

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 20 AUGUST 1919**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 20 AUGUST, 1919.

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

QUESTIONS.

SUGAR CROP FOR 1920.

Mr. BERTRAM (*Maree*), in the absence of Mr. Smith, asked the Acting Premier—

"1. In view of the fact that the agreement between this State and the Government of the Commonwealth, regarding the purchase of the Queensland sugar crop, expires at the end of this season, have any negotiations taken place with reference to next year's crop?"

"2. In the event of the Government entering into a further agreement with the Commonwealth, will he take steps to prevent the Federal Government imposing conditions subversive of the sovereign rights of this State, and safeguard the right of the Queensland Parliament to amend any Act dealing with the sugar industry in any way that experience has shown necessary?"

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

"1. No.

"2. That consideration will not be lost sight of."

EXTENSION OF TICK CLEANING AREA.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. Does he contemplate extending the tick cleaning area of the State?"

"2. If so, what district or districts does he propose to include?"

"3. Before such action is taken in tick-infested districts, will an opportunity be given to stockowners in such areas to express their views and experiences regarding the advisability of such action?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. The direction will be in relation to the extension of the existing cleansing areas.

"3. Not necessarily, but I am always willing to receive the opinions of those interested in all matters relating to stock and agriculture."

LATE PRINCIPAL OF TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGE.

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

"1. Is it a fact that the principal of the Teachers' Training College is about to be retired and appointed to a subordinate position on the staff of the Queensland Museum?"

"2. If so, what is the reason for the contemplated action?"

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. H. F. Hardacre. *Lrichhardt*) replied—

"1 and 2. Dr. Shirley's services have been much appreciated by the Government, but as he attained the full age of seventy years on the 11th August instant, he had, in terms of section 49 of the Public Service Acts, 1896 to 1901, to be retired from the position of principal of the Teachers' Training College, and was so retired as from the 31st December, 1918. His services indeed were so much appreciated that he was retained for four months beyond the age which is ordinarily regarded as the age of retirement. The Queensland Museum is controlled by the Chief Secretary's Department, and I would suggest that the hon. member address to the Chief Secretary the inquiry regarding the re-employment of Dr. Shirley in connection with the Museum."

#### TAROOM SETTLEMENT FOR ABORIGINES.

MR. ELPHINSTONE asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Has his attention been called to a paragraph appearing in the 'Courier,' under date 16th June, wherein a church dignitary, who has recently visited the Taroom Settlement for Aborigines, complained, amongst other things, that the conditions were thoroughly depressing, and that money was being spent there without any real plan or object in view?"

"2. Will he state whether these criticisms are justified, and what steps he is taking to have the conditions remedied, and the expenditure better directed?"

THE HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*) replied—

"1 and 2. Yes: money has not been spent without any real plan or object in view."

#### RAILWAY REVENUE PER EMPLOYEE OF RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

MR. CORSER, in the absence of Mr. Morgan, asked the Secretary for Railways—

"What amount of revenue (net) was produced by the Railway Department, per employee, during the year ended—(a) 30th June, 1919; (b) 30th June, 1914?"

HON. W. N. GILLIES (*Eacham*) replied—

"(a) £17 3s. 9d.; (b) £102 11s. 11d."

#### STRIKES IN STATE BUTCHERIES.

MR. CORSER, in the absence of Mr. Morgan, asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. How many strikes have there been in State butcheries in Queensland during the year ended 30th June, 1919?"

"2. How many shops were affected by those strikes, and what was the total period for which each was closed?"

"3. How many customers, on an average per week, were served by shops affected by the strikes during the year ended 30th June, 1919?"

"4. Were the strikers paid any wages in respect of the time they were on strike; if so, how much?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*) replied—

"1. Four.

"2. (a) Twenty; (b) Townsville, four, nine days; Charters Towers, two, nine days; Mount Morgan, five, five days; Rockhampton, three, five days; Bundaberg, one, one day. Brisbane—Victoria Bridge, eleven days; Roma street, ten days; Woolloongabba, eight days; Valley, nine days; Albion, eight days.

"3. Townsville, 7,000 per week; Charters Towers, 4,000 per week; Bundaberg, 4,000 per week; Rockhampton, 5,600 per week; Mount Morgan, 8,000 per week; Brisbane, 22,000 per week.

"4. No wages paid."

#### PAPERS.

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

Report of the Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane.

Twenty-fourth report of the Auditor-General under the Supreme Court Funds Act of 1895.

#### STATE BUTCHERIES.

On the motion of Mr. GUNN (*Carrievon*) it was formally resolved—

"That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing—

(1) The number of State butcheries in operation in Queensland at date.

(2) Where they are situated.

(3) The average number of customers served by the State butcheries as a whole."

#### DISSENT FROM MR. SPEAKER'S RULING.

##### STANDING ORDER NO. 280A.

MR. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*), in moving—

"1. That so much of Mr. Speaker's ruling, given on Wednesday, the thirteenth day of August, 1919, on the motion 'That the Speaker do now leave the chair,' reported in 'Hansard' for this session (pages 151 and 152), as determines that debate cannot take place on a motion that a Bill be introduced under clause (2) of Standing Order No. 280A, be disagreed with; and

"2. That Standing Orders Nos. 245, 263, and 264, which provide for the second and third readings of Bills upon a 'future day,' have not been affected by the provisions of Standing Order No. 280A."

said: In rising to move the motion standing in my name, I may say I do not move it because I have any hope of its being carried by this Chamber, nor do I move it with any desire of being disrespectful to Mr. Speaker. I desire that the question of how the business of this Chamber should be conducted be cleared up, in order that members on either side may know exactly where they are. The Government of to-day are sometimes the Opposition of to-morrow, and what applies to the Opposition to-day may apply to the Government when they get into Opposition.

THE ACTING PREMIER: You are looking far into the future.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We are not going to discuss that side issue now. The motion is not quite in the form in which I gave notice. There is a slight error in printing it. Shortly, it means, however, that I wish to disagree with Mr. Speaker's ruling so far as it prevents a discussion at the time of the introduction of a Bill, and that it can be put through all its stages in the one day.

The SPEAKER: I would like the hon. gentleman to state clearly what he means by the introductory stage. Is it the motion for leave to introduce the Bill?

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is the point I am going to deal with. There are two methods of introducing Bills into this Chamber. One is by order or leave of the House, which is a plain motion that leave be given to introduce a Bill. That practice is not ordinarily resorted to. Bills which impose a charge upon the revenue require a message from the Governor, and are ordinarily introduced in Committee. That, I take it, accounts for the particular form in which the Dairy Produce Bill was originally introduced last session. That is to say, a preliminary motion is notified and moved after receipt of a message from the Governor, in the following form:—

"That this House, at its next sitting, do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill."

In such case, therefore, the Bill is introduced, not on the first motion that "To-morrow the House will resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole," but on the subsequent motion moved in Committee, "That it is desirable to introduce the Bill." That seems to be the point, Mr. Speaker, upon which you and I, at any rate, have differed in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER: Might I interrupt here? Where would the first stage start when the Bill would not need the introductory Committee stage? A Bill may be introduced which is not a money Bill, and which would not need a Committee stage at all.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Speaker is bringing me to the point of the meaning of the word "stages." The word "stages" can only be interpreted in the sense in which it is used in any particular place. You may speak generally of the stages of the introduction and passing of a Bill through the House. Of course, every step is a stage from that particular point of view. The technical stages generally are regarded as the first, second, and third readings, and you, Mr. Speaker, are speaking of the word in another sense. But in this particular case I say that the word "stages," in the Standing Order, deals more particularly with the second point I am coming to. We are entitled to debate or amend, if necessary, the "motion after notice," which is referred to in the Standing Order. If hon. members will look at the Standing Order they will find that, under paragraph (1), when the conditions to which that paragraph is applicable exist, the Bill may, "on motion after notice, be resumed in a subsequent session of the same Parliament at the point which it had reached in the previous session." There are no words there limiting either amendment or debate.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are relying on paragraph (2)?

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am questioning paragraph (2), but I am referring to paragraph (1) for the purpose of the interpretation. There is no limitation there in regard to amendment or debate of the "motion after notice"—which clearly shows what the Standing Orders Committee had in mind in regard to paragraph (1). I say it is quite reasonable to assume that the committee had that in mind in regard to paragraph (2), because they use exactly the same language. Paragraph (2) says—

"The same Bill may be introduced into the Legislative Assembly on motion after notice, in a subsequent session of the same Parliament—"

That is the same up to that point.

"and passed through all its stages—"

That does not refer to the "motion after notice," but to all the stages of the Bill—

"without amendment or debate, and sent to the Legislative Council for their concurrence."

Therefore, I contend that it was the intention of the Standing Orders Committee—and it is the Standing Order as it is that must be interpreted by this House—that the "motion after notice" could be discussed; and there are very good reasons for that.

The SPEAKER: I ruled that the "motion after notice" could be discussed.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Yes, I pointed that out. It seems to me that the Speaker differed from me on the point of where that discussion could take place. The Speaker seemed to think it could take place on the motion, "That this House shall, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole," and not on the motion for the introduction of the Bill which is put to the Committee. My difficulty in connection with that is that I have rulings by Mr. Speaker in which Mr. Speaker has disallowed, on the first motion, a discussion of the subject-matter of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, as reported on page 2527 of "Hansard" for 1916-17, stopped the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tolmie, from discussing the Commissioner for Trades Bill on that particular motion. He would not permit any discussion. As a matter of fact, in connection with the Bill upon which I raised the point of order, he stopped the hon. member for Drayton.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that it is not usual to discuss a Bill on the original motion.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I know that is so, but we have to be careful that our rights are preserved.

The SPEAKER: Those rights will be preserved.

Mr. MACARTNEY: We have your ruling that on this particular motion—"That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole at its next sitting" and so on—the matter cannot be discussed. If we have that ruling, and the ruling that you gave the other day, then we are in this position, that we do not know whether we can discuss the Bill at all.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member might give me the quotation and page, so that I might answer him.

*Mr. Macartney.]*

Mr. MACARTNEY: I gave you the page. I mentioned page 2527 of "Hansard" for 1916-17. It seems to me that we may fall between two stools. I would like to say that a Bill may be introduced under this Standing Order twelve or fifteen months after it was dealt with in the preceding session, and the personnel of this House might also to some extent have changed in the meantime.

The ACTING PREMIER: It must be during the same Parliament.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The personnel might change, not by a general election, but to some extent by by-elections; and, as a matter of fact, the purport of the measure may have passed out of the public mind, and may have passed out of the minds of hon. members of this Chamber; and, if we are going to adopt a short cut, such as Standing Order 280A provides, then we ought to adopt it with such reservations, at any rate, as would enable the Chamber to be thoroughly acquainted with the pros and cons relating to the measure which is going to be so introduced. It is a matter in regard to which we should protect ourselves as to our right of discussion. I am not particular, except so far as the strict observance of the Standing Order is concerned, as to whether we have the discussion on the introductory motion or on the motion in Committee, so long as I am sure of having it on one motion or the other. I say that, according to a strict interpretation of the Standing Order—and you can only interpret the Standing Order by what the Standing Order says, and not by what was in the mind of any member of the Standing Orders Committee when the Standing Order was passed, or by what he thinks it means—you can only interpret the Standing Order by what the Standing Order actually says; and, according to my reading, the Standing Order says we have the right to discuss the "motion after notice." It so happens that this Bill on which the Speaker's ruling was given is a Committee Bill—that it is a Bill imposing a charge on the revenue. If it came before the House in another form, and only required the leave of the House to be introduced, there would have been no trouble. It seems to me that it is the second motion—that is the motion before Committee—which is the actual Order of Leave, and which is the introduction of the Bill. I say, technically speaking, that that is the period at which we should have the discussion.

On the second point, I say that it is manifestly clear on an interpretation of the Standing Order that the Standing Order is not effective to enable the Bill to be put through all its stages in one day, because such a procedure is directly in conflict with the Standing Orders referred to in my motion, which specifically say that the second and third readings shall be taken on a future day. It would have been very easy for the Standing Orders Committee, if they had in their minds that a Bill should go through all its stages in one day, to have put in the words "in one day." That would have been the simplest thing in the world; but by leaving out those words you can only come to the natural conclusion that the committee, for some reason or other, thought it was of some import that the various periods should be allowed to run between the various stages. There is a considerable misconception as to what the position is. Last week, the hon.

[Mr. Macartney.

member for Keppel, who is a member of the Standing Orders Committee, attempted to deal with the matter somewhat fully. I have read his remarks, and I have not been able to discover that the hon. member really realised what the matter in dispute is.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The same might be said about yourself.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I also know that the Treasurer, who spoke on the previous occasion, took this House into his confidence when the Standing Order was introduced, and he told the House that it was never intended to apply this Standing Order to important Bills; it would only be, in his opinion, applicable to Bills of a simple character such as the Townsville Harbour Board Bill.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member would not suggest that as a reason for disagreeing to my ruling?

Mr. MACARTNEY: No. I am dealing with the interpretation of the Standing Order.

The SPEAKER: The interpretation of the Standing Order is not in the hands of the Treasurer or in the hands of the Government.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I might, in discussing the question, give the history of the Standing Order when it was passed. The Standing Order has a history. The Treasurer introduced it in this Chamber and explained it, and he gave his view as to what it would apply to, and I am saying that there has been a general misunderstanding. By and large, as Mr. Kidston used to say, the Standing Orders can only be interpreted from what they say. I am referring to you, Mr. Speaker, as the officer who must protect the rights and privileges of hon. members, and I ask that you will interpret the Standing Order in accordance with what it says, and not in accordance with what might be merely a convenient interpretation for the moment. There may be a good reason why the stages should be taken at different times. I press very strongly on the right of having a discussion on the motion introducing the Bill.

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

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): It cannot be conceived for one moment that it was proposed by this Standing Order to debar debate in connection with the introduction of a measure such as the one which has caused this discussion. The point now is that two rulings of Mr. Speaker have been quoted. One ruling says that debate can only take place at one point, and the other says that debate can only take place at another point. The whole object now really is to have it laid down definitely at which point debate can take place. As the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, there can be no doubt that, according to the Standing Order, there can be no debate on the measure itself; yet something may have arisen which may really require debate as to whether the matter should be entered into at all or not. As the leader of the Opposition says, there may have been a change in the personnel of the House owing to by-elections, or public

opinion may have changed upon the point, and it may require debate and discussion as to whether the particular measure should be permitted to come before the House at all.

MR. BERTRAM: What is your opinion?

HON. J. G. APPEL: We are asking for a ruling; it is not a question of my opinion.

MR. MULLAN: You have a ruling, and you are disagreeing to it.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We have a ruling by Mr. Speaker—

THE SPEAKER: Has the hon. member read the ruling?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I simply heard it quoted by the leader of the Opposition.

THE SPEAKER: In that ruling I said I would allow the fullest debate on the motion to introduce the Bill.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Is that the first ruling or the second ruling?

THE SPEAKER: The first ruling.

HON. J. G. APPEL: What is the second ruling?

THE SPEAKER: The second ruling is that there can be no debate at any other stage.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Of course, the point really is that we desire to elucidate the matter, and to ascertain definitely when debate can take place. That is the whole question.

THE SPEAKER: The leader of the Opposition is not raising any question as to the right of debate. He admits that there can be no debate on the Bill itself; it is only as to the stage when debate may take place.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I admit that, too. It is only a question as to whether debate may take place as to whether the measure should be placed before the House or not.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: There can be no debate on the measure being introduced a second time—the Standing Order is clear on that point.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member has not grasped the point I am endeavouring to arrive at. There is no question that,

when the measure is once before [4 p.m.] the House, there can be no debate upon it. What we want to elucidate is the time when a debate can take place as to whether the Bill should come before the House or not.

The second point raised by the leader of the Opposition is also one that I think it would be well to elucidate—that is, as to whether the Standing Order permits a measure, when it is once before the House, to be passed through all its stages in one day. There is no direction there. I take it that, if it has been intended that a Bill should come before the House in the usual way, stage by stage, the Standing Order would have distinctly said so. However, we may get an elucidation of the matter from you, Mr. Speaker, and I, therefore, second the motion of the leader of the Opposition.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*): The object of introducing such a Standing Order as this, in the first place, was to do away with useless discussion on Bills which the House had already agreed upon. (Hear, hear!)

The leader of the Opposition says that he thinks discussion should be allowed in Committee—that is, on the second stage. I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that a general discussion may be allowed on the motion. "That you do leave the chair," so that, if there should be any alteration in the personnel of the Assembly, those members who were not here the previous session could be made acquainted with the objects of the Bill, if necessary. That is all that should be required, because the Government who introduce a Bill which has been passed by the Assembly, and not dealt with by the Council, have then the right to bring in the Bill again. We know the enormous cost when Bills go to the other Chamber, then come back here, have amendments made in them again, are sent back a second time, and again amended in the Council, and then are brought back here again.

MR. MACARTNEY: This Standing Order does not alter that.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No. I am speaking of the need for having the Standing Order in the first place. The leader of the Opposition says he thinks that the Assembly have a right, under the Standing Order, to discuss the Bill in Committee on the motion for leave to introduce. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman there at all, because a discussion at that stage would be of no importance whatever, unless the discussion permitted of an amendment being made to the motion. Unless it could lead to an amendment being made, the discussion would be absolutely useless. As an amendment is not permissible under the Standing Order, it only goes to show the wisdom of the introduction of a Standing Order of this sort. With regard to the question of putting the measure through all its stages in one day, I think that the very paragraph of the Standing Order, under which this motion of disagreement was brought in, settles that—

"When a Bill has been passed by the Legislative Assembly, and transmitted to the Legislative Council, and not returned to the Legislative Assembly owing to prorogation of Parliament, the same Bill may be introduced into the Legislative Assembly, on motion after notice—"

which was done—

"in a subsequent session of the same Parliament, and passed through all its stages without amendment or debate, and sent to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in these Standing Orders contained."

That is the principal point of the Standing Order, which upsets the contention of the hon. gentleman. It says that it shall be sent to the Legislative Council, after being passed through all its stages, without amendment or debate. Does that mean that you are going to spread it over six months?

MR. MACARTNEY: It does not matter. That is what it says—"without amendment or debate."

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The object of this Standing Order was to return the Bill to the Chamber which had not had time to deal with it in the previous session, so that they might deal with it.

MR. MACARTNEY: Why did they not put in the simple words "in one day"?

*Hon. J. H. Coyne.]*

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Because there was no necessity for it. It was left to the good sense of hon. members to understand it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: And you are a legislator. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am more than a legislator. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. F. A. COOPER: You are an instructor.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. gentleman made out a very poor case. He referred to Standing Orders 245, 263, and 264, which have no application to his contention that the Speaker's ruling should be disagreed to, because the last line and a-half of the Standing Order completely upsets his contention. It says—

"notwithstanding anything to the contrary in these Standing Orders contained."

Mr. MACARTNEY: That applies to amendment or debate.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It means nothing of the sort. It means that it shall be passed through all its stages without amendment or debate, and sent to the Legislative Council for their concurrence.

The ACTING PREMIER: Forthwith.

Mr. MACARTNEY: "In one day." Do you find the word "forthwith" there?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No. But there is no necessity to bring in the word "forthwith," or the words "through all its stages in one day," seeing that the final sentence—

"notwithstanding anything to the contrary in these Standing Orders contained." is there.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That only applies to what was done before.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, it refers to the passing through all its stages without delay, notwithstanding what other Standing Orders say.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Are the words "without delay" in it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are not there. Why do you want to read the words in? If they were there, there would be no need to put in the last part of the sentence, because then the Bill would have to go through all its stages in one day.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The last part of the sentence is only surplusage.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; the last part of the sentence does what the hon. gentleman says it does not do.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It does not say that a Bill should be passed through all its stages "in one day."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That could not be done without the provision contained in this Standing Order.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You do not understand what you are talking about.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I understand that, if it were the intention of the Standing Orders Committee to pass the Bill through all its stages in one day, there would be no necessity to insert the concluding part of the sentence.

