail a change of the Constitution, and which are revolutionary in their character, then, I say, delay is necessary. Such delay is not only needed by the Opposition and the people outside, but it is very often needed by the Government. Only to-day the leader of the Opposition quoted one case where a Bill was brought forward by the Government, but was not gone on with after the Upper House rejected it. The Government realised the wisdom of the Upper House, and have not gone on with that Bill, and that is proof that delay is not only necessary but is absolutely beneficial. Now, I would like to refer to some of the places where they have single-Chamber Governments. Single-Chamber Governments might be all very well in such a country as Costa Rica, and places like that. They may be all right in Russia, but if the people of Queensland want to mould their Constitution on that of Costa Rica or some such place, then I am very much surprised.

The PREMIER: What is the Constitution of Costa Rica? (Laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: There is also the place mentioned by the Premier—South Africa. There was once a single Chamber in the colony of Natal, but the people of Natal were not satisfied, and they agitated and agitated until they got two Chambers, which they have to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: By a revolution?

Mr. SIZER: No; they did it by that tremendous power which I have spoken of—public opinion. When the Premier mentioned South Africa, I think he must have forgotten that experience. Not only is the need of a second Chamber proved by history, but the very Bill that the Premier has brought forward emphasises that need, by the fact that he has added a new clause to provide for a revisory committee. If one set of men is going to do the thing at one time, what is the need of this new clause that has been added to the Bill? Why trouble to select four or five men from this House if a single Chamber can do the work as well? One would think, by the Premier's speech, that we were to have absolutely no revision whatsoever; that there is no need for it—it was antiquated; and it was—I do not know what. Yet he himself has introduced a provision to establish a revisory committee! Possibly it may be a sop to the electors in the hope that it may possibly help them a little bit. Not only do we find the need in the hasty legislation that has been passed through this House, but we also find the need in connection with the Bill which has been brought in. Last Parliament the Bill was introduced, and the Government were very annoyed because it was rejected. At that time the Government said the Bill was perfect; yet within twelve months they themselves have found it necessary to amend it. Surely, as this legislation has been in the forefront of their platform, and legislation which they have had in their minds for years and years, they should know all about it, yet they introduce a Bill which has to be revised twelve months later. That shows the necessity for a revisory Chamber, and particularly do we need a revisory Chamber when we have legislation for one class only. There is need for all classes to receive justice. All people are entitled to their rights and to their rights only, whether they be rich or whether they be poor. We have a Government which is ruled by a cast-iron caucus, and they dare not go against the expressed will of the caucus, because, if they do, it means excommunication and political suicide.

[7.30 p.m.] (Government laughter.) We know that some members in New South Wales who belonged to the hon. gentleman's party have dared to express opinions antagonistic to the Perth Conference, and they have been threatened that they will not be selected as the party's candidates at the next election. If the Premier had not brought in this Bill as soon as he has, if he had kept his impatient supporters waiting any longer, and if he had been game enough to tell them that he would not bring it forward, he also would have been dealt with. It would possibly be as well if I were to quote the views expressed by a very eminent man in the House of Commons in connection with the projected reform of the House of Lords. They are the views of Mr. Munro-Ferguson, now Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia. He was a member of the Liberal party which introduced certain resolutions having for their object the reform of the House of Lords. When the Premier referred to a cable representing the views of a certain section of the Liberal party in Great Britain, I interjected that that was nothing new. It is nothing new, because the men who then advocated that policy have since lost sway. Men like Mr. Asquith are done politically. You do not see men like Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Balfour advocating anything of the kind now. We know that Mr. Asquith went to the country on the cry of the reform of the House of Lords, and he was sent back with a big majority. But the House of Lords is still there. The hon. member for Enoggera said that we never had a single-Chamber Government in England. That is not so. We know that in 1649 the House of Lords was abolished, and within four years it was reinstated. We know that in 1892 the House of Commons passed the Home Rule Bill. Had the veto of the House of Lords not been in existence at that time, that Bill would have been passed into law by the House of Commons. But, as a matter of fact, the Government of the day went to the country on the Home Rule Bill, and they were swept out of office. The will of the people would have been flouted on that occasion, had the House of Lords not been in existence, or had its power of veto been destroyed, and if the views held by the Liberal party in Great Britain in 1910 had then prevailed. Now let me quote the remarks of Mr. Munro-Ferguson

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Munro Hull, did you say? (Laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: I quote from the Commons "Parliamentary Debates" of 1910, page 1207, during the debate on the resolutions of which I have spoken—

> "Although I appeared alone in my opinion——"

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

Mr. SIZER:

> "Although I appeared alone in my opinion, yet from touching confidences which have been made outside, I now know that I had sympathy even in the most responsible quarters, and so to-day, although I may appear separated for

> the moment, yet I believe I represent the great mass of Liberal opinion, which, although firmly resolved to secure an elected second Chamber, and to do away with the hereditary principle, is yet convinced that a responsible second Chamber is an essential part of the British Constitution."

Mr. HARTLEY: Perhaps that is why they made him Governor-General.

Mr. SIZER: A little further on, he said—

> "We have heard a reference to the reform of the second Chamber from the Prime Minister, but what security have the Government, or what security does it think it has, against a single-Chamber system being the final outcome of the second resolution?"

He voted against his party on those resolutions. Further on, he said—

> "For myself, I believe in the necessity for some safeguard, not only against hasty and ill-considered legislation but for the maintenance of continuity of policy, on the stability of which the security and welfare of our great oversea communities, as well as our own, ultimately depend."

The TREASURER: He was one out of 380 Liberals at that time.

Mr. SIZER: No one can deny that he is an able and an eminent man, and no one can deny that he is a man who realises what democracy means. He has a soul far above that of any hon. member opposite.

Mr. COLLINS: And we pay the man who expressed those sentiments £10,000 a year.

Mr. SIZER: Such an opinion must carry weight, particularly when they are views contrary to those entertained by the party to which he belonged in politics. He has since been elevated to the important position of Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia. And he was not alone——

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You said that he was alone. (Government laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: He was not alone in his advocacy. I may tell the Premier that many of the ablest lawyers in the British House of Commons—men like Sir F. E. Smith and Mr. Cave, who hold high positions—have argued the legal position with great effect, although the hon. gentleman says there is no case to argue. The opinions of men like these must be considered. The Premier poses as the highest authority on the British Constitution, and as a judge of what is the best Constitution to adopt, and sets his opinion against those of the eminent men I have mentioned, who have built up the British Empire. Much as we may admire and respect the ability of the Premier, nobody would seriously suggest that he is the most able constitutionalist in the British Empire. I believe that, with a single Chamber, too much power would be placed in the hands of any Government, whether it be a Labour or National Government. When men rise to a position of power, they are liable to abuse it, no matter what side of politics they may be on. Hon. members opposite may often find that they have to restrain themselves from abusing their power, and members on this side would on some occasions have to restrain themselves lest they might abuse their power: and it would be a mistake to remove the only obstacle we have in the shape of a second Chamber to check hasty legislation, and which can dispassionately look over the work of this Chamber and point out where improvements could be made. I say that once you remove that obstacle you will leave open the door to abuse and graft of the worst kind. I am quite convinced that when this matter goes to the people they will say that it is too much power to give to any Government.

The PREMIER: Why not give it a trial?

Mr. SIZER: A Government is only in power for a certain time. Every Government meets with its downfall sooner or later. The trouble is that there is much time spent in the experiment, and then there is the danger also that if the experiment is not successful the damage which has been done has to be undone, and more time is wasted.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The biggest danger is that the Government are governed from within.

Mr. SIZER: If the experiment is a failure, all the time involved in carrying it out has been a failure, and the Government goes out of power. Another Government comes in, and the most of its time is taken up in rectifying the mistakes which the other Government has made. I do not know why Queensland should want to make this experiment and run this risk at the present time.

The PREMIER: We would not run the risk. It is the capitalistic combines that would be running the risk.

Mr. SIZER: I have heard a lot about combines and capitalists. If I was half the capitalist the hon. gentleman is, I would be well satisfied.

The PREMIER: We might exchange places.

