

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1918

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER, 1913.

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

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies and Building Societies for 1917.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES AND ORDERS.

MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES, in moving—

“That the report of the Standing Orders Committee recommending certain amendments in the Code of Standing Rules and Orders as laid upon the table of the Council on the 15th October, be now adopted,”

said: Although I am not a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I have perused the report, and I think the Council should adopt it. The first alteration proposed is in Standing Order No. 9, which deals with the days of meeting. At present the Council is supposed to meet at 3 o'clock, but the President does not take the chair until half an hour later. Under the proposed Standing Order the Council will meet at the exact time specified in the Sessional Orders passed at the opening of the session, namely, 3.30 p.m. It is proposed to repeal Standing Order No. 10, dealing with the absence of a quorum at the opening of a sitting, and to substitute the following:—

“At the hour appointed for the meeting of the Council, the President shall read prayers, and shall take the chair as soon thereafter as there shall be a quorum present; but if at the expiration of fifteen minutes after the hour appointed there be not a quorum present, the President shall then take the chair and adjourn the Council to the next sitting day.”

The present practice is that, if there is not a quorum present after the President has read prayers, the Council stands adjourned until the next sitting day. Under the proposed Standing Order fifteen minutes' grace will be given. The next alteration is in Standing Order No. 13—“Absence of President.” It reads—

“When the Council is informed by the Clerk at the table of the absence of the President, the Chairman of Committees so long as the President is absent shall perform the duties and exercise the authority of the President during such absence.”

Then provision is made for the amendment of Standing Order No. 14, making it read—

“TEMPORARY ABSENCE OF PRESIDENT DURING SITTING.

“When, in consequence of protracted sittings of the Council, or from any other

Hon. A. J. Jones.]

cause, the President is unable to continue in the chair, the Chairman of Committees or one of the Temporary Chairmen, nominated under Standing Order No. 17, shall take the chair as Presiding Chairman during the President's absence."

Standing Order No. 15—"Temporary Presiding Chairman"—is also amended. Standing Order No. 18—"Temporary Chairman"—is also amended. It is not necessary for me to read the whole of these amendments, as hon. members have the report in their hands. One alteration to which I may direct special attention is the repeal of Standing Order No. 116, and the substitution of a new Standing Order. The first paragraph of the new Standing Order reads—

"DISSENT FROM RULINGS OF PRESIDENT.

"A ruling of the President may only be dissented from by motion after notice: Provided that the President shall be entitled to put the question when debate on any such motion shall have exceeded sixty minutes, and that no member shall, without concurrence, speak to such motion for more than ten minutes."

That is in accordance with the practice adopted in the Assembly, and also in the New South Wales Parliament, and the Standing Orders Committee recommend that the same procedure shall be adopted in this Chamber.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: There has been no occasion emphasising the necessity for that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I do not say there has been any occasion for it, but one never knows when the occasion may arise. The next alteration to which I wish to direct attention, is in Standing Order No. 128—"Appointing Tellers." It reads—

"In a division, the members present shall take their seats, the 'Contents' on the right, the 'Not-Contents' on the left of the chair respectively; and the President shall appoint tellers, two from either side, and shall declare, from lists of the members voting on each side, to be handed to him by the tellers, which has the majority."

Under the old Standing Order only one teller was appointed on either side, but I think it is necessary that there should be two on each side.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Taken as a whole, the alterations will probably assist us, but I would suggest a slight amendment in the proposed Standing Order No. 128. It makes provision for the appointment of two tellers on either side when the President is in the chair, and I think similar provision should be made in connection with divisions in Committee. It should be made absolutely clear that the Chairman of Committees shall follow the same procedure that is adopted by the President.

The PRESIDENT: With reference to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn, I would point out that Standing Order No. 134 reads—

"Divisions in Committee of the Whole shall be taken and recorded in the same manner, and the same rules shall be applicable thereto, as in the case of divisions in the Council."

So that the new Standing Order will apply to proceedings in Committee as well as to proceedings in the House.

[Hon. A. J. Jones.

Hon. T. J. O'SHEA: I do not wish to appear to obstruct, but I think it is rather hasty to try to shove these new Standing Orders through without giving hon. members an opportunity of considering them. I have only had them in my hands for a few minutes, and, I think, even with the little time I had at my disposal, that I see a difficulty in connection with Standing Order No. 10. I may be wrong, but I would like to have a little time for consideration. I see no necessity for rushing the motion through this afternoon, and think it would be preferable to adjourn the motion at least until to-morrow. I do not know that it will make any material difference for the remainder of the session, which can only have a few days to run. New Standing Order No. 10 deals with "Absence of quorum at opening." It is a question as to what is the "opening" of a sitting. I presume it means the present hour of meeting—half-past 3. If I remember aright, our old Standing Order states that the House shall meet at 3 p.m., which, according to a long-standing fiction, means 3.30 p.m.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Now it is proposed that we shall meet when we say we shall meet.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The present Standing Order does not say anything about 3 o'clock. It says—

"The Council shall meet on such days and at such hours as may be appointed by Sessional Order. Half an hour after the time appointed, the President shall read the form of prayer ordered to be read daily before the commencement of the proceedings of the Council."

Hon. T. J. O'SHEA: It may be all right, but I think it is unwise to rush the matter through in five minutes without giving members an opportunity of reading the report.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I may explain in defence of the officers that the report was circulated this morning, and if the hon. gentleman has not read it that is his own lookout.

Hon. T. J. O'SHEA: With all due deference to the President, and without disapproving of anything he says, I may say that even if the report was circulated this morning that is no reason why it should be rushed through now. Many of us do not get our mails till late in the day, and have not had an opportunity of reading this report. I do not reflect on anybody, but I want to understand what I am doing, and as I have not had time to study the report, and no doubt other members are in the same position, I suggest that the matter should be adjourned until at least to-morrow. It may then go through in two minutes.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: As a member of the Standing Orders Committee, it is not necessary for me to say very much, as the report speaks for itself. I can quite understand that hon. members who have not had much time to go into the report may require time to consider it, as I know I spent four or five hours considering the matters dealt with when they were before the Standing Orders Committee. I think the suggested amendments of our Standing Orders are an improvement on the present Standing Orders, and that they will work well. A similar rule to that relating to a quorum not being present within the prescribed time obtains in the Imperial Parliament, and is working

well. I believe that the proposed alterations will meet with the approval of the House.

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

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made on Order of the Day for to-morrow.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: In view of the fact that it is proposed to close this debate this afternoon, and of the fact that the question has been fairly and fully debated—

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: And that there will be another opportunity of discussing it.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: And, I was going to say, we may presume there will be another opportunity next session of discussing the measure again, I do not propose to go at very great length into the matter. I have been greatly pleased with the way in which the question has been debated in the House, and I wish more particularly to make reference to the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Brentnall and the Hon. Mr. Curtis. They are two of our oldest members—the Hon. Mr. Brentnall particularly—as far as both age and appointment to seats in the Council are concerned, and I consider that it reflects very great credit on this House that men of their mature age and experience should be able, even although they have been called by persons who oppose them “old fossils,” “incapables,” and “men who should get out,” to put this matter before the country in such a succinct and creditable manner.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is hardly fair to imply that we used that expression with regard to the hon. gentlemen mentioned. I have never once referred to any member of this Council as an “old fossil.”

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I am not referring to the Minister. I am referring to persons both inside and outside the House. The gentlemen I have mentioned have put their views on this question very clearly before the country, and if their speeches are read by the electors I am sure they will be convinced that we are moving on right lines, and that they will be on right lines in voting for a continuation of this Chamber. It has been said here that the people have given the present Government a mandate to do many things, and that amongst other things, a mandate to abolish this Council, because that is part of the platform of the Labour party. Amongst the many things which were put before the country very plainly at the last election the question of the abolition of this Council was not very prominent. Members in their election speeches rather avoided that subject, no doubt feeling that the decision of May last year was so greatly against them that it would not be well for them to go into this matter too largely.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is a plank in the platform.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It may be a plank in the platform, but that platform was drawn up twenty-five years ago, and conditions have changed considerably as far

as this House is concerned since that time, and the reasons for urging the abolition of the Council are gone, although that plank is still in the Labour platform. At that time the people had no veto in matters in dispute between the two Houses. They had no opportunity of getting a Bill which was rejected twice by this House referred to them, with a view to their deciding whether that Bill should become law or not. This is a feature of the question that has never been put prominently before the people at any election. The plank for the abolition of the Council is still in the platform, although, as I have said, conditions have changed considerably. I am sure that the fact that conditions have changed must have weighed considerably with a large number of people when they were considering the question of abolishing the Council on 5th May last year, and said most emphatically that they wished the continuation of the present Legislative Council. I am at a loss to understand what has occurred since that time to make the Government believe that they are likely to get a majority of votes in favour of the abolition of the Council if another referendum is taken. We have done nothing in this House on which we can be attacked since we went before the people on that referendum. The bulk of the Bills which have been brought before us and which we have rejected from time to time, were before us prior to that referendum, and they have all been considered by the people, who have endorsed our action in regard to those Bills, if they have endorsed anything. Therefore, I cannot see anything to justify the Government taking another referendum. I do not know that it is necessary to go into the constitutional and legal position, as that has been gone into at different times at very great length. We say that it would be unconstitutional to abolish the Council in the way proposed in this Bill. That is a matter, of course, which will come on for consideration later on, probably before the Privy Council, if the people are so ill-advised as to give their votes in favour of the abolition of this Chamber. The Hon. Mr. Curtis read extracts from Lord Haldane's speech which show that the Privy Council were fully seized of the importance of the question. It was plainly shown by the speech of Lord Haldane that the members of the Privy Council do not treat the matter in any light or trivial manner, but look upon it as one of very great importance which should be considered, not only by Queensland, but by every portion of the British Empire, and that every portion of the British Empire where there are two Chambers should have an opportunity of appearing when the case is argued before the Privy Council.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Liberal party in England want to abolish the House of Lords.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They do not want to abolish the House of Lords; they want to reform it. This question, with many others of even greater importance, was only brought in a subsidiary sort of way before the electors at the last election in Queensland. The question which put the present Government in power then was the question of conscription or no conscription—that and the German vote. I say, without fear of contradiction, that that is really what put the Government in power.

HON. R. BEDFORD: What put them in power in 1915?

Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The hon. gentleman knows that it was the cheap food cry that put them in power then, yet the cost of living now is as high as ever, and it is going up as fast as it can. The only thing the Government have cheapened is meat, and they have done that because they have acquired it illegally. They have taken advantage of the war. This House has no fear of going before the public and asking for the public support. We have done everything to justify our existence, and not one reason has been shown by the Government why the vote of 5th May, 1917, should be overturned. There is no portion of the British Empire which has not a second Chamber. There is no civilised community that is worth reckoning with which has not a second Chamber. We have Bulgaria, Mexico, I think, and Norway.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: What about the seven States in Canada?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They are only provinces. You cannot possibly compare a province of Canada with a State of Australia; the conditions are not nearly the same. I have no fear that the people of Queensland are going back on the Legislative Council. They are not going to be the first portion of the British Empire to say they shall not have two Chambers.

[4 p.m.] They are not going to put themselves on the same footing as these two or three small nations which have a single Chamber. They are not going to put themselves out of the pale so far as the Commonwealth is concerned. We have the great advantage in this House that we can consider all legislation from a most impartial and independent point of view. In the other Chamber they have to be always considering how their speeches and votes are going to affect them with the electors. I know that a man in the Assembly is very largely affected by the consideration of how his actions are going to be looked at by his electors. It is all very well to say it is not the proper way to look at it. You cannot avoid it.