[Hon. J. H. Coyne.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That is not there for that purpose at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I think it is, and it seems to me that that makes the intention of the Standing Order quite clear.

The ACTING PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I think the Standing Order is not as complete as it might be, and that it is open to more than one interpretation. I feel that a common-sense interpretation of the Standing Order might be given either way; but, reading the Standing Order as it stands, and knowing the way in which it will be applied, it seems to me that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is correct. The interpretation you have given of the Standing Order is a perfectly natural interpretation to read into it. The words "in one day" were evidently intended to be read into it. If the Standing Orders Committee had decided to put the matter absolutely beyond doubt, they could have inserted the words "in one day," but, even with the omission of those words, the ruling you have given is perfectly reasonable, especially in view of the latter words of paragraph (2)—"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in these Standing Orders contained." What are these things? They are that the Bill shall pass "through all its stages without amendment or debate and be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence." Why are those words put in if the ordinary stages are to be delayed in accordance with the ordinary Standing Orders after the Bill has been introduced? The intention obviously is that the Bill should be transmitted to the Council forthwith, after all the stages have been treated as formal and passed in the one day.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Does it say "forthwith"?

The ACTING PREMIER: The word "forthwith" is not there, but that is evidently the intention of the framers of the Standing Order. The leader of the Opposition has argued that, if the Speaker's ruling were upheld, it would have the effect of destroying the effectiveness of the Standing Order. But I hold that the Speaker must place such an interpretation on the Standing Order as will make it effective, and the interpretation he has put upon it is reasonable.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You could get the Order altered at once.

The ACTING PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman thinks the Standing Order is likely to be strained by the interpretation put upon it, then, as he is a member of the Standing Orders Committee, he could get the Order altered.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Fancy my asking for anything and getting it!

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. member is joking when he says that. The fact is that the general treatment accorded by the Government to the present Opposition is much more generous than the treatment which was accorded to us by hon. gentlemen opposite when we were in opposition.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Your memory is very short.

The ACTING PREMIER: I think the ruling of the Speaker a perfectly sound one.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What about discussion at any time?

The ACTING PREMIER: That point the hon. member may consider more material than the point I have been discussing, but my own opinion is that no discussion is permissible at any stage. The whole test of his contention on that point is what constitutes a stage of the Bill. Are there any more stages in connection with a financial Bill or an Appropriation Bill than there are in connection with ordinary Bills? There are. The additional stages in connection with a financial Bill or an Appropriation Bill are their introduction and initiation in Committee. If a strict ruling is given under this Standing Order, I doubt very much if there can be any discussion after the Minister has introduced the Bill under Standing Order No. 280A. The Speaker was, I think, very considerate to the House in laying down a ruling which permits of discussion on the "motion after notice" has been given.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What do you mean by "motion after notice"?

The ACTING PREMIER: That is the motion to go into Committee. I think the Speaker's ruling is reasonable, and it ought to be sustained.

The SPEAKER: If the first stage is the motion to go into Committee, then, if the Bill is not a money Bill, there would be no chance for discussion.

The ACTING PREMIER: Quite so. But under the Standing Order as it now stands, you would be absolutely justified in stopping discussion at any stage.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Standing Order provides that some notice of the introduction of the Bill must be given.

The ACTING PREMIER: Those are stages of the Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The first motion is—

"That the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the desirableness of introducing the Bill."

The ACTING PREMIER: Necessarily that is a stage of the Bill. The Standing Order is so wide that its application may amount to a serious limitation of the rights of members in regard to discussion, but I think the ruling of the Speaker is right, and ought to be upheld.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): This is a subject which is interesting to a layman, although it must be admitted that it requires a certain amount of legal training to deal with it in its entirety. I would call the attention of hon. members to the Standing Orders of New South Wales dealing with a similar position. On page 117 of the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, hon. members will find Standing Order No. 295, which reads—

"If a public Bill which shall have originally been introduced in the Assembly shall have passed any or all its stages therein, but shall have been interrupted before its completion by the prorogation of the Legislature, whether such interruption shall have been in the Assembly or in the Council, the consideration of the same, with such amendments as may have been made in a previous session, may be resumed by motion in a subsequent session of the same Parliament."

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will recognise that under that Standing Order

of the New South Wales Parliament, members are not given a chance of discussing the Bill at all.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is a point I am coming to. Referring to the Federal Standing Orders, I find that the Standing Order with regard to "Lapsed Bills," on page 63, provides that—

"(a) If the Bill be in the possession of the House in which it originated, not having been sent to the other House, or, if sent, then returned by message, it may be proceeded with by resolution of the House in which it is, restoring it to the notice-paper.

"(b) If the Bill be in the possession of the House in which it did not originate, it may be proceeded with by resolution of the House in which it is, restoring it to the notice-paper, but such resolution shall not be passed unless a message has been received from the House in which it originated, requesting that its consideration may be resumed."

The inference to be drawn from that is that, if the intention of this House is the same as that disclosed in the Standing Orders of the New South Wales and Federal Parliaments, we may reasonably ask why are not similar words used in this Standing Order?

The SPEAKER: I will explain to the hon. member why similar words were not used in our Standing Order.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I shall be glad to hear that explanation. The point we have to consider is not as to the necessity of introducing a measure without discussion, but whether we should not have a definite ruling as to the construction of the Standing Order. I think the Speaker was uncertain in his own mind on this matter, because, when the hon. member for Drayton was making some remarks on the Bill, the Speaker told him that he must wait until he had seen the Bill. What was the object of saying that if the Bill was not open to discussion at a subsequent stage?

The SPEAKER: Because I did not then know that the Bill was to be introduced under this Standing Order.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Then the House should be advised on the introduction of a Bill of this sort whether this particular Standing Order is to be taken advantage of.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Keppel*): In 1916-17, when this Standing Order was first brought into operation, a specific motion was moved by the Minister to the effect that Standing Order No. 280A should be applied. That motion was carried, and consequently there was no further debate, because Standing Order 280A states that after such procedure is followed the Bill must be passed through all its stages without amendment or debate. Therefore, to my mind, until a specific resolution has been passed by the House to deal with a Bill under that Standing Order, discussion is possible, but after such a resolution has been passed, no discussion is possible. Now, let us argue by analogy, taking what is termed the "guillotine" section of the Standing Orders. It sets out a certain course of procedure, but it does not operate automatically. When it is being used, the leader of the House comes down

Mr. Larcombe.]



with a motion that Standing Order so-and-so shall apply to a certain Bill that is under discussion. In the same way, to my mind, the necessary specific motion should be moved under Standing Order 280A. The Standing Order does not operate automatically at all. It is only machinery, and the machinery has to be set in operation by a specific resolution. If that had been done in this case, if the practice of 1916-17 had been followed, this discussion would not have taken place at all, and the procedure would have been quite clear. The Speaker himself, when the discussion took place on the point that the leader of the Opposition has raised, distinctly suggested to the Minister in charge of the Bill that he should embody in his motion certain words setting out that Standing Order 280A was to apply, and it is surprising that he did not follow that advice and avoid all this discussion. The position then would have been clearer and satisfactory. The motion of the hon. member for Toowong really is based on a misstatement and is contrary to fact. It states—

“That so much of Mr. Speaker's ruling, given on Wednesday, the thirteenth day of August, 1919, on the motion ‘That the Speaker do now leave the chair,’ reported in ‘Hansard’ for this session, pages 151 and 152, as determines that debate cannot take place on a motion that a Bill be introduced under clause (2) of Standing Order No. 280A, be disagreed with.”

The Speaker did not rule in that way at all. On the contrary, he distinctly ruled, as on a previous occasion, that discussion could take place on an introductory stage, and it does not matter to the leader of the Opposition whether the discussion is on introductory stage No. 1 or introductory stage No. 2.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Oh, yes; it must be a point where no amendment can take place.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I do not hold that view at all, because, if an amendment can be moved on stage No. 2, it can be moved on stage No. 1.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, because the question at stage No. 2 is that the Speaker leave the chair.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It is quite competent to defeat the motion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That would not be an amendment of the Bill.

Mr. LARCOMBE: As a matter of fact, on stage No. 2 there can be no amendment on the Bill either, because it is only an introductory stage, and does not refer to the Bill at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, you can add to it.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It only affirms or denies the principle that the Bill be introduced. To my mind, exactly the same conditions exist in connection with stage No. 1 and stage No. 2; and, if the Speaker gives the Opposition a distinct assurance that they can have a discussion on stage No. 1, then why quibble? The discussion on stage No. 1 can be just as full as on stage No. 2. Viewing the question from that point, I heartily agree with the Speaker, and say the Opposition have no cause of complaint.

[Mr. Lacombe.

The intention of the framers of the Standing Order to some extent enters into this discussion. I was one of the Standing Orders Committee who framed the Standing Order, and my understanding of that discussion was that this Standing Order should only operate in the way I have mentioned, that is, by resolution, because it was pointed out by some members of the committee that the Minister might desire to amend or discuss his own Bill; and, if the Standing Orders were to operate automatically, he would not be permitted to do so, so that the question as to whether it was competent to discuss or amend the Bill was to be determined by specific resolution bringing into operation the Standing Order to which I have referred.

Again, dealing with the question of what constitutes a stage, I think that your ruling is absolutely sound. The Standing Orders do not define a stage, nor does “May's Parliamentary Guide.” We have to rely therefore on the dictionary, and “Webster's Standard Dictionary” defines “stage” as “a degree; progress in development.” Each motion is a stage, or degree, or progress in development. So, if we rely on the only possible authority we have, the Speaker's ruling is absolutely correct on the question of what is a stage. These are a few points I desire to place before the House. I think that the remarks of the leader of the Opposition were not quite generous, and, as one of the committee who helped to place this Standing Order where it is, I say that on point (1) he is not correct, and on point (2) he is not correct.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Did you ever know him to be correct?

Mr. LARCOMBE: Not very often. He is too petulant and narrow-minded to be leader of a side of a House, and sometimes the worst side of his nature gets the better of him, his temper runs away with him, and he says things that perhaps he does not really believe; and, instead of trying to appreciate a point in a fair, broadminded way, he allows those police court qualities to take advantage of him. (Government laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): This is one of those matters on which a layman is somewhat at a disadvantage, but I will point out that even the Speaker was uncertain as to the exact position. You may notice that the Acting Premier thought that your interpretation was right, and the hon. gentleman also thought that the interpretation of the leader of the Opposition was right. I want to point out that the House, in any case, whoever may be right or wrong, has suffered very largely, I think, because of an interjection which you made to the hon. member for Oxley, that is, if I did not misunderstand you with regard to it. The inference conveyed to my mind, when notice was given, when the Bill was being introduced in its first stage, was that you drew attention to the fact that you did not know that it was going to be the particular Bill it was. I want to assure you that in discussing this matter there is no feeling on my part. I take it that we all want to get at what is the correct meaning, because underlying the point which we are discussing is the important principle of the protection of the rights of members. To-day there may be a majority on one side; on another day it may be on the opposite side; and I take

it that, in the interests of the House, there should be no mistake at all about it. I may say that it was a source of very great pleasure to me to hear the Acting Premier and the Minister for Lands, and I am sure it would be a pleasure to listen to other Ministers, for instance, the Minister for Public Instruction, who is an authority on these matters.

MR. FOLEY: Don't be sarcastic.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I was going to draw your attention to the debate, as recorded on page 116 of "Hansard" for this session. Perhaps I would be out of order in reading something that took place in the House during this present session, but the fact remains that, when the Secretary for Agriculture was introducing the Bill, he said that he was fortified by Standing Order No. 280A, and he went on to say that it did not permit any discussion on the Bill on any but its formal stages, and that it must be moved and passed without debate. The point I want to make is, that the House—and I am quite sure absolutely unintentionally—were lulled into a false sense of security in a matter affecting their rights. I find that you yourself at a later stage made this remark, as recorded on the same page—

"I suggest that the hon. member should wait until he sees the Bill."

That was a suggestion made in reply to the hon. member for Drayton, and I think it is perfectly patent that that remark of yours quite unconsciously—I do not suggest any intention to do anything but what was quite fair and right—that suggestion was the means of allowing what is now contended to be the proper time for discussion to pass by, and therefore I say in that connection that the House has not been quite fairly treated. I would also point out that at a later stage you said, as recorded on the same page—

"The motion now before the House only proposes that it is desirable to introduce the Bill at another sitting. I have no knowledge of what that Bill may be. If, at a later stage, the Secretary for Agriculture proceeds to put the Bill through all stages under Standing Order No. 280A, I think that would be the proper time to raise the question as to whether it comes under that Standing Order or not."

I am not impugning your ruling, Mr. Speaker. We are exceedingly [4.30 p.m.] anxious to find out where we are. I want to point out that as the result of the ruling which you subsequently gave, the members of this House were practically deprived of the opportunity of discussion.

THE SPEAKER: It was not any fault on my part. It was the fault of the Minister who introduced the Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am sorry the Minister is not here.

MR. BERTRAM: The Minister's remarks inferred that he intended to put the Bill through under the operation of the Standing Order.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Maree is quite right, but I wish to point out that in the midst of it all this House has fallen to the ground as far as any rights of theirs are concerned. I think that must be conceded. If there is anything faulty in connection with the Standing Order, in the

interests of the community generally and the rights of this House, anything that is not clear should be cleared up so that we may know what the Standing Order really means.

THE SPEAKER: I want to say a word. At the outset, I believe the leader of the Opposition moved this motion to give an opportunity for a discussion on this Standing Order, which is an innovation so far as this Parliament is concerned. No benefit could accrue to me or to anybody else by giving the ruling that I gave. I gave the ruling, not to gain any particular time, because, as a matter of fact, the Bill is still on the stocks in the Upper House, and we are no further advanced than we would have been had we allowed it to go through its several stages.

MR. MACARTNEY: We could have had another cut at it.

THE SPEAKER: Under his own interpretation of the Standing Order the hon. gentleman would not have had an opportunity to debate or amend the measure.

MR. MACARTNEY: We would, when the Chairman was in the chair.

THE SPEAKER: In regard to the motion for the disagreement with my ruling that the discussion should take place at the first stage, the leader of the Opposition has pointed out that he intended something different to the manner in which the motion reads. I want to be fair to him in that matter. I ruled the other day that I would allow discussion at that stage. I think I was quite correct, because a Bill may be introduced which does not require a Committee stage, is read a first time, printed, and goes on to the second reading. That is under our ordinary Standing Orders. Consequently, if we are going to allow discussion at any stage it must be on the first stage.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE SPEAKER: We would have to leave the discussion until the second reading stage if we did not allow it at the first stage. The hon. member for Oxley referred to the Standing Order in force in New South Wales, which the Standing Orders Committee actually had in mind in framing this Standing Order. That Standing Order does not allow discussion at all, except on a motion to send a message to the Upper House to place the Bill again on the business paper in that House. For the purposes of discussion, the New South Wales Standing Order is much more drastic than the Queensland Standing Order. So is that of the Commonwealth. The hon. gentleman says "Why did we not do likewise?" If he will remember, the reason for not adopting the New South Wales Standing Order was that Queensland has the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act, and that Act—which is part of our Constitution—says that a Bill must pass through this House on two separate occasions and be sent to the Legislative Council before it can be submitted to a referendum. We found ourselves up against that difficulty. I remember distinctly that it was pointed out at the Standing Orders Committee meeting that, if we had a Standing Order on the lines of New South Wales, and the Council refused the Bill upon the first occasion and again on the second occasion, this House could not take advantage of the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act. To get over that point we framed a

*Hon. W. McCormack.*

Standing Order that would allow the Bill to go through all its stages here, to conform with the provisions of the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act.

Mr. MACARTNEY: That does not refer to a Bill that is rejected by the other House at all.

The SPEAKER: No, it does not, but that was the point the Standing Orders Committee had in mind, and that is why the more drastic method was not adopted. I do not want to go over what I said previously. The Speaker has to interpret the Standing Orders, not from a legal point of view—not in the method adopted in the reading of the Criminal Code. The hon. gentleman would introduce the methods adopted in reading the Criminal Code. Those methods are not adopted by any Speaker, either one who is a lawyer or by one who is a layman. I have looked the matter up, and I find that in the House of Commons great Speakers who have been lawyers invariably have adopted the common-sense attitude, and that is not always the strict legal reading of the words contained in the Standing Orders.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Where the law does not provide for it.

The SPEAKER: I must say that that method was adopted perforce by me, because I am not a lawyer. I have invariably tried to put the reasonable, common-sense construction upon the Standing Orders.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: That being the case, it was for me to inquire what was the idea behind that Standing Order. The idea was despatch. The House, being desirous of passing a Bill in exactly the same terms as that passed in the previous session, and not having changed in personnel from one session to another, desires that Bill to get to the Legislative Council without delay.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Is it not reasonable that I should construe this Standing Order in such a way that, when no result can come unless the motion to introduce is negatived—which the hon. gentleman has the opportunity of doing—the utmost despatch must be observed in sending that Bill to the Upper House? That is the way in which I read the Standing Order. I said on a previous occasion that probably the Standing Order is slightly ambiguous—the hon. gentleman will recollect that—that it might have contained the words “in one day.” I read into the Standing Order that that was what was intended—that the Bill should pass through all its stages here in one day, and go along to the Legislative Council. The Acting Premier has rightly dwelt upon the latter part of the Standing Order, which says, “and sent to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in these Standing Orders contained.”

Mr. MACARTNEY: “Without amendment or debate.”

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman may say so. That is not my reading of it. The hon. gentleman has not stated what would be gained by stringing a Bill over several days without the opportunity of saying one solitary word on it, or amending it in any form. If the Parliamentary Bills Referendum Act had not been in the way, I have no doubt the Standing Order would have been similar

[Hon. W. McCormack.

to that of New South Wales, and this House would have been asked to pass a message to be forwarded to the other House, requesting them to place the Bill again on the business-paper. That would have been the procedure adopted, but it was prevented by having an Act on the statute-book which could not be got over without putting a Bill through all its stages. If hon. members think the Standing Order is taking away any of their privileges, then they can get a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee, and have the Standing Order altered. It was an idea in the minds of some members of the Standing Orders Committee, and it was made the law. I have no hesitation in stating again that my ruling is the correct interpretation. I know that that was in the minds of the Standing Orders Committee, and is supported by the fact that in other Parliaments in the Commonwealth, a more drastic procedure is adopted.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has no opportunity now of discussing the question.