Mr. SIZER: If I thought the Premier was serious I would come along this moment. I would not need to go to a bank. I could put my hands in my pockets and pay it over quickly. We know perfectly well that some of the biggest capitalists of the lot are to be found on the opposite side. The Premier has referred—and no doubt he will refer again—to the beef trust, but no one is getting more advantage from the beef trust than the hon. gentleman. The Government are getting the benefit under the terms of the contracts they made with respect to meat. All this talk is so much hypocrisy on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are glad to accept the benefit which the beef trust—if there is such a thing—will give them. I understood that when the Government came into power all trusts and combines would be swept away, but hon. gentlemen opposite must be neglecting their duty. If they were swept away, hon. members opposite would have lost their one retreat, and would go on the long, long trail to political oblivion. I do not think we are justified at the present time in taking a referendum, as we had an emphatic verdict from the people last year. The result will be just as emphatic if a referendum is taken this year or next year, and so much of the country's money will be wasted. There is no need for a referendum, because the Premier is not sincere in his advocacy in this matter; and possibly when the fight is on he will be away in England appearing in a most important case before the Privy Council. He will then be able to lie back and smile at the poor, unfortunate members of his party battling

away in some of the backblocks of Queensland. Hon. members opposite at the last election did not speak of the amount of legislation which had been blocked, but they all mentioned the long list of wonderful progressive legislation which had been passed. They said that legislation such as that had never been passed before in such volume. They would now say that there was a deadlock between the two Houses. Surely, if it be true that they have passed all these things, and if at the last election they were returned, as they say, on their wonderful achievements during the last three years, surely they cannot claim to-day that the Legislative Council is such a death's hand to them—that they have not been able to put any of their proposals into operation! The two things cannot go together. All I wish to say, in conclusion, is, that I am quite convinced that the people will not give to the Ryan Government—I am certain they would not give to any other Government—such wide powers as they are seeking in this Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I think that hon. members who this afternoon and to-night have said that this is one of the most important of Bills have rightly sized up the position, because I am perfectly certain that no Bill has been brought into this House which is going to have such a bearing on the life of Queensland as will this Bill if it is passed. There is no question in my mind that the Premier, in introducing the Bill on this occasion, has not brought it in because he himself believes that it is a measure which is desirable in the interests of the community.

The PREMIER: What is the use of talking nonsense?

HON. W. H. BARNES: But he has brought it in by reason of the pressure put upon him from behind, and perhaps as a result of those long caucus meetings the Bill is now laid on the table of this House. But, notwithstanding that, it is the duty of every member of the House to look at it fairly and squarely, and try to find out whether it is going to be for the benefit of Queensland generally. I venture to say that it is not going to be in the interests of Queensland. I want to-night to go back to the period when the Premier first introduced this measure; I want to remind him, and the House, and the country what he said on that particular occasion. The Premier distinctly stated, when he brought in the Bill originally, that if it were defeated he would appeal to the people. I say that that was a fair stand to take, an absolutely fair stand to take so far as the Premier was concerned.

The PREMIER: I sent it to the people.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, and there was no question as to the answer of the people. The answer was a most deliberate answer. I am prepared to admit that the Premier says that the people did not understand the question that was put to them.

The PREMIER: I did not say that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That does not say much for the intelligence of the people, or for the idea of the intelligence of the people as outlined by the Premier. But the fact remains that a certain question was put to the people, and by a majority of 62,000 they turned it down.

The PREMIER: That does not dishearten me at all.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Surely, having been democratic enough to put it to the people, there is no reason to come along again and introduce this Bill?

Mr. STOPFORD: Why did you stand for Bulimba again after being defeated once?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I realise the danger to the community, and I think that before I sit down I shall be able to show that, instead of the other Chamber being a Chamber which has blocked business, it has sometimes stepped into the breach and passed legislation which has been condemned by members sitting opposite.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Name it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am asked a very fair question and I am going to name it. At one particular period there was put through this House one of the most democratic measures that was ever put through a House of Parliament. I refer to the Workers' Dwellings Act, one of the most democratic measures put through this House.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And with the best results.

HON. W. H. BARNES: And with the very best results. I shall be able to show that the Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Lennon, ridiculed that Bill, and that another member—and I refer to him with the greatest reverence as an illustration; I think no member could have other than the greatest respect for him—the late Mr. Bowman opposed it. Both those gentlemen were opposed to it, and had it not been for other members and the Upper House that legislation would not have been passed; at any rate, not in the form in which it was desired it should be.

The PREMIER: He wanted it passed in a better form.

HON W. H. BARNES: In "Hansard," page 387——

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will have to show that the remarks have something to do with the Upper House.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I was going to show that the Upper House encouraged legislation which was of a democratic nature, and which the Minister for Agriculture had mentioned here as being only a measure for land sharks and not in the interests of the genuine worker. However, I will not read the quotation, Mr. Speaker, because you would probably pull me up. The other House, instead of not being a democratic House, has often shown that it is more democratic than we are.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Rubbish!

HON. W. H. BARNES: There is no doubt that the Premier got the shock of his life when this Bill was rejected by the people, and the only excuse he could make when he was so miserably defeated, was to say that the people did not understand the position, that it was something they were unaware of, that it was something they did not understand—whereas they understood it only too well, to judge by the way they turned it down. They gave it a thump which astounded the Premier.

The PREMIER: You are not telling the truth, you know.

HON. W. H BARNES: What are some of the reasons why it is urged that the other place should be abolished? The leader of the Opposition showed this afternoon most conclusively that, as a matter of fact, the

other place was a place which had again and again given of its very best in connection with legislation. Looking at the standing of members generally of another place, do they not compare, from the point of view of brains, favourably with any member sitting in this House—taking them man by man? I think it will be admitted that intellectually they are just as capable of dealing with the affairs of this great State as any man in this House, or any men in this House. Have they not again and again risen to the occasion and improved some of the legislation which has been sent up from this House? One of the charges alleged by the Government against them was that they had altered one Bill slightly. I want to ask whether it is a crime for any part of a Legislature to put into a Bill dealing with individuals—I am referring now to the Meatworks Bill—a provision that when any settlement is made it shall be on just terms? Have we got to such a condition that the ques-

[8 p.m.] tion of just terms should not apply to the Government of Queensland? I say the question of just terms should step in especially with the Government of the country, and there should not be any attempt made to get outside justice through any legislative act. One of the reasons of the hostility of the present Government to the other place is because they have been out to do justice to the community, and because they have not allowed others to practically try and exploit the community by unjust legislation. That is why there is so much opposition to the other place. Has the other place helped the country?

The PREMIER and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No! No!

HON. W. H. BARNES: I want the members of this House to go back over the days of the past, and I say the other Chamber have been a distinct help to this country. They have given of their very best. They have sometimes saved not only one Government but other Governments from being run into positions when the passions of the people have been at their highest. Surely there is not a member here to-night who will not admit that there have been times when the passions of the people have been very high.

Mr COLLINS: Give us one case in point; only one.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am asked to give one case in point. I might say that to-day there are influences at work of the most awful kind in this State, and, if we have a Government that have no controlling influence, they may not only drive themselves but drive this State on to the rocks.

Mr. COLLINS: That has nothing to do with the past; give us the past.

HON. W. H. BARNES: In the past they have again and again returned to us measures improved—it may be faulty drafting; it may be in other directions. Generally speaking, they have done that which has been a distinct advantage to the community. Yet, because they have done their work so faithfully, exception very frequently has been taken to it. Is it a crime for men to try and do their duty according to their consciences and according to their lights? I followed the Premier very closely this afternoon when he held out something which I admit was of an intrinsic nature to hon. members in the other House, by saying that if there was any little inconvenience they were going to suffer as a result of their being wiped out, he would be prepared to continue to allow them the use of their gold passes. It was so very thin, so very apparent, that one could see at once what was behind it. Continue to allow them the use of their gold passes! As if men who have done such faithful duty in the past—as many members of the Council have done—were going to be influenced by that kind of thing. A mere gold pass offered by a man in that particular way, apparently in order to expedite the passage of the Bill. You will agree that it was very unworthy of the Premier.

The PREMIER: You are very obtuse.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I say it was unworthy of the Premier of this great State. Now I want to ask another question. What is really, after all, necessary in connection with sound legislation. I think compromise very often. Take, if you will, the Opposition. I venture to say that if they got into the conference room there would always be a difference of opinion. I assume that I am perfectly right in thinking that the hon. gentleman and the members of his party naturally do not always see eye to eye. I think that is a perfectly fair and reasonable conclusion to come to. I say the basis of true legislation is compromise.

Mr FREE: That is what we want in connection with the war.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for South Brisbane is interjecting. He is very much better occupied when he is presiding at a meeting where Mr. Simonoff is—one of the Bolsheviks; one of the enemies of the country. He is very much better presiding there than interjecting here.

Mr. FREE: He is not an enemy of the country; he is one of the allies.

Mr. COLLINS: Why is he not interned? You have no right to say that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I shall get back to this point—that there may often be a difference when there are conferences being held. I say the Legislative Council has been a splendid brake even upon the people, in connection with their legislation; a brake in the interests of the community.