HON. R. BEDFORD: You do not care for the electors at all?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We care largely for the electors, but we endeavour to do the very best we can in the interests of the whole of Queensland. We are not like each member in the other House, who is bound by the opinions of the particular electorate he represents. We, on the other hand, are bound to consider the interests and the sentiments of the whole of the people of Queensland.

HON. H. C. JONES: They do not believe it.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They do, as was shown by the fact that we had a 63,000 majority in our favour last year. I am confident that they will increase that majority at the next election.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Keep that faith. You are going to die, anyhow.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I suppose the hon. member expects to live for ever.

HON. R. BEDFORD: No.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the Hon. Mr. Bedford to cease these interjections. They are too frequent altogether.

HON. R. BEDFORD: There are others.

[Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.

The PRESIDENT: There are others; but the hon. gentleman is making very frequent interjections.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Thank you, Mr. President. I do not like these harassing interjections. They put one off the track. Probably, that is what they are done for.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Oh, no!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I say it is absolutely necessary that we should have a second Chamber to prevent hasty legislation—legislation that is passed through “another place,” in many instances, with the gag, and no proper opportunity is given of discussing the matter thoroughly. It comes up here, and it receives the very best attention. Bills that come up here secure greater deliberation and consideration; they are not rushed through—as the Hon. Mr. Fowles has said before to-day—as if they were put through a sausage machine. They get that deliberation to which they are entitled. I say unhesitatingly that they go out of this House improved. A large number of the Bills that we improve here are accepted unhesitatingly by the other Chamber. It is ridiculous for the Minister and others to say we never pass any legislation here. Look at what we have done right through the session. There were forty-six Bills brought in during one session and thirty-eight were passed. This session, I think, ten have come here and seven of them have been passed and three negatived; and those three were Bills we were entitled to and should negative—Bills like the Valuation of Land Bill, and the Trades Hall Bill, which was going to take away a park from the public and prevent the poor little children from Spring Hill having a place of recreation. Goodness knows, the parks are scarce enough up there. Those are the sort of things we do. Do we do them in the interests of a class? No; we do them in the interests of the whole of the people. It would be rather interesting to make a short review of the Bills that we have thrown out in this Chamber since the present Government have been in power. If anyone looks into those Bills he will see that we had every justification for dealing with them in the way we have. I just want to point out shortly our justification for dealing with certain Bills, and throwing them out. The Minister, probably, will not like it, but I think it is just as well to let the country know what they are and what are our reasons for having done so. In 1916 there was the Industrial Arbitration Bill which we threw out. Our main reason was that it had an objectionable clause of preference to unionists in it. We have always held that it is an objectionable thing to compel every man to be a unionist before he can work. Hon. members opposite have their own views on the question, and every man is entitled to his opinion; but we on this side consider it is not a fair thing to compel every worker, before he can earn a living, to be a member of a union whose politics probably are not his.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You belong to a pretty close association.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We do not compel everybody to join our association. A large proportion of the solicitors of Queensland are not members of the association.

HON. T. NEVITT: And practising?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: And practising. Nobody interferes with them. They are not told that they are going to be cut out of all work if they do not join the association. That is an association that has done a tremendous amount of good. It has kept every man up to the collar. If that association is informed that anything wrong is going on in connection with any member of the legal profession, he is brought to book at once; and if he is brought before the court and it is found he has done anything wrong, he is struck off the roll. That is the risk you always run. The solicitor has to pass an examination the same as a doctor and dentist have to do. I think for all the professions it should be necessary to pass an examination.

HON. R. BEDFORD: A member of the Waterside Workers Union has to be competent.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I do not think that is so. Anybody who liked to go on the wharves used to be able to become a member of the Waterside Workers Union.

HON. R. BEDFORD: He cannot last, though.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Another Bill was the Meatworks Bill. As hon. members know, that is a Bill which we threw out because the Government wanted to commandeer the meatworks on any terms they liked. We insisted that they should be taken over on just terms. That was denied to us, and because we would not give way on that the Government threw the Bill out. To show how wrong they were, last year they brought in a Sugar Cane Prices Boards Bill, giving them the right to take over the sugar-mills under certain circumstances. There the Council agreed, and the Government endorsed it, that they should only be taken over "on just terms"—the very words we tried to put in the Meatworks Bill. Then we had the Local Authorities Bill, which we threw out because it contained the objectionable clause with relation to the adult franchise. We have always held that the man who "pays the piper" should "call the tune."

HON. H. LLEWELYN: Everybody pays rates indirectly.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I believe the man who pays his rates should have the right of saying how the money should be spent.

HON. R. BEDFORD: A landlord who lets his house does not pay the rates; the other fellow pays them in the rental.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Why should a man who is not likely to be called on in any way to pay the cost of any borrowing be able to say "We will borrow £50,000 in this particular local authority"? He can pass a loan, put his hat on, and walk anywhere he likes, and leave the other man to bear the cost. We looked upon that as an iniquitous thing, and we accordingly threw out the Local Authorities Bill. The Commonwealth Powers Bill was another which we looked upon as iniquitous. The Bill was brought in to hand over to the Commonwealth powers which we had retained under the Federal Constitution, and which the people, at two referenda, had stated they did not want to be handed over. We would have been false to our duty had we allowed that Bill to go through here. We were absolutely justified in throwing that Bill out. That is one of the things we have to justify

before the people. That certainly is one of the particular things the public knew of when they voted for us on 5th May, 1917. Then there was the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Bill, which was brought in to make contractors pay money that they were not bound by law to pay. We considered that was a most improper thing to do, so we threw the Bill out. Then in 1917 we passed out, first of all, the Chillagoe and Etheridge Railways Bill. Will any hon. member say that we were wrong in doing that?

HON. R. BEDFORD: Yes.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Why?

HON. R. BEDFORD: Because it is a trunk line that should be taken over.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The Select Committee appointed by the Council showed that there was absolutely no justification for spending public money on that railway at that particular time. If further evidence is brought forward to show that the proposition is a good one now, and that we are justified in spending half-a-million on it, no doubt the Council will pass the Bill.

HON. R. BEDFORD: It looked a better scheme to pay £950,000 for the railway than to pay £450,000.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We did not think so. We turned down both. We also passed out the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill.

HON. T. M. HALL: We did not pass it out. We amended it.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Yes, we amended it. We offered the Government a most democratic addition to their Bill in the shape of the recall, and they would not agree to it.

HON. H. C. JONES: You would not apply it to yourselves, though.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We are quite prepared to apply it to ourselves if the Government can show us how we can do so. The people have the power of recall under the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908; but we shall not object if the Government like to bring in an amendment applying the recall to both this Chamber and the Assembly. (Hear, hear!) In that Bill we also wanted to give the people some say in the spending of their own money. We wished to give them some control over the financial proposals of the Government. Was that not a democratic thing to do? I think the people who find the money should have the right to say how it shall be spent. The Government also brought in the Requisition of Ships Bill. I am sure the public of Queensland will say we were perfectly justified in refusing to pass that Bill. The Government wanted to commandeer those ships so as to assist the unionists who were then on strike, and we objected to that. Not only did they want to commandeer the ships, but they actually wanted to commandeer every man who was working for the shipping companies. They wanted to conscript men under that Bill. We objected to that, and that our objection was well founded was evidenced by the fact that later on the Federal Government saw the necessity of stopping the game of the Queensland Government, and said that if the Bill were passed here they would not recognise it under the War Precautions Act. Then we had another

Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

Bill sent here which we improved very materially by our amendments, but the Government would not accept those amendments. I refer to the State Iron and Steel Works Bill. We considered that State iron and steel works were an absolute necessity in Queensland, and we still hold that view. But we are asked to give the Government a blank cheque, as we have been asked on several occasions since. Their own Public Works Commission reported that only £5,000 was required for a start for the purpose of making pig iron. We thought it a fair thing to give them £100,000, and when they grumbled at that we offered them £150,000, although we knew they could not spend anything like that amount before Parliament met this year. Apparently the Government members in this Chamber were satisfied with that; but when the Bill went to another place, they would not accept the £150,000, with the result that the Bill is not law yet.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Did the Government representative in this Chamber accept it?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Yes, he seemed to be perfectly satisfied to accept £150,000. Since then the Public Works Commission have endorsed our action on that occasion by saying that £150,000 is a fair amount for a start. (Hear, hear!) If it can be shown, after that money has been expended, that there is a justification for further expenditure, then the Council will have no hesitation in giving the Government whatever is wanted, so long as we know the specific sum they require and the purpose for which it is to be spent. Then we had the Many Peaks-New Camindah Railway sent to us for approval. No hon. member can justify that. The railway would have involved an expenditure of something like £500,000, and we would have had to borrow the money at 5 per cent. or 5½ per cent., although the Commissioner for Railways reported that the line would not return more than 10s. per cent. Was that business we were likely to consider, or that we were going to pledge the country to? I say no. That is another thing we can justify.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The best line in the State.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Then it says very little for the others. How can it be said that it would be the best line in the State when the Commissioner said it would only return 10s. per cent., and some of our lines are returning 3 per cent. and 4 per cent., although, taking the railways as a whole, the Government are only getting a return of £1 7s. 6d. per cent.?

HON. L. McDONALD: The Commissioner does not know that country as well as the Secretary for Mines.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The people of Maryborough, Bundaberg, and Eidsvold are all against the line.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It will be time enough to build the line when the mines have been proved. We also amended the Land Act Amendment Bill, No. 3, which proposed to break a contract that was made by a previous Government with the pastoral lessees, and to compel them to pay very much more rent upon reassessment than the increase of 50 per cent. that was agreed upon in the contract made between them and the Government. We regarded that as something that no Government should do, and

as a thing that the State of Queensland should not endorse; and I say we were perfectly justified in our action.

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: That is your long suit.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We have a lot of long suits.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Justify your action on the State Enterprises Bill and the Insurance Act Amendment Bill.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I will come to both those Bills directly. What have we done this session? We refused to pass the Valuation of Land Bill, and I am sure we had ample justification for that. We do not want to multiply the appointments that are being made by the present Government. We look upon the Bill as unnecessary. The local authorities are making their own valuations at the present time, and doing good work. They are the people who know best the conditions in their own areas, and they are best able to carry on their own affairs. We also threw out the Trades Hall Bill.

HON. L. McDONALD: That was absolute prejudice.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Mere spite.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: There was no prejudice about it. We had to consider the question of public parks in and around Brisbane. This was the only park in that neighbourhood.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: Only about one-eighth of an acre would have been taken out of the park, and you know people are living in hovels—eight and nine houses to an acre.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It is the people in the hovels whom we were considering. We wanted to give the people a little more fresh air.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Naboth's vineyard.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We also amended the Insurance Act Amendment Bill, which proposed to give the Commissioner practically unlimited power of borrowing, and power to go outside Queensland and risk the money of the State.

HON. R. BEDFORD: No. He was going to compete with the private insurance companies outside the State, and that was your trouble.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: That was not our trouble. Our trouble is that we do not want the money of the people of Queensland to be risked in outside ventures. We say there is a sufficient field for the Commissioner inside Queensland, and when the business of State insurance is fully developed here it will be quite time enough to consider the advisability of going outside. We consider that in this matter a "go slow" policy is prudent; and certainly we do not believe in giving anybody but the Government the right to borrow and spend money as he likes.

HON. E. B. PURNELL: The insurance companies pretty well exploited the public before the Government took a hand, and we have full proof of it.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Then we amended the State Enterprises Bill. That also proposed to give a Commissioner unlimited power to spend money.

HON. R. BEDFORD: We proposed a Minister; you put the Commissioner in.

[Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Well, the Government proposed to give the Minister power to borrow and to spend to any extent he liked. The result would have been that not only would we have had a borrowing Government, but we would have had a borrowing Insurance Commissioner and a borrowing Commissioner or Minister for State enterprises—all of them borrowing and spending as they liked, without any control.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Surely the Labour party do not borrow?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It is one of the planks in their platform. (Laughter.) This Council is not only here to consider and amend legislation, but, although we are supposed not to amend money Bills, we are also here to see that the money of the people of Queensland is judiciously spent, and that it is not spent on unauthorised expenditure to an unlimited amount. We are here to see that it does not go in increases of salaries that are not authorised under the Constitution Act. We are here to see that it is not spent in fighting one branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear!) We are here to see that one section of the community does not take money out of the general revenue to fight another section of the community. It is our duty to protect the people of Queensland, and so long as we are here we will endeavour to do so.

Hon. W. H. DEMAINE: You are here because you are here.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We are here because the people sent us. The Hon. Mr. Demaine's interjection leads me to say that the hon. gentleman and his followers and the body of which he is president furnish another justification for the existence of this Council. (Hear, hear!) This House is the only buffer between the people of Queensland and the hon. gentleman and his followers.

Hon. R. BEDFORD: Who are the people?

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: The people behind the Hon. Mr. Demaine are the majority of the people.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I do not know that.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: You are finding it out gradually.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We are finding that party out, and we are finding the Hon. Mr. Demaine out.

Hon. W. H. DEMAINE: You will find him in.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Now that the hon. gentleman has directed attention to himself, I may say that he and his friends are one of the main justifications we have for being here, and they are the best justification we have for continuing here. (Hear, hear!) A report appeared in the "Daily Standard" of 29th January, 1918—and I presume hon. members will not question its accuracy—containing a report of the meeting of the Labour convention that took place the day before. The Hon. Mr. Demaine was the president of that convention, and he gave an address. I will not read it all. I think that the Government and the hon. gentleman will be sorry for that address before it is all over. In the course of that address the hon. gentleman said—

"And, now, what of the aims and

aspiration of our grand Labour-socialist movement generally?"

And then he went on to say—

"We need first to make the movement more definitely socialistic to have our people realise that Labour objects and ideals are more than high wages and shorter hours."

They are doing very well on those lines now. Not that I object to high wages and shorter hours, but I believe that, if they [4.30 p.m.] get high wages and shorter hours, they should give efficient work in return. If the employer pays good wages, he should get a good return for his money.

Hon. W. J. RIORDAN: We all believe that.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: But your followers do not; there is a good deal of slowing down in their work.

Hon. R. BEDFORD: You don't know what a fair day's work is.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You have never done a fair day's work in your life. You are only good at writing prospectuses for "wild-cat" schemes.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! I must ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to cease these personalities, which are very unbecoming.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: When the hon. member rudely interrupted me I was showing what are the "aims and aspirations" of the Labour party. The Hon. Mr. Demaine further says—

"We need first to make the movement more definitely socialistic, to have our people realise that Labour objects and ideals are more than high wages and shorter hours. These are, of course, necessary during the transition period from wagedom to freedom, but the ideal, the abolition of the wages system, and the substitution of common ownership and control of industry for the common good must be kept more before the people than it has been."

Is that going to commend itself to the general body of the public of Queensland? The hon. gentleman goes on to say—

"Liberty the Watchword."

Is there any liberty in the Labour movement for individual members?

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: Yes.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I say there is very little liberty in the Labour movement.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The PRESIDENT said: Order! I must ask hon. gentlemen once again to cease these interjections across the Chamber, and not to disregard the call from the Chair.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Under the heading "Liberty the Watchword," the Hon. Mr. Demaine says—

"We must educate, agitate, and organise in season and out of season, and 'solidarity' must be our watchword. The industrial unionists who believe that the emancipation of the workers can be attained only through what is termed 'direct action,' must be shown that to attain this, without at the same time attaining control of the political administration is sheer folly. The industrial and political Labour-socialist movement is one

Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

and indivisible, and there must be complete and absolute solidarity of Labour's forces if capitalism is to be overthrown."

Is the overthrow of capital likely to prove attractive to the general body of the people? Where would they be if there were no capital? The Labour party would find it very hard to carry on if there was no capital for them to spend. The Hon. Mr. Demaine then speaks of "The Need of Class-Consciousness," and says—

"One of the educational needs of the hour is to bring the workers to a fuller realisation of the need for a greater class-consciousness amongst them. The fond hope that some of them have that they may become employers and exploiters of labour in due course must be dispelled, and the fact that there can be no possible identity of interest between employer and employees must be driven into their mind."

That is a most obnoxious doctrine. The only way in which the world can go on is by capital and labour, employer and employee, working together, but the Hon. Mr. Demaine says they must be continually fighting. These are his further remarks on the subject—

"We cannot have a true democracy until—"

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the hon. gentleman to point out what connection his remarks have with the matter before the House, as, unless he can show that there is a connection between the two, his remarks will not be in order.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I am trying to justify the existence of this House, and I say that, if this House is abolished and we have only a single Chamber, ruled by people entertaining those views, the whole State will be upset in no time, and Queensland will not be a place worth living in. There will be no capital or anything else here if those people have their way. I contend that I am perfectly justified in showing what will happen to the people if this House is not here to protect their interests. I want to show what risks the people will run if this House is wiped out. The Hon. Mr. Demaine continues—

"We cannot have a true democracy until capitalism is overthrown, and only a class-conscious people can do the overthrowing. Therefore, we must have labour class-conscious and imbued with the knowledge that only by the communalisation, or socialisation of capital, can the interests of labour and capital become identical."

How long will capital and labour be identical if they are bound together under the Labour movement? However, I do not think it is much use going further into the question at the present time. We shall have another opportunity of dealing with it next session, and shall be able then to put our views still more fully before the people. I move as an amendment to the motion—

"That the question be amended by the omission of all words after 'That' with a view to inserting the following:—

"This House disagrees with the principles proposed in this measure, for the following general reasons:—

"1. Because, since all the other States of the Commonwealth retain the bicameral system, its destruction in

Queensland would fatally prejudice the standing and rights of this State, reducing it below the level of all the others, and dislocating the provisions by which due representation in the Federal Parliament is secured to Queensland.

"2. Because some revising Chamber is necessary in order to obtain equity, harmony, and consecutiveness in legislation, as a single Chamber, unbridled and acting before election heat has time to cool, is tempted to force measures through that are partisan, haphazard, and due to momentary impulse. No alternative proposal for a second Chamber, whether elective or otherwise, has at any time been submitted to this Council by the Legislative Assembly. The present Bill proposes even to deprive the people of their constitutional option of having an elective second Chamber.

"3. Because the Legislative Council represents all classes of the community—agricultural, grazing, commercial, mining, and industrial. No class is overlooked, and wherever party interests in the Legislative Assembly clash, the Legislative Council holds an even balance and secures just treatment for all. If the Council were abolished several important classes would be inadequately represented in Parliament—e.g., at present the grazing industry, which is the largest in Queensland, is directly represented by only two out of seventy-two members in the Legislative Assembly.

"4. Because the legislation passed by the Legislative Council in the last fifty-five years (including adult suffrage, local government, Acts relating to factories and shops; wages boards; trade unions; free, secular, and compulsory education; and an increasing body of democratic measures during the past fifteen years) has been in the interests of all classes, without fear or favour, and has resulted in the continuous and substantial progress of this State.

"5. Because the Legislative Council has always assented to Bills that embodied the undoubted will of the people, and has used its powers of amendment reasonably. Many of its amendments, made during the present session, and during past Parliaments, have been welcomed by the Legislative Assembly, and are now statute law.

"6. Because during the present Parliament the Legislative Council has not insisted upon any amendment except where necessary to prevent confiscation, injustice, or wanton interference with business—

e.g. (a) In the Meatworks Bill the only amendment insisted on by this Council was that property acquired by the Government under the compulsory clauses of the Bill should be acquired on 'just terms.' The Legislative Assembly refused to agree to 'just terms.'

"7. Because if the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908 is valid, the Legislative Council's veto or amendments are always subject to a referendum of the people, and such powers are limited to a few months' delay of any measure—a delay which is often necessary in order to allow public opinion to mature

[Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

and to prevent casual and costly experiments in legislation.

"8. Because the abolition of the Legislative Council would remove all checks upon the Legislative Assembly by referendum or otherwise, and the people would be robbed of their right of appeal.

"9. Because the abolition of the Legislative Council would place the Judiciary and the Land Court at the mercy of the dominant party in a single-chamber Legislature; and would shake the security of tenure of officers such as the Auditor-General, the Commissioner for Railways, and the Commissioner of Police, whose duties are such that they should be freed from all political temptation or menace.

"10. Because there has been no public desire or mandate for such abolition; on the contrary, this Legislative Council, during the present session, has been continually relied on to secure liberties for the people and to defend the rights of the community from rapacious encroachment.

"11. Because at the referendum taken on this express single issue on 5th May of last year, the people of Queensland emphatically refused to be robbed of their constitutional rights, and desired, by an overwhelming majority, to retain the safe form of Government by two Houses. There is every reason why that verdict should be duly respected in the interests of all classes in the community.

"12. Because the present grave period of the war, with so many of the electors of this State absent on active service at the front and elsewhere, and with so many serious tasks of urgent and vital importance engrossing the public mind, is no fitting time for plunging the State into violent and prolonged controversy on matters of constitutional change.

"13. Because in the present world-wide turmoil, industrial, political, racial, and otherwise, there appears to be need rather for strengthening than for undermining any of the constitutional safeguards in any part of the Empire.

"14. Because the Council acts as the permanent co-trustee of the public safety and welfare, and no valid reason has been adduced why the Queensland community, an integral part of the Empire, should be deprived of such protection."

Those are all good reasons which should justify this House in the eyes of the country.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Our one reason is weightier than the whole of your fourteen reasons.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The only reason hon. members opposite have for abolishing the Council is that we have prevented them passing unfair and extravagant legislation, but we are here to defend the rights of the people of Queensland, and, so long as we are here, we shall endeavour to do that to the best of our ability.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I should like to say a few words on this proposition before we go to a vote, but I shall not detain the Council very long. I do not intend to go over the list of measures which have been referred to in detail by the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn, as I do not think there is any need to do so. What I wish to speak about is the

attack which has been made on this Council by several persons, including the Minister, in which attack we are charged with having habitually mutilated Government measures. We amended and rejected a good many measures; but I throw down this challenge to show where this House has in any serious matter interfered with or mutilated any Bill that did not conflict with one of four principles—principles that, so far as I as a member of this House am concerned, I stand by; and I am sure the same can be said of a good many other members in this House. We stand by them, not merely because they are principles which are acceptable to us, but because we think they are vital to the success and the welfare of the community.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: We are not attacking your principles; we are attacking the system.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: The hon. gentleman does not know yet what those principles are. I say that the hon. gentleman, in the measures brought forward, has attacked the principles on which we have had to insist. In the first place, the majority of us in this House stand for the principle of the honouring of public contracts. We will not stand by the dishonouring of the State by the breach of Government contracts. The next principle I wish to refer to is that we object to legislation which is unjust to an individual or a section of individuals, such as has been proposed.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: You have not proved the dishonouring of contracts by the Government.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I do not intend to be drawn into a full discussion of those things. They are notorious.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is all very well with a shake of the hand to make a vague assertion, but you have not proved the dishonouring of contracts by the Government.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I will give one instance alone, and that is the attempt to break the contract of the pastoral lessees. That is one instance, and it is enough for my purpose. I do not propose to go into it. I am merely here to-day to assert certain principles that we stand by and intend to stand by, and to which nearly all the mutilations—so called—can be referred. The second one that I was speaking of was that we will not stand by legislation which is unjust or unfair, or which deprives individuals or a section of the people of their legal rights. Another thing we stand for is the fulfilment by both Houses of the duty imposed upon them by their position of a strict, close attention to the public finances. We are not disposed to depute the responsibility of those things to any Cabinet, or any section of the community, or anybody appointed by the Government in power. It is the duty of Parliament to keep a close view and hold upon the public purse.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES interjected.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to speak? He has no more right to interrupt than any other member in the House.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Look at my speeches; they are full of interruptions.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: If they were, the men who have done it have been guilty of a