Question—That the ruling be disagreed to—put and negatived.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): So far as the references to the war are concerned, I think that portion of His Excellency's Speech has been sufficiently well covered, and I will not take up any portion of the time of the House in referring to them. I will deal more particularly with the practical portion of the Governor's Speech which sets out the work to be done by this Government during this session, and I am sure that anybody who dispassionately views that Speech will say that those Bills cover ground which back up assertions previously made by members of this party—that this party goes about its business very surely, very carefully, and in accordance with the ideals of the Labour party. Now, our opponents, who are a very cool and calculating opposition, generally charge the Labour party with being rash, hotheaded, impetuous, and hasty. They say that our legislation and our legislative programme is generally visionary; that it is unsubstantial and impossible. But when they are asked what particular measure passed by this party it is that they object to, we always find it very difficult to get an expression of opinion from them. The same thing exists right throughout Australia. Wherever there has been an accredited Labour party in power, and it has done anything for the good of the country, the Governments that follow make no effort to repeal those measures. I want to know now from the Opposition what measures this Labour Government have passed they will repeal if they get into power, as they seem to want to do. I remember reading this morning the programme and platform of the National party. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, and we find they are imitating this party by laying down a specific platform and programme. We find that many of the things they are advocating have been advocated by this party for many years, and, if they are a party in direct opposition to this party, I want to know what game they are coming at. I want to remind those people

that many, many years ago it was said on Mount Ebal, "Cursed be he who removes his neighbour's landmark"; and by taking things out of our platform and placing them in their platform, they are removing their neighbour's landmark, and the people of Queensland want to know on what ground they stand—whether on Labour ground or whether on National ground. It is likely that curse will fall upon that party, and they may wither up altogether, though the people who look after the inner workings of that party assure us that that is not likely to happen. The exposure made by the hon. member for Flinders last night shows that there is some underground current at work, and I remember reading to this House a session or two ago a particularly interesting document with reference to State insurance, wherein it was shown that the National party were absolutely entering into a contract with a number of insurance companies to repeal the State Insurance Act provided a certain donation was made to the funds of the National party. The Nationalists have attempted to wriggle around that thing; they have attempted to explain it away; but nothing in the wide world will explain the cold type of the agreement they entered into. It is an astonishing thing that there are any people who have to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow who will listen to the blandishments of a party such as that. If they are not going to repeal any of the measures that have been passed by the Labour Administration, they must be wanting one thing; they must want power for a certain purpose. I am not going to stoop to the level of the Opposition by saying that they want power merely for the emoluments of office, but I do say they want power for the purpose of administering. They want to administer the laws according to their own ideas. They want to stop fresh legislation in the interests of the people. They want to shift the burden of taxation from the shoulders of those who are well able to bear it, and upon whose shoulders the Labour party have placed it, and place it on the shoulders of those who are unable to bear it; and, finally, they want to educate the youth of the State to that condition of obedience when they will belittle themselves before their so-called betters. They want to dethrone the doctrine of democracy—the doctrine of helping the people—and to enthrone the power of money. They ever worship the money power, and I have come into possession of a document—another of those documents that are so damaging so far as National Governments are concerned. These people are compelled to negotiate in the dark; they are compelled to conduct their business in a peculiar way, and I have here a very interesting document which was written from 27 New Zealand Buildings, Queen street, Brisbane, as long ago as 24th August, 1914. The reason why it has not been read before is that the censor might not have permitted it. Now that the war precautions regulations, so far as the censorship is concerned, have been repealed, we are getting at the inner history of things. This letter was addressed to a well-known gentleman, Mr. Osborn J. Fenwick, general secretary, Liberal Association of Queensland, and it says—

"I have to report that since the war in Europe started, there has been a serious falling off in the contributions to the fund."

The war started on 4th August, 1914, and on 24th August this gentleman reported that there had been a serious falling off in contributions to the fund. The letter goes on—

"Of course, all commercial interests are affected, and most of the houses view the future with apprehension, not only regarding the shortage of stocks, but the small prospect of replenishments."

Where did they get their stocks from? Then he says—

"Several firms have already reduced the number of hands, and the remaining members of the staffs have had to submit to reductions of salaries.

"Notwithstanding this, however, several firms who have used the war as a reason for not contributing, figure in the patriotic list for considerable amounts."

(Government laughter.) Think of the terrible crime of those people who first and foremost contributed to patriotic funds, and left the more important funds of the Liberal Association to go hang! (Government laughter.) Can you imagine anything more terrible than the might and main of this money power being undermined by the patriotic funds of the nation? They can conceive of nothing more dreadful—nothing more atrocious in the annals of crime—than putting money into the patriotic fund that ought to go to the party fund of the Liberal Association. The horror expressed in the paragraph is so clear. It goes on to say—

"I think it as well to mention the names of two firms from whom I can get no satisfaction, and who might have been expected to have sent their contributions in without solicitation long ago. They are Messrs. Alexander Stewart and Sons and Perry Brothers. Mr. J. K. Stewart promised some time ago, after severe criticism of the 'Denham Government,' to send a cheque along, but in my last interview with him, he was extremely brusque, and told me that he would not give one threepence at present."

(Government laughter.) After having the privilege of severely criticising the Denham Government, he then refused to give 3d. To have the privilege of denouncing the Denham Government through an organiser of the Denham Government ought to have been worth £100, but to value it at less than 3d. is more than I can understand. (Government laughter.) Then, he goes on—

"Mr. Bond promised several times to send a cheque round to the office, but eventually asked me not to worry him. That he knew all about the funds, and would send his contribution in good time."

I wonder if it arrived before 1915, because that was the good time for them, when they were to get power to control things during that very necessary period; but, fortunately, it was a good thing for the people of Queensland that in May, 1915, they had the good sense and foresight to place a Labour Government in power for the balance of the time that the dreadful war raged in Europe. Then he goes on—

"I had an interview with the Hon. W. H. Barnes, who intimated that he did a lot for the association outside of monetary support."

*Mr. F. A. Cooper.]*

(Government laughter.) We know that style of gentleman. He says, "I will give you a little contribution, but you understand that in my quiet moments I will give you much more secretly." (Government laughter.) Mr. Barnes did a tremendous amount for the Liberal Association in regard to the actual funds the many times he attended the bazaars and sales of work and bought pin cushions—I dare say he did a considerable amount more for the Liberal Association than actually appeared in his contribution. Referring again to Mr. Barnes, he says—

"He finally said he would consult his brother, and would let me know what they would do, but he has not yet informed me."

(Government laughter.) One of the deadly things we have in this world is procrastination, and if the procrastination of Mr. W. H. Barnes was responsible for the downfall of the Liberal Government in 1915, it is the most splendid example of procrastination that this world knows. (Government laughter.) It goes on further to say—

"I have also interviewed the manager of Messrs. Denham Brothers a number of times. He has always promised to speak to Mr. Denham on the matter, but never appears to have done so."

Cannot you see that little building in Roma street, where produce comes in and is sent out, and the profits come in? Cannot you imagine him saying, "Well, Digby, old boy, they are worrying me for that cheque," and Mr. Denham replying, "And they want to cut my throat at the next election?" (Government laughter.) He goes on to say—

"These instances will enable you to form an idea of the attitude taken up by some of the firms who would be expected to contribute promptly and liberally."

"There are still a number of promises to be fulfilled, and I have yet to hear from the different trade organisations with whom I have been in communication."

"Yours faithfully,  
"E. O. REES."

That is the letter. It is another damning proof that the National Association—

Mr. MOORE: Another proof of the high morality of the Labour party—to read private correspondence! (Government laughter.)

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The hon. member talks about the high morality of the Labour party, because it reads private correspondence. He would cavil at the prosecutor in a murder charge who brought forth a dagger and said, "This is the dagger with which he tried to slay me"; he would be such a contemptible man in bringing forth the private dagger with which the prisoner attempted to slay him! (Government laughter.) These are the daggers with which the party opposite are attempting to kill the people of Queensland. The hon. member for Aubigny wants to rebuke me because I desire to expose these various matters. I am astonished to think that such things can happen. We are getting pretty well used to the attitude of the Nationalist opposition. We know, as the hon. member for Port Curtis pointed out last night, that they are in the hands of the money power, and that all the time they are attempting to persuade the people that they are as milk and water, that they are very mild, and

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.

there is nothing damaging about them, and that, if we will only trust them, they will alter no laws which the Labour party have introduced, but will make things run more smoothly. You have heard that—

"There was a young lady of Niger,  
Who went for a ride on the tiger;  
They returned from their ride  
With the lady inside,  
And a smile on the face of the tiger."

(Laughter.) That little story is too well known by the people of Queensland, and too well applied by them, ever to trust the tiger on the other side. We know too well what would happen to the people of Queensland if they ever again got into the clutches of the party opposite. We are fully aware of their intentions and ideas so far as Queensland is concerned. Whatever little differences may crop up amongst the labouring class, we have come to the conclusion that, whatever else is to be fought, the menace of Nationalism is to be fought all along the line. We have only one thing to fight Nationalism with, and that is the outstanding features of the programme before us to-day. It can be divided into two parts—the things for to-day and the things for to-morrow. For to-day we have to struggle along and keep going, and, in order that a man may keep going, he needs food, clothing, and shelter. The profiteers have been abroad of late, and it is very necessary for us to grapple with this matter at the earliest moment. The capitalistic system under which we live divides the people practically into three sections—the capitalists, the workers, and the consumers. The capitalists are completely organised to-day, as the letter I have read, and the exposure made by the hon. member for Flinders last night, prove. The workers are not organised completely; they are organised in a number of separate bodies, and they are being urged to remain in separate bodies, so that they may war one with the other instead of being in one conglomerate body and presenting a strong face to the enemy. We may quarrel about the absolute ideals of the One Big Union—quarrel as to the way the preamble is framed, and quarrel with some of the things in the preamble—but I have yet to find any wholehearted supporter of the Labour party who has not his heart and soul in the idea of one big union to fight their enemies, who have been for centuries living upon them. While the workers are not completely organised, there is another section of the community practically composed of workers, and they are the consumers, who are not organised at all. Things have been going on for many years that we have not taken a tumble to, but which the last four years of war have shown us. While the worker has been fighting the capitalist in the matter of wages, the capitalist has been drawing his reserves from the worker. It is not a three-cornered fight, but Labour with its one head is fighting this hydra-headed monster, and this hydra-headed monster has one of its many mouths at the back of Labour, swallowing it from behind. Through the consumer capital is actually drawing its reserves from Labour. What hope have we of fighting a beast of that description? We have to do something to meet the terrible position. Up to the present we have had some faint idea that we might do it by way of arbitration. Our friends opposite agree with us that arbitration is an excellent

thing. They have it in their programme, and, as far as it goes, there is nothing particularly wrong with arbitration, in so far as it fixes the price of the worker's commodity. The worker's commodity is his labour,

and the price of that commodity. [5 p.m.] It is fixed by the Arbitration Court, but the price charged for the commodity he produces is allowed to go unfixed, and the profiteer can charge what he likes. There should be a Fair Prices Court which will fix the price of the commodities that the worker produces. We should fix the prices of all the commodities produced by the worker, so that he may get a decent return for his labour, and, unless we do that, the Arbitration Court may go by the board. Therefore, we should take effective steps to fix the prices of the commodities which labour produces, so that the worker may get some sort of a living. At present he is getting no sort of a living: he is simply handing out from his pocket all the day long. I believe that arbitration and the fixation of prices should go hand in hand. If the splendid metal which is now in the melting pot is to come out with any degree of purity, we must remove the dross that is floating on the surface of that metal.

The second part of our programme refers practically to education. I regard knowledge as the only effective weapon which the workers have to wield against the capitalists. Brute force is absolutely no use, because money can always obtain more brute force than the worker. In any case, brute force is not an ideal. Knowledge and education constitute an ideal, and that is the ideal for which the Labour party is striving. The Labour army has its advance guard and its main guard, as well as its rear guard, and the men at the back of the army are just as essential to its advance as the men at the front. The men at the front are preparing the way for the main body. The Labour party can look down the vista of years and read the lives of men whose achievements are monuments to the progress of the Labour party. There have been many men who have fought, struggled, and died for this wonderful gospel. There have been men who have fallen out of the fight because they were unable to go any further, and, worst of all, we have had deserters from the ranks who are now generals fighting as a rear guard for the capitalist section. None the less the Labour party will go on; it will keep on the path it has set itself to travel, and will reach its desired goal in good time. So far as the educational programme of the party is concerned, I think it is high time that we took steps to extend the compulsory age for the attendance of children at school. Fourteen years is not a fit age at which to take children away from school and set them to work; they should continue at school until they reach the age of sixteen years. Long years ago children of the age of seven, eight, and nine years were taken into the mines and factories, but we have passed those times. I believe the age of thirteen or fourteen is too young for children to leave school. (Hear, hear!) We know what are the conditions with regard to the employment of youths at the present time, and I hold that we should extend our trade schools, and arrange that they shall co-operate more with the Departments of the State and with the industries of the State. We have at Ipswich a trade school which has something like forty boys

attending it, but, owing to the blundering of the committee or the tutors in the Technical College, that school is not as effective as it should be. It was stated by authorities of the Technical College that after those boys had served two years in the trade school they would be admitted to the workshops in the Railway Department. But the officials of the Railway Department advise that only those candidates who pass the necessary examination are admitted to the workshops, and that attendance at the trade school for a specific period is not sufficient qualification. Nevertheless the trade school has blundered on in its operations, and has thus spoilt the lives of those boys. Many of the mothers of the boys were told that it would be all right, and that matters would be fixed up. But that cannot be done, because it means going against regulations. The old system of doing things contrary to the regulations has to be beaten down. I very much regret to say that the Technical College authorities at Ipswich were so short-sighted that they allowed the kind of thing I have described to go on. I believe that the worker should be trained, and that he should be as skilful as possible. We would be a better people if everybody was a tradesman. The drug in the market in Queensland is unskilled labour. We have to-day a surplus of unskilled labour, and a shortage of skilled labour. People sometimes ask why trains cannot run to time. The reason is that there are not enough mechanics available in Queensland to do all the repairs required, to repair the engines when they break down. Yet the people are turning out their own boys to be labourers. In the Ipswich workshops there is room for 140 apprentices, but the man in charge of the shops says he thinks he will take thirty boys. When he was asked why he would only take thirty boys, he said, "For reasons of economy." I think it is a regrettable thing that we should have in charge of such an important department a man who is so short-sighted as that. Queensland is going to make wonderful progress in the coming years, and we shall require all the tradesmen we are able to get, so that to refuse to accept boys as apprentices is a ridiculous thing. In five or ten years we shall need all the tradesmen we can possibly procure, and, if we are long-sighted enough, we would insist upon Government departments taking all the apprentices they can carry. Therefore I ask the Government to take steps to see that the public departments take all the apprentices they are able to take under existing awards, so that in five years' time we may have sufficient skilled men to turn their hands to the very necessary work that will have to be done.

MR. ROBERTS: Do you know that the Railway Department has the full complement allowed by the award?

MR. F. A. COOPER: No. That may be so in Toowoomba, but it is not so in Ipswich. The Ipswich Workshops can take 140 apprentices, but the officer in charge thinks that, on the score of economy, only thirty should be employed. I know that the argument is sometimes used that, if the Department takes on these boys as apprentices, the boys will expect to be kept on, and that the Department would not be in a position to find sufficient work for them; but I do not think there is much force in that argument.

MR. GUNN: Why complain about us?

*Mr. F. A. Cooper.*

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am coming to the hon. member again. I have been dealing with members opposite, and I can deal with them again. If they are in any way concerned about the attention I am not paying to them, I will attend to them immediately, but, if a man were to attend to all the shortcomings of hon. members opposite, an hour would not be sufficient. I doubt if a lifetime would be sufficient. (Laughter.) Notwithstanding their boosted idea of themselves, I think there are other things much more important. I say that if the department should raise the argument that they will have to retain these boys, a regulation can easily be made saying that they need not continue after their apprenticeship.

Mr. ROBERTS: You ought to be ashamed to say such a thing—teaching a man a trade, and then not giving him a job.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I say there is no need for it. The hon. member displays just about the full limit of the intelligence he possesses. I say that the chief thing we are concerned about is teaching boys trades.

Mr. ROBERTS: And finding them work afterwards.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: We can find them work afterwards. I say that, even if this excuse should be made, we need not worry about it, because Queensland will be such a good State in five years' time that we shall be able to absorb all the tradesmen that we can produce.

Mr. ROBERTS: You are employing fewer than five years ago.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: In the railways?

Mr. ROBERTS: Anywhere in Queensland to-day.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. I know that the railways can do with every tradesman they can get.

Mr. ROBERTS: You have got more unemployment too.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The Government are employing more than they were five years ago. And, if the charge that there is more unemployment is to be laid at any man's door, it should be laid at the door of those who stand behind the hon. member for East Toowoomba.

Mr. ROBERTS: You are not employing more tradesmen.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I say we are.

Mr. ROBERTS: You are not.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: We are. I wish the hon. member would produce some argument, I hate this continual so-called argument—"You are." "You ain't." "You are." "You ain't." (Laughter.) It is so inconclusive, and I believe the hon. member has an opportunity yet of speaking. If he would retire for about a week, he might produce something that would last him half an hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: He is worrying you.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The argument is not worrying me at all; it is the noise that is worrying me. (Laughter.) I say that the Government should put on every apprentice that the awards will allow them to do. It is a very shortsighted policy not to put them on now, because we think we will not be able to employ them at the end of five years. That is a policy that we should not pursue. I regret to say that that is the case at

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

present. We want our men to be tradesmen. We want them to be efficient men, and they can only be efficient men if they are properly trained. And the use of that word "efficient" leads me to the point that perhaps to-day the most burning question is efficiency. There is a good deal of misunderstanding as to what it really means. For one thing, it does not mean high salaries to the boss, because you can pay high salaries and have no results. It does not mean big results, because you can have big results by sweating and profiteering. And it does not mean the greatest output per person employed, because you can have output regardless of conditions, regardless of health, and regardless of life. I think that "efficiency" might be summed up in the words "quantity and quality of product in comparison with the human effort and sacrifices involved." It is all very well to talk about efficiency and let it go at that. It would be a better thing for us to consider how it might be obtained. And in considering that question, I think it is just as well for us to understand that we have to live, and that to live we have to work. I think it is just as well for us to lay down the principle that we work to live, and that we do not live to work. There is a vast difference between them, and I think it should be thoroughly understood. The fault to-day in regard to production and efficiency is that we worship wealth, but have no appreciation or regard for education, culture, or happiness. We make no attempt to eliminate waste. Our managers, our controllers, and our overseers and foremen seem to have hands which still itch for the whip of the nigger-driver, for the methods of the sweater. They do not seem to be able to adapt themselves to new methods, and it is not to be wondered at if the wage-plodder naturally resents being turned into a machine. If efficiency is only going to aim at profit, it is no wonder that he "bucks" at efficiency, and he naturally objects to the introduction of new methods thrust upon him merely to that end. I believe that the worker is as keen for efficiency as the boss, but it must be an efficiency in the benefits of which he participates as well as anybody else. As a State, we are developing enterprises. We are attempting to grapple with the old, old disease of unemployment, and we are sufficiently far advanced to know that lopping off a limb here and lopping off a limb there is not of much use. We have got to go right to the root and cure the disease, and the disease is the construction of the system of society in which we live. I do not believe that we are going to solve the unemployed problem absolutely, no matter how much we may relieve it, until we get right down to production and control the whole thing. So far as our State enterprises are concerned, which, as a party, we regard as the first step towards the co-operative commonwealth, we must have efficiency as a first consideration, and there is a very mistaken idea of efficiency abroad, and that is, that it only applies to the workman. You hear the boss continually grumbling that he has not got efficient men, and saying what he could do if he had efficient men. Efficiency should not start at the bottom; efficiency should start at the top. If we have not got efficiency at the top, we cannot hope to have it anywhere else. I say that the man in charge should be a man inspired with a zeal for the enterprise which he is conducting, and it is a very regrettable fact

that the heads of certain industries we are conducting are absolutely antagonistic. Some are luke-warm and some are half-hearted, and I say that the most shocking example of this is the railways, and it is the most shocking example because it is the oldest State enterprise we are conducting in Queensland. It was instituted under different conditions to those under which enterprises are instituted to-day, and consequently its constitution has made it absolutely out of sympathy with the ideals of Labour administration. Sometimes there has been hostility to the aims and objects of Labour administration. I remember being one of a deputation to the head of the department over some trouble, and the man at the head advanced the argument, "Twenty years ago we did not have any of these things we are having to-day. Twenty years ago we did not have to meet the union secretary. Twenty years ago there was none of this." Why, we march with the times, or we ought to march with the times, and to-day, if the manager or supervisor, or overseer, or head refuses to meet the accredited representative of the union, the men naturally think he is afraid, because he does not want to be beaten or there is something he wants to hide. A man has no idea of efficiency who advances an excuse of that kind.