Mr COLLINS: In the interests of the capitalists.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I remember very well, during my election campaign, addressing a number of workers employed in connection with Hargreaves's factory, in the Manly district, when one of them turned round to me and said: "If you had not got a Legislative Council, it would be like driving a pair of horses down a hill without breeching." That was the view of one of the workers.

Mr. COLLINS: He was not a worker.

HON. W. H. BARNES: And let me say that that only reflected the judgment of the workers generally in connection with the vote which was previously taken. Let me say, further, it will reflect against the judgment of the workers in connection with the coming vote. If the Premier thinks the workers are going to be behind him in this matter, he is making the biggest mistake of his life.

Mr. PAYNE: That will be all the better for you.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It will be all the better for us. Did you notice how the Premier tried to make it appear as if it did not matter at all? He got very theatrical indeed. Now, what does the Council, after all, stand for? I am going to show that the Council stand for liberty of the people. (Government laughter.) Yes, they stand for the liberty of the people against tyranny.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh! Oh! and dissent.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: That is a stretch of imagination.

HON. W. H. BARNES: There is a tyranny outside which has been displaying itself. There is a tyranny even against the Premier himself. I say that the Council stand against tyranny.

The PREMIER: I have not felt any of it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Is there not a tyranny outside which comes along and says to some men, "Unless you are branded in such and such a way, you shall not work"? Am I not right in saying that there was an attempt not very long since, when there was a tyranny which said that unless you got a permit from the Trades Hall you should not be allowed to eat? That was really the position in Queensland not very long ago. There was a tyranny then; and it is that very same power which is behind the Government, driving them on in connection with this legislation. The Premier knows that they are his bosses. If the Council were abolished, what would be the result? I very much fear that the result is going to be a feeling in the minds of the community of absolute distrust. Let me put it to the Premier that this young State of ours cannot progress unless the country is developed along the industrial side; because, after all, the industrial side is the mighty factor in Queensland. If you are going to strike at the foundation of confidence, what will be the result? I hold that in the past the tendency of the legislation of the Government, and the legislation which has been blocked in another place, has been one of repudiation. We have said we do not believe in repudiation; we say there should be no repudiation.

Mr. PAYNE: Where was the repudiation?

HON. W. H. BARNES: We say that, when a contract is entered into, it should be faithfully carried out; there should be no repudiation whatever. If you are going to have legislation of that kind, you are going to strike right at the very foundation of the community. I want to-night to raise my voice in saying that the party opposite, in that particular direction, are making one of the biggest mistakes of their lives. The hon. member for Enoggera to-night, in that very temperate speech of his, in the arguments that he used, very largely proved—not that there should be no second Chamber, but that there should be a second Chamber. He quoted New Zealand and our own States, each one of which has a second Chamber. The point that he raised was that, in the matter of appointing them, they were not on all-fours. But still, he proved one thing—that, at any rate, the States of the Commonwealth and New Zealand believe in a second Chamber. He was not able to prove that they do not believe in a second Chamber. When we established the Commonwealth Parliament we went in for a second Chamber and we have got it still. Is there anyone here who will advocate that we should do away with that second Chamber? I do not think so. I am of opinion that many members opposite believe in a second Chamber, and would gladly support it if they were allowed to do so. We have also been told about that wonderful State, South Africa. That country also has a second Chamber.

Mr. MULLAN: It is only a temporary expedient.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is, at any rate, an expedient which has worked well, and we do not hear of any proposal to abolish the second Chamber. The hon. member who has interjected knows that that Chamber is going to last, because it works well. Then we have heard a great deal about the dominion of Canada. What is the position in Canada? We know that, generally speaking, there is a feeling there that the safe and wise thing to do is to follow the course we are following in Queensland to-day, and maintain a second Chamber. A man who is a fool can knock down a building, but a man must be something more than a fool to erect one. The policy of the present Government of Queensland is to pull down a building which has successfully stood the test of time and experience.

Mr. MULLAN: It is a ruin.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Queensland has flourished remarkably well if the building is a ruin, and the building has rendered good service to the country. What has happened to legislation in the past? Did the Council block that democratic legislation which went through this House prior to the advent of the Labour party, or at the time when the Labour party did not have a majority in the Assembly? Did they block the Workers' Dwellings Act and those other measures which have laid the foundation of all those democratic things of which Queensland can proudly boast to-day? Make no mistake about it, the Labour Government may seek to claim credit for the majority of those democratic things which are on our statute-book, but all the same they were introduced and passed by a Liberal Government. Even old-age pensions were introduced first of all in Queensland, and introduced by a Liberal Government.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting simultaneously,

The SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members will have an opportunity of replying to the hon. member later on.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I say that even old-age pensions were introduced and passed by a Liberal Government. The Premier made a statement to-night that I think was unworthy of him when he referred to the High Court of Queensland as a court which gives their decision with much alacrity. The inference was that the High Court of Queensland is dead up against the Premier.

The PREMIER: I did not suggest that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Does the Premier know the meaning of words?

The PREMIER: Yes, I do.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Well, I am afraid he does not if he says that is not the

inference from what he said about the court of Queensland. The Premier should be the last man to make such a statement.

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of anything I say.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The inference from the hon. gentleman's words was that that court was against the Premier. However, this is a big question. It is a big question from the standpoint of the people, and it is a big question from the standpoint of Queensland. Yet only twelve electorates in the State voted in favour of the abolition of the Council at the last referendum. I am sure there is not a member sitting in the House who will not admit that Paddington is regarded as a very strong Labour seat, and yet Paddington voted against the proposal of the Government. The Premier may say that the people did not understand the question, or that they had not sufficient intelligence to understand it, but I say they did understand it, and understood it so well that they voted against the Government. The Premier took up a theatrical position this afternoon, and tried to make it appear that we represent only what you might call the big people in the community. I would not be in this House for one moment if I did not feel that I was representing the genuine workers in the community. What did the Premier say? He said we were the friends of shipping combines and beef trusts. He did not say we were the friends of brief trusts, but that we were the friends of beef trusts. Probably he will be able to tell us who are the friends of brief trusts.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understood the Premier to make reference to the Upper House and the interests they represent, but the hon. member is taking the remark to himself and discussing it as a personal matter. If the hon. member is going to discuss such details he will be out of order.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I shall endeavour to proceed in a way which will not merit your disapproval, and which will convince the Premier that my argument is quite right. The Premier also referred to the Tramways Company, and suggested that by some means we had to do with the Tramways Company. Anyone who knows anything about the subject knows that is not correct, and that it has no connection whatever with the proposal to do away with the other Chamber. If ever there was a party which had a clear record and a clean name, it is the party sitting on this side of the House. The question of raising funds was also mentioned. Sometimes one looks with jealous eyes at the funds raised by the hon. gentleman's party. He knows better than we do how to get funds.

The PREMIER: More innuendo.

HON. W. H. BARNES: What is the object of bringing forward this Bill? I have some suspicion that it has some little connection with the Perth Conference—(Government laughter)—that the idea is to cover over the Perth Conference. Things apparently are not going too well, and the Perth Conference may be the cause of bringing in this Bill, so that it will draw the people away from the discomfiture that is coming in connection with the Perth Conference. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: The more reasons you give the better for me. That is the fifth reason.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Premier himself referred to the revisory committee as provided by the Bill. What a very simple instance that is: a revisory committee. Naturally, I admit that where there are majorities you do not give minorities the voting power. None of us would do it, but we do know, whether it be that Government or any other Government, they will be pretty careful to put on the committee those who will carry out the wishes of the majority, and that is only natural, too, in connection with party politics. It is just an excuse to try and make this measure a little more palatable to the community as a whole. Instead of it being an advantage to the Bill it is a marked disadvantage.

The PREMIER: Then you ought to be pleased.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am pleased, for this reason: I do not think that the measure, if submitted to the people, is going to be passed.