Hon. A. J. Thynne.]

rudeness which ought to be reproved. There is too much of it. My pleasure in attending this House is largely marred by the manner in which interruptions go on on both sides of the House. I dislike being in the House when these interruptions are going on. I think, when a member is speaking, it is a personal rudeness and an injustice to the other members for interruptions of that kind to take place. I hope the President will stand by the attitude which he has taken up this afternoon, and prevent it as much as possible. The third point I was speaking of was the control of the public funds. The idea of passing that responsibility or that duty on to anybody else who is not strictly under the control of Parliament is, I think, a breach of the duty of Parliament, and one which I hope this Council will endeavour to resist as long as possible. Another principle is that we stand as far as possible for not only the control of the finances, but the control of that legislation which we depute to various bodies to enact. The old system of giving the Executive or any body the power to make by-laws which shall be a part of the law, without this House having a say in the acceptance or approval of it is against the solid principles of Parliament. Those are things to which we have stood up and on which we have amended and rejected measures. Another thing we stand for, as far as we have been able to do it, is the integrity of our courts of justice. It has been said here at various times that the Government have received a mandate from the people for this, that, and the other. That mandate contains a great many clauses, according to the account given of it. I say that no mandate can be presumed to be given by the people which involves either a breach of public contracts, unfair legislation, or neglect of duty on the part of Parliament. All the mandates are more or less liable to qualification, but those are qualifications that are essential to the existence of every mandate which can be claimed by any party. Those are the main things by which this Council apparently has acted; and so long as the Council stands on those lines, unless some cataclysm comes over the people of this State, this House will stand high in the confidence of the people of the State. Any neglect of, or departure from, those will bring dishonour to this House, and will be much to be deprecated. I trust that every member of this House will appreciate the obligations he has taken in accepting the honour of a seat in this House. It has been said that this House is one which is specially hostile to the existing Government. I have been in this House now for nearly thirty-seven years, and I have never known a Government in this country who have not had opposition in this House. For seven years or so I occupied the position which the Minister has now, and I had to contend with opposition and severe criticism of all the measures, and the loss of measures, at the hands of this Council. I have taken part in opposition to Bills that were introduced by various Governments. I have opposed Bills and tried to amend Bills that were introduced by the Government of which I was supposed to be a follower. I say with some pride that I have never been a follower of any political Government while I have held a seat in this House. When I was a Minister I did my duty as well as I could as the Minister in charge of the business committed to me by my colleagues; but

[Hon. A. J. Thynne.

throughout the whole of my career in this House I have taken an independent part, and criticised fearlessly both my friends and my foes, if they were such, at the time. I hope that so long as I am spared to continue to occupy a seat in this House, that will be my attitude.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: You would be partly responsible for the Bills introduced here.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: Yes; and I took very good care that I introduced no Bill that did not get my approval. If the measure was one of which I did not approve, I would not introduce it, and I would not support it.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The same system as ours; it has the approval of the Cabinet.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I hope the hon. gentleman can say that it is so. I do not say whether it is or not. I am speaking of what my experience was.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: But you said you took up an independent attitude.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I took up an independent attitude. I have done so all my life in this House. I took up an independent attitude in the Cabinet as to whether I approved of the Bills coming forward or not. If I did not approve of a Bill coming forward I did not support it, and I did not carry it through in this House. I feel I can now say that, in justice to my colleagues of those days—most of whom, I am sorry to say, are not here to take the part they used to take in the legislation of this State.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: According to your own statement, you must have been the whole Government; if you refused to bring in a Bill which a majority of the Cabinet had accepted it was not gone on with.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: That interjection is quite beside the mark. I accepted office as a citizen of this State, anxious to do my best for this State. I worked hard for it. But unless I was convinced in the Cabinet that the measure was right—and I am proud to say that my colleagues respected my opinions on those matters—unless they were measures I could support, I could not carry them through. I do not think there was one measure I had the honour of piloting through this House that had not my complete support and approval. I think the hon. gentleman made some reference to the Governments of Canada, by interjection, during the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn's speech. I would like here to say that the difference between the status of the State of Queensland and the provincial Governments of Canada is a fundamental difference. Queensland, in all matters within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Queensland, is a sovereign State—independent of the Federal Government, not controlled by anybody except by the Houses of Parliament and the representatives of the King. In Canada the provincial Governments are subordinate States that Queensland is to-day. The evidence of their subordination is that their Governments are persons who are appointed by the Central Government in Canada, and that their functions are very much more limited than are ours. The Constitution is the very opposite of that in Australia. In Australia the functions of the Federal Government are strictly limited, and everything

else goes to the States. In Canada, everything that is not specially allotted to the States—and they are minor considerations which are allotted, compared with what we have to deal with here—goes to the Federal Government. Possibly, under a virile people such as the Canadians have proved themselves there may be no great difficulty or no great failures on their part. I presume we are going to have a division this afternoon, and I do not desire to detain the House any longer, beyond expressing my sincere hope that, whatever may happen, the high standard which I claim this House now enjoys in Queensland, Australia, and elsewhere, will not be marred or stained by any failure or weakness on the part of its present members. (Hear, hear).

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: At this late hour and at this stage of the debate it would be very inappropriate to detain the House long. I understand there is a desire to have a division on this question this afternoon, and I certainly will not do anything to prevent that. A good deal has been said with regard to the effect of this Bill, if it ever became law, and a good deal has been said with regard to the reasons for bringing it in. I think that the members of this House may be justly proud of the traditions of the Chamber. I think I have heard it said during a previous session that before

[5 p.m.] certain members came into this Chamber they had a very different opinion as to its constitution, its traditions, its sense of justice, its sense of absolute independence. I am glad to know that the sojourn of a session in this Chamber has removed some of their erroneous impressions. If every individual in the State were called upon to cast a vote in the referendum—which some people are apparently determined shall be taken, no matter what the consequences—and if every individual had the same opportunities of forming opinions as to the honesty, integrity, and utility of this Chamber, there would be little or no doubt about the result. Personally I have none now. It is not eighteen months since this matter was referred to the people, and, without a single member of this Chamber raising his voice in support of the retention of this House as one of the bodies constituting Parliament, the people of Queensland by a majority of 63,000 or thereabouts, decided in favour of the retention of the Legislative Council—and that, in the face of a most energetic crusade by members on the Government side in the other place, and by certain members even in this Chamber. So far as I know, not one member of this Chamber who is supposed to oppose the present Government took the trouble to stump the country in support of the existence of this Chamber. The matter was left absolutely to the people of Queensland themselves, and they in their wisdom, and without any exertion on the part of members of this Chamber to induce them to retain the Legislative Council, decided in favour of its retention.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Did you see the pamphlets that were issued?

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: My hon. friend refers to the pamphlets that were issued. He surely does not deny that a large amount of pamphleteering was done on his own side, and a great deal of it not in accordance with truth. If a pamphlet was issued exposing

some of the false and malicious statements, it was only justice to the people of Queensland to give them an opportunity of reading, if not hearing, some of the facts that would justify them in giving the vote they afterwards did in such a substantial form. I trust that, when the matter goes before the people again—which will not be for some months, I presume—the people will have even better opportunities of knowing the truth than they did last time. I understand that there is to be a sum of £12,000 spent in propaganda work. I will not digress by criticising that at the present moment, though, if some of the rumours current are at all reliable, there is room for very keen criticism. However, there will be another opportunity of considering that question, and I shall not delay the House by dilating on it this afternoon. I think Queensland at the present time is fortunate in having a safety-valve—a Westinghouse brake—as a means of preventing the chariot of State from rushing headlong to perdition. This Chamber has, throughout its long existence, invariably brought a calm and deliberate mind to bear on every matter brought forward, and, as the Hon. Mr. Thynne mentioned this afternoon, it is to some extent in opposition to every Government. In other words, it is the cool, calm, and deliberate critic of every Government. What is good in the measures brought forward by each Government receives its commendation, receives its approval, its support. What is pernicious, what is useless, what may lead to evil results, is carefully criticised and excised. If that is not a useful function I am very much mistaken. I would ask hon. members who blatantly and loud-mouthedly say they were brought here to bring about the abolition of the Council to go by their experience and decide the question—in which of the two Chambers, the Legislative Assembly or the Legislative Council, is the better, the keener, the more alert, the more discerning criticism. If one were to judge by the way legislation is run through in another place at the present time, it would appear that measures are considered in the caucus, and, if they get the caucus approval, they get no criticism from the Government and its forty-eight members, and then they are sent up here.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: And the Opposition rely on you.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: There is no truth in that statement. I have been in this Chamber about five years, and I can honestly say that no member of the Opposition has ever asked me to vote for any particular measure or clause before this House. Not that I say there would be anything wrong in it if he did, but it has never been done to me, and, so far as I know, it has never been done to any other hon. member.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: But it is a fact that the Opposition rely on your action here.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The country relies on it too, and says, "Hear, hear! You are doing good work, go ahead." I would like the Minister to answer the question—does he think now that the measures brought in receive that careful, critical attention in the other place that they get in this Chamber from those whom he regards as opponents? Does his own party give them that careful

Hon. T. J. O'Shea.]

consideration which they receive from other members here?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know you are longer getting through here.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: You have not answered my question, and I take it that, if you could, you would.

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: Give notice of it.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: There is too much flippant larrikinism going on here.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rub it in.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: It is time this House rose to the position it was in before these acquisitions.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. F. McDONNELL: You are not in the Police Court now, and you are not going to browbeat us.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: What do I care for your threats? Not a snap!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! I must ask the hon. gentleman to address the House, and not carry on a conversation with individual members.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: If hon. members obeyed the President's mandate and refrained from insulting interjections—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: There would be no occasion for it.

HON. F. McDONNELL: You are very touchy.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I object to being threatened by you.

HON. F. McDONNELL: You are not in the Police Court now.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I can defend myself from you, and from all around you, and I am not going to be thrown off my guard by you or anyone else. It seems that hon. gentlemen on one side make it a rule to make rude and insulting remarks—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: And they think they can continue it—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I think hon. members in this Chamber have something to be proud of in the way they have carried out their duties, and have endeavoured to do what they believed to be best in the interests of the country. There are hon. members here who can ill afford the time they are giving, but they give it generously and without any reward or profit to themselves, and, what is worse than that, they get a good deal of abuse for their efforts to bring about what is beneficial to a large proportion of the people of Queensland.

HON. T. NEVITT: Does that not apply to both sides of the House?

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I am quite prepared to admit that hon. members on both sides devote their attention at times to the measures, but I say that those members in this Chamber who are now so clamorous for its abolition are not those who devote the

[Hon. T. J. O'Shea.

greatest care and attention to measures which come along and demand their attention. They take in globo whatever the Assembly likes to send up to them, without making any effort to criticise it or amend it. For the last three years I have not noticed an important amendment to any measure coming from that side of the House.

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: The strangle-hold is put on by you.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I have never moved an amendment on any measure in this House which I did not honestly believe to be for the betterment of the State. I have not noticed an amendment of any sort that could be regarded as worth taking notice of that has been suggested from the other side. Surely to goodness, it is of some advantage to the State of Queensland that men who are capable of criticising and improving, and men whose honesty cannot be questioned, men whose integrity is above suspicion, should devote their time to improving the hasty legislation which comes from another place! Surely it cannot be said that such a House will be abolished or done away with!