Mr. MULLAN: Some big Government officials will not meet them.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: They will have to learn to meet the accredited officials of unionism, and those who do not will show their lack of appreciation of present-day methods, show that they are back in the dim, distant past, that they desire to maintain a spirit of antagonism to their men, that they do not want to advance as they ought to advance. A shocking thing occurred in this connection in Ipswich. Five boys finished their apprenticeship and applied, naturally, to be recognised as tradesmen. The foreman under whom they had served their time reported that they were not efficient, and he could not recommend that they be paid as journeymen. I say that a foreman who sent along a recommendation like that about five boys he had trained should also have sent along his resignation, because he was responsible for their training, and to allow those boys to waste five years and then say they were not efficient casts a very grave reflection, not upon the boys, but upon the head of the department. That is one of the things that make for inefficiency in the railways, and will make for inefficiency in other departments of administration unless it is checked. It is high time the heads of departments were given to understand that they must take some different attitude to that. In the Railway Department particularly there must be some co-ordination of effort. We must get rid of this eternal feud between the locomotive department and the traffic department. Some members of those branches live for nothing else but this strife between the two departments. The Railway Department, as I say, is an old department, fifty or sixty years of age, ruled mostly by regulations drawn up under the Act, and those regulations are based on regulations which were drawn up fifty or sixty years ago. They are based upon the old military idea of regulations. Many of them were absolutely taken from the military regulations of the old country. Some

of them were based upon prison regulations. Based as they are upon those old ideas, those regulations should be swept entirely away. It is high time that we swept away every railway regulation that exists to-day and drew up an entirely new set. We must base the new regulations upon the new ideas. I think the basis of all the regulations should be, not control of the employees by the industry, but control of the industry by the employees. I believe, with others, that industry can best be controlled by the employees in the industry. They can control it best who shoulder the responsibility, and, as the workmen have generally shouldered the greater portion of the responsibility—in State enterprises, at any rate—it would be a much better thing if they shouldered the whole of the responsibility and the control were given over wholly to them. There must be one principle firmly established in the new regulations, and that is that every employee must be in accord with the ideals of the industry, from the manager down to the last lad employed. They must all be given to understand that they are an integral part of the mechanism requisite for the success of the undertaking. The result then will be creditable equally to the last lad engaged and to the manager. There must be the co-operation of every man to help the industry. To-day the position is that between the managers, the foremen, and the men there is nothing but antagonism; and, while that antagonism exists, there cannot be anything in the nature of efficiency. We can still trace in the Railway Department and in other branches of enterprise the hand of the autocrat. One of the things in which we can still trace that is in the matter of punishment by regulation. To-day in the railway service they still punish as they punished in the army forty, fifty, sixty years ago. If a man did something wrong, they stripped his epaulettes from him; they took away stripes; they reduced him in rank. To-day in the railway service they do exactly the same thing—they strip his status from him; reduce him in rank; throw him back; make him suffer in that way—the old, old ideas. Cannot we advance a little? Cannot we get along the line some way? Cannot we move our ideas up in conformity with the ideas that are embraced to-day? Even if it is a new venture, cannot we venture? We say a man who commits a crime shall be tried by a jury of his peers, so far as the common people are concerned. In the railway service, if you commit a crime—that is, if you break the regulations—you are tried by the man whose regulation you have broken—the boss immediately over you. You have broken the regulation with which he governs you. He is your accuser, and he is also your judge. He tries you; he awards the punishment; and after punishment is awarded we have an opportunity of going to the appeal court. How is the appeal court constituted? One man representing the boss, one man representing the man, and an independent magistrate, an unbiased magistrate, with a strong leaning to the boss; otherwise, why should the man be in the dock? He must have done something, or he would not have been there! The old, old attitude in the old, old days that the man must be guilty; that he must have done something, at any rate, or he would not have had a charge brought against him. I think it is high time we broke new ground

*Mr. F. A. Cooper.]*



in the matter of regulations for the trial of offences. I think men working in an industry should be in complete accord with the industry. Any man who breaks regulations in such a way that it would be to the detriment of that industry, to the throwing back of that industry, should be put out of the service. There should be practically only one punishment for serious breaches of the regulations, and that should be dismissal. I think, also, that we might try the experiment of allowing to men who commit serious breaches in the Railway Department the opportunity of being tried by the men with whom they work. Let them be tried by their peers, and not, as they are to-day, tried by the man immediately over them, with the right of appeal to a court composed of a man against him, a man with him, and an independent chairman who, we strongly suspect, is unconsciously biased.

I notice in the papers to-day the programme of the National party. I notice that they are going to make an effort, through their programme, to have a Chair of Medicine and a Chair of Commerce instituted at our University. I say nothing against it, but I say we have Chairs of Medicine and of Commerce in other parts of Australia. Let us also strike out on a fresh line there. Let us institute a Chair of Industry. Let us educate industry along effective lines—because, after all, industry is the thing we live for—the uplifting of the people generally. If we have any object in life, if we have any ideals at all, it is not to go along in the same old way perpetually quarrelling, seeing some people in absolute misery and others in absolute luxury. Surely we have something in us which impels us to make things a little better than they have been. If we can do it, let us do it. Let us start in the very best way—by initiating a proper system of education. Let us have a Chair of Industry along effective lines, where there will be effective co-operation and co-ordination of intellectually directed effort to obtain the fulness of life by the elimination of waste, by the application of science to industry, so that the fulness of life may be enjoyed by all. Life has to be lived, not to be endured. The worker's life I described a little while ago as the life of an army—struggling, fighting, quarrelling, repelling this onslaught, repelling the other onslaught. Cannot we raise a higher ideal of life? Cannot we lift it out of the idea of a thing of struggle into something else. I hope that in the near future we may be able to drop the simile of an army and take on the simile of an orchestra—striving for harmony, concord, and a happy life. The hon. member for Bulimba might even be a happy drummer. Even if he beat the drum, so long as he beat it in harmony, he would be doing something for the community. The man who beat the drum would be as indispensable in a good orchestra as the man who wielded the baton. I hope the efforts of the Labour party will continue to be directed along the lines of a harmonious community, enjoying the full product of their labour and coming into that fulness of prosperity that the people of a State are entitled to. (Hear, hear!)

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat made a remark about the member for

[*Mr. F. A. Cooper.*]

Bulimba beating the drum in this new order that he is endeavouring to forecast.

MR. KIRWAN: Would you rather play the trombone?

HON. W. H. BARNES: It may be consoling to him to know that in past days the hon. member for Bulimba has done something perhaps more mental than beating a drum.

MR. F. A. COOPER: I did not say that it would be mental. I said it would be as important as wielding the baton.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have done things very much more mental than beating a drum. If there is one thing more than another upon which I pride myself, it is that I know all the difficulties associated with the life of men, because I have had the privilege—and it is a privilege—of commencing at the bottom rung of the ladder and working up by dint of hard work. It should be no news to inform the hon. member that, if I had to undertake a task of that particular description, I would endeavour to do it well. I take it that, after all, the greatest happiness in life comes to the man who believes that he has a duty to perform and, according to his lights, does it to the very best of his ability. I do not know what the hon. member for Bremer meant by

[5.30 p.m.] some of his arguments, but it seems to me that, boiled down,

his speech was a kind of vindication of something that I shall have to refer to later on in connection with certain recent happenings in the North. It seems to me that the hon. member's contention is really this—that all authority, practically, should be thrown overboard and that there should be placed in the hands of irresponsibles the duty of regulating the control of public departments. That seems to be the leading point that the hon. member sought to make. The hon. member's references to having an unbiassed magistrate associated with railway appeals—he spoke sarcastically about having an unbiassed magistrate—were utterly uncalled for. If I know anything of the men who are appointed to positions of that description, they enter upon their duties with a sincere desire to carry out their duties in an absolutely impartial manner. Nothing can be more humiliating to public life in Queensland than for public men to get up in this House and speak of the men so appointed as though they wanted to carry out their duties in an improper manner. That is absolutely against the very best interests of the community.

Before dealing with the Address in Reply. I want to comment on one or two matters that have been referred to by hon. members. I am sorry the hon. member for Bremer has gone out of the Chamber. The other day reference was made, by question, to the use by returned soldiers of motor cars belonging to the leader of the Opposition and myself. Let me say here and now that the hon. member was exceedingly unfortunate in his remarks in that connection, because, as a matter of fact, only the night before he made that reference, my car was at the Central Station, as it had been on many previous occasions, to serve and help the boys. A man who grudges his car to help the boys, at any rate, has missed his opportunity. It is, comparatively speaking, a very easy thing for me to allow my car to meet the returned soldiers, but my position

is entirely different to that of the leader of the Opposition. As a matter of fact, I cannot drive a car; I have a chauffeur; while the leader of the Opposition drives his own car; but I know sufficient of the leader of the Opposition to know that, if he only chose to speak in this matter, he would put to shame even hon. members on the opposite side who brought in that reference to our returned boys. It is only right that these remarks should be made.

The hon. member for Port Curtis, last night, touched on a matter which is exceedingly vital to the community. He read some correspondence which emanated from the Military Department of Queensland, in connection with certain people who, it was suggested, should be deported. I want to say here and now, and I have never hesitated to say it on the floor of this House, that I do not care what nationality a man is; whether he is English, Irish, Scotch, German, or any other nationality, if he has the advantages of British rule and British freedom, then, if that man is not a loyal man, he should be sent out of the country.

MR. STOPFORD: Without a trial?

HON. W. H. BARNES: A trial is part and parcel of British justice. One of my own constituents received a similar notice to that which was read by the hon. member for Port Curtis last night. I am not saying that any member on this side of the House is here to support any action that is inhuman or unkind towards a man because of his nationality. When I got that notice I immediately took action, because I felt it was one of the things that did not appeal to me, as a member of the National party of Queensland, and I wrote to Mr. Watt, the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, and I received this reply from him, dated 7th July, 1919—

"Dear Mr. Barnes,

"In continuation of my letter of the 24th June, regarding a circular issued by the military authorities in Brisbane, in connection with the deportation of aliens, I desire to inform you that the circular in question was sent without instructions from headquarters, and the Military Commandant in Queensland has had his attention drawn to the error of judgment made by him in sending such circular out.

"Before any naturalised subject could be deported, it would be necessary that he first be denaturalised, and even when this course is followed, he would not be sent away without first having an opportunity of applying for permission to remain in the Commonwealth.

"Yours faithfully,  
G. W. H. WISE,

"For Acting Prime Minister."

MR. STOPFORD: That does not apply to the men who came here too late to get naturalisation papers.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It shows that the hon. member for Port Curtis, in my judgment, was seeking to make political capital in view of the coming Federal elections. He was seeking to make political capital out of that circular when, as we know, very frequently letters and circulars are sent out of Government offices unknown to the Minister, and especially from such offices as

distant as Queensland is from Melbourne. It is only right that I should place before this House what was in the mind of the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth.

In connection with His Excellency's Speech, I wish to say at once that any Bills that are to be introduced, that have in them qualities for the betterment of Queensland, will have my earnest and strong support. Any measure which has for its object the uplifting of the people of Queensland will always have my support, because I believe it is most essential that every man in this House, whatever his political views may be, should seek to help along these lines. Having said that, I wish to state that, from my view, His Excellency's Speech largely excludes the things that would be of benefit to this State.

THE ACTING PREMIER: That is a reflection on His Excellency.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is not a reflection on His Excellency, because His Excellency merely reads what is put into his hands. It is a reflection on those hon. gentlemen who furnished His Excellency with such an Address. The Speech very largely is a resurrection of old Bills. Some of them have been brought forward again with a view to trying to induce another place to pass them. We had evidence of that here to-day in the notice of motion of the Home Secretary for leave to introduce certain Bills.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Don't you believe in them?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I shall have an opportunity of saying, at the proper time, what I believe in, when those Bills come before the House. At any rate, I will seek, when they do come before us, to find out what is the proper time, because on that point there seems to be a difference of opinion in the minds of the big guns of the House.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Yes, but you had a chance last session.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I would like the Home Secretary to know that I do not always avail myself of my chances. I think that the Bills that have been included in the Governor's programme have been put forward for the specific purpose of tickling the ear of the man outside, without having any real business in them. I think that the Speech itself contains a great deal of padding. I want to draw attention to some of the measures to which reference is made. There is the Legislative Council Abolition Bill—that is an old friend—an Elections Act Amendment Bill, a Seaforth Repurchased Estate Bill—

THE ACTING PREMIER: That is an old friend.

HON. W. H. BARNES: And a Fair Prices Bill. I want to know if the Government are going to start with themselves in regard to fair prices. If the Government are going to be fair and square, they themselves will have to start with fair prices. May I remind them of the fish shops, and of the big percentage of profit which they are getting in connection with other business ventures under their control?

THE ACTING PREMIER: Meat, for instance.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Quotations have been read by hon. members opposite in the

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

direction of trying to prove that enormous profits have been made.

The ACTING PREMIER: Has there been any profiteering?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, there has been profiteering, and the profiteering has taken place practically by the Treasurer. It will be interesting to see if the Government are going to try fair prices in some of their own departments, because, if the State has done one thing more than another in connection with some of its projects, it has been to raise the price of commodities.

We are told there is going to be a Legislative Council Abolition Bill brought in. What is the offence which the Council has committed against the Government?

Mr. DUNSTAN: They have been too long on the political stage.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I hope the hon. member may have as good a record as hon. members in another place; if so, he will have nothing to be ashamed of. What is the offence of the Council? Is it because it has been a protection to the community against spoliation by the Government?

Mr. CARTER: It has saved the profiteers.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If it had had the opportunity of doing its duty, some of the profiteers who make a very great noise would have been dealt with. It has not done that, but it has come along and said that British justice should be done. (Government laughter.) It has said that when certain things are acquired, they shall be acquired "on just terms." Surely, we are not going to tear justice into shreds in connection with the administration of the Government of this country! One of the things we have resolutely set our face against is the wilfully doing an injustice to any person in the community, because that would do untold damage to the community itself.

Then there is to be an Elections Act Amendment Bill. Has the Acting Premier been bringing himself and his constituency into line? Does he propose to remove the inequality which exists in connection with the representation of the people? If votes are, comparatively speaking, equal, allowing for a proportion in favour of the country, is it fair that there should be electorates with 12,000 voters and other electorates with 2,000, and that the Government should be unwilling to rectify the injustice? Does the Acting Premier say that it is just to place one electorate in that respect at such a great disadvantage with another electorate? Is it due to the fact that the hon. gentleman is afraid to tackle the matter, because the brains are on the side where the big electorates are? (Government laughter.) Why is it that a man who has a reputation for going straight like the Treasurer should apparently hesitate to influence his colleagues in the direction of doing justice? The Toowong and Toombul electorates have each about 12,000 electors, while the Acting Premier's electorate has only about 2,000, and yet the hon. gentleman is sitting complacently on the front bench.

The ACTING PREMIER: I will confess that those 12,000 electors in Bulimba did not deserve credit when they elected you. (Government laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: I confess that I have some feelings of sorrow for the 2,000

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

electors in the electorate which the hon. member represents. (Laughter.) What is going to become of the principle of adult suffrage? If John Brown is as good as Tom Jones, how is it that the John Browns in Bulimba, Toombul, and Toowong are not as good as the Tom Jones's in the hon. member's electorate? However, I presume that the Bill to which prominence is given in the Speech really has to do with giving a vote to minors. It seems to me that this is one of those things with which the Government are tickling the community, and making certain classes think that the Government are their only friends.

Then, I want to deal with the Seaforth Repurchased Estate. I admit that the Seaforth Estate was not a good purchase.

Mr. CARTER: A very smellful purchase.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member knows as well as I do that the estates that were repurchased by the Liberal Government were, on the whole, satisfactory purchases, that none of them were smellful, and that there has been no loss, even including the Seaforth Estate.

The ACTING PREMIER: What about Jimbour?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I think that when Jimbour was repurchased, the hon. gentleman was sitting behind the Government when repurchased it.

The ACTING PREMIER: No.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I may be wrong; but that is my impression. There is nothing in the Speech in the nature of creating new industries. The whole endeavour seems to be to try to catch the ears of the unwary outside.

Another question which must be faced by the community generally—and I take it that this question is bigger than party politics—is the fact that Queensland is face to face with a depletion of the country districts. I am quite prepared to admit that some of the factors which contribute to that state of things cannot be controlled by the Government; but there are other factors which may be controlled by the Government, and which are not being controlled by them. The producer is being squeezed out—and here I may say I want to consider this matter apart from politics and only in the interest of the State—the producer, I say, is being squeezed out. The tendency has been to induce men in the country, especially young fellows, to come into the city. I am referring now to agriculture and dairying, more particular dairying. If a man wants to make a success of dairying, he has to work early and late seven days a week, and the returns from his labour are not all that could be desired. The advantages which people in the country enjoy are not very great as compared with the advantages enjoyed by residents in towns and cities. The producer finds himself living at a distance from the metropolis, where there are all kinds of advantages, such as theatres and picture shows—advantages which are not available to country people, but which must attract young fellows to the city.

The TREASURER: What attracted you to the city?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Treasurer knows I did my job in the country well, and was thus attracted to the city. Distance from the metropolis is a factor which is influencing the settlement of men on the

land. Then, again, the producer finds that he is a target for all the additional taxation that is imposed. Further, every new industrial award means a temptation to the young men in the country to leave their employment and come into the towns or cities.

The TREASURER: Are you against awards?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not against awards, and I am not against arbitration. What I say is, that we have to face the position fairly and squarely, and ascertain what is going to be the outcome of this continual trend of country people towards the city. The time is not perhaps very far distant when the Government of this State will have to do something in the direction of giving some assistance to men on the land in order to keep them there. I am sorry to say that lately Queensland and other parts of Australia have suffered very keenly from the effects of a drought. It requires a man with a very stout heart to remain on the land after he has put a crop in and seen it fail. We shall, I say, have to face the problem of keeping men on the land, because, unless the men on the land are kept there and prosper, it is as evident as the fact that I am present in this House to-night that the cities must suffer.

I wish to draw attention to another matter. Our position has changed as a result of the war, and it is necessary for us to see that our population is increased. When I think of the large territory we possess, it seems to me that we who are sent here by the constituencies to look after their interests should try to help the State in this respect, and that, instead of the Government bringing forward some of the Bills which are mentioned in their programme, they should earnestly set about seeing what can be done in the way of preparing for the day when it will be noticeably manifest that we require a larger population in the State. No member can speak about the war through which we have passed without recognising that the boys who have left Australia and gone to the front have done their best in our interests. But the very fact that we entered into the war has made it more patent that we are part and parcel of a great Empire. I do not think there is any man in the community who would not wish that this country should be part and parcel of the great Empire to which we belong. The fact that we are part and parcel of that Empire should cause us to recognise that the war has placed us in a new position, and I want to ask those who are listening to my voice to-night if that has not been forcibly brought before us by the report of Lord Jellicoe? The British Government, and those associated with them, recognise that there is going to be a new responsibility placed upon Australia in connection with our navy. Lord Jellicoe has said that Australia must protect herself and must have her own navy, and, according to the reports which have been published, he has also said that it will be necessary for us to have assistance from the British Government. We must accept the responsibilities which have been placed upon us in that particular regard, and I say that our duty is obvious.

One of the duties we should attend to is that of making our land laws more attractive. I do not believe in the principle which is enunciated by members on the other side of the House that men should be asked to come here and then be told that all they

are to get so far as land tenure is concerned is a perpetual lease. The man who wants to take up a small holding does not want a perpetual lease; he wants to feel that he owns the freehold, and that the land which he takes up and improves is his own. I am quite prepared to admit that a lot of land has been held under leasehold in Queensland. I am also quite prepared to admit that even those unfortunate people who were washed out at Clermont have taken up leaseholds.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The people there prefer the leasehold system.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I doubt that very much; I think they are exceedingly sorry they have had to take up leaseholds.

(Sitting suspended between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: One of the very necessary things to be done in connection with settlement is to make provision for providing water upon the lands which are being opened up. I recognise that it is not a bit of use to put men on the land, possibly only to find that at the very commencement they are assailed with drought, and, having very little water, it may mean ruin for them unless they are financially strong. It is our duty to improve by making provision for the men who, after all, are the backbone of the community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What land are you referring to now?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member knows that there are localities where the water supply is not good, where there are no natural rivers; and to a large extent we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to put down artesian bores.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is being done in places.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That was done by the Government of which I was a member, but I say it wants to be done again and again, to make it easier for the man who is settling on the land.