The PREMIER: Then, why bother about it?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Because we are exceedingly anxious on this side of the House to put our case before the country as well as the Premier. One of the reasons for this Bill is because there is a desire that the Government should not have to hold to some of the bargains which have been made and that is going to affect the financial side. I want again to strike a note of warning as ex-Treasurer, and say that anything that is done which is going to undermine the financial side is going to be a factor that is going to damage Queensland very materially, and if the introduction of a Bill which has for its object the wiping out of another place is going to affect the finances of the country, then it is going to be a very serious thing for the country indeed, and I honestly believe that that is going to be the effect of this Bill. I would suggest, further, that the bringing in of this Bill may have certain effects which I would like to point out from my place in this House, because I believe from the bottom of my heart that there is a danger. One is, it may affect even the men who sit as judges in our courts. It may affect even the men who may be in the position of Auditor-General; men who have to bring in reports dealing with the affairs of this great State. It may have an influence upon the appointment of a gentleman to the position of Commissioner for Railways, because only one House has to do with it. I want to point out most earnestly and strongly, and I hope the people outside will see it, that the party that is in power to-day may be able to do those things, because of their majority, in the event of the Council being wiped out; but some day that party will be superseded by another party, and they may find themselves in a minority, and probably another party seeking to do in some measure what they have done themselves without any check. What they are doing is not in the interests of the community. I say it is absolutely against the interests of the community. It may even be a convenient way of increasing their salaries. I do not suggest it, but that is one of the things that might be done if these blocks are removed—sensible, sane blocks. Then, it has a tendency towards extreme legislation, and I raise my voice here to-day, and I say one of the dangers which Queensland has to face is

the danger of extreme legislation. I am prepared to admit that I do not think the Premier himself would go beyond a certain stage, but the Premier may find himself, with no excuse of another House, forced by a party controlled by an extreme section outside, to undertake legislation which, under other circumstances, he could not be forced to undertake. I say, therefore, that there is an absolute danger in that particular regard, and when it comes to the big question of whether a party is Labour or National, I say the true National party is the party which realise their duty to every section of the community. It may bring about violent changes. It may bring about mob rule, and, further, it may bring about even the bowing down of the knee to men who are enemies to this great State. We have to admit that in this community—I am sorry to say sometimes expressions have come, not from the Premier, but from gentlemen sitting on the Government bench—expressions which indicate there is an absence of loyality in the community.

Mr. COLLINS: Who are you referring to?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Name them! Name them!

HON. W. H. BARNES: This Bill will have the effect of opening that door, which will be exceedingly dangerous.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Name them! Name them!

HON. W. H. BARNES: The records of the past are sufficient without my saying any more. It might also open the door for victimisation, for corruption, for injustice, for graft, and I say, in conclusion, that it is absolutely in the interests of the State that this Bill should not pass, and that the Opposition should strain every nerve to try and stop it passing, and if it does pass and is sent to the people, then to do their utmost in the interests of this great State to induce the community to try and block it, because they believe it is going to be one of those weapons which will destroy the general good and help to ruin this fair State of Queensland.

Mr. MULLAN (*Flinders*): The hon. member for Bulimba is much concerned about the policy of this Government in resubmitting a referendum for the abolition of the Upper House. Because we were defeated in 1917 he argued that we should not submit it to the people again. What I want to ask is this: Why should the hon. member who was defeated for Bulimba in 1915 reassert his claims this year? Then, again, the Opposition were hopelessly defeated at the polls a few months ago; and are we to understand from the reasoning of the hon. member that they will never attempt to secure control of the Treasury benches again? The fact that the referendum was defeated last year is no reason at all why it is going to be defeated next year. If we were to take that line of reasoning the Labour party would never have got anywhere. We have been defeated again and again, and we came again and again until eventually we won and are now in possession of the Treasury benches. Now, I will give the hon. member an illustration to show that because we were defeated on this proposal last year that that is no reason why we should expect defeat next year. When the Federal Government submitted a referendum to the people in 1911 in regard to monopolies, the people were against it to the extent of 18,000 votes, but when the question was submitted in 1913—only two years later—the people were in favour of it to the extent of 21,000 votes, showing a change in the voting to the extent of 39,000 votes. As a matter of fact, the Labour vote in two years in Queensland advanced by no less than 68,000, or 6,000 more than the number by which we were defeated on this question last year. Having accomplished that herculean task in two years, it is not too much to expect the success I hope we will achieve next year.

Mr. MACARTNEY: And now Labour will be asked to vote against that referendum.

Mr. MULLAN: I do not know what the hon. gentleman is driving at.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Your own party is against it now.

Mr. MULLAN: That is a very flimsy argument. The hon. gentleman is very much concerned about the attitude of this party. He has gone to great pains this afternoon to show how dangerous it would [2 30 p.m.] be to wipe out the Upper House. If he thinks that by any possible stretch of imagination any member of this party would support his cause, why is he so concerned? I am not in the least discouraged because of last year's defeat. We know very well that last year the question did not get what might be termed a fair trial. Every fair-minded man must recognise that there was a multiplicity of issues before the people. The people were called upon to vote at one and the same time for (*a*) three Senate candidates; (*b*) for a candidate for the House of Representatives; (*c*) the reduction of licenses; and (*d*) the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council. The fact that so many issues were before the people at the same time must have led to some confusion. But the issue will be much clearer next time, because there will then be only the one question submitted to the people. Then, again, the Opposition party applied for and succeeded in securing from the courts of Queensland an injunction, and that very much hampered us in our efforts, and it was only the day before the voting took place that the injunction was removed by the High Court of Australia. I hope that we shall have none of these difficulties to contend with next time. What is the position to-day? The Labour party is in office, and the Tory party presume to be in power. Although this party was returned at the last elections by the overwhelming, and I believe unparalleled, majority of twenty-four—that is, a two-to-one majority—yet we have twenty-four men on the other side, who, because of their alliance with the Upper House, can prevent this party from giving effect to its most sacred promises and pledges at the last election. That is a position that no self-respecting party can tolerate. This party is not going to tolerate it, and it is taking the earliest opportunity and the best method available of doing away with this position. Although this party was returned on 16th March with an overwhelming majority, we find that the members of the Upper House actually have the audacity to prepare and present a memorial to the Governor advising His Excellency not to flood the Upper House. I am quoting now from their own organ, the "Daily Mail,"

of 11th May, 1918, under the heading "Anti-Abolitionists Present Memorial," and it reads—

> "The memorial referred to the possibility of the honourable the Premier making a recommendation to His Excellency with regard to additional appointments to the Council. His Excellency formally received the memorial."

Here we have the Opposition—a most extraordinary and, I believe, unparalleled act in any Parliament in the British dominions—tendering advice to His Excellency the Governor. No party would tolerate that sort of thing for long, and I am glad that this party is taking the bit in its teeth, and is going right on with this proposal, to stop this thing once and for all. Why has this State two Houses of Parliament? The chances are that, if the Imperial Parliament had only had one House when we got responsible government in 1859, we would have followed their example. But, because there were two Houses of Parliament in the Imperial sphere at that time, we engrafted on our Constitution the principle of two Houses. But in Great Britain they have altered the whole scheme since then, while we have gone on practically without any alteration except for the slight change made by the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act. Under the Parliament Act of 1910, the House of Lords cannot now prevail against the will of the people. In the case of a money Bill, that Bill can secure the Royal assent in spite of the House of Lords if it is introduced a month before the close of the session. In the case of other Bills, other than a Bill to prolong the life of the Parliament, if it is passed in three consecutive sessions, it can become law regardless of the action of the House of Lords. By the Parliament Act the Imperial Parliament has been practically remodelled, whilst our Parliament just stands as it was. But in the United Kingdom they are not even content with the reform of the House of Lords, because in the latest platform of the Liberal party they advocate the abolition of the House of Lords. Still we go on with our local House of Lords. When we were arguing in favour of a Federal Parliament in 1899 one of the strongest arguments used throughout the country was that it was unnecessary to have twelve Houses of Parliament, as we had at that time. It was argued that, if we established the Commonwealth, we could dispense with one House of Parliament in each of the six States. But nothing has been done in that direction, and to my mind it is inexcusable that we have not done anything, because it was pointed out that, if we adopted the Commonwealth Constitution, we would be delegating to the Federal Parliament thirty-nine matters of great legislative importance, and it would not be as necessary to have two State Houses as it was before. But, in spite of all those arguments, which were used by men on the other side, too, they were quickly forgotten after the referendum had been carried for the adoption of the Commonwealth Constitution, and nothing whatever has since been done in the direction of reforming Parliament by a reduction in the number of Houses of Parliament in the various States. The leader of the Opposition this afternoon emphasised the point that the Upper House was a check on hasty legislation. I have been closely watching the Upper House and its antics, and I have come to the conclusion that the Upper House is not a check on hasty legislation, but it is a check on Labour legislation, and that is why hon. members on the other side are so strong in their advocacy of the retention of the Upper House. Regarding this argument about hasty legislation, the new clause which has been inserted in this Bill will afford more time for reflection in connection with legislation, and it will certainly reduce to a minimum the possibility of ill-prepared, ill-digested, hasty legislation getting on the statute-book. This revisory committee will give an opportunity for reflection and for revision, for more thoroughly digesting measures before they become legal enactments; and, if the Opposition are so concerned about hasty, ill-digested legislation getting on the statute-book, why have they not secured the remedy by asking their allies in the other House to pass the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill?

The Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill is specially designed to trust the people—to make the people masters of the situation all the time. If the argument of the leader of the Opposition—that a party which got into power later on might pass unwise, or dangerous, legislation—is correct, then if the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill were on the statute-book, there would be an opportunity to give the people the power of vetoing such legislation. By passing that Bill, which has been before the Upper House now three times, you would have a remedy against hasty and unwise legislation. Here is the remarkable thing: The leader of the Opposition attacks the Government because of its policy with regard to the abolition of the Council. As a matter of fact, the leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party have condemned the Upper House themselves. Every hon. member opposite, by the fact that he is on the other side of the House, has condemned the Upper Chamber, root and branch. The leader of the Opposition knows that, because, at the opening of the last campaign, he advocated that the Upper House, as now constituted, should be abolished, and an elective Chamber substituted, so that he is in favour of abolition. It is only a question of method. We want to abolish it because we think it is an unnecessary appendage to the body politic; he wants to abolish it for the purpose of substituting something therefor. What does the hon. gentleman propose? An elective Upper House? What is the franchise to be? Is it to be on the same basis as this House?

Mr. GUNN: Everyone that has a union ticket. (Laughter.)

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: 640 acres of land.

Mr. MULLAN: Does the hon. gentleman propose that the members should be pastoralists exclusively? We want to know from the hon. gentleman what he proposes as the franchise.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Get a Royal Commission.

Mr. MULLAN: I think that the people are entitled to know what the alternative of the hon. gentleman is. Of course, it is absurd to argue that the hon. gentleman would contemplate a franchise such as applies to this House, but suppose he advocated such a franchise, what would happen? It would simply become a duplication of this House, and could not be a check at all: because, on the same wave of popular opinion, the same party would be returned

to both Houses, as happened in the case of the Federal Parliament, and one House would in no way be a check upon the other. But suppose the hon. gentleman proposes a restricted franchise, representative of vested interests. We would then have a more dangerous Upper House than the present. Bad as the present House is, it is better than an elective House with a restricted franchise would be. We have an example in Victoria of what an Upper House elected on a restricted franchise is; and, bad as the Upper House is, I would rather have it than an elective House on the lines of the Victorian Upper House to-day. An Upper House such as we have at present is not compatible with democracy. We had quinquennial Parliaments at one time, but we changed to triennial Parliaments, because we thought the period was too long, as members got out of touch with the thought of the electors. The Denham Government proposed to have quinquennial Parliaments again, and they got wiped out on it. In the face of that awful example, is there a member in this House who would advocate a longer life for Parliament? Would anybody suggest that we ought to have a ten years' or a twenty years' Parliament? But, although we have a triennial Parliament here, if the other House can have a life Parliament, the benefit of our triennial Parliament is lost. I have no personal quarrel with the individuals in the Upper House—I do not know the majority of them at all—but there are many there who were appointed between thirty and forty years ago. I do not want to indulge in personalities, but I have here a list of the members who have been longest in the Upper House. One man has been there forty years, another thirty-six years, two thirty-two years, one thirty years, one twenty-four years, two nineteen years, and two seventeen years. There you have men controlling the Government of this country to-day who were nominated by Governments long since doomed to destruction at the hands of the electors. The Governments are dead and gone, but the nominees survive, to wreck the legislation of later and democratic Governments. That is incompatible with democratic ideals, and should not be tolerated. It is unthinkable that a lot of babbling octogenarians should have the right to undo the work of democracy to-day—men who live in the dead past. They may have been all right in their day, with the ideas current then, but Queensland has progressed since then. We have different conceptions of government, and of the treatment of the masses; but they go on and live still in the Stone Age. And then, again, you have men there—a great number of them, in fact—whose chief qualification in the past seems to have been that they were political rejects. A number of them could never have secured an elective seat at all. Most of them are merely there because they were subservient, pliant pieces of machinery in the hands of the Governments that nominated them. That is the chief qualification.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Were you not a defeated candidate when you were put there?

Mr. MULLAN: I was elected. I had to go before the electors and stand the test of public opinion as to whether I was a fit and proper person to go there—that was the difference.

The PREMIER: And it was a different Chamber.

Mr. MULLAN: It was not a nominee Upper House, as the hon. member knows. It was the Federal Senate.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I was talking about this one—you were a member here (indicating the Council), were you not?

Mr. MULLAN: You are making a mistake.

The PREMIER: That will do in the backblocks where there is no Press, but it is no good here.

Mr. MULLAN: So long as the hon. member uses that in the backblocks, it is all right, as the Premier says. Take the policy of most Governments with respect to public servants. We consider it expedient—at least, it has been the policy of several Governments—to retire public servants at the age of sixty-five. Yet gentlemen in "another place" can go on, like Tennyson's brook, "for ever." In fact, there is quite a number of men in that House who are over eighty years of age. One is eighty-nine, three are eighty-four, one is eighty-two, one seventy-eight, one seventy-seven, one seventy-six, four are seventy-four, and others are seventy-three and seventy-two. Surely most of those gentlemen, at any rate, have outlived their usefulness as legislators! We know that in critical times many of those gentlemen who are approaching their dotage have been brought into that Chamber to vote on measures about the meaning of which they had very grave doubts. That is not the way in which the legislation of a country should be conducted.

The member for Bulimba to-night, by innuendo, which is his chief weapon, pointed to the insecurity of one Chamber as regards our judges, the Auditor-General, and such persons. I have here in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Liberal party in connection with the Upper House campaign. It is headed, "Startling Facts for the Electors." Certainly many startling facts there are in the way of misrepresentation and falsehoods. It says, "The Plain Truth about Parliament." I have read it carefully, looking for a grain of truth. Here is one junk—

> "What about the public service? A word to the wise will be quite sufficient here. If the Legislative Council is abolished, not a single officer in the public service would be sure of his billet for twenty-four hours."

What a dastardly thing to say?—

> "The Supreme Court judges themselves would be at the mercy of the dominant party in a single-Chamber Legislature."

Mr. MACARTNEY: So they would.

Mr. MULLAN: What would a man in America or some other country think of Queensland, obtaining his impression of it from a publication like that? It would put him in mind of some of the South American republics.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is perfectly true.

Mr. MULLAN: It is a scandalous misrepresentation of the position, as I will show.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is what the position will be.

Mr. MULLAN: This pamphlet goes on—

> "The Auditor-General, the Land

Court, the district court judges, the various commissioners, all Under Secretaries, and every man in the State service, no matter what his profession or grade or occupation or tenure, would be at the absolute mercy of every successive Legislative Assembly. It would be Tammanyism with a vengeance.

"If the Legislative Council were abolished, general elections would be no safeguard for public servants. There might be no 'general elections.' In the long run there would be nothing between the people and I.W.W.-ism."

Mr. MACARTNEY: What do you think of the police magistrates and others who have been retired?

Mr. WELLINGTON: Some of them should have been retired years previously.

Mr. MULLAN: Some of the gentlemen should have been retired years ago because of their misconduct and their gross partisanship.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Because they convicted members on the other side?

Mr. MULLAN: I do not want to be personal, but in the matter of conviction, there was any amount of conviction on the hon. member's side of the House.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is what you call misconduct.

Mr. MULLAN: Getting away from these little passing personalities, let us get back to the issue. Why would the judges, or the Auditor-General, or any other member of the public service be less secure with one Chamber than with two? It has happened again and again that the same party with the same policy has been in command of both Houses of this Parliament. One House has not been a check on the other. As I pointed out in my previous arguments, where one party is in control of both Houses—that is, with a majority in both Houses—one House cannot be a check on the other. That has happened again and again here, which has practically reduced it to a one-Chamber Parliament, and yet nothing happened to the public service; and if it did not happen under the Liberal party, why do they expect it to happen under the Labour party?

Mr. MACARTNEY: There is individual right of conscience there.

Mr. MULLAN: I will show the hon. member that he is wrong again. As a matter of fact, the Labour party have been in power in the Federal arena for two Parliaments—for four years—with absolute command of both Houses, with the fate of the judges, with the fate of the public service in their hands, and I challenge one member on the other side to get up and mention one injustice that was perpetrated. What the Labour party have done in the Federal arena may be equally fairly expected of them in the State arena, so it is not fair for the hon. member to anticipate. Anticipation is not argument.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We have had a fair indication of it already.

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. member has certainly not shown it in his arguments.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We will get them later on.