HON. W. J. RIORDAN: The only time you reckon it is hasty is when it interferes with your class.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I have been a worker all my life, and will be till I die. I am not representing any class. If anything emanates from any side of the Chamber which is worthy of approval and support, it can always command my sympathy, it does not matter where it springs from. I am sure hon. members will have noticed that members on this side of the House frequently propose amendments to improve a clause. Somebody else suggests an alternative. I have done it myself, and I have frequently heard other hon. members say, "That is better than my suggestion. Adopt that." Surely criticism, scrutiny, observation of that sort is beneficial? Why should the people do away with this Chamber?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The people outside can do that.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The people outside do not frame the laws.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We are attacking the system. The people say we have no right to be here.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I thank the hon. gentleman for his interjection. He says: "The people say we have no right to be here." What could be stronger than the vote of 5th May, 1917, when the people said by a majority of 63,000 that they wanted this Council retained? That was a very much larger majority than the hon. gentleman's party got at the polls in March last. The hon. gentleman frequently boasts of that majority.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We got a two-to-one majority.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The Government got a two-to-one majority of members in the Assembly; but they only got a 5 per cent. majority of those who voted at the polls. This House got a 50 per cent. majority, or more. Which is the greater—a majority of 50 per cent. or a majority of 5 per cent.? A majority of over 50 per cent. of the people said: "We want to retain the Legislative Council of Queensland."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: How can you say that a majority of two to one is not greater than the majority this Council got?

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: Of those who voted in March last, the Government had a majority of a little over 5 per cent. In the vote for the abolition or the retention of the Legislative Council, something like 101,000 voted in favour of the abolition, and 164,000 voted for the retention of the Council, giving a majority in favour of this House of somewhere about 63,000.

Hon. F. T. BRENTNALL: Sixty-three thousand nine hundred.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I thank the hon. gentleman for his wonderful memory for figures; it is better than mine. That is a majority of more than three to two. At the general election in March last the Government secured something like 52½ per cent. of the votes polled as against 47½ per cent. of the votes polled for the Opposition. The Government therefore had a majority of 5 per cent. as against a majority of over 50 per cent. in favour of this Council. And still the Minister says "Two to one." I am sorry for his method of computing ratios if he thinks his contention is correct. He talks of a two-to-one majority in the Assembly; but I think he and his colleagues would very much prefer a majority of three or four instead of a majority of twenty-four. They would find that majority much more amenable than the present majority of twenty-four. The tail is wagging the dog now.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is the newspaper cry. We read that in the "Daily Mail" this morning.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The hon. gentleman knows very well that Ministers have more to fear from their so-called supporters than from their political opponents. They get more knocks and kicks and growls from behind than they do from in front.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They are a very united party; we can assure you on that point.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: We know very well that this measure would never have come before this Chamber, and it would never go to a referendum again, if the Ministers of the day had the right to decide the question; but they have not.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: Who told you this?

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: As has been said in this Chamber before, they are being pushed on, and they are putting the best front they can on the matter.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: Who told you this? It is only a surmise.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The hon. gentleman cannot deny it.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: I can deny it.

Hon. H. LLEWELYN: It has been in our fighting platform for a long time.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I have just as good opportunities as some other people of gauging the honest opinions of men at the head of the Labour party, whose opinions are worth respecting, and I feel certain that, if the level-headed, capable, honest men at the head of that party were allowed to carry out their honest convictions and their policy, we would not have this measure before us to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If you are in the confidence of any Minister or any member of the party, you should say from whom you get your information.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I am not in the confidence of any Minister or any member of the party with regard to that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You should say who your informant is, lest it should be inferred that I was.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: The hon. gentleman was not my informant; but I am certain that, if the hon. gentleman had his own way, this measure would never go to the country.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is mere assumption.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I do not need to be told that. Give me certain facts and give me a man with an honest, capable faculty for forming an opinion, and I can draw a pretty good conclusion as to what his opinion will be.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: The great mind of the Hon. Mr. O'Shea!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I can afford to disregard these sneers. They do not affect my equanimity.

Hon. E. B. PURNELL: You get plenty of them in your caucus.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: I do not; but I can give and take knocks without any venom in them. After it is all over, there is no malice on my part. It is all in the game; it is good cricket; and, even if the game is strenuous, that is not to say that it should be at all malignant. So far as I am concerned, it is not. I do not wish to detain the Council any longer. The subject is of very great importance, and the sooner we face the critical position in which we are placed the better. We shall have another opportunity some months hence of further dilating on it, and for that reason I shall not delay the Council, as I understand there is a general desire to take a division before 6 o'clock. I conclude by saying that I trust the campaign which will follow—although it may never materialise—will be conducted in a straightforward and dignified manner, and that there will be no recriminations on either side. I trust that it will be conducted in a spirit of fairness, and with an honest endeavour to arrive at the will of the people that we hear so much about. I trust that no unreasonable or undignified methods will be adopted to coerce people to vote one way or another; that people will be left to their own honest decisions as to whether or not this Chamber is a necessity and an advantage to the State of Queensland. If that principle is carried out, I have no doubt whatever what the result will be, or that you, Mr. President, will long continue to enjoy your present office. (Hear, hear!)

* HON. F. McDONNELL: It is hardly necessary for me to explain my attitude on this question. I have already voted for two Bills similar to this, and I am going to vote for this Bill. I have had nearly twelve years' experience in this Chamber, and the longer

Hon. F. McDonnell.]

I am here the more I am convinced that this Council is a body that should not exist. I have never seen any benefit from it. Talk about hasty legislation! I have seen more hasty legislation passed in this Chamber while I have been here than ever I saw in the other place. I have seen venerable old gentlemen sit up all night to see important measures put through, they were so anxious to pass them. But I have never yet seen a measure that has been improved by this Chamber. The Hon. Mr. O'Shea said that the country was stumped by those who supported this measure at the last referendum. I interjected that there were pamphlets issued by the other side. I would just like to point out in that connection that a committee of hon. gentlemen representing the side who are opposed to this Bill approached every elector of Queensland by means of literature, and it is very questionable if their facts were quite correct. Not only did they approach the people by means of pamphlets, but there were cartoons, pictures, and so forth put into the hands of every elector of this State. Not only that, but nearly all the newspapers in Queensland opposed the side that the Government represented. All the wealthy influential papers, both daily and weekly, opposed the abolition of the Council on that occasion. And why was that so? They opposed it in the interests of the vested interests of this State. We know very well that the "Brisbane Courier" and the other daily papers were heavily subsidised. And who subsidised hon. gentlemen on the other side? Who found the big money that was involved in issuing pamphlets to every elector in Queensland? The pastoralists and the other large capitalists, who look on this House as their only protection. I have been here nearly twelve years, and I have seen how difficult it is to get any reform through this House. The greatest possible pressure has had to be brought to bear on hon. members to get them to pass the comparatively few reforms that have been passed in Queensland. I remember years ago when the country was in a lamentable condition, what action was taken by the venerable, pious, religious gentlemen in this House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

HON. A. GIBSON: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman in order in using such language?

HON. F. McDONNELL: I did not say you were one of the religious men. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of being religious.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the hon. gentleman to use language more in keeping with parliamentary usage.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I do not wish to offend anybody. I am simply stating plain facts; and no one dare say they are not facts. You yourself, Mr. President, were fully cognisant of the truth of what I am [5.30 p.m.] saying. In those days you and I, when we were fighting for reforms in another place, found that the barrier in the way of carrying those reforms was this Chamber. This House has been a barrier in the way of needful reforms at all times. This House has always been opposed to reforms until members were practically

[Hon. F. McDonnell.]

forced to accept them. That has been my experience during the whole of my public life, which now extends to twenty-three years, and I can say that it was only because public opinion was so overwhelming that the House accepted the comparatively few reforms which have been placed on the statute-book through the agency of the present Government and the few reforms passed by the Kidston Government. From time to time measures are brought down imposing taxation on the people best able to bear it, and what a fight has been made in this Chamber against those measures—the Income Tax Bill, a Land Tax Bill, and other Bills of that nature! Why has this been so? Has any member on the other side ever come over and voted with members on this side to advance reforms? The Hon. Mr. O'Shea and the Hon. Mr. Thynne have talked about the criticism which has been bestowed on measures by hon. members who are not supporting the Government; but the bulk of that criticism has been in the way of mutilating important measures that the Government have introduced. We, who are supporting the Government, have been prepared to accept any fair and reasonable proposal that would not destroy the fundamental principles of the measures introduced, but we have found, not only this year, but in previous years also, that there has been a "dead set" made by members on the other side in this Chamber against any measures of a liberal tendency. I am not going to say what is the reason why the previous referendum was defeated. There is no use in giving excuses now. The previous referendum was defeated, and the question now is what is going to happen in connection with the next referendum? I am quite satisfied that if the people of Queensland came here and heard what the Hon. Mr. O'Shea called the intellectual discussions which take place, and saw the attitude which hon. members opposite assume towards reforms, they would be very decided in their opinion that the Council should be abolished. My opinion is that it is a pity that we cannot bring a large number of people into this Chamber to see the attitude taken up by hon. members opposite on certain questions, because I am sure that if they were present the fate of this House would be decided in a very certain manner.

HON. B. FAHEY: They have an opportunity of reading the speeches of members.

HON. F. McDONNELL: They are not all students of "Hansard," and, in any case, I think, if they read one or two of the speeches which appear there, that would be quite enough for them. Last week hon. gentlemen occupied three days over the State Enterprises Bill. What would the people think about such conduct if they had an opportunity of seeing what went on in the Chamber? I do not want to go into any personal element or to raise any bitterness. I hope the people of Queensland will have this question fairly and fully put before them. I think the Government are wise in their decision to have both sides of the question placed before the people, so that the people may have a chance of arriving at a fair and impartial verdict on the question. Something similar was done in connection with the Commonwealth referendum, and I

am satisfied that, if it is done in this case, the result of the voting will be far different from what it was on the last referendum. I am glad that there is to be a division on the Bill to-night, and I do not intend to say anything further on the question, except that for twenty-three years I have pledged myself to vote for the abolition of this House, and the longer I remain here the more satisfied I am that the existence of this House is not in the interests of the good government of the State. Measures of a party nature which will tend to the general betterment of the conditions of the people have no chance of getting a fair show in this Chamber, and it seems to me that in order to give reforms a fair chance we must either abolish this House or have in it a majority of men whose opinions are exactly the same as the opinions held by the Government. I am satisfied that if the question of the abolition of the Council is put in a clear way before the people, they will decide it in the affirmative.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: Was it not put in a clear way before?

HON. F. McDONNELL: I am not going to be drawn off the track, but I may say that the question was complicated with a great many others, and that many people did not understand it.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: You do not mean that?

HON. F. McDONNELL: Yes; that is my opinion. I think that, if the question is put fairly before the people by both parties and no bitterness or partisanship is imported into it, the people themselves can be left to decide it, and I believe their verdict will be in favour of the abolition of this Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I rise to oppose the amendment. We on this side of the House have given reasons why the Bill should be passed, and I contend that our one reason is greater than the whole of the fourteen reasons set out in the amendment. However, the amendment indicates that the Council will have another opportunity of discussing the question, which we recognise is of importance to every hon. member. Many members on this side have preferred not to speak, because we are desirous of terminating the session at the end of this week or early next week, but the members who have spoken on this side have made out a remarkably good case in favour of the abolition of the Council and the adoption of a unicameral system of government. A stronger case could have been made out if other members had spoken, but for the reason I have given they have refrained from doing so, in order that we may get on with other business. I hope the amendment will not be carried.