There is one phase of things that we must consider. Though we are only one of the States—a very important State—of the Commonwealth, still we have entered into a League of Nations through the Commonwealth Government, and we have taken upon ourselves certain responsibilities which, I feel, will demand the fullest attention from every man in the days to come, whether he be a member of the State or the Federal Parliament. I think I am right in saying that not only should the Federal Parliament have representation at the League of Nations, but that it would not be an unfair thing that the State Parliaments should have some representation also.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Surely you do not distrust your Imperial Government?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I do not distrust the Imperial Government one bit, but the knowledge which a member would have coming from a particular State would be of very great value in the deliberations. No one for one moment would suggest that the making of that suggestion arises from any distrust of the Imperial Government. I am an Australian, but I believe in the Imperial Government, and believe that they will do a fair thing by us in Australia.

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

Just now we have a responsibility cast upon us to assist more and more in the development of the State along the lines of manufacturing. I fancy that in some directions Victoria holds the key to the position, but surely we should do what we can generally, and not only in one direction, to develop the great State of Queensland. It will be admitted that we have abundance of raw material in some directions, and I want to congratulate those men in Queensland, and possibly to a larger extent elsewhere, who, as a result of the stoppage of the importation of some lines, took advantage of that fact and manufactured articles in Australia which had previously come from abroad. It is distinctly along those lines that we can help to develop the State.

It also seems to me that we should, to a very large extent, husband our resources. For a very brief moment I want to deal with the financial position, and I think we should endeavour to keep that question away from the realm of party politics. I believe that, if the Acting Premier were willing to give to this House his own views in regard to the financial position generally, he would say that it required the closest consideration, and called for a tight grip, because it appears that not only in Queensland, but right throughout the world, we are faced with financial difficulties. Possibly I shall be told that I am a kind of Jeremiah, but it is a patent fact right throughout the world. Take, if you will, Lloyd George and the Federal Prime Minister, who again and again have referred to the need for exercising the greatest care so far as the finances are concerned. It is a fact, whether we like it or not, that we have been spending a very considerable sum of money in Australia, and, having contracted debts, must pay them.

Mr. HARTLEY: Of course, you want to pay the interest on the war loans.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I take it that any Government should carry out their obligations to those with whom they have entered into contracts. The policy of the party on this side of the House is not to repudiate contracts, but to adhere to them, and carry them out.

Mr. HARTLEY: The policy of this party is to keep faith with the worker.

HON. W. H. BARNES: A writer in the "Age" recently, after dealing specifically with other States, said, with regard to Queensland—

"The position is equally bad in Queensland. The present Government came into office pledged to economy. When it took over the reins in 1915 there was a surplus of £3,259. On 31st December last there was a deficit of £371,000. During its last year of office the Denham Government spent £7,199,000. In its first year the Ryan Government exceeded this by £472,000; in its second year by £935,000, and in its third year it planned to exceed it by £1,550,000.

"All the other States also show a considerable increase in their public service, and, generally, the position of Australia in this regard is rapidly becoming desperate. Unless the various Governments soon make up their minds that systematic economy is imperative, there will be a black day in store for Australia."

Mr. BERTRAM: In what way would you effect economy?

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is a very pertinent and plain question. There has been a tendency on the part of the Government unduly to fill up departments.

The ACTING PREMIER: You would have wholesale sacking.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No; I am not out to do that. In answer to the hon. member for Maree, I say the duty of the Government, if they have been—and I believe they have—carrying on an orgy of expenditure, is to put on the brake, and see that the policy of the departments in placing men here, there, and everywhere should cease, and that time should be one of the factors in righting the position.

The ACTING PREMIER: Would you take it away from the hospitals, or starve the children?

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is getting a threadbare argument on the part of the hon. gentleman. Let us look again at some of the conditions in Queensland as they are to-day. There are two factors. One is that Queensland is the most heavily taxed of the States, and another is that it is apparently proceeding along lines which are going to lead to heavier taxation still.

Mr. WHITFORD: By profiteers.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If the taxation is to get at the profiteers, they will be found on the other side—not only at the men who may be in business—it is said they are profiteering, but I do not know any of them—but the men who are "brief barons" and such like. Let me deal with one phase of our life as it affects the Administration itself. Since this Government came into office they have systematically spent more money in some departments from Loan Fund, and reduced the amounts paid from ordinary revenue. I am referring more particularly to the Works Department. Let me illustrate what I mean. The amount spent from revenue by the Department of Public Works on buildings in 1913-14 was £192,755; in 1914-15 it was £228,689; in 1915-16, £173,866; in 1916-17, £166,504; in 1917-18, £142,866. Ever since this Government came into office they have gradually whittled down the amount spent in public works from revenue, and increased the amount spent from loan. It all indicates a tightening of the finances.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: New schools have been put up.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I recognise that the hon. gentleman is always willing to help in connection with schools, and I am not scolding him for that. I am scolding him for not getting his colleagues to see the importance of the position, and to shape their course so that they will adopt legitimate methods in connection with finance. The amount spent from Loan Fund in 1913-14 on public works and buildings was £72,657; in 1914-15—the last year of the Denham Government—it was £77,333; in 1915-16—the first year of the Ryan Government—£151,574; in 1916-17, £205,372; and in 1917-18, £158,157.

The ACTING PREMIER: We built a lot of schools.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to put the two sets of figures together, that argument of his will be at once dissipated, because, taking the expenditure on buildings from revenue and loan together, it will be found that the

Liberal Administration spent about as much year by year as has been spent under the present Administration. The railways produced a net revenue in 1915-16 of £1,269,000; in 1916-17, £837,780; and in 1917-18, £613,764. What is the explanation of that? An hon. member—I think the hon. member for Murilla—the other night asked a question which revealed a tremendous shrinkage in the train mileage and a very large increase in the number of railway employees. Is it any wonder that there should be a shrinkage along those particular lines when that kind of action is being followed? Let me draw attention to another phase in connection with finance. I said a while ago that Queensland was the most heavily taxed of the States. I am quoting now from the "Year Book of Australia" for 1917.

The ACTING PREMIER: We tax the rich men in Queensland.

HON. W. H. BARNES: My time is limited, and I will not reply to these unruly interjections from the hon. gentleman. The taxation per head of population in 1917 was: New South Wales, £1 9s. 1d.; Victoria, £1 12s.; South Australia, £1 13s. 8d.; Western Australia, £1 6s. 1d.; Tasmania, £2 3s. 11d. Queensland, I suppose, the Acting Premier will say, takes pride of place with £2 6s. 9d. per head of population.

The ACTING PREMIER: It comes out of the pockets of the rich men.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am very glad to know it comes out of the rich man's pockets, because then it is coming out of the hon. gentleman's pocket.

The ACTING PREMIER: It shows you how impartial I am.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The total Commonwealth and State taxation per head of the population was: 1915-16, £4 16s. 7d.; and 1916-17, £6 17s. 6d. Now, let us look at another phase of it. The State expenditure per head of population in Queensland was, in 1914-15, £10 12s. 7d., and in 1916-17, £12 3s. There is no doubt a rapid rise in that particular regard. Am I not right, therefore, in saying that there is abundant need for every man who is a statesman, for every man who is conducting a department, for every man who believes that this State wants the best that we can give, to look into the matter and see that we face the financial position so that we shall be able satisfactorily to deal with it? The Treasurer must know that, if the finances break down, there must come a lot of other things in the wake of that breakdown.

The ACTING PREMIER: There is no danger of the finances breaking down.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Is it not a fact that the Acting Premier has had to go to the Savings Bank and get £1,000,000 to help the finances so that they would not break down?

The ACTING PREMIER: I did not get as much as you did.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Can the Acting Premier deny that?

The ACTING PREMIER: You had £3,000,000 odd.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Can the hon. gentleman deny that he had to go to the Savings Bank to get a million of money? If the money were called in, the hon. member knows the difficulty he would have in

repaying it. I want now to deal with the question of arbitration. It seems to me that we have to look into the question of how it is arbitration has failed to some extent. I am a believer in arbitration with all its disadvantages, but I am not a believer in the sentiment which appeared in the columns of a daily paper recently, which practically said to the men, "Flout the Arbitration Court. It will be all right in the near future, as you have a sympathetic Government." I notice also a message from the Assistant Minister for Justice, the Hon. Mr. Gillies, with regard to certain things that happened to men employed in the Railway Department, and their suspension. I notice the Minister is particularly careful in what he says. This is what he said—

"Your wire received. This matter is under consideration by the Cabinet."

The ACTING PREMIER: Is that what you complain about?

HON. W. H. BARNES: No. I am going to tell you something more. Then I notice that Mr. H. J. Ryan sent a wire to Mr. Murchison, Cairns, as follows:—

"Approve railway workers' action, and think, as unionists, they could not do otherwise. Urging Cabinet to reinstate."

That is all in keeping with what was said by an hon. member of the other side this afternoon, practically stating that the men themselves should control and direct what is to be in Queensland. If that happens, what a pretty mess we shall get into! What a shocking mess we will get into! There is another wire to Mr. Murchison, Cairns, in reply, which reads—

"Thanks your action regarding comrades. Trades Hall Council and unions' delegation to Premier is being arranged. In the meantime I think it advisable to refrain from making any announcement. Matter of retrospective pay is in hand. (Signed) Rymer, Northern organiser."

There is one other name here. I refer now to the hon. member for Cairns. Hon. members will understand that I am not dealing with the high office of the chair. This is what the hon. member for Cairns wired—

"Have already urged Government not to penalise men for obeying their union. Northern members acted conjointly on this matter: think Government be persuaded take more lenient view shortly."

That shows there is a conspiracy going on. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that you are in that.

The SPEAKER: I would suggest, if the hon. member wishes to attack the hon. member for Cairns, that he should take the opportunity when the House is in Committee so that the hon. member for Cairns will have an opportunity of replying.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I hope you will not rule me out of order for criticising the hon. member for Cairns.

The SPEAKER: I only make the suggestion.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I respect the suggestion, and, if the House likes to exclude the hon. member for Cairns, so be it; but, at any rate, there was a conspiracy going on

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

apparently by which it was suggested—I do not suppose the Acting Premier will deny it—by which it was suggested, “Let sleeping dogs lie.”

THE ACTING PREMIER: I did not say that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I know you did not.

Mr. KIRWAN: A very wise proverb that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I do say that we have to face this position—that, if we want to have law and order, we must have control. If every man is going to be his own judge of what is right and of what is fair, what sort of a position shall we get into? Are we not all of us under control? Why, I am now under your control, Mr. Speaker, and, if I offend, you can very sharply bring me to order, and I say it is essential that where there is a big department such as the Railway Department, such a department should be under control. I notice that the Minister is reported to have said that, if the men promised not to offend again, they might go back. I think that is a very reasonable and a very proper suggestion to make; but it must be laid down, and emphatically laid down, what is to be the policy of the Government in that regard. If the Government want to wreck Queensland, they will play absolutely into the hands of the men who, after all, want no authority and want to pull down. The Government themselves have created a mighty instrument which is seeking to wreck them. I can remember when that genial member the Secretary for Public Lands used to go round and tell the people that they were being most unfairly and improperly treated.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: Those chickens are now coming home to roost, and the instrument they have created is an instrument which is striking at the very vitals of the community. There is no doubt that the Secretary for Public Lands is one of those who is responsible for what is happening.

So far as the policy of the Government is concerned, the Speech is full of padding. It seems to me that, if one reads the Speech through, he can, in another sense, read into it a remark which was made by a Minister of the Crown—namely, that the Speech is full of cant and humbug. Very largely, it is full of cant and humbug.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you accuse the Governor of that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No, nor do I accuse the hon. gentleman of it. There are loyal references made in that Speech which must have cost a very great deal to make them.

THE ACTING PREMIER: That is another reflection on the Governor.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No. It must have cost Ministers a very great deal of trouble to make those remarks, because there are some Ministers—not all of them, and by no means all of them—who never once mounted a platform to assist in any way to give a welcome to the boys who are coming back. I want to ask: Can we have any confidence in utterances like this, when we know that the Premier attended the Amsterdam conference, and was prepared to associate with our enemies while the war was on? Is it not also a fact that we have some hon. gentlemen opposite who went to the Perth conference, and asked for “Peace by negotiation,”

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

when the old country was facing a position that was as dark as it possibly could be?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Was it not “Peace by negotiation?”

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, but no thanks to those men who went to Perth and tried to do what they could to pull down the Empire at that time.

Mr. VOWLES: They cheered for the revolution.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member is right; such a call was reported from Perth. Now, we find in the Speech these words—

“It must be a source of intense gratification to you that the dreadful war which for more than four years had devastated the fairest portion of Europe and had caused appalling loss in life and treasure has come to an end.”

THE ACTING PREMIER: You should not oppose that sentiment.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I do not oppose the return of peace. I thank God for the return of peace, but I say that it is regrettable, when some public men of Queensland had the opportunity of testifying where they were, and of trying to help the old country, that, instead of doing that, they were pulling the strings all along the line to try and down the old country. Now, however, they come out as full-blown loyalists, and pose as being men who were most anxious to serve the Empire at a critical time. I want to close by saying there are some matters referred to in the Speech which will receive my hearty support. Mention is made about overcrowding in the city. I think it is a sin and a shame to permit overcrowding, and should any attempt be made to prevent overcrowding, I shall only be too glad to assist the Government. Any measure that has for its object the development of a more satisfactory citizenship, will always have my assistance and support. I know attempts have been made by some hon. members opposite to try and create the impression that members on this side of the House have no sympathy for the worker. Our sympathy is broad and wide, and we are out to help the meek, the poor, the needy, and do anything along the lines of constitutional Government to help the people to work out the great destiny that lies before this State, and, if we do that, we shall not have failed in our duty to the country.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I was very sorry to hear the hon. member who has just resumed his seat make an attack on members on this side, by accusing them [7.30 p.m.] of having no sympathy with the old country, but I will refer to that later on.

To some extent, my speech will deal with North Queensland and my own electorate. I notice a paragraph in the Governor's Speech which reads—

“With regard to State enterprises associated with mining, the question of an iron and steel works site is still engaging the closest attention of my advisers; the arsenic works at Jibbenbar are already in the experimental stage; the Chillagoe and Etheridge railways, and the mines and works connected with them, have been taken over; the Bamford battery continues to work satisfactorily; the Bowen coalmine needs only the completion of

the railways to it to make its development practicable and successful; and prospecting for coal on the areas reserved for State purposes is being continued at Styx River and Baralaba."

I am very pleased to say that, so far as the Bowen State coalmine is being developed, there has within the last few days been a bulk test made of the coal from the Bowen seam for coking purposes, and I am glad to say that the coke which I have in my hand is a sample of the coke made from the seam on the Bowen River coalfield. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) I believe there are seventeen similar samples to this at the Mines Department, which hon. members can inspect. The Bowen seam has been proved by a shaft recently sunk to be of a thickness of 10 feet 10 inches of good coal, and this is some of the coke that has been made from the coal in that seam. Hon. members will remember that, when the discussion on the Iron and Steel Works Bill took place, I stressed the point that three of the principal countries in the world had been built up by the development of coal and iron—namely, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States of America. I am satisfied that, as time rolls on, and we develop the Bowen coalfield, we shall find it one of the biggest coalfields in Australia, if not in the civilised world. We have five seams of coal in less than 500 feet of sinking. I would be lacking in my duty to the North if I did not bring this matter up, because, after all, no matter what Government has been in power, the North has not been developed as it should be developed, as I shall prove before I sit down. There is no better place for the establishment of iron and steel works than North Queensland, and the best place to establish these works is at Bowen. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) We have a suitable site there. I was taught, long before I saw Port Denison, that the Bowen Harbour is the third harbour in Australia. I was always taught that Sydney Harbour was first, then Port Curtis, and Port Denison came third. We not only have the coal deposits, but what the Bowen people believe should be the site. We have in the Bowen Harbour an immense volume of limestone—over 1,000,000 tons are in sight above the surface—and it is State-owned. The member for Bowen has seen to it that it was reserved to the State. Then again, nature has been most kind to us in the North, as anyone who has studied the iron deposits of Queensland must know, and it is only fair to tell the truth, that the largest iron-ore deposits known in the State of Queensland are in the Cloncurry district. Mount Leviathan has a deposit of 10,000,000 tons. Then again, quite recently the Government Geologist has told us that Mount Philp, a few miles beyond Cloncurry, contains no less than 20,000,000 tons, also above the surface, and could be easily mined. In other words, in these two deposits alone we have 30,000,000 tons of iron-ore, and I am satisfied that, if we do not develop it, the little brown man would be only too pleased to develop it. I believe that during the past few years the Japanese have inspected the deposits at Mount Leviathan. It has been argued that the distance from Cloncurry to Bowen is too great to bring the ore to the seaport and make it into iron. I deny that. No matter what those who believe that it is too far away may say, they have to convince me that it is too far away. The distance from

Cloncurry to Bowen is 601 miles. They say that the expense on our railways would be too great to bring the iron ore that distance and manufacture it into iron and steel. My reply to that is, that in some portions of my electorate there are only about three trains per week, and the same thing is true of many other parts of Queensland. To make our railways pay we must have increased production, and there must be more trains run over the railways. Presuming that each mile of railway cost £5,000, and there are only six trains per week running over that mile, occupying one hour per week, in one hour that railway service has to earn interest upon capital invested, and maintenance likewise. My contention is that, if we develop those iron-ore deposits in the Cloncurry district, and we could bring a trainload of ore over the railway from Cloncurry to Bowen every hour, we would be able to carry our ore at a mere fraction per ton. Even supposing the iron-ore did not pay—that we had to carry it at a slight loss—would it not be better to bring the ore from the place where nature has been so lavish in putting such immense deposits, than not to develop them? It is all moonshine to tell us that we cannot compete against other countries in the manufacture of iron. Where you have a mountain it is easily mined. I think you could mine it and put it on the trucks for 2s. 6d. a ton. It is there in abundance. Nature has been most kind to us in the North. It is in the North where the big things are, just the same as with the men who count in this Parliament—the big men of this Parliament. You have only to look at the front Treasury bench and the Speaker's chair to realise that.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: Another reason why I am advocating the establishment of iron and steel works north of Brisbane is in regard to population. The hon. member for Bulimba referred to the fact that the country was getting depleted of population. I have a few figures here in reference to the population of Northern, Central, and Southern Queensland. I wrote to the Registrar-General on the 23rd of last month, asking for the estimated population of the northern, central, and southern divisions of the State ten years ago, five years ago, and at the present time, and he writes—

"In reply to your letter of the 23rd instant, asking for the estimated population of the Northern, Central, and Southern divisions of the State for ten years ago, five years ago, and at the present time, I beg to inform you as follows:—

	Northern. Persons.	Central. Persons.	Southern. Persons.
1908	122,614	70,859	364,764
1913	124,848	82,764	452,546
Increase on 1908	2,234	11,905	87,782
1918	130,512	86,738	477,190
Increase on 1913	5,664	3,974	24,644
Total increase since 1908	7,898	15,879	112,426

The increase in South Queensland in that case amounted to the total population of North Queensland, within a few thousands. We can easily understand why Southern

Mr. Collins.]