[*Mr. Mullan.*

Mr. MULLAN: Then the hon. member expects to be there a pretty long time. Talking about the insecurity of a one-Chamber system, as a matter of fact, history reveals that where you have an obstructionist Upper House it becomes a great danger to society and the security of the State Has it not happened that the House of Lords, in the case of the great reform measure of Earl Grey, brought England perilously near to revolution? Again and again the people of England have been threatened with revolution because of the obstructionist tactics of the House of Lords? And had they not yielded in time they would have had revolution. That was the case under the two-House system, and would it not have been obviated under the one-House system? Now,

[9 p.m.]

I have heard a great many encomiums passed to-night upon the Upper House. They were real democrats, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us put the matter to the test. We all know that the Upper House members have the right to initiate legislation. Can any gentleman name one measure that has been introduced by the Upper House, except for political tactics and for political obstruction, designed to benefit the people at large? They have the right to initiate legislation. Where are the great reform and humanitarian measures that they have initiated in the last fifty years?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Six o'Clock Closing Bill.

Mr. MULLAN: Six o'clock closing, one hon. gentleman interjects. Why did they do that? So as to destroy the effect of the great Initiative and Referendum Bill of our party, designed to deal with 6 o'clock closing and all other questions in a comprehensive way. That is why they introduced that. There you have the test. It has been in existence for over fifty years, and where is their great programme of usefulness and reform? What have they done, except keep back the clock of progress?

As the Premier pointed out to-night, we all know that the Upper House is especially designed to be a class House, representative of class interests.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Representing the banks, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, insurance companies, pastoralists, and the great vested interests. If anybody doubts my statement, here is a list of the gentlemen who appealed for boodle on their behalf from the banks and the other great financial institutions, in order that they might fight successfully on the referendum last year. We find it says here—

"REFERENDUM ON THE ABOLITION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

"CONSTITUTION DEFENCE FUND.

"*Contributions Urgently Required.*

"At a large and representative meeting held in Brisbane on Tuesday, 3rd April, 1917——"

Pretty close to the date of the referendum, mark you. It shows that they can get in the boodle as quickly as they want it. They only have to pass the hat round, and in it rolls like a mighty sea.

Mr. MACARTNEY: They did not have a Liberty Fair then.

Mr. MULLAN: Well, that is a more honourable way, in my opinion, than many of the ways adopted by the Opposition to secure the boodle.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Anyhow, the workers are quite prepared to subscribe to their own funds. Here we have the list. I am not mentioning the names of the gentlemen as any personal reflection upon them, but merely to indicate the class of gentlemen who presume to represent the people and fight to retain this so-called democratic House: Sir Robert Philp, Sir Alfred Cowley, Hon. A. H. Whittingham, M.L.C., Hon. E. W. H. Fowles, M.L.C., Hon. P. J. Leahy, M.L.C., Mr. W. J. Hooper, Mr. George Story. Whom do they represent? Do they represent the people—the workers of this State?

Mr. MACARTNEY: All classes of the community.

Mr. MULLAN: They represent the vested interests. They represent all that stands for exploitation.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not true.

Mr. MULLAN: Everything inimical to the progress and welfare of the State and the workers of this State, and the hon. gentleman knows it——

Mr. MORGAN: No. You are stating an absolute falsehood.

Mr. MULLAN: These are the gentlemen who urgently appealed for funds, and we know that the funds rolled in like a mighty sea.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call upon the hon. member for Murilla to withdraw his statement that the hon. member is telling a falsehood.

Mr. MORGAN: I thought I was using a very mild expression. If it is against the Standing Orders, I will withdraw it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I suppose I might be permitted to say "It is not true."

Mr. MULLAN: Personally, I do not think the public will attach much importance to the statement of either the leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Murilla.

Mr. MORGAN: They will not attach any importance to your speech.

Mr. MULLAN: Well, we will see after the referendum is taken; that will be the test. The hon. gentleman is whistling, to keep his courage up. Now, I think it is substantially true that Parliament and parliamentarians are slaves to precedent. The position I take up is that I would rather make a good precedent than slavishly follow a bad one. We know that we have two Chambers here as a matter of precedent, simply because there were two in the Imperial arena and in several other places. But, as a matter of fact, we know, after all—and history proves it—that a second Chamber in England itself was a mere accident. Mr. Lloyd enlarged upon this question tonight. We know that at one time there was but one Chamber in the Imperial Parliament, and it was a matter of accident that we got the other. In fact, the proposal at one time was to have three—the Lords, the Clergy, and the Commons. Fortunately, we were saved the three. It is bad enough to have two. But there is the fact—that the second was an accident. In any case, even taking the question of precedent, we have ample precedent for what we are doing in abolishing one House and relying upon one only to transact the business of this State. Anyhow, this party does not look for precedent always. It has not followed slavishly in the footsteps of any precedent, but has been making a good precedent

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Apart altogether from that, if we wanted a precedent for what we are doing, we have it—as the Premier pointed out this afternoon in his able, eloquent, and convincing speech, which is going to have a telling effect on the great campaign which has now commenced—in Canada. No person can question the sanity of the Canadians. The Canadians have quite a number of States relying upon the one-House system. There are nine States there. Out of the nine States no less than seven have adopted the one-House principle; and one of those States, be it remembered—Ontario—is nearly six times as large in population as Queensland, and is managing its business successfully with the one House. Now, if they can manage in that way, we ought to be able to manage, too. I could, if time permitted, cite quite a number of other places where they have the one-House system. Now, again talking about the Upper House, I would just like to tell hon. members—and the people of Queensland—something that they have done in the way of stifling democracy. Here is their record during the life of the last Labour Administration—

> "The following is a list of Bills passed during the sessions of 1915-16, 1916, and 1917 by the Legislative Assembly, but rejected by the Legislative Council. It also includes Bills which could not be passed owing to the hostile attitude of the Council, which mutilated many of the measures:—
>
> Meatworks Bill.
>
> Commonwealth Powers (War) Bill.
>
> Constitution Act (Legislative Council Abolition) Bill.
>
> Local Authorities Acts Amendment Bill.
>
> Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill.
>
> Hospitals Bill.
>
> Income Tax Act Amendment Bill.
>
> Wages Bill.
>
> Constitution Amendment Bill (disqualification as members of Parliament of directors or solicitors for alien and monopoly companies).
>
> Valuation of Land Bill.
>
> Criminal Code Amendment (abolition of capital punishment) Bill.
>
> Chillagoe and Etheridge Railways Purchase Bill.
>
> Opticians Bill (subsequently passed in mutilated form).

Sugar Experiment Stations Act Amendment Bill.

Marsupial Boards Act Amendment Bill.

Mining for Coal and Mineral Oil Bill.

Rabbit Act Amendment Bill.

Land Tax Act Amendment Bill.

Requisition of Ships Bill.

Succession and Probate Duties Act Amendment Bill.

Stamp Act Amendment Bill.

Bundaberg Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill.

Iron and Steel Works Bill."

And in 1918 they have rejected a very important Land Act Amendment Bill—a Bill intended to compel the wealthy pastoralists to disgorge much of their ill-gotten gains. In conclusion, I want to say that not only is the abolition of the Upper House involved in this fight, but the whole platform of the Labour party is also involved in it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): I have listened very attentively to the arguments both for and against this measure, and it seems to me that a tremendous lot of time and energy is being spent upon the discussion of the question as to whether the last referendum was reasonably and rightly taken, whether the people understood it, and what the probable results of the coming referendum will be. I do not see what good purpose such a discussion can serve. I should encourage the Government to hold the referendum, and let them ascertain once and for all when the issue is clearly defined what are the wishes of the people regarding this very important question. Then we should know what the position is. The one thing I regret is, that for the next eight months, or probably longer, Queensland is going to be in a turmoil and a passion, in which we shall hear discordant notes on the question of the abolition of the Upper House, when our attention ought to be directed to something very much more serious and important. That is the most unfortunate phase of the whole situation. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat referred to a certain injunction which the members of the Upper House obtained against the holding of the referendum. Personally, I think that was a mistake. I think the Upper House would have been better advised if they had allowed the referendum to take its course rather than to have attempted to put any impediment in the way of ascertaining the views of the people, because, if the view of the people is that the Upper House should be abolished, it is a waste of time attempting to put impediments in their way. The same hon. member also harped upon the statement that the Opposition are in alliance with the Upper House. I have been associated with this party for a few months now, and I must frankly admit that during the whole of that time I have never heard or seen the slightest suggestion or hint of any association with the Upper House. My object in making this statement is to remove that impression altogether. There is no association, directly or indirectly, between this party and the Upper House. (Government laughter.) Hon. members opposite may laugh, but I am here to speak the truth, and I intend to do so always, and I flatly contradict the statement that the party I am associated with has at any time whatever had any truck with the Upper House.