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

CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. R. Bedford	Hon. L. McDonald
" F. Courtice	" F. McDonnell
" W. R. Crampton	" T. Nevitt
" W. H. Demaine	" G. Page-Hanify
" A. Hinchliffe	" I. Perel
" A. J. Jones	" E. B. Purnell
" H. C. Jones	" W. J. Riordan
" H. Llewelyn	" R. Sumner

Teller: Hon. T. Nevitt.

NOT-CONTENTS, 25.

Hon. F. T. Brentnall	Hon. P. J. Leahy
" J. Cowlishaw	" C. F. Marks
" G. S. Curtis	" E. D. Miles
" A. A. Davey	" C. F. Nielson
" A. Dunn	" T. J. O'Shea
" B. Fahey	" A. H. Parnell
" E. W. H. Fowles	" W. Stephens
" A. Gibson	" E. J. Stevens
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor
" H. L. Groom	" A. J. Thynne
" T. M. Hall	" H. Turner
" A. G. C. Hawthorn	" A. H. Whittingham
" J. Hodel	

Teller: Hon. A. H. Whittingham.

Resolved in the negative.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 25.

Hon. F. T. Brentnall	Hon. P. J. Leahy
" J. Cowlishaw	" C. F. Marks
" G. S. Curtis	" E. D. Miles
" A. A. Davey	" C. F. Nielson
" A. Dunn	" T. J. O'Shea
" B. Fahey	" A. H. Parnell
" E. W. H. Fowles	" W. Stephens
" A. Gibson	" E. J. Stevens
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor
" H. L. Groom	" A. J. Thynne
" T. M. Hall	" H. Turner
" A. G. C. Hawthorn	" A. H. Whittingham
" J. Hodel	

Teller: Hon. T. M. Hall.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. R. Bedford	Hon. L. McDonald
" F. Courtice	" F. McDonnell
" W. R. Crampton	" T. Nevitt
" W. H. Demaine	" G. Page-Hanify
" A. Hinchliffe	" I. Perel
" A. J. Jones	" E. B. Purnell
" H. C. Jones	" W. J. Riordan
" H. Llewelyn	" R. Sumner

Teller: Hon. R. Bedford.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 25.

Hon. F. T. Brentnall	Hon. P. J. Leahy
" J. Cowlishaw	" C. F. Marks
" G. S. Curtis	" E. D. Miles
" A. A. Davey	" C. F. Nielson
" A. Dunn	" T. J. O'Shea
" B. Fahey	" A. H. Parnell
" E. W. H. Fowles	" W. Stephens
" A. Gibson	" E. J. Stevens
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor
" H. L. Groom	" A. J. Thynne
" T. M. Hall	" H. Turner
" A. G. C. Hawthorn	" A. H. Whittingham
" J. Hodel	

Teller: Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. R. Bedford	Hon. L. McDonald
" F. Courtice	" F. McDonnell
" W. R. Crampton	" T. Nevitt
" W. H. Demaine	" G. Page-Hanify
" A. Hinchliffe	" I. Perel
" A. J. Jones	" E. B. Purnell
" H. C. Jones	" W. J. Riordan
" H. Llewelyn	" R. Sumner

Teller: Hon. G. Page-Hanify.

Resolved in the affirmative.

GOVERNMENT LOAN BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

The second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Hon. A. J. Jones.]

METROPOLITAN AND IPSWICH WATER
SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

(*Hon. W. F. Taylor in the chair.*)

Question stated—That lines 6 to 15, clause 1, be omitted (*Mr. Hall's amendment*).

HON. T. M. HALL: When the Bill was before the Committee the previous evening, it was discussed from the standpoint of whether Ipswich voluntarily came within the area or whether it had been dragged into it, and, in order to get an expression of opinion from those interested in the Ipswich area, it was deemed advisable that an opportunity should be given them to express their opinion. In order to provide that opportunity, he asked permission to withdraw his amendment with a view to submitting another amendment which he thought would meet with the approval of the Minister and other hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

HON. T. M. HALL moved the insertion, after line 21, of the following words:—

“The Governor in Council shall cause a poll to be taken of all persons whose names appear on the voters' roll (or such roll revised to the latest practicable date consistent with the due taking of the poll) of any local authority in respect of land comprised within the Ipswich water area constituted under the Water Authorities Act of 1931 (and for this purpose shall, if necessary, cause such roll to be compiled), upon the following question: ‘Is the Ipswich water area to be combined with the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage District in accordance with the provisions of the proposed Bill?’

“Such poll shall be taken on a day to be fixed by the Governor in Council, not being later than the thirtieth day of November, 1918, but if for some unforeseen reason such poll cannot be taken on the day so fixed, then upon some later day to which the taking of such poll has been postponed by the Governor in Council. The poll shall be taken as nearly as practicable in the manner provided by section 11A of the Local Authorities Acts, 1902-1917, for the taking of a poll of ratepayers with such modification, if any, as the Governor in Council may deem necessary.

“If upon such poll being taken the number of votes given in the affirmative is greater than the number of votes given in the negative, this Act shall forthwith come into full operation; but if otherwise, the Ipswich water area shall not be deemed to be combined in any way or for any purpose with the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage District, and this shall in all respects be deemed to be amended accordingly, and any provision therein for the abolition or dissolution of the Ipswich water area and the Ipswich Water Authority, respectively constituted as such under the Water Authorities Act of 1931, shall have no force, effect, or operation whatsoever.”

If that amendment were carried, the various amendments standing in his name, with perhaps one small exception, would be rendered unnecessary.

[*Hon. T. M. Hall.*]

HON. H. LLEWELYN: Did the amendment make it clear that every ratepayer in the Ipswich district would have a vote on the question?

HON. T. M. HALL: Every ratepayer on the municipal roll.

HON. H. LLEWELYN: Those that had water now would have a vote, and those that had no water would not have a vote?

HON. T. M. HALL: Every ratepayer on the Ipswich voters' roll will have a vote.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He hoped that the Committee, on second thoughts, would pass the Bill without submitting that question to a vote of the ratepayers of Ipswich; but, if the Committee were not in the temper to do so, then he would accept the amendment. With all due respect to the legal gentleman who had drafted the amendment, he thought the amendment could have been put more briefly.

HON. T. M. HALL: You are not blaming me for it?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Hon. Mr. Hall, the Hon. Mr. Fowles, and others, he supposed, had drafted the amendment. A brief amendment, saying that “This Act shall not have any force or effect nor come into operation until the ratepayers of Ipswich have had an opportunity of voting on the question,” would have been sufficient.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: That would not do, as that would tie up the Brisbane portion of the area.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: However, the amendment was acceptable, because it overcame the difficulty they were in the previous evening, and it would give the people of Ipswich—which, after all, was a fair thing—an opportunity of saying whether they wished to come under the

[7.30 p.m.] operation of the Bill or not. It was always a fair thing to submit a question to the people, and he was pleased that so many hon. gentlemen believed in the principle of the initiative and referendum. The only thing he regretted was that the franchise was not quite as broad as hon. gentlemen on his side would like, but in these days, when a spirit of compromise was in the air, they had to accept the inevitable and bow to the will of the majority.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 2—“*Electoral franchise*”—

HON. P. J. LEAHY moved the omission, on lines 7 to 20, of the words—

“After the definition of ‘drainage apparatus,’ the following definitions are inserted:—

‘Elections Act’—The Elections Act of 1915 and any Act amending or in substitution for that Act;

‘Elector’—A person named as such in any electoral roll and enrolled on a voters' roll compiled under this Act;

‘Electoral district’—An electoral district constituted for the time being under the Elections Act;

“In the definition of ‘open to inspection,’ the word ‘ratepayer’ where it twice occurs is repealed, and the word ‘elector’ is inserted in lieu thereof.”

The franchise question had been fully debated on the second reading, and the Minister knew, from the opinions expressed

by hon. members, that a majority of hon. members were opposed to the adoption of the parliamentary franchise under the Bill, as proposed in the clause. He would, therefore, content himself with merely moving the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES regretted that the amendment should have been moved. The Government stood on the broad principle of the adult franchise in connection with parliamentary elections, referenda polls, local government polls, and polls under the Bill now under consideration.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Why stop at twenty-one years of age? Every child drinks water.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: They are not going to stop at twenty-one. They are going to reduce the age to eighteen, if they are permitted.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That was quite another question. Some people at the age of eighteen were just as able to record an intelligent vote as others at the age of eighty.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Some are never capable of giving an intelligent vote.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He did not want to debate the question at any length, but desired to place it on record that the Government stood for the principle of the adult franchise for all elections, and he hoped to live to see the day when there would be only one roll for all kinds of polls.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: You will live a long life, then.

Hon. T. M. HALL: Are you going to elect the Trades Hall representatives on the same roll?

Hon. W. J. RIORDAN: They wouldn't allow you in there.

Hon. T. M. HALL: I should be sorry to be seen in such company.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He did not think it was proper in that Chamber to speak disparagingly of the Trades Hall. He was not ashamed to say that he had been to the Trades Hall.

Hon. T. M. HALL: I would go there to pull down the red flag.

Hon. W. J. RIORDAN: You would want an army to go and pull down the red flag.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Perhaps, if the Hon. Mr. Hall had his way, no one would be allowed to wear a red rose or a red tie, or to sit in a red car.

Hon. T. M. HALL: It all depends on what the red stands for.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Government were not ashamed to advocate adult franchise for all kinds of polls. Under the restricted franchise proposed to be incorporated in the Bill many water consumers would have no right to vote, although they had to pay for the water. Every person who paid rent paid rates.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: If they pay rates, they will get a vote.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Hon. Mr. Fowles said that every person who wore clothes or ate food paid taxes, whilst the Hon. Mr. O'Shea said that the Domain "dossier" and the "sundowner" should not have votes.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: How many Domain "dossers" are on the water wagon?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The fact that a man did not own property of a certain value should not deprive him of the right to vote. The Hon. Mr. Curtis had expressed the opinion that some men should have ten votes, whilst others should not have more than one.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: He did not say that. He said that every man should have one vote.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Hon. Mr. Curtis wanted to give him (Mr. Jones) one vote and to have ten votes himself because he held different political opinions to the hon. gentleman.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: The Hon. Mr. Curtis was prepared to give votes for intelligence. You might get twenty then.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He thought he would have more than one. (Hear, hear!) They had heard long enough the argument about the loafer not getting a vote; but there were two classes of loafers in the community. There was the poor wretch who had to carry his swag over the country looking for work, and there was what he might call the "white shirt" loafer—the man who did nothing at all, and who was really a greater menace to society than the poor "sundowner."

Hon. G. S. CURTIS: There was a fundamental difference between local government and parliamentary elections. Parliament had power to make laws on all questions whatsoever, whereas local government bodies dealt with such questions as the making of roads and bridges, and providing proper sanitation. If the parliamentary franchise were adopted in connection with local government, those who contributed nothing towards the revenue, and who were in an immense majority, would have it in their power, by means of that majority, practically to confiscate the property of those who had a stake in a district. In effect, the owners of property would be disfranchised, and the control of affairs would be taken out of their hands. It was not unreasonable to conceive of all sorts of "wild-cat" schemes being embarked upon by the large body of non-ratepayers who would have votes to provide employment for a lot of manual labourers; and, if the thing resulted in disaster, it would not matter to them. They would be able to go somewhere else and obtain employment, whereas the property-owners would probably be ruined. It was laid down by John Stuart Mill that only those who contributed to the rates and taxes should be able to vote with respect to taxation or expenditure of any kind, whether general or local; and, further, that any departure from that principle would be a violation of one of the fundamental principles of free government.