Queensland grows, and why the progress of the North is retarded. We have not got the secondary industries in the North that you have in Southern Queensland. But, considering that we have iron ore deposits, coal deposits from which such excellent coke can be made, limestone deposits, and magnesite—that we have everything necessary for the establishment of iron and steel works—it seems to me that the Government should seriously consider the suggestion to establish those works in that part of the State. Coke is a very important thing for North Queensland. With coke, the Cloncurry copper field can be developed, and that field is one of the largest copper fields in the world. All that is required to enable it to be developed is cheap coke. The iron and steel works should be established in either the North or Central Queensland, to enable us to settle those parts of the State. Quite recently, as a member of the Public Works Commission, I travelled over a greater portion of the North than I had ever travelled over before, and I had previously travelled over a good part of that part of Queensland. When I saw the magnificent lands which are to be found on the Barkly Tableland, and the stream of the Gregory River containing millions of gallons of water which were rushing to the coast, I said, "Oh where, oh where are the people?" It is all very well to talk about cattle and sheep, but neither cattle nor sheep ever make a great nation. That splendid country is within a few days' travel of the millions of people in Japan, China, and other parts of the East, and I contend that it is the duty of this Government—and not only of this Government, but also of the Commonwealth Government—to assist in the work of developing that part of Queensland. The Barkly Tableland, which is not all in Queensland, extends for 360 miles in length, and is 200 miles wide, and it contains some of the most magnificent land that ever a man travelled over. If I had my way, notwithstanding the stringency of the State finances, I would put a sum of money on the Estimates to enable every member of this House to go and inspect that part of Queensland, where there are fewer people than are to be found in one of the suburbs of Brisbane. This State has to grow in the future much faster than it has grown in the past, and it can only grow by developing our railways and our natural resources. Personally I am tired of talking about this matter, and I say that it is time we did something more than talk about it, and I hope the Government will consider the remarks I have made this evening with reference to the establishment of iron and steel works in the North. The hon. member for Bulimba this afternoon referred to the fact that his electorate contains 12,000 electors. My electorate has 7,227 electors—very nearly 2,000 more than it had when I was first returned in 1915. I am proud to say that it is one of the electorates in the North which is growing, and I hope it will continue to grow, and that it will still return me as its representative to Parliament. Quite recently 600 and odd names were put on the electoral roll. I am not afraid of an election if it takes place to-morrow, as I am satisfied that I will come back to this House when election does take place.

Mr. VOWLES: Are they cane workers from the South?

[Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS: They are not moaning and groaning like the people in the South, nor like the Jimbour electors, for whose relief we are continually passing Acts of Parliament. As showing the importance of my electorate, I may mention that the Government quite recently made the announcement that they are going to put 200 men on the railway under construction from Proserpine towards Mackay. I want to thank the Government for the good work they have done in my electorate. Some hon. members will remember that a few days ago I asked the Secretary for Agriculture certain questions in reference to the export of fruit from Bowen. I hope you do not all believe what appears in the daily Press in Brisbane, because, if you do, you will believe a lot of things that are not true.

Mr. GUNN: It is all right in the "Standard," isn't it? (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: No. Personally I do not believe all that appears in any newspaper, but I believe the "Standard" contains more truth per inch than is contained in any newspaper in Brisbane.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Even the "Worker"?

Mr. COLLINS: The "Worker" is the best newspaper ever published in this State, and possibly in the Commonwealth, or even in any part of the civilised world. I am one of those who were pioneers in connection with that newspaper, and I am proud of the position it has attained. Coming now to the fruit industry, I want to thank the Premier, the Treasurer, the Hon. Mr. Hunter, and other members of the Ministry who during this great shipping upheaval have assisted the Bowen fruitgrowers. From reports which have appeared in the Press, you would be led to believe that all the fruit from that district had rotted, but such was not the case. I asked the Secretary for Agriculture what was the quantity of fruit exported from Bowen during the months of April, May, June and July, in 1918, and the quantities exported during the same months in 1919. What are the facts? Taking vegetables in sacks, and fruit in cases, the facts are that for 1918, 37,746 packages were exported, and for 1919, 48,279, or an increase of 10,533. That gives the lie direct to those persons who say that this Government have no sympathy with the fruitgrowers and farmers of Queensland—an increase even when a big shipping strike was on of over 10,000 packages. I am not saying that, if there had been no strike, there would not have been more, because there has been an exceptional crop of tomatoes, citrus fruits, and vegetables in that part of Queensland. As most hon. members know, most of the fruit goes direct to the Sydney market. Let the truth be told. I am not one of those who got into Parliament by telling the electors lies, but by telling the truth, and I say that this Government have done all that it is possible for any Government to do under existing conditions in assisting the fruitgrowers of Bowen. The hon. member for Drayton sneered that Bowen was represented by an international socialist, and that the fruit was rotting on the ground. I want to point out that the hon. member for Bowen knows his duty to the people who sent him here, and the people who sent him here know that he is doing his duty.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

I am willing to admit that people in the sugar industry are passing through a very critical time, owing to the fact that we are unable to get sacks to the North; and that on the Burdekin, which is in a dry belt, the cane is drying up, or in other words, even if they were to crush now, some of the cane would have a very low density. But let the blame be placed on the right shoulders. Who is responsible for the shipping dispute? Not our party; not this Government, but the Federal Government. I said in this House on one occasion, and I am prepared to repeat it even if that little Kaiser, "Billy" Hughes, were in my presence, that I question whether the Federal Government are fit to run a lavatory, let alone a Commonwealth. Even if the seamen had been in the wrong, as I claim they are not, are men after nearly five years of war to get up on a pedestal, and say, "We will let the country be ruined sooner than come down from our pedestal and settle the strike?" If Lloyd George had adopted that attitude after the war was over, Great Britain at this moment would have been wiped out. When the transport workers threatened to hang up that country, did he sit upon his pedestal and fold his arms, and say, "I am the Prime Minister of Great Britain, returned by the greatest majority ever known in the history of Great Britain. I will not meet these transport workers and listen to their terms?" Nothing of the kind. He came down from his pedestal and met the workers in conference. By doing so he kept the wheels of industry going. That is what should be done in the Commonwealth. You should not cut off your nose to spite your face. You do not want to have a strike for months, when by giving concessions you can settle it. Is that going to increase your greatness or swell your production that you talk so much about? Nothing of the kind. My friend, the hon. member for Wide Bay, quoted a remark of William Ewart Gladstone, to the effect that the workers, as a rule, were always right, and my experience of them is that, as a rule, they are always right. The fact that we cannot get sacks to my electorate and to other electorates in the North, and the fact that, unless crushing on the Burdekin starts soon, there will be no cane to crush, because it will be dried out, may mean the ruin of hundreds of sugar-growers in that part of Queensland, and further North, and in the Mackay district. But we cannot send sacks, because the people are crying out for food, and the first obligation is to provide it for them. I am satisfied that the Commonwealth Government will have to give way in the long run, unless they wish to bring this Commonwealth to ruin. That is what I claim they are doing. Why do they not get into touch with the modern thought that is going right throughout the civilised world to-day? Do they not know that we were told this was a war for democracy? Were we not told by men like Lloyd George that everything is in the melting pot? Why do they not realise that things are changing, and that the workers are now standing erect? I am one of those who helped to pioneer the way and teach them to stand erect, and I am not going to desert them now when they are standing erect and acting the part of men. How would these men who criticise the seamen from time to time like to be in the fore-castles of some of those ships, or to work

the hours that they have to work? Why always say that the workers are wrong? Why do the Tory papers always contain leading articles abusing the men who create the wealth of the nation? Why do they not abuse the men who control the means of production of wealth, or who control the shipping? Why do they not tell them to come down from their pedestals, meet these men, settle this dispute, and let the wheels of industry go on? Nobody wants to see the nation ruined—at least, I do not—but I am prepared to say that we are not going to get over the difficulty by going on in the way in which the Commonwealth Government are moving at the present time. They cannot defeat Labour in Australia. They know that, or ought to know it—a country with the greatest percentage of organised workers of any country in the civilised world. The workers are awaking at the present time. Before long they will be fully awake, and when they get fully awake hon. members had better beware.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Is that a threat?

MR. COLLINS: No, it is not a threat, but it is a warning. I have been fairly correct all through this war. I saw your monarchs toppling from their thrones. I saw the map of Europe practically changed. Hon. members, when they were creating their Frankenstein, did not realise what they were creating. They need to be very careful lest it should overpower them altogether. (Opposition laughter.) It is no use laughing. I could see the signs of the times. I could see what was happening in Russia. I can see what is going to happen later on in the United States of America; and what is going to happen here in Australia, unless there is common sense.

In the Speech I notice a reference to sugar—

"An additional sugar experiment station has been formed, and it is proposed to establish an irrigation farm on the Burdekin delta."

I am very pleased to think I represent such an important electorate. The idea of that farm on the Burdekin delta is to demonstrate to the farmers that other crops than sugar-cane can be grown. They do not require any demonstration as regards cane, because they have grown it for a number of years, and have proved the worth of irrigation. I notice an article in to-day's "Courier" which I would like to quote. I always like to quote the "Courier"; although it is not my Bible, I read it fairly carefully.

"NATIONAL DEMOCRATS.

"POLICY AND PLATFORM.

"Loyalty and Sane Government—"

I would like a definition from the hon. member for Bulimba of "loyalty." I notice there is a very peculiar plank, and I am going to read it—

"SUGAR INDUSTRY.

"The development of the sugar industry along lines that will safeguard the interests of all parties engaged therein, preserving the principle of cane price boards."

I read that half a dozen times to make sure of what I was reading. Preserving the principle of cane price boards! Surely never! Did not the leader of the Opposition

Mr. Collins.]

address a meeting of that particular council the other night? Fancy the leader of that party adopting that plank! Is [8 p.m.] that the platform hon. gentlemen on the other side are going to fight on at the next election? Here is what the leader of the Opposition said in this House in 1913. "Hansard," volume cxvi, page 2775—

"I say unhesitatingly that this Bill splinters every principal plank in the Liberal platform and adopts straight out to the same extent the platform of the Labour party."

(Colonel Rankin's Cane Price Boards Bill was under discussion at the time. Is the hon. gentleman stealing our platform now? That shows what the war has done. (Laughter.) We shall have to get a move on, or else there will be only one party and one platform in this House. (Laughter.) Then, again, I got hold of the primary producers' platform, and find that they have lifted it nearly holus bolus out of our platform. In other words, they have come to the conclusion that they cannot get into Parliament on their old, obsolete methods. The war has changed people. The world is in the melting-pot.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Opposition will be in the melting-pot.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, the Opposition will disappear altogether and a more radical party will take their place. In the North we are being considered as fairly conservative ourselves, so I do not hold out any hope for hon. gentlemen opposite up that way with this new platform. The hon. member for Mackay asked a question or two in reference to the sugar industry the other day regarding the right to amend the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act, and we were told we could not do it owing to an agreement having been entered into with the Commonwealth. We say that that Act should be amended in the interests of the sugar-grower, and I suppose we shall have to wait until the agreement expires.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We will have a new Government in the Commonwealth by that time.

Mr. COLLINS: I hope we will have a Labour Government in the Commonwealth by that time. Coming to land settlement, I defy anybody in this House to produce evidence from any speech of mine, even when I represented an important industrial centre like the Burke, decrying the man on the land. When I was very young I read John Stuart Mill, and I remember how he stressed the importance of land cultivation. I am one of those who believe that we should have more people on the land than we have in Queensland at the present time, and anything I can do towards bringing that about will be done by me. I am one of those who believe that a nation can be great only by having its people rooted to the soil. I am not afraid of their becoming conservative even when they are rooted to the soil, if they are rooted to the soil under proper conditions. We must try to persuade more industrial workers to settle upon the land and make homes of their own.

Coming to industrial unrest, of course there is industrial unrest. It exists all over the world. It is not confined to Queensland

[Mr. Collins.

or the Commonwealth: it exists everywhere. What is the cause of the industrial unrest in Queensland and in this Commonwealth? As I travel to and fro in Queensland and the Commonwealth I notice schools everywhere. What have you been erecting those schools for? The member for Bremer told us to-night it was to increase the knowledge of the people. While some people may claim that profiteering is the cause of the industrial unrest, I go deeper down and claim that the cause of the industrial unrest throughout the civilised world is the fact that we have an educated democracy to-day—a democracy that you can no longer deceive—a democracy that is saying to you and to me and to parliamentarians right throughout the British-speaking dominions and the civilised world, "Your parliamentary system is now on trial." It is on trial in the State of Queensland, in the Commonwealth of Australia, and even in Great Britain. "You cannot go on fooling the people any longer," that is what they are saying. They say, "Come down to bedrock and do something for us." That is the cause of the industrial unrest—the knowledge that has been spread among mankind, the knowledge which I have been trying to point out since 1911 in this State. Last year—you cannot get away from the fact—a few persons and a few companies took nearly one-half the wealth produced in this State, and what is true of the State of Queensland is true of the Commonwealth and of the whole civilised world. The workers say, "We produce the wealth: others spend it." Only last night I looked over to the Bellevue Hotel opposite, and what did I see? Talk about Bolsheviks getting abroad! That is the kind of thing that breeds your Bolshevik.

Mr. KIRWAN: They were doing the jazz over there. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: I do not know what they were doing.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: If you look along George street, you will see a crowd every day.

Mr. COLLINS: I know what a crowd of people would think, looking at it. Some of the ladies there, maybe, spent more in dress than the average man in Queensland received during the past twelve months. The people are looking on at all these things, and are taking note of them. The hon. member for Albert knows that. Everyone knows it. We cannot deceive ourselves. There is no use in our being like the ostrich, putting our heads in the sand and saying that these things do not exist. They do exist. The capitalistic Governments of Europe brought about the war. They are now reaping that which they have sown.

Mr. VOWLES: Do you want those people to dress like Chidley did?

Mr. COLLINS: I notice a lot are dressing like Chidley. In the part where I was reared they would be classed as indecent if they went about in some of the dresses I looked at last night. They are adopting Chidley's dress. (Laughter.) It might be a good dress, for all I know—I have never adopted it myself. (Laughter.) I am dealing with industrial unrest, and I want to quote from a paper called "The New Statesman," which is an English publication, and published in a country where they have got more

toleration than we have in Australia. This country is becoming damnably intolerant; I am practically ashamed of it. The utterances I hear from time to time and the expressed desire to suppress literature make me tremble for the future of Australia. I come of a race of men who, as you all know, did not hesitate to take a king's head off when he stood in the way. In literature, men in England have sent forth to the world some of the best thoughts that have ever been written; but here in Australia, if you get up and act the part of a man—if you express the thought that God has given you—you are accused of being a disloyalist or a Bolshevik. I claim that I am no disloyalist; I would not say that there is not a bit of the Bolshevik about me. (Laughter.) At any rate, I am not disloyal except in the minds of those people who are intolerant. This is what "The New Statesman" says about the cause of strikes—

"The fundamental causes of the world-wide unrest are mainly economic. Some peculiarly bad clause in the peace treaty, some blunder of the politicians, some manifestation of militarist reaction, may prove to be the spark which will set the world ablaze. But the fundamental cause of the conflagration will lie deep down in the economic system. The workers of France, or Italy, or Great Britain will rise in revolt, not really because injustice is being done to the workers of Germany or Hungary or Russia, but because in every country it is becoming increasingly difficult, as the Coal Commission has abundantly shown, for the workers to live any longer under an economic system devoted primarily to the making of profit. This is not to say that a majority, or anything like a majority, is consciously demanding the overthrow of the capitalist system. Socialism of any constructive sort remains, probably in every country, the creed of a minority. But even the majority which has not attempted to formulate a constructive opinion has changed. The pre-war industrial system rested upon the general acquiescence of the workers in the subordination of their personality to the needs of industry as interpreted by capitalists and employers. It was possible only because it was able to treat Labour as a thing instead of a number of persons, and because Labour, though it kicked occasionally, as a rule acquiesced in that treatment. To-day, nearly everyone has a higher conceit of himself than he had before. Nearly everyone makes not only higher material claims, which are hard enough for capitalism to satisfy, but also higher human claims, which it has no means at all of satisfying, and which most of its protagonists do not even attempt to understand. We are face to face with the fact that the war has taught the workers in almost every country to assert their human claims by putting forth the vast economic strength which hitherto they have not known how to use."

"We all know that arbitration is a plank of our platform, but I am one of those who never expected that in the transition period there would be no trouble. We who belong to the working class have been accustomed to strike from time immemorial. We had no other method of settling our disputes in

Queensland until the Industrial Peace Act was passed in 1912. At that time we adopted methods whereby we could settle disputes under what was known as arbitration; but do you think you can change in seven years a people who have been accustomed, for hundreds of years, to the right to strike? The idea of the strike still lingers. As I said in my electorate, when speaking to a big crowd of industrial workers, "To go back to direct action is a form of atavism." In other words, they would be going back to the wilderness where we were when I was a boy. I further said, "What you want to do is to point out to the Labour party and the movement in general the defects in your Arbitration Act, and get Parliament to amend your Act; but you do not want to go back to where we were when we were boys. We want to keep on progressing." I never said arbitration was perfect, but I want to quote what I did say on the introduction of the Arbitration Bill in this House, because on that occasion I was a fairly good prophet. I know the working class pretty well, and I know we can only advance step by step. When the Industrial Arbitration Bill of 1915 was under discussion in this House, as reported on page 817 of "Hansard," volume cxx. I said—

"We do not state—at least, I do not—that this measure is the be-all and end-all of this great movement."

Further on I said—

"After all, the Industrial Court will be presided over by a judge. I might say here that it all depends on that judge. I prefer that Charles Collins should be appointed the judge, and then I am satisfied that the worker would get a square deal."

That may appear egotistical to some people, but I know the type of men who sit as judges in our Arbitration Courts. Further on I said—

"I say again, and emphasise that point, that much depends on the judge."

I find that I was fairly correct on that occasion. Much does depend on the judges of our Arbitration Court. I question very much whether a man drawing £2,000 or £3,000 a year is a fit and proper person to say I shall receive only £3 per week. I think the whole of the methods of arbitration could be changed with advantage. What do our friends opposite stand for? What does any man who believes in war stand for? War is direct action, is it not? It is direct action of the worst kind, because in our industrial upheavals we do not kill each other, as a rule; but in war they do kill. After 1,900 years of Christianity you have not been able to change the people and abolish war. I am not one of those who are going to raise the cry that this is even the last war. So long as there remains on this earth a system of society which enables one man to make a profit out of another man, so long are you likely to have war, and I say that system has got to go. It is just as immoral that any man should make a profit out of men, or that I should make a profit out of him, as it was for the slaveowners of America to own slaves. The world is changing. Why, even Lloyd George, according to to-night's "Standard," admitted in the House of Commons that before the war the condition of thousands of workers in England was deplorable. We hear from time to time that the

*Mr. Collins.]*

Government must govern. The "Courier" is always writing in that strain, and the "Daily Mail" likewise. They should add to that that the Government must govern with the consent of the governed. Could Lloyd George, with all his strength, govern Great Britain if the miners of Great Britain said he was not going to govern? He knows that. He has got more intelligence than these editors who write leading articles in such a strain as I have mentioned.

Mr. MOORE: Your own Ministers have been saying it.

Mr. COLLINS: I am not responsible for all our Ministers say, any more than I am responsible for what the hon. member says. I look upon him as one of the most conservative members of this House. Quite recently he was elected as president of the most conservative body in Queensland—the Local Authorities Association. The Government of Great Britain will have to bow to the demands of the transport workers of Great Britain. Will anyone say that Lloyd George was not governing when he agreed that the mines in Great Britain should be nationalised, which the Sankey report recommends should be done? What rot to say you are going to govern! That is how the Czar of Russia talked, and where is he now? That is the way the Kaiser talked, and where is the Kaiser now? He is in Holland, exiled from his native land. Where are the Austrians who sat upon the throne, who said they were going to govern? Where, oh where, are they now? Where are some of the princes of the little States in Germany? They governed with an iron hand. I am one of those who believe that the world is going to change. We have had thousands of years of government by force. I am one of those who believe that in the future mankind will be governed by a higher law than force—that is, by the law of love. That may be something new to hon. members opposite. I am glad the hon. member for Bulimba is present. That is the new power which is going to rise throughout the world—to govern, not by force, but according to the old saying of the Nazarene, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."

Mr. GUNN: Like the Bolsheviks.