The PREMIER: The most charitable view to take is that they did not let you into "the know."

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is not so, because there is very little that the leader of this party does not make known to his supporters, otherwise they would not be the happy and contented party they are. The Government are proposing, by this measure, to abolish the Upper Chamber, and the great reason why that should not be done under existing circumstances is that the Opposition in this House at the present time are powerless, and could spend their time better somewhere else than in trying to amend measures submitted to the House. That is the conclusion I have deliberately come to after having listened to and taken part in debates, and after having found that any criticisms which emanate from this side, with a few exceptions, are lost. I have heard a Minister say that he did not intend to accept any amendments in a Bill, and have seen him carry out that statement. I may refer particularly to a Bill which was handled by the Minister for Agriculture, who said he had no intention of accepting any amendments in the measure, and who sat there hour after hour combating suggestions emanating from this side of the House, and then the Bill was reported without amendment. The same kind of thing happened with regard to another Bill, which was full of pitfalls. I refer to the State Enterprises Bill, which I think was in this Chamber for two days, and which was passed without amendment. I contend that while such a state of affairs exists you cannot do without a revising Chamber. If members of this House were permitted to discuss all measures on their merits, and the ideas and experiences of members were accepted in the spirit in which they were given, then, possibly, we might do without a revising Chamber. If we look upon ourselves as the directors of the destinies of Queensland, or as the directors of the shareholders, who are the voters, then we might arrive at a state of affairs in which a revising Chamber would not be necessary. Possibly, members opposite will be in the same position as we are in one of these days, and then they will understand what it is to devote their best attention and energies to the improvement of a measure only to find that their suggestions are thrown aside without any consideration whatever, and they will realise in such circumstances that we must have a revising Chamber. Give me a Chamber that is composed of men who are free to express their opinions, and where proposals will be discussed and judged on their merits, and I shall not want a second Chamber. But until that state of affairs arrives we must have a revising Chamber. I could mention some measures which have been bludgeoned through this House without any consideration being given to them. We have the experience of seeing Ministers handling Bills that they knew nothing about, and having to continually run from their seats to the permanent officer of the department who was there to advise them on those particular measures. In such a case the Bill before the House is the permanent officer's Bill, not the Minister's Bill, and, while

measures are dealt with in that way, we cannot do without a revising Chamber. The Minister runs along to the permanent officer in the gallery, and says: "Shall I accept this amendment or not?" If the permanent officer says "No," then there is an end of it. Such a state of affairs renders a revising Chamber necessary. Give us freedom to express our opinions, and let the issue be decided on those opinions and not on party considerations, and then we can dispense with the other Chamber. I freely admit that the Council, constituted as it is at present, is a mistake. No man who has ability and can express his opinions clearly and forcibly at forty years of age can be expected to have the same ability at eighty years of age; and I quite admit that in a young country, such as this is, we want to keep the revising Chamber as virile as we keep this Chamber. But you must have that revising Chamber while the state of affairs that I pointed out exists.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They are the representatives of past defeated Governments.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am not defending the constitution of that Upper Chamber. I am one of those who would be glad to see the Government bring forward some reasonable measure applying to that Upper Chamber: and, if they do that, then I think they will find there are certain members on this side of the House who would support it.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What do you suggest?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is not for me to suggest the details of the measure. We are not the Government. It is for the Government to suggest a way out of the difficulty, and if the Government's suggestions are feasible, then they will be adopted.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They have suggested a way out of the difficulty.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I have endeavoured to point out how monstrous the proposal is. With the state of affairs that exists today, where party control is absolutely the only control, then you must have a revising Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The revisory committee meets that objection.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I dare say some hon. members opposite have studied the question of proportional representation. If we can accomplish, in the selection of our candidates and the selection of our members of Parliament, what I am going to suggest, then we can have the one Chamber. But until we do adopt some system which permits of the aims and objects that I propose reading being adopted, then you will find—whether you are on the Government benches or whether you are in opposition—that you must have a revising Chamber. One of those aims is—

> "To reproduce the opinions of the electors in Parliament and other public bodies in their true proportions."

Is there a member in this House that will admit that forty-eight to twenty-four in this Chamber is the true representation in Parliament of the will of the people? We must all admit that that is not so. The second is—

> "To secure that the majority of electors should rule and all considerable minorities shall be heard."

I contend that, although we represent a considerable minority in this House, that we are not heard, and therefore that points to the necessity of a revising Chamber which takes the place of that considerable minority. The next thing is—

> "To give electors a wider freedom in the choice of representatives."

If we had that wider choice of representatives, then, as I contend, there would be no necessity for a revising Chamber, because by reason of that wider choice we would have men of mature experience in this House to voice their opinions, which opinions would be heard and given attention to. Then—

> "4. To give representatives greater independence from the financial and other pressure of small sections of constituents.
>
> "5. To ensure to parties representation by their ablest and most trusted members."

Give me those aims; give me those principles in the selection of our members of Parliament, and I am with you up to the hilt. One Chamber is sufficient for me, but until that state of affairs exists then you must have a second Chamber, or a revising Chamber, constituted differently if you will, but you must have it. I am not going to take up the time of this House very long, because this is a matter that has been thrashed out very thoroughly, and I am not one of those who believes in talking for talking's sake. But I am going to make this appeal to the House, and I would like the Premier to listen to me. It is this: He has absolutely and thoroughly put his case for his own side. Our leader has done something similar, and no man can take any exception to those two speeches. The Premier has said: "I want the people of Queensland to understand this issue and to judge fairly and squarely between the two cases." Now, I am going to ask the Premier to do this: When his literature is going out to flood Queensland, as it is about to do, let these two cases be put side by side so that the people can read the arguments both for and against on a main issue of this description which is of vital importance to the people of Queensland. If one side shows a desire to deal with the issue fairly and squarely like that, then you will find that there is considerable reciprocity on the other side. I have great hope of such a proposal being favourably considered, because it is a matter of vital importance, and the issue can be considered without the passion that is otherwise going to be introduced. Look at the passion that was introduced in the Premier's remarks!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: A very fine speech.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am not saying it was not a fine speech; I am simply saying it is impossible to approach this subject without a certain amount of passion. Let us judge the thing absolutely on its merits. Don't let us try and introduce overwhelming passion into it so that the State of Queensland will be split assunder—into two camps—when our attention should be directed to more important and graver issues. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat referred to a leaflet which was issued by the party for the retention of the Council at the last referendum. I would ask hon. members if they have seen the leaflet that

I have in my hand? That was issued under the authority of the present Speaker of the House and the late member for Oxley. That is just as objectionable, if not more so, than the leaflet which the hon. member has referred to. What good is that sort of thing going to do?

Hon. W. N. GILLIES and other GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Read it! Read it!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is called "Tammany Rampant." I do not particularly want to read it, but I will place it on the table if any hon. member wishes to read it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Put it in "Hansard."

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I would rather not read it. It is one of the official papers issued in connection with the last referendum on the abolition of the Council, and it is repulsive to any right-minded man.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It might be thought that there is something indecent in it.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is what I call indecent when it has to do with a matter like this.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Read it. It is a fair thing to read it out.

Mr. BERTRAM: It is very short.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If it is thought desirable, I will read part of it. It says—

"TAMMANY RAMPANT.

"PARLIAMENTARY LOBBY SCANDAL.

"When parliamentary measures are submitted to the Legislative Council which encroach upon the preserves of the kings of beefdom and the privileges of the insurance cormorants and the acres of the squattocracy, the vestibule of this Chamber swarms with indecent 'lobbyers.' Well-paid lawyers, blatant, well-fed company promoters, insolent business magnates overflow almost on to the street itself."