Hon. A. A. DAVEY: He thought the Minister had not given the matter due consideration when he expressed the desire that he might live long enough to see the general adoption of the parliamentary franchise in connection with all kinds of polls. There was a very good reason why everyone should have a vote in connection with the making of the laws of the country. That reason was, that everyone in the community had to obey those laws. In free countries no body of people had the right to impose legislation upon all the rest of the people against their will. Hon. members on his side of the Chamber believed in the democratic principle that everyone was entitled

Hon. A. A. Davey.]

to have a vote in regard to the making of the laws of the country. Boiled down, the Minister's argument was that everyone who drank water should have a say in providing the pure water. There was no reason for arbitrarily fixing the age at which the parliamentary franchise should be given, but it had been decided, in the wisdom of the people, to fix the age at which people might be considered fit to exercise the franchise at twenty-one years. Ordinarily, they ought to have a little sense at that age. But he understood the Minister to argue that everyone who drank water should have a vote. If that was so, let them reduce the age to about one year, which, of course, would be an absurdity, as a child one year of age would not have the intelligence to vote. He contended that it was neither right nor reasonable to ask that everyone on an electoral roll should have an equal vote in this matter with the people who were paying the rates and taxes. Everybody living in a free country should be satisfied with having an equal say in the making of the laws, but it was unreasonable to propose that everybody who drank water should have a vote on the question of how the waterworks were to be managed.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: The Minister said that every man who drank water should have a vote. Did the hon. gentleman think that every man who drank beer should have a say in fixing the price of it, or that every man who smoked cigars should have a say in the manufacture of those cigars, or that a man who rode in a motor-car should have a say in the company which manufactured that motor car? The thing was ridiculous. Every man and every woman who was not a lunatic, or who was not in gaol, had a vote at parliamentary elections on reaching the age of twenty-one years, because, as the Hon. Mr. Davey pointed out, they had to obey the laws of the country. But this was a question of giving a vote to those who paid for services rendered.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The very arguments that had been adduced that evening by the Hon. Mr. Curtis and the two last speakers were brought forward against the present parliamentary franchise. He would point out that, under the local option provisions of the Liquor Act, electors on the parliamentary roll could close up an hotel without giving compensation to the hotel-keeper.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: We give him time compensation now.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Again, on the question of whether new licenses should be granted, the vote was taken on the parliamentary electoral roll. Everyone in the community was interested in pure water and electric light, and why should they not have the same voting power in regard to those matters as they had at parliamentary elections? He remembered a case in which one man had his name on thirty electoral rolls in Queensland for a property qualification, and he thought it was a very great hardship to be struck off all those rolls but one when the adult franchise was introduced. The objection to the proposed broadening of the local authority franchise was based on similar grounds, and he thought it could not be sustained.

HON. A. DUNN: One substantial reason why the franchise should not be extended was that this measure involved the borrowing

of money on the security of properties in the area concerned, and only those whose properties were mortgaged should have a say as to whether such obligations should be incurred or not. When borrowing the money, it might be estimated that 6d. in the £1 would be sufficient to cover interest and redemption charges, but it might afterwards be found that 1s. 6d. in the £1 would be required, and the property-owner or his tenant would be called upon to make good that amount. The tenant could evade the obligation by giving up his tenancy, but the property-owner could not evade it, as it stood as a charge against his property until the debt was liquidated. He knew that the Government were very anxious to have the parliamentary franchise adopted in regard to local authority matters; but the proposal was unpopular even among their own supporters in the country, especially those who were property-owners. He knew one shire composed of six members, all of whom had been supporters of the Labour party as long as that party had existed, and yet at the very first meeting of their shire after this matter was brought up in the Local Authorities' Conference they expressed themselves as being entirely out of sympathy with the Government on this matter; and he believed that the same feeling prevailed throughout Queensland. He was sure that the Council had no desire to go against the wishes of the electors as a whole in this matter, and he would suggest that, when the referendum on the abolition of the Council was taken, the Government should ascertain the views of the people on the proposed extension of the local authority franchise, and that was a matter which was likely to crop up and cause a difference between the Council and the Assembly on every Bill of the kind that was introduced. If the question were put to the electors their decision would set the matter at rest for all time.

HON. R. SUMNER: Would you accept their verdict?

HON. A. DUNN: The Council would accept their verdict, he was sure. If the people showed that they desired that the local authority franchise should be extended in the way proposed by the Government, he was sure that the Council would offer no further opposition to the proposal.

Amendment (Mr. Leahy's) agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of section 6"—put and passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of section 7"—

HON. T. M. HALL: If the clause were passed as it stood, and Ipswich did not come under the operation of the Bill, then Oxley would be excluded from the Brisbane area. He moved—That after the word "Toowong" on line 51 there be inserted the word "Oxley."

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the people of Ipswich decided when the poll was taken, as provided for in the amendment already agreed to, not to come under the measure, the clause would be all right as it stood, because only Ipswich would be excluded from the Bill, and Oxley was mentioned as being included in the Ipswich division.

HON. T. M. HALL: He accepted the explanation of the Minister, and, with the permission of the Committee, would withdraw his amendment.

[Hon. A. A. Davey.]

[8 p.m.]

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: Oxley, in that case, would be neither in nor out. Mr. Hall was interested in providing for Oxley in either event.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No matter how the poll goes, Oxley will be in the Bill.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Clause 5 put and negatived.

Clause 6 put and passed.

Clause 7 put and negatived.

Clauses 8 to 11, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 12—"Works by Tramway Company"—

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The hon. gentleman would see that if there happened to be a dispute between the board and the Tramways Company with respect to any matter arising under that section, it had to be referred to the Minister. The board would be a department under the Minister, and the Minister could make regulations with regard to the Act; so that really the Minister would practically be deciding his own case. He was sure any Minister would not agree to be put in that position. If there were a dispute between the board and the company, let them have an impartial tribunal to settle the matter. He did not care whom the Minister might suggest, but he suggested that it be a District Court judge, as the dispute would not be very serious. He moved the omission of the following words on lines 39 to 42:—

"The Minister in manner prescribed by the by-laws (which by-laws the board is hereby empowered to make), and the Minister,"

with a view to inserting, in lieu thereof, the words "a District Court judge who."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That sub-clause was in conformity with other Acts on the statute-book. Under the Local Authorities Act any dispute was referred to the Minister.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: And it has always worked well.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They should avoid litigation by leaving the clause as it stood, rather than encourage the submission of the matter to somebody other than the Minister. He was well aware that there was a desire recently in that Chamber, wherever the word "Minister" appeared in a Bill, to eliminate it and put in "Commissioner," or somebody else.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is in clause 14.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They would need to amend clause 14, which read—

"Provided that, if any dispute shall arise between the board and the owner of or person controlling such tramway line or works as aforesaid with respect to any matter arising under this section, such dispute shall be referred to the Minister."

He did not regard the amendment as very important, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would not insist upon it.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 13 to 17, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 18—"Electricity and motive power"—put and passed.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There were three hon. members standing up when the Chairman declared the clause carried.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: They would have to recommit the Bill. He was sure the Chairman would understand that in the buzz of conversation it was very difficult to find out whether it was clause 18 or 23 that was being put.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman should attend to the business. Clause 18 has been disposed of.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It would only mean recommitting the Bill.

Clauses 19 to 24, both inclusive, put and negatived.

Clauses 25 and 26, put and passed.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: He had an amendment which was squeezed out of clause 18, but it would fit in very well after clause 26. He moved the insertion of the following new clause to follow clause 26:—

"Nothing in this Act or the principal Act contained shall empower or be construed to empower the board to compete with a local authority or an electric authority which has been duly authorised to supply electricity."

The reason for the new clause was very clearly stated in the petition from the Ipswich City Council. The Governor in Council had granted authority to a company to supply electric light in Ipswich, and it savoured a little like going back on one's word if the Government, almost before the ink was dry, proposed to establish competition with those who had received the franchise from the Government.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: The Government did not grant a monopoly.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It was a strange policy to refuse electric light to places like Balmoral and other places that had returned Liberal members to the Assembly, and then to pretend to give power to supply electric light to three or four companies in Ipswich, which was pretty enlightened at the present time.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It is a great pity they did; but the company should not get a monopoly.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The petition put it this way—

"The board should not, your petitioners submit, be allowed to abrogate the powers and privileges or become a competitor of the Ipswich Electric Supply Company, as contained in their Order in Council, which was given them by the Governor in Council at the request of the local authorities in and around Ipswich; such a step would be contrary to all precedent. Nor should the board, by becoming a competitor, be allowed to abrogate or interfere with the power given to the city council to purchase the company's plant and works at the end of fifteen years, which may, in that time, become a very valuable asset to the council."

Hon. E. W. H. Fowles.]

The city council had the right of purchasing the plant at the end of fifteen years, and it was hardly fair for Parliament to step in. Water and lighting were purely local affairs, and the local authorities should be allowed to make all they could out of them, giving the people the best supply, and cutting down the rates by the small profits they might make. It was not a national affair, but a local affair.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: You want to protect the company.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: He wanted to protect the city council. He knew that the City Council of Ipswich was looking forward to getting that plant at the end of the fifteen years.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Bill was "A Bill to amend the Metropolitan and Ipswich Water Supply and Sewerage Acts, 1909 to 1915, in certain particulars," and the hon. gentleman now proposed to insert a clause which was trying to amend the principal Act, when the Bill said that that Act should be amended only "in certain particulars," and the new clause was really outside the scope of the Bill.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Clause 18 amends the principal Act.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Clause 18 said—

"Subject to any general Act in force for the time being regulating such matters, or any of them, the board may enter upon and continue the manufacture of electricity."

That was subject to any general Act in force. He hoped the hon. gentleman would not insist on the amendment, as he doubted very much whether it was in order.

HON. F. McDONNELL: To his mind the amendment had been moved to protect the Brisbane Electric Light Company. Why should that company be protected against the local authorities or against the water authority which was elected by the ratepayers? The Hon. Mr. Fowles asked why they should allow competition to take place, seeing that company had the right to supply electric light for fifteen years? The same thing applied to the Brisbane tramways. The people of Brisbane were suffering from the fact that the Brisbane Tramways Company had a long franchise, very largely against the interests of the local authorities here, and the hon. gentleman wanted to tie up this water authority from attempting to compete with the Brisbane Electric Light Company. The amendment was a very far-reaching one, and it was well that the Committee should consider it before accepting it. It was generally understood some years ago that the Government were going to erect a large power-house in the Ipswich district, not only to have Ipswich lighted by electricity, but to have that power-house provide electricity for the city of Brisbane. In what position would the new clause place a proposal of that nature? It would simply lock it up in the interests of the Brisbane Electric Light Company.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The amendment was rather an important one, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would not insist upon it. It was so important that it would interfere greatly with the passage of the Bill in another place, and now that hon. gentlemen had agreed to accept the Bill and

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

to give the people of Ipswich an opportunity of taking a poll on the question, they should not amend it in a way that would affect the principles of the Bill. It was a pity, after they had agreed to accept the Bill, to wreck it now by inserting an amendment which they knew would not be accepted by the Assembly. The amendment would have the effect stated by the Hon. Mr. McDonnell.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: He wished to add his powers of persuasion to induce the Hon. Mr. Fowles to withdraw the amendment. It certainly would have a very far-reaching effect, and it was going to make a present to a private company of something they were not entitled to get. It was quite true that the City Electric Light Company had received a concession from the Government to supply electric light to the city of Ipswich. He regretted very much that they had received the concession, but they had not received any monopoly, and the new clause, if agreed to, would give them a monopoly to which they were not entitled. That was one of the things the Council was so often charged with—that it was always on the lookout to protect the interests of capitalistic concerns and to sacrifice sometimes public interests for those concerns. That would be the effect of the amendment, if carried. He hoped the hon. gentleman would agree to withdraw the amendment, or, if he persisted in it, that the Committee would not accept it, because it was not a fair thing that they should make a present of a monopoly right to that big corporation. He hoped the Minister would press the matter to a division, and that the Committee would not give away something so valuable and which it was not competent to give.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There would be nothing to prevent the Government giving any other company the right to supply electric light to Ipswich.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Why prevent this public body from doing it?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: According to the title of the Bill, that public body was supposed to supply pure water. This was a water scheme, not an electric light scheme.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Read clause 18.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The supply of electric light was quite outside the purview of the Bill, and he had to bring in the amendment because there was [8.30 p.m.] nothing to prevent the Government to-morrow giving an Order in Council to any other company to supply Ipswich with electric light.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The amendment was evidently intended to prevent the water board from competing with the City Electric Light Supply Company. Why should the water authority be prevented from supplying electric light? Without reflecting on the personnel of the water board, he had always thought from the outset that it was unfortunate that they did not follow the example set by South Australia, and, when the principal Act was introduced, create a Government water supply department. That would have been more satisfactory than the present system, and he was sure the work would have been more economically carried out than under the present system. It was quite evident that the amendment was introduced in the interests of the Brisbane Electric Light Company. They had had a sore experience

in the past in connection with franchises of that nature, which had tied up cities for fifteen or twenty years; and, no doubt, the amendment would have the effect of tying up Ipswich for another fifteen years, and all to further the interests of a certain company.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: Only last session they passed a small Bill to remove the disabilities under which local authorities had laboured for a generation past, and now it was proposed to subject the Ipswich local authority to a similar restriction. The amendment would practically put back the clock, and would restrict the operations of the water board in favour of private enterprise.