Mr. COLLINS: Does the hon. member know anything about the Bolsheviks? If he will read an article in "Round Table," he will know something about it. I am one of those who believe that the Russians have a right to govern themselves as they think fit, and not as you and I think fit, and I have no time for Great Britain interfering in Russia. I know the history of my country, and I know that for twenty years we fought the French after the French Revolution, in order to suppress the spirit of the revolution.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: If you doubt my word, read Buckle's "History of Civilisation." That is the kind of literature I was brought up on, not the intolerant kind of stuff that some of our people read to-day. Buckle, the man who wrote one of the finest works in English literature, points out that for twenty years we fought the French and suppressed the revolution.

Mr. BAYLEY: The excesses of the revolution.

Mr. COLLINS: The revolution; and that is what the capitalistic Government of

[Mr. Collins.

Europe want to do in regard to Russia—they want to suppress the aspirations of the working-class of Russia. Let the Russians govern themselves as they think fit. That is what I believe in. We should not interfere with the Russians as we do from time to time. As I said, I do not believe in government by force. I do not know whether my speech will be allowed to go out or not. I notice that the little chap who has been associating with—I said on one occasion dukes and duchesses, but I believe there are not many outside Great Britain at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You mean the gentleman who ended the war?

Mr. COLLINS: Yes. The Prime Minister of Australia is about to return to Australia. There have been some interesting articles recently in "Stead's Review" on "The Censor and I." We must admit Mr. Stead has been one of the most fearless writers we have had in the Commonwealth. He states in his last article that "Billy" Hughes, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, censored his magazine.

Mr. GUNN: It was a pro-German magazine.

Mr. COLLINS: It was not a pro-German magazine, and, if the hon. member went to Great Britain, he would not say that, because his father was recognised as one of the foremost English journalists, and a man who helped to educate the masses of Great Britain by the publication of his 2d. tracts on literature, and his "Penny Poets." I owe him a great deal myself. I would be a coward if I allowed the hon. member to traduce the name of Stead—a man who has made it possible for the present Labour party to sit in the House of Commons, by making them acquainted with literature. Mr. Stead states in his magazine that even now we do not know the peace terms, and we are not likely to know them, until this little chap comes from overseas to tell us all about it. What he may have up his sleeve I do not know, but I know that things are happening in Australia that make one blush. When the Russian nihilist could not live in his own country, he could live in my country. When the Italian anarchist could not live in Italy, he could live in England. When the German socialist could not live in Germany, he could live in England; and when the French communist could not live in France, he could live in England. But we find that deportations are taking place in Australia.

Mr. VOWLES: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member says "Hear, hear!" What blood flows in his veins?

Mr. VOWLES: I hate treachery.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you believe men should be deported without a trial? Is that British justice? Is that what we stand for as a great nation?

Mr. WALKER: They can have a trial; and they have a right of appeal.

Mr. COLLINS: Why have they not had a trial?

Mr. WALKER: Because they have never asked for it.

Mr. COLLINS: Who was responsible for bringing these people here? It was the

Liberal party. Who settled the Binjour Plateau, up in the Gayndah district, with Germans?

Mr. BAYLEY: In times of peace.

Mr. COLLINS: Who was it that advocated that 5,000,000 people should be brought here in 1910? This is what the Hon. R. Philp said, as reported on page 1547 of "Hansard" for 1910—

"He picked up a paper the other day and read that in Germany there were 5,000,000 people out of work. Where could they go to? They must come to Australia or some new country; and why should we not take them if they wanted to come to Queensland? Why should we act the dog-in-the-manger policy, and say, 'We will not have them here'?"

Mr. GUNN: He was quite right.

Mr. COLLINS: Suppose the hon. member said to-day that I was a good sort of chap, but because I happened to fall out with him to-morrow he said that I was a scoundrel.

Mr. GUNN: When you come here you ought to be loyal to this country.

Mr. COLLINS: I am more loyal to this country than the native-born are—I stand for Australia.

Mr. VOWLES: We are not talking about you; we are talking about the Germans.

Mr. COLLINS: What we have to look after is our own development. Coming back to the question of deportation. Is that British-like—separating the wife from the husband, the children from the father? Can you build up a great nation on those lines? A nation can only be great by showing its greatness. I am prepared to say that they are not going to these extremes in any other part of the British dominions. Owing to the censorship—to the kind of Government we have in the Commonwealth—there are a lot of things happening that we know very little about; but, thanks to men like Mr. Stead, we are going to get the censorship exposed, and then we shall know what did take place during the war. We will get the truth, and no one should be afraid of the truth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): The programme put forward for the session is a very long one, and the titles of many of the Bills are attractive, but I cannot see anything in it that is going to affect the real troubles we are suffering from in Queensland at the present time. There is no reference to the financial disaster which is coming on, and no way is suggested by which [8.30 p.m.] it is going to be stopped, and prosperity brought back. Taxation is not going to avert it. At the present time we are taxed more heavily than any other State in Australia. Every year we have fresh taxation, and every year we have a deficit. I was very anxious to see in the programme of the Government a proposal to adopt some methods by which the development of the State would be encouraged; but, instead of that, we have foreshadowed a number of measures which are calculated to bar the way to progress. We must all recognise that there is a feeling of insecurity, and a feeling of want of confidence in the country.

Mr. HARTLEY: What is barring the way to progress?

Mr. MOORE: The obvious tendency to produce less for more pay.

Mr. HARTLEY: Where?

Mr. MOORE: Among the workers.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is wrong, and I challenge you to prove your statement.

Mr. MOORE: Experience is the best way of learning whether that is the case or not, and we know for a fact that workers are producing less. The court which was appointed to settle industrial disputes is allowed to be bluffed. I think the leaders of the Government should take some responsibility in this matter and do as British political leaders have done—preach the gospel of more work and greater production.

Mr. HARTLEY: And greater profits for the profiteers.

Mr. MOORE: No; production means more prosperity to the whole of the country.

Mr. HARTLEY: No, it does not; that is what is wrong with the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. MOORE: Everybody admits that there must be greater production in Australia if we are going to meet the liabilities we have incurred, and I do not think we can have greater production unless there is an end to these industrial disputes and men do their utmost in the matter of production. There is a limit to the number of hours that men should be required to work, and apparently that limit is eight hours a day.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Lord Leverholme says six hours a day, and he knows better than you, perhaps.

Mr. MOORE: I think the principle adopted by Lord Leverholme in connection with his enterprises is a good one—viz., the principle of profit-sharing, and I hope it will be adopted in Australia. In connection with his works they have a model industrial city; the men endeavour to produce as much as possible; and they do not have industrial unrest, because they have conditions that they can work under. I do not think there is any profiteering in the industry in which Lord Leverholme is concerned. But here the system of profit-sharing has been fought against by the unions, and unionists have been advised not to accept the system unless it is hedged round with certain conditions. If they are going to hedge round the system with harassing restrictions and say they will not have profit-sharing except under the conditions they propose, the system is not likely to be adopted. Under that system a man is paid for any extra skill he may acquire or any extra industry he may display in the work in which he is engaged.

Mr. HARTLEY: That system leads to pitting one man against another.

Mr. MOORE: It does not lead to anything of the kind. Mr. Justice McCawley laid it down in a perfectly clear manner that the conditions which exist in the old country do not prevail in Queensland, where the worker is protected. It is my opinion that, if a man is particularly adapted for a certain work and becomes well skilled in that particular work, he should be paid for his increased skill and industry, and should not be restricted to the same pay as is given to a man with less skill and less application. I certainly believe in profit-sharing. You cannot expect that a good man who is

*Mr. Moore.*]

peculiarly adapted for a certain class of work will produce the best he can produce if he gets only what is paid to a man of mediocre ability. I see no scheme outlined in the Government programme by which confidence is to be restored. Confidence has undoubtedly been destroyed in the country, with the result that thousands of acres of land which used to be cultivated and made productive are now uncultivated. That is not owing to the drought, but to want of confidence, and the fact that the Government are carrying on as they are doing at the present time is not going to alleviate the condition of affairs. The starting of 'State butchers' shops and State fish shops is not likely to alleviate that want of confidence or lead to any increase in private enterprise. That sort of thing does not engender confidence. Men must have some security if they are to embark on enterprises; but, when you find the State embarking in particular industries in opposition to private enterprise, it is not likely that private individuals will be encouraged to engage in those industries. Naturally a man expects to get a commensurate return for the risk he incurs when investing in an enterprise; and, instead of the Government commandeering or threatening to commandeer businesses, they should encourage private individuals to enter into those businesses and develop them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Government are not going to deal with any private individual who is not injuring the public.

Mr. MOORE: We must have individual enterprise in Queensland. It cannot all be State enterprise.

At twenty minutes to 9 o'clock p.m.,

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

Mr. MOORE: State enterprise up to the present has not been such a success that we want to continue it indefinitely. The more development we can get carried out the greater will be our prosperity, and the better will be the progress we shall make. Have we not got stagnation in many parts of Queensland and an enormous amount of unemployment? Then, is it not the best thing the Government can do to encourage people to develop our resources by private enterprise? It is said that there has been profiteering. Well, the Government have been in power for four years, and have had an opportunity of doing something to stop that profiteering.

Mr. KIRWAN: No; they had the War Precautions Act to stop them, and you know that.

Mr. MOORE: When the State Government started their price-fixing in Queensland, was it a great success? It only helped to ruin a number of farmers. The Government appointed a man who fixed prices without reference to the cost of production. They put on an embargo in order to keep meat cheap in Queensland, and it ruined several people. Did it do any good to anybody else? Did it do any good to the workers?

Mr. HARTLEY: Yes.

Mr. MOORE: It did not. It gave the farmers 1s. 6d. per lb. for their butter, and left some farmers so poor that they were not able to buy food for themselves. The Government are prepared to rob one section so that

[Mr. Moore.

benefit shall accrue to another section who happen to live in the large centres where the most votes are.

Mr. KIRWAN: We lost seats here and won them in the farming districts.

Mr. MOORE: You did not win any on the Downs. In connection with the industrial unrest, which is one of the most important things we have to face to-day, I should like to call the attention of the House to the remarks of the Premier in his pre-election speech—

"The Labour party believes in conciliation and arbitration. If given a majority we will establish a system of industrial arbitration, the details of which will be settled after due consideration of the Commonwealth. Such a system will recognise the necessity of industrial boards with limited jurisdiction, and an Arbitration Court with more extensive powers. We will also adopt to a greater extent than has been tried in Queensland before a system of conciliation boards for the purpose of settling and shortening industrial disputes. The adoption of a wise policy in regard to these matters, and the promotion of harmony between the employers and employees, will do away entirely with the probability of industrial deadlocks."

I thoroughly agree with that, and I certainly think that was their intention. But how do we find, not only those behind the Government here, but those outside who support the Government, are carrying that out? Instead of helping to carry it out—instead of advising the men, as has been said, to endeavour to get the Arbitration Act amended as they wanted it to be amended, we find them preaching industrial unrest and class-consciousness throughout Queensland, and endeavouring, apparently, to stir up strife instead of discouraging it. What is the good of stirring it up? What other reason is there for preaching class-consciousness or stirring up industrial strife except to gain political advantage? The Arbitration Act was passed, and the judges were appointed, not as the hon. member for Bowen said the workers feared, but by this Government. And surely it is up to the Government now to give advice to the men who strike and the men who prefer direct action, and see that the laws are upheld until they are amended by the means by which they ought to be amended. We know perfectly well that, if an employer, even technically, breaks an award, the inspector is down on him straight away.

Mr. POLLOCK: The stations' award of the State Arbitration Court is being flouted every day.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: On State stations?

Mr. POLLOCK: Not on the State stations, but on private stations.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know that; I have seen no evidence of it. All my experience goes to show that, if an employer commits even a technical breach of an award, the inspector comes down on him straight away; but there are breaches on the other side of which no notice is taken. There is one phase of this question I strongly object to. We find that, when the Treasurer was Acting Premier some time ago, he spoke to the soldiers outside the Trades Hall in Brisbane, and instead of asking all parties to come

together to assist the returned soldiers in every way they could, these were his remarks—

“Attempts had been made, and would be made, to use returned soldiers for political purposes, but those attempts were destined to fail while returned soldiers showed the spirit they had that morning. Returned soldiers and the workers must link together in a common cause. The workers had many grievances and reforms to accomplish, and the soldiers also had many grievances and reforms to accomplish. Therefore, they must stand shoulder to shoulder in order to be of mutual advantage to each other. Mr. Theodore said there was evidence in Western Australia and other States that the returned soldier was beginning to realise that he must look for support from the workers, his natural friends, rather than from the capitalists, his natural enemies.”

What is the good of going out and trying to stir up strife? Has not the whole principle for which we have been contending been that of trying to unite everybody to give everybody who has returned what he requires? When we find the Acting Premier saying to the soldiers, “Turn to the workers, your natural friends, rather than to the capitalists, your natural enemies,” can we say that is the way to bring about harmonious relations—to encourage the people to work together to give these men the best that can be given to them? I suppose that, according to the Acting Premier, the capitalist is a man who holds different opinions from his. Surely that is not the way the Acting Premier of a State like Queensland should talk! Is that the way politicians, or the statesmen of Queensland, as they call them, are going to act? Are they going out on to the streets to preach stuff like that in order to create strife? One would think that their object would be to bring the people together so that they could all work unitedly for one purpose.

Mr. WHITFORD: That is what he was trying to do. Are not the interests of the soldiers who fought on the western front and the workers identical?

Mr. MOORE: All classes of soldiers went from Queensland. I do not think any section lagged behind.

Mr. KIRWAN: Eighty per cent. of the workers went.

Mr. MOORE: What is the good of any man saying that 80 per cent. of the workers went? There is no proof of that.

Mr. KIRWAN: Mr. Holman said so, and he is one of your apostles.

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Holman does not know everything. I might as well say that 80 per cent. of the squatters went.

Mr. WHITFORD: Who would believe you?

Mr. MOORE: Nobody believes the other thing. I certainly think that open incitement to rebellion is allowed to go on in Queensland. Judges are terrorised apparently as well as the Government by a few extremists whose common sense is in inverse ratio to their vanity. We find all sorts of statements being made and nothing done.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Are you insinuating that the judges are not doing their duty?

Mr. MOORE: No, but when a court is held up to derision and contempt, how can it perform its duty? I will read what Mr. Carney said—

“They had no use for the court, and his union would only accept the Arbitration Court award when it suited them. His union was strong enough to get all it wanted in spite of the court.”

Does that not hold the court up to derision?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That does not terrorise the court.

Mr. MOORE: I call that terrorism. I think that, when you find men holding up a court to derision and saying they will not accept an award unless they get what they want, that is terrorism.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The court does not take any notice of that.

Mr. MOORE: That is what I am complaining of. The court does not take notice of it, and neither do the Government. We find State employees practically asking other State employees to rebel. We have a lot of railway men coming to this resolution:—

“That this meeting of railway men expresses its indignation at the despotic attitude of the Railway Department and the Government in the treatment of our Northern comrades, whose loyalty to union principles in connection with the Northern strike has been responsible for the situation created.”

And another section passed this resolution—

“We commend our comrades for their adherence to union principles and pledge ourselves to stand behind them and the council of the union, and to loyally support any action that may be taken to secure justice for the men concerned.”

The Government are those who are sending the police up to Townsville. Why should these other railway servants pass resolutions that they are prepared to stand behind the Townsville men in any action they like to take? Is that not incitement to open rebellion against the Government? Every man in Queensland has a vote. He puts into Parliament men who will govern him in the way he wants to be governed. Surely, that Government must have the power to carry out what they consider to be in the best interests of the whole community. Are we to allow certain State employees to go round and practically incite others to rebellion?

Mr. KIRWAN: I can quote you a sermon from a pulpit in Brisbane inciting to rebellion.

Mr. MOORE: I am not concerned with sermons in churches, but I am concerned with a section of Government employees openly inciting others to rebellion. I think it is a mistake, and it is wrong. The Government are not doing their duty when they do not point out that this sort of thing only leads to anarchy. We heard the hon. member for Bowen saying that people could not be governed unless they consented to it. I would like to quote this statement by the Secretary for Mines—

“Mr. Jones said that he spoke his mind pretty plainly on certain subjects of public interest, especially industrial. The Government had every sympathy with the unemployed, but none whatever with the unemployable. This

*Mr. Moore.*]



covered the policy of the Government in this matter. Following floods, cyclones, and drought, the Queensland Government had come into conflict with the Commonwealth Government, the national Government of Australia, and it must be patent to every mind that a Government which had the courage to defy the higher Parliament could arrange to fight a section which came into conflict with it, and the policy under which it was elected. The people of Queensland might rest assured that the Government intended to govern irrespective of any section, either in Townsville or elsewhere, until a majority of the people said that they should not govern any longer."

Then we find the Secretary for Railways saying this—

"My point mainly is this: If you people of Toowoomba send Mr. Brennan into Parliament, and the people of Queensland send the Labour party into office, we should demand the right to govern while we are there. (Applause.) The duty of a Government is to govern and not to trade, and my opinion always has been that it is the duty of the Government to look after the benefits of the people."

Both those Ministers say that the Government must govern, and that they intend to govern. They were able to fight the Federal Government, and consequently they should be able to fight any section that stands up against them. Do we find the Government being firm, or giving even reasonable advice? No. We find Northern members practically going behind the Government and encouraging the railway men up North to stop where they are, inciting them to rebel, and saying, "We will endeavour to get the Government to be lenient." Is that a fair thing?

Mr. COLLINS: Do you say members from the North did that?

Mr. MOORE: Did not the hon. member for Bulimba read out telegrams to-night?

Mr. COLLINS: Don't you know the history of the Boer war—that after that war the British Government gave pardons?

Mr. MOORE: Talking about this question of the "remorseless profiteer," I would like to quote what a New Zealand Arbitration Court judge has to say about it, because it has a very intimate bearing on the position in Queensland to-day. The court in New Zealand used not to fix wages on the cost of living; it used to fix it on a different principle. Then a statute was brought in at the end of a session, in which the cost of living was made the basis for the fixing of awards. These are the remarks the judge made in court—

"The court now interprets the recent statute to mean that in the absence of any countervailing consideration wages of workers should, for the future, be increased in correspondence with the increase in the cost of living since the making of the several awards. The court has now granted increases in wages on this principle. It is not blind as to what must be the effect of the judgment. The judge stated that it was certain that the workers in other industries would in course of time make application to the

court for an amendment of their awards similar to those now made, and a general increase in wages of workers might, therefore, be expected. It is inevitable that the effect of these increases will be reflected, and probably in a magnified form, in further increases in the cost of living. Unless, therefore, the cost of the necessities of life is reduced as the result of the cessation of the war, or, failing this, unless the Government and the Board of Trade are able to devise some methods of preventing further increases in the price of such necessities, the court will again and again be asked to amend its awards and increase wages in conformity with the ever-increasing cost of living. It is obvious that continual increases of the wages of organised workers through the medium of the court, which results in these workers obtaining partial and often only temporary relief, largely at the expense of members of the community with fixed incomes and of unorganised workers, cannot continue indefinitely, and that sooner or later many industries may become unprofitable and cease operations, with the result that many workers may be thrown out of employment. If this is to be avoided means of doing so must be found by the Legislature, as the court is powerless in the matter."

Is not that the condition which we are getting in Queensland? Our primary industries are not in a position, owing to the perpetual droughts we have had lately, to have continual interference going on. Through co-operation we have endeavoured to keep the markets as steady as possible. I do not think there has been profiteering. If you are going to constitute a board similar in any way to that constituted in 1915 by the Government, where prices were fixed irrespective of the cost of production, it is not going to make for prosperity in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You do not suggest that the cost of production was not taken into consideration last time?

Mr. MOORE: Most decidedly, it was not taken into consideration. Political considerations were the ruling factor. It was admitted by the price-fixer himself that the cost of production was not taken into consideration—that he had to do it according to political considerations.

Mr. W. COOPER: What price-fixer was that?

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Sumner was the price-fixer at the time. He was appointed by this Labour Government. It does not matter twopence who appointed him, it is the principle to which I object, "where the cost of production is not taken into consideration in the fixing of prices."

Mr. BRENNAN: What did the Federal Price-fixing Board do?

Mr. MOORE: We had our cost of production taken notice of by that board. We put our case before the Federal Price-fixing Board. Many factories—cheese and butter—have received deferred payments from the Federal pool.

Mr. BRENNAN: What price did you get?

Mr. MOORE: I could not tell, from memory, what was the price.

Mr. BRENNAN: Less than the State price.

Mr. MOORE: Oh, no!

Mr. KIRWAN: I say, yes.

[Mr. Moore.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!  
Mr. BEBBINGTON: One hundred per cent. more—175s. per cwt. now, and your price was 121s. per cwt.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member asked for figures, and when he gets them he does not seem to like them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the hon. member address the Chair, and take no notice of interjections.

Mr. MOORE: One question I want to mention is the settling of returned soldiers. I do not know how it is going on in many districts. In my own district the land itself is all right, but its inaccessibility is the trouble. The expense of cartage and haulage to a lot of those blocks of land is enough to make the selection prohibitive. They are selections which have been available for years, and have never been taken up. The quality of the land is not objected to. It is all right. When you come to the question of being able to get to it, the difficulty is going to come in.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where is the hon. member referring to now?

Mr. MOORE: Up in the Cooyar and Yarraman districts.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I suppose the hon. member knows it was at the soldiers' own request that that land was made available?

Mr. MOORE: I cannot help who made the request. Soldiers have gone on the land who have never had any experience. They do not realise the enormous difficulty they have to contend with in getting their produce to market. There is one other question in regard to soldiers' settlements [9 p.m.] that I want to bring forward, because it is one the Government are pushing a great deal—not only the Queensland Government, but the Government of New South Wales, and the Governments of other States in the Commonwealth. I have here a letter which I received from a returned soldier, who says—

“After the armistice was signed I attended the A.I.F. educational lectures on poultry farming. As a result of these lectures, I decided to take up poultry farming on a fairly large scale on my return. I decided to purchase an incubator and outfit, and buy the eggs. We were told that the Governments in all States were doing everything possible to induce returned men to take up this branch of agriculture, one of the few lines that does not take too much capital to start in. We were told that we could get good, reliable eggs at a reasonable cost from any of the Agricultural Departments, who were only too anxious to help us, etc., etc. I wrote first to Gatton, and received a reply that they regretted they were unable to supply incubator lots, but they could supply trios from £3 3s., or fifteen eggs for £1 1s. I then wrote to the Department of Agriculture and Stock, and told them I was a returned soldier, etc., starting poultry farming, and that I intended purchasing an incubator and eggs to start with. I asked if the department could supply the eggs, and if not, for advice as to the best means of obtaining same. They referred me to the poultry expert,

and he advised me not to purchase eggs, but to buy day-old chicks. I wrote to him again, asking him where I could obtain these chicks. He replied that he was not allowed to advise any particular stock, but if I was intending to go in for poultry, I should become a subscriber to ‘Poultry,’ a New South Wales publication. He said I could get all the information I required from that paper's advertisements. He also mentioned a Victorian poultry journal. I have become a subscriber to ‘Poultry,’ which is well worth the subscription, but all the advertisements are for Sydney breeders. That is what Ryan can do for us in the poultry line—advise us to go to Sydney and get eggs or day-old chicks. Not a bad way of putting returned men on the land. I may add I am still determined to go in for poultry. I have got an incubator, and am getting eggs at 5s. a dozen from F. Hoffman, Haden. He has good stock, and has been at the game for a few years. Last year he purchased 500 day-old chicks in Sydney, and when they arrived here they were a very poor lot, 110 dead, and many crippled, which had to be destroyed. He reared about 300, and I saw some of them, and they are a very weedy lot, and certainly far from pure bred, so the only thing they will give you is advice, and that appears to be bad.”

Considering the number of returned soldiers who are being induced to go in for poultry farming, surely, if the Queensland poultry expert is not allowed to give advice as to one particular breed, a list could be prepared of those persons who are reliable breeders, and to whom they could recommend the returned soldiers to go for eggs or chickens.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you say the poultry expert is not allowed to advise?

Mr. MOORE: He says himself he is not allowed to advise as to what stock to secure, and he advises the returned soldier to get a publication from Sydney and to get his information from the advertisements in that paper.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Are you sure the poultry expert himself said that?

Mr. MOORE: I have read this soldier's letter to that effect.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not believe that it is correct. There is no restriction on him, and he can give what advice he likes. That is what he is there for.

Mr. MOORE: He replied to this returned soldier that he was not allowed to advise as to the purchase of stock. (Considering the difficulties that a novice has to encounter when going in for poultry farming, all the advice that can be given by the poultry expert should be available.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We reckon we have one of the ablest poultry experts in Australia, and I think it very unfair for you to say, on hearsay evidence, what you have just said.

Mr. MOORE: It is not on hearsay. I have this man's letter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. member for Windsor will bear out what I have said.

*Mr. Moore.]*

Mr. MOORE: I am not saying anything against the qualifications of the poultry expert.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. member for Windsor will bear out what I have just said—that there is no restriction whatever on him and he can give whatever advice he likes.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Can he recommend any particular breed?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is his business.

Mr. MOORE: This man gives me definite information, and, if what he says is the case, the position wants remedying; I certainly believe it is the case, as I am perfectly satisfied he would not write in that strain if it was not true.

Mr. BRENNAN: Did you investigate the matter at the department?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have you any objection to giving me that letter?

Mr. MOORE: The Secretary for Public Lands is perfectly welcome to the whole letter. I am only too willing, if there is a mistake, to have it pointed out, and, if there is not a mistake, the thing should be remedied. I do not want to make political capital out of it.

Mr. BRENNAN: Why did you not make inquiries before publishing it?

Mr. MOORE: Other hon. members have had similar letters from all over Queensland, and surely a thing like that should be brought up in this House!

Mr. BRENNAN: Why not make investigations first?

Mr. MOORE: Make investigations! Hon. members opposite want to shield the Government on every possible occasion.

I notice in the Governor's Speech reference is made to the influenza outbreak. It is extremely fortunate for Queensland that we have got out of it up to the present as lightly as we have. To my mind it is a most extraordinary thing that before the influenza outbreak occurred in Queensland a conference was held down South of representatives from the Health Departments of each State at which a policy was formulated which was to be carried out in the event of an outbreak of influenza occurring; and then, as soon as an outbreak was threatened, the whole result of that conference was practically wiped out and each State had to fight the epidemic on its own. Apparently the Queensland Government was more concerned about making political capital against the Commonwealth Government than they were in fighting the epidemic. They went about the matter in a very feeble manner indeed, and the most feeble thing about the whole business was the reasons which were given for handing over the control to the local authorities. The reason given was the extravagant demand of three or four districts in Queensland who wanted a huge amount of money spent in their divisions. Because the Home Secretary considered they were extravagant in their demands and he did not consider it politic to stand up against them, because the requests were backed up by members supporting the Government, so the whole control was handed over to the local authorities. I do not object to the control being handed over to the local authorities; but what I object to is that it was not handed over to them before the epidemic occurred to enable them to organise

[Mr. Moore.

It was handed over to them after the outbreak occurred, which did not give the local authorities an opportunity of carrying out the work in an efficient manner. The local authorities and the Government have every reason to be proud of the way in which the community as a whole helped. There were voluntary workers throughout the different shires who were prepared to give the whole of their time and who were prepared to take any amount of risk, in order to help people whom they did not know at all. In my own shire we had voluntary workers who gave up days and nights for weeks to help people who were sick. In cases like that sufficient notice should have been given if the Government had wanted the local authorities to take over the work. Fortunately, the outbreak, while severe, was not as virulent as in the Southern States. It was more good luck than good management that we were enabled to cope with it.

The HOME SECRETARY: If I had followed the advice given, it would have run into a quarter of a million of money, and then there would have been a howl.

Mr. MOORE: If the Home Secretary had followed out certain advice given by members behind the Government, who wanted money spent in their electorates, I should not have been surprised if it had cost a million of money; but the principle of carrying out the work is what I object to.

The Government talk about the difficulty of getting houses and the necessity for a fair rents court. The Government is one of the greatest sinners in raising rents in Queensland. Some years ago you could buy timber at 2s. or 3s. per 100 feet in the log, but to-day the Government are getting 13s. 6d. per 100 feet in the log at Yarraman.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why don't you be fair? Don't you know the Government had no say in the putting up of the price of timber, because it is only an infinitesimal part which the State supplies?

Mr. MOORE: I am going to quote two advertisements for two reasons—one is the extraordinary manner in which the State mill has to be spooned, and the other the way in which the timber has been put up. The following advertisement is taken from the "Nanango News" of 25th November, 1918:—

"TIMBER SALE.

"The undermentioned lots of timber will be offered for sale by public auction, at the railway station, Benarkin, on Friday, 1st November, 1918, at 10 a.m.:—

"Blocks 1 to 4, on Timber Reserve 283, parish of Colinton, each containing 350,000 superficial feet of pine. Also, 350,000 superficial feet of pine on Timber Reserve 290, parish of Taromeo. Upsets: 6s. 3d. per 100 superficial feet for logs 70 inches girth and over; 5s. 3d. for logs 60 to 69 inches; and 3s. 3d. for logs under 60 inches girth. Tops, 6d. over 50 inches, and 3d. under 60 inches girth. Term of agreement, twelve months.

"All timber on the above lots must be delivered to the State sawmills, Taromeo, at 11s. per 100 superficial feet for logs 70 inches and over; 10s. for logs 60 to 69 inches; 8s. for logs under 60 inches; 5s. 3d. for tops 60 inches and over; and 5s. for tops under 60 inches.

"Blocks 6 to 12, on Timber Reserve 290, parish of Taroneo, each containing 140,000 superficial feet of hardwood. Upset: 3s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet. Term of agreement, twelve months.

"All timber on these lots must be delivered to the State Sawmills, on trucks, Benarkin, at 8s. 10d. per 100 superficial feet.

"W. M. WATTS.  
"Land Commissioner."

That is the upset price at the State mills. Then take the following advertisement as a comparison:—

"TIMBER SALE.

"The undermentioned lots of timber will be offered for sale by public auction, at the Land Office, Nanango, on Tuesday, 26th November, 1918, at 11 a.m.:—

"Lot 1.—All crow's ash, yellow wood, and maiden's blush, on portion 148v, Cooyar. Upset: Crow's ash and yellow wood, 60 inches and over, 3s.; under 60 inches, 1s. 6d.; maiden's blush, 6d. per 100 superficial feet. Monthly removal, 10,000 superficial feet. Term to 30th November, 1919.

"Lot 2.—Forty-nine pine logs on reserve 257, Cooyar and Emu Creek. Upset: 70 inches and over, 10s. 6d.; 60 inches to 69 inches, 10s.; 48 inches to 59 inches, 8s. 9d.; tops, 60 inches and over, 2s. 6d.; under 60 inches, 1s. 6d. Term to 31st December, 1918.

"Lot 3.—50,000 superficial feet of pine (80 inches G.B.H.), on part reserve 120, Neumgna. Upset: 70 inches and over, 10s.; 60 inches to 69 inches, 9s.; under 60 inches, 7s.; tops, 6d. Monthly removal, 10,000 superficial feet. Term to 31st March, 1919."

The above timber-buyer has the option of long haulage by team about 12 miles to Yarraman or heavy freights to meet if trucked at Tarong, in which case it would have to be railed via Theelbine to Brisbane. That means, roughly, that the State mill has an advantage over the ordinary mill of about 5s. or 6s. per 100 feet.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How do you contend from that that the State is putting up the price of timber?

Mr. MOORE: We know that five years ago timber up there was selling at 2s. 6d. or 3s. 6d. per 100 feet, and to-day it is 13s. 6d. Can anybody say that the price has not gone up? The Government itself has put up the price of timber to the highest figure it can get, and consequently the price of building has gone up.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Government are charging the market price for their timber and no more, and they do not make the market price.

Mr. MOORE: The Government endeavour to show that the timber mills are making huge profits, but the Government mill has the advantage of 5s. or 6s. per 100 feet in getting the timber, and they are still charging the same as other mills.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Government have to pay the same rate of wages as the other mills.

Mr. MOORE: The high price of building is partly attributable to the profiteering of the present Government, which has jumped up the timber to the highest price they can get.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the Government gave the timber away, do you think the price of timber would come down? Nothing of the sort.

Mr. MOORE: The State has not brought its prices down, but has raised them to those charged by other mills. The State has raised its prices twice since it embarked in the enterprise. The Government talk about what profiteering there was in the timber business, but after they started their mill they discovered there was no profiteering, and raised their prices to those of the other mills.

I want to call particular attention to the question of giving assistance to the farmer in securing seed wheat, as a large number of settlers are suffering distress. We find that during the past four years in Queensland relief has been given out to the unemployed in large centres of population. Last year £9,000 was spent in relief. But when, owing to bad seasons, the farmer gets no returns, there is no question of relief for him. It is a question of asking for sufficient seed wheat to carry him on for another year, but the conditions on which the seed wheat were offered were too drastic for any farmer to accept.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They paid a couple of "bob" more for it in Toowoomba.

Mr. MOORE: Would not any farmer rather pay 2s. a bushel more than sign the paper he was required to sign?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; it was because he would not pay off his debt.

Mr. MOORE: This is the sort of circular that was sent out to the farmers, and it shows the distinction which is being made between different sections of the community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They do not make a profit out of it.

Mr. MOORE: And do the farmers make a profit out of the assistance which is given them? Certainly not. This is the "Declaration and Application for Seed" which farmers are required to fill up and sign—

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STOCK, QUEENSLAND.

"DECLARATION AND APPLICATION FOR SEED.

All information given will be treated as strictly confidential.)

"I, \_\_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly and sincerely declare that—

"1. The land I occupy as \_\_\_\_\_ is situated at \_\_\_\_\_, and has an area of \_\_\_\_\_ acres; the title is \_\_\_\_\_, the description as contained in \_\_\_\_\_, numbered \_\_\_\_\_, volume \_\_\_\_\_, folio \_\_\_\_\_, being

"2. The most convenient railway station to which goods may be consigned to me is

"3. The existing encumbrances on my interest in the above land are

"4. My other existing liabilities are

"5. My present principal sources of income are

Mr. Moore.]

"6. The amounts of my income for each of the past three years have been  
1916 , 1917 , 1918

"7. I propose to sow in 1919 the following:—

Wheat	acres.
Barley	acres.
Oats	acres.

and I shall require therefor the following seed:—

Bushels of wheat.
Bushels of barley.
Bushels of oats.

"8. The areas in acres cultivated by me in recent years have been as follows:—

Year.	WHEAT (acres).	BARLEY (acres).	OATS (acres).	OTHER CROPS (acres).
1914				
1915				
1916				
1917				
1918				

"9. I am unable to secure seed without the assistance of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, and I am unable to pay cash for the seed required.

"10. Though I should prefer I shall be satisfied with whatever variety or varieties the department may supply.

"And I hereby make application to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock to supply to me the above seed, or such amount as he may approve, and in the event of seed being supplied to me I undertake that—

"1. The seed supplied shall be used for no other purpose than sowing during 1919 the aforesaid number of acres, and until so sown the said seed shall be and remain the property of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, and I will not dispose of the same to any other person or persons whomsoever.

"2. I will pay not later than 31st January, 1920, to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, or such officer as he may appoint, the full cost of the seed supplied to me, including freight and all other charges and interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum on the total amount outstanding until date of payment."

That is what the Government call "giving" things to the farmers. The document goes on to say—

"3. I will forthwith, and from time to time, upon demand, give to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock a lien (bill of sale) on my crops for the said cost, freight, charges, and interest, but such lien (bill of sale) shall not operate to prevent the said Secretary for Agriculture and Stock from proceeding to recover from me any amounts so owing in accordance with this undertaking.

[Mr. Moore.

"4. If the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock shall deem it necessary, I will authorise to pay to the said Secretary for Agriculture and Stock the amount of my debt to him, by regular monthly instalments, of such amount as he may require out of the amount or amounts periodically due to me for supplied to the said , and in such case the receipt of the said Secretary for Agriculture and Stock to the said for any amount so paid, will constitute a full and sufficient discharge of such amount.

"Dated at , this day of , 19 .

"Signed by the abovenamed, in the presence of

" (Signature of applicant.)"

Then follows a certificate, which is couched in these terms—

"CERTIFICATE.

"*Note.*—This certificate, that the application is bona fide and in accordance with the conditions under which assistance will be granted, must be signed by a police magistrate, or an officer of the Department of Agriculture and Stock, or an officer of the Lands Department, or a justice of the peace.

"I hereby certify that the applicant is known to me, that from inquiries made by me I know that the contents hereof are true, and that I can recommend this application for the favourable consideration of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, for the following reasons

"Signature

"Occupation

"Date

A justice of the peace or a police magistrate has to go and inquire into the applicant's private business, and ascertain every debt he owes, and yet the Government go round the country saying, "We gave seed wheat to the farmers." Do you expect that any farmer in his senses would take wheat on those terms? When the Government are able to distribute relief to distressed people in the town without the amount spent on that relief being refunded, is it a fair thing that they should ask farmers to sign such a document when applying for a supply of seed wheat? It is not a question of the department making inquiry, but of the farmer having to go to a justice of the peace or police magistrate and place his affairs before that officer before he can get assistance.

Mr. POLLOCK: Relief was given to miners in the Cloncurry district on exactly the same principle, and they did not object.

Mr. MOORE: Was relief given to the people of Townsville under the same conditions?

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not know.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Why was Brisbane favoured?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOORE: I do not think that the amount spent on relief distributed to people in the cities of Queensland is expected to be paid back, but I take great exception to fish being made of one class of people and fowl

of another. Is it a fair thing that farmers should not be given some assistance without being expected to sign a document such as I have quoted? I say it is a most unheard of thing that they should be compelled to sign that document? Is it any wonder that the Government should afterwards complain that the wheat was left on their hands? There is no reason why a form of that kind should be sent out to be signed by farmers who have suffered as farmers on the Downs have suffered. But I would not take any notice of the matter if it were not for the fact that relief is distributed in the towns without any such conditions. The relief distributed in the towns during the past four years amounts to just as much as the cost of seed wheat distributed to farmers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: According to your logic, you would not give relief to men unless the amount spent is repaid.

Mr. MOORE: No; I would give relief if it was required.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What security has a man with a swag got?

Mr. MOORE: That is just it. Because the Government can grab something from the farmer, they are treating those men in a different way from the manner in which they are treating the men who have got nothing.

Mr. FOLEY: Would you leave those men to starve?

Mr. MOORE: Would you leave the farmers to starve?

Mr. FOLEY: No; they have plenty of money to go on with.

Mr. MOORE: Have they plenty of money to go on with? I can tell you that to-day the amount of the factory cheques paid to farmers at present is infinitesimal. I know many families who are getting £2 a month from their dairying, and that is all they have to keep them. I am not denying that in certain small portions of the country there has been rain, and that landowners are able to depasture a large number of stock; but there is a large area where there has been no rain—where, in fact, there has been a drought for the last two years, and where the people require assistance. And those are the people who are penalised by the Government, who are supposed to assist the farmer. Then the Government go round and say, "We gave the farmers wheat, and we gave them fodder." The way they have "given" them those things is to charge them 5 per cent. interest on their cost. I hope that the Government will relent, and see that assistance is given to farmers who are suffering distress through no fault of their own, and that those men will get the same consideration as is given to other men in the community who are in distressed circumstances.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): The main burden of the song of members of the Opposition during the whole of this debate has been the necessity for increased production, with complaints as to the action of certain bodies of men regarding the shortage of food-stuffs in North Queensland and the general depression throughout Australia caused by the present shipping strike, or lockout, as I should more rightly term it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hold-

Mr. POLLOCK: Perhaps that would be a better and more legal term to use. I am not going to condemn the men, because I believe that, if the Commonwealth Government adopted a sensible method of meeting the men and considering their grievances, it could be settled in a very short time. I have a firm opinion that, if this trouble