That is sufficient. I am not going to detain the House with any more of it. How is a statement of that description going to help "the man in the street" to form a clear opinion as to whether the Upper Chamber should be retained or not? Is that going to appeal to his passions or to his common sense? Which? It is his common sense I am after, and not his passions. In this campaign which is coming eight or ten months hence let us direct our appeals to the common sense of the people, and not to their passions.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: How can you do that in the "Courier"?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am contending this: That if a good example is set, I am satisfied that hon. members who occupy the benches here will do their utmost to restrain those extreme methods of pleading the cause of one side or the other. Let me put this suggestion forward. Appoint a joint committee of both sides to revise the literature that is going to be issued in connection with this matter. It is going to cost thousands of pounds; it is going to inflame the people and rouse the passions—for what good? It is a mad proposal. Let a joint committee be appointed to control all this literature, and let it fairly and clearly and truthfully put the position before the people, as expounded by the Premier and as expounded by the leader of the Opposition, and decide the issue on that basis.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do you propose to make the Council literature subject to the committee you suggest?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Undoubtedly; let all the literature be subject to it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They would not agree to that.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat said if he did not succeed on the first attempt, he tries and tries until he does. Let us adopt that principle in regard to revising and controlling our campaign literature. Let us save money, let us save passion, and let common sense prevail. If the majority of the people of Queensland then vote for a single-Chamber Parliament, they must have it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Sometimes the people must be educated.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If the Minister for Railways tries to impress upon me that the present method is the way to educate the masses, then I shall withdraw the opinion which I have formed of his ability to run the railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have not seen it.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I have read some of it, and if the hon. gentleman desires to see more of it, I would refer him to the Speaker, whose name appears as having been responsible for this literature, and if the Speaker has not the time available, I would refer him to the late member for Oxley, whose name also appears on the leaflet. The only thing I can commend about the publication is the figure appearing upon it, which closely resembles a pig. (Laughter.) I do not mean that to refer to the late hon. member for Oxley.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Apparently you got away with the bacon. (Laughter.)

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I put the proposal of a joint literature committee forward with all seriousness, because I think it is worthy of consideration. It is time that common sense prevailed. It is time we tried to still the passions and attempted to control the country in a proper way.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I intend to have a few words to say on this Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is a breach of the contract.

Mr. COLLINS: I was not aware there was any contract made. So far as I am concerned, there is no contract. I am going to take up a different line to what has been taken up this evening by other
[9.30 p.m.] speakers. I am one of those who have been connected with the Labour movement for the best part of my life. We have always had in the forefront of our platform the abolition of the Legislative Council. I am not going to be disheartened by one failure, or even by half a dozen failures, knowing that the whole of Time is before us. It does not follow that,

because we could not abolish the Council in 1917, we may not be able to abolish it in 1919. I have not heard any argument this evening why the Council should be retained. I realise that we are living in changing times. The people are coming to the conclusion that they must rule. In the past they have not ruled. So far as I have been able to read, there has been no such thing as representative government—at least, not what I call representative government—in any part of the British Dominions outside the Federal Parliament. Representative government means the will of the people being placed on the statute-book, and that has not been done up to the present time, especially in our own State. Just the same as the House of Lords has stopped the progress of the people in Great Britain, so the Legislative Council has stopped the progress of the people in this State. We all know that in years gone by—especially in Great Britain, where this system has been copied from—the House of Lords prevented for a long time the right of dissenting ministers of religion to go into the Church of England churchyards to bury the dead belonging to their denominations. We all know that the dissenting bodies for a long time were refused admission to the universities; and we all know that it was the House of Lords who refused for years to give the agricultural labourers the franchise. And, if it had been left to the Legislative Council of Queensland alone, the workers of this State would not have got the franchise they have got to-day. I am quite willing to admit that the House of Lords has granted reforms, but they have only granted those reforms when the people became dangerous. When the people became dangerous, for their own safety the House of Lords allowed certain reforms to go through their Chamber. It is something similar in all British communities. The Labour movement in Queensland is in accord with the Labour movement in Great Britain. The Labour movement in Great Britain stands for the abolition of the House of Lords. The Premier this afternoon told us, and the hon. member for Flinders likewise, that the Liberal party in Great Britain believe in the abolition of the House of Lords. The Labour party also stands for the abolition of the House of Lords. I hold in my hand "The Aims of Labour," by the Right Honourable Arthur Henderson, a Labour member of the House of Commons—a gentleman who was recently a member of the Imperial Cabinet, and who resigned from a position carrying a salary of £2,000 per annum. He is now secretary to the Labour party. This is the latest publication that has arrived in this State, and I intend to read some extracts for the benefit of hon. members, and of the people in general, to show what the Labour party stands for in Great Britain. He says—

> "The party stands, as heretofore, for complete adult suffrage, with not more than a three months' residential qualification, for effective provision for absent electors to vote, for absolutely equal rights for both sexes, for the same freedom to exercise civic rights for the 'common soldier' as for the officer, for shorter Parliaments, for the complete abolition of the House of Lords, and for a most strenuous opposition to any new second Chamber, whether elected or not, having in it any element of heredity or privilege, or of the control of the House of Commons by any party or class. But unlike the Conservative and Liberal parties, the Labour party insists on democracy in industry as well as in government."

You will notice those words, "And for a most strenuous opposition to any new second Chamber, whether elected or not." I am in accord with that. I am one of those who would have abolished the Legislative Council a quarter of a century ago, because I claim that it fulfils no useful purpose whatever. We want legislation by the people. There is no one who can tell us to what heights we might not have attained, so far as progress and legislation go, if there had not been a second Chamber standing in our way. I am not afraid of the people. What I am afraid of is the people who try to obstruct the people. Our opponents are continually quoting from the mother of Parliaments, and telling us what takes place in the mother of Parliaments. I wish to get into "Hansard" the opinions expressed by Arthur Henderson, who occupied the position of a Cabinet Minister in Great Britain, and it is a warning to the ruling class in Great Britain not to obstruct legislation in the interests of the people—

> "It would be idle, however, to deny that the temper of democracy after the war will not be so placable as it has hitherto been. Whether we like it or fear it, we have to recognise that in the course of the last three and a-half years people have become habituated to thoughts of violence. They have seen force employed on an unprecedented scale as an instrument of policy. Unless we are very careful these ideas will rule the thoughts of masses of the people in the post-war period of reconstruction. The idea that by forceful methods the organised democracy can find a short cut to the attainment of its aims will have its attractions for men of unstable temperament, impatient of the inevitable set-backs which we are bound to encounter if we work along constitutional lines. Let that idea stand unchallenged by the leaders of democracy, and we shall be faced with graver perils than any that have confronted us in past times. Never before have we had such vast numbers of the population skilled in the use of arms, disciplined, inured to danger, accustomed to act together under orders. When the war ends this country and every other will be flooded with hardy veterans of the great campaigns. Among them will be thousands of men who have exercised authority over their fellows in actual warfare, and who will be capable of assuming leadership again if insurrectionary movements come into existence. We may be warned by a perception of these facts that if barricades are indeed likely to be erected in our streets they will be manned by men who have learned how to fight and not by ill-disciplined mobs unversed in the use of modern weapons, likely to be easily overcome by trained troops. Revolution, if revolution is indeed to be forced upon democracy, will be veritable civil war."

Now, he is raising a note of warning in Great Britain—that the ruling classes want to realise the democracy they have to deal with. This is from a man who occupied a

position in the British Cabinet. Further on, he says—

> "By peaceable methods, or by direct assault, society is going to be brought under democratic control. And the choice of method does not primarily rest with democracy: it lies rather with the classes who own the machinery of production and control the machinery of the State to decide whether necessary changes are to be peaceably introduced on the basis of willing co-operation, or resisted to the last ditch. Conflicts will inevitably arise between the privileged classes and the great mass of the people as to whether this or that specific reform is opportune or expedient at a given moment."

There is no need for me to quote further from this little book. It can be bought in Brisbane, and everyone who wants to keep in touch with the Labour movement should read that book. We in Australia are surely not going to drag behind the times? If the Labour party in Great Britain thinks, notwithstanding they have a Veto Act, that it is a wise thing to abolish the House of Lords, how much wiser is it for us to abolish the Legislative Council in the State of Queensland? When one examines the men who go to make up the Legislative Council, who are they? Do we not find the successful pastoralist, the successful brewer, the successful merchant, and the successful lawyer? There are two or three barristers there. You will find there all the elements which go to represent the vested interests of this country. It is quite true that we have got a few working-class representatives there, but they are only a drop in the ocean as compared with those who make up the majority in the Council. Then down through all the ages, the working classes have cried out for justice and that they should have their rights given to them. Can anyone tell me that we are likely to get our rights as workers as long as we have the Legislative Council blocking the way? At any rate, I am not one of those who believe that democracy will rule until we get the one Chamber, whether in the Federal or the State arena. I never have believed in the two Houses. I believe the principle is entirely wrong. I believe the early reformers who advocated the abolition of the House of Lords were on sound and just lines. I do not intend to detain the House any further. I wish to enter my protest against the speeches delivered from the Opposition side of the House. I believe that this measure should go through this Chamber. I would like to see it go through the other Chamber, so that we could abolish it without a referendum; but, failing that, the next best method is to submit it to the people, who, I am satisfied, will vote for the abolition of the Council by a large majority—maybe a larger majority than what we got on 16th March last.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at fifteen minutes to 10 o'clock p.m.