HON. T. M. HALL: He did not think the hon. member had a grip of the situation. The city of Ipswich was desirous of obtaining a twentieth century system of lighting, and the city council applied for an Order in Council to carry out the work of supplying the city with electric light. That would involve a large expenditure. A company then offered to supply electric light for a certain number of years, the undertaking to be taken over at the end of that time by the local authority.

HON. W. H. DEMAINE: They should have done it themselves.

HON. T. M. HALL: They would have been delighted to have done it themselves, but, unfortunately, the party opposite took up the rôle of the dog in the manger. They would neither allow the local authorities to supply electric light nor would they carry out the undertaking themselves. In the district in which he resided the local authority would be only too pleased to undertake the work, but the Government would not give them an Order in Council, nor would they do the work themselves, and people had to resort to a rushlight method of illuminating their premises. It was all very well to talk about private enterprise, but people were compelled to turn to private enterprise when they could not get things done with the assistance of the Government. If local authorities asked the Government for money for lighting purposes, they were immediately told that the Treasury was empty, and the progress of the community was retarded because the Government would not find the necessary money. The Government had given the city of Ipswich the right to get a company to supply them with electric light, and the city council had entered into an arrangement with that company under certain conditions, and now the Government proposed to allow the water board to enter into competition with that company, thereby interfering with the arrangements already made by the city council, with the result that the people of Ipswich would be unable to acquire a lighting plant of their own when the franchise given to the electric light company had expired. Having given the Ipswich City Council the power to make a bargain with another company, it was wrong to allow the water board to start in opposition.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There would be something in the argument of the Hon. Mr. Hall if the Ipswich Electric Light Company had got a concession from the Government and had a monopoly to supply Ipswich with electric light; but that was not so. The amendment would give the company a monopoly that it did not possess at

the present time. He thought the amendment was introduced in the interests of a lighting company, and there was no question that it was foreign to the Bill. He would again refer hon. members to clause 18, which gave the board power to supply light and power. Why amend the Bill in such a way as to take all the effect out of that clause just in order to give a concession to a lighting company that it did not possess before the Bill was introduced, and which it should not possess?

HON. T. M. HALL: He knew nothing about the matter from the standpoint of any electric light company. His only knowledge on the subject was obtained from the petition presented by the Ipswich City Council. Paragraph 19 of that petition read—

“The board should not, your petitioners submit, be allowed to abrogate the powers and privileges, or become a competitor of the Ipswich Electric Supply Company, as contained in the Order in Council, which was given them by the Governor in Council at the request of the local authorities in and around Ipswich; such a step would be contrary to all precedent. Nor should the board, by becoming a competitor, be allowed to abrogate or interfere with the power given to the city council to purchase the company's plant and works at the end of fifteen years, which may, in that time, become a very valuable asset to the council.”

That was all he knew about the matter.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: Perhaps he might be able to give a little information that would be of some use. Going back a little in the history of electric lighting and the manufacture of electric appliances, the original concessions that were granted in Great Britain to electric light companies were for the period of twenty-one years. It was found from experience that it took at least ten years after the establishment of a company before the business began to pay expenses. That system was continued for a considerable time, with the result that Great Britain lost control of the business of manufacturing electric appliances and electric machinery, and the whole industry was driven to Germany. Afterwards the British Parliament increased the period from twenty-one years to forty-two years; but it was too late then to remedy the evil and to recover the business that had been driven into German hands. Another principle that had been established in the old country, as the result of their bitter experience, was the laying down of the rule that, where one electric authority was operating in a district, no other electric authority should be allowed to enter into competition with it. There was no prospect of success for one or the other if there was undue competition, and the protection provided against a monopoly was the limitation in the Order in Council of the charges the company could make. He had occasion many years ago to study this subject, and nothing impressed him more than the folly of taking too narrow a view in giving Orders in Council for electric lighting. If they had two authorities in the same district and they put a proper limitation on the maximum charges which might be made, neither authority could succeed. It seemed to him that in this matter where there was already an Order in Council authorising the municipality to supply electricity, it would

Hon. A. J. Thynne.]

only be courting disaster for both the municipal council and the Water and Sewerage Board if they were both allowed to compete in the same locality. That was why the wise provision to which reference had been made was inserted in the Local Authorities Act—the provision that the local authority should not take up the supply of gas or electrical lighting where there was any authority supplying those things, unless that authority was absorbed. The restriction was imposed for the purpose of making sure that there should be a fair chance of the undertaking succeeding.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: By restricting competition?

HON. A. J. THYNNE: By restricting competition and imposing a reasonable limitation on the charges. He might be pardoned for saying that it was he who prepared and introduced in Parliament the Electric Light and Power Act. That was a measure to which a great deal of close consideration was given, and in the preparation of which he had the splendid assistance of the late Mr. Hesketh. He understood that in this particular case the local authority had already got an Order in Council, and it seemed to him that it was most undesirable, so long as that Order in Council was in existence, to court failure by enabling another authority to enter the field in competition with the local authority. The water board authority would, of course, be a local authority, but it would be elected by a different constituency from that which elected the Ipswich Municipal Council, and some of its members would be chosen by persons who had no interest in Ipswich. Instinct, as well as reason, led him to disapprove of the issuing of two Orders in Council for the same territory.

Question—That the new clause proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Fowles's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

CONTENTS, 19.

Hon. F. T. Brentnall	Hon. J. Hodel
„ G. S. Curtis	„ P. J. Leahy
„ A. A. Davey	„ C. F. Marks
„ A. Dunn	„ C. F. Nielson
„ B. Fahey	„ T. J. O'Shea
„ E. W. H. Fowles	„ A. H. Parnell
„ A. Gibson	„ W. Stephens
„ H. L. Groom	„ A. J. Thynne
„ T. M. Hall	„ H. Turner
„ A. G. C. Hawthorn	

Teller: Hon. T. M. Hall.

NOT-CONTENTS, 13.

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

Teller: Hon. G. Page-Hanify.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 27—“*Amendment of Schedule II.*”
—put and negatived.

Clauses 28 and 29 put and passed.

Clause 30—“*New Schedules VI. and VII.*”—

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: If the Ipswich people decided not to come under the provisions of this Bill the schedule would not be in harmony with the provisions of the Bill, and he would suggest that the Minister

[*Hon. A. J. Thynne.*

should postpone this clause and the schedule until he was able to get a competent surveyor to supply two descriptions, one of the Ipswich district, and one of the combined districts, to meet such a contingency.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: He was inclined to allow clause 30 and the schedule to remain intact, for the reason that he anticipated that the vote in Ipswich would be favourable to that district coming under the provisions of the Bill.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Couldn't you have two schedules in the Bill?

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, they could have two schedules, and, if the vote was in opposition to the scheme of the measure, there was no doubt that clause 30

and the schedule would be erroneous. To meet that difficulty a better suggestion would be to negative clause 30 and the schedule, and allow it to be amended in the Legislative Assembly. Then it could come back to that Chamber in its amended form. That was the simplest way.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I suppose you will not say we are sending down a lopsided Bill if that is the case.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: It would not be the first lopsided Bill they had sent down.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: That is not true. You have no right to say that.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: A good many of the Bills were more than lopsided.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: They were well-balanced when they left this place.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not as good a Bill as he expected. They had agreed on submitting a certain question to the ratepayers of Ipswich, but they strenuously opposed the alteration of the franchise, and were unable to get their way. The Bill was not so much to boast of as the Hon. Mr. Leahy wanted to make out. It was the best they could get under the conditions under which they were governed.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA asked the Minister what use were Schedules VI. and VII. He had honestly searched for their utility. Schedule VII. was a map—a big, clumsy thing at that.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: They are useful as defining the area.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: Clause 4 defined the districts. He was not opposing the inclusion of the schedules, but was really looking for reasons for their existence. He had not consulted an expert on the matter, and that was why he was asking the hon. gentleman if he could tell him.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: One of the schedules was a map, and it clearly defined the area. That was the only answer he could give. He thought his suggestion should be adopted, as being the most convenient way of dealing with the difficulty that might arise in the event of the poll not being carried in favour of the Bill.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: He did not wonder that the Minister was willing to have that arrangement, because, if the Bill were passed and could be accepted by the other House, the original Act would be amended by the insertion of those schedules, altering the sphere of operation of the Brisbane Water Board and cutting out the whole utility of the vote

of the people of Ipswich. He advised the Hon. Mr. O'Shea not to consent to sending the schedule as it stood to the other House. He thought it was essential that the schedule should be amended, or that provision should be made that that schedule should not operate unless the vote of the people of Ipswich was in favour of the proposal.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He thought the Hon. Mr. Thynne had not understood that he (the Minister) proposed to amend the Bill by omitting clause 30 and the schedules, so that Schedule VI. might be amended as suggested by the Hon. Mr. O'Shea.

HON. B. FAHEY presumed that the Minister would give a guarantee that the Bill would come back to that Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Oh, yes.

HON. B. FAHEY: He had no objection to the hon. gentleman, but he always knew the influence of bad company.

Clause 30 put and negatived.

Schedules VI. and VII. put and negatived.

The Council resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments; and the report was adopted.

The third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS REFERENDUM ACT.

PUBLICATION IN "GAZETTE" OF COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS IN POPULAR INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM BILL.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I beg to move, without notice—

"(1.) That, in terms of the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act of 1908, the Legislative Council request that in the case of the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill, which has been 'lost,' the Home Secretary will cause to be published in the 'Gazette' together with the Bill, such amendments thereto as have been made by the Legislative Council.

"(2.) That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded' by the Clerk to the Home Secretary."

This is similar to motions previously passed in this connection.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the Council do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow will be the consideration of the report of the Standing Orders Committee recommending certain alterations to the Code of Standing Rules and Orders, to be followed by the second reading of the Government Loan Bill, the consideration in Committee of the Assembly's message on the Succession and Probate Duties Acts Amendment Bill, and the Stamp Act Amendment Bill, Wages Bill, and the State Enterprises Bill. It has been arranged with hon. gentlemen opposite that the Council will sit on Monday to complete the business of the session. I wish to make that intimation to hon. gentlemen who may be leaving for the country. Probably the business of the session will be completed on Monday.

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at eighteen minutes past 9 o'clock p.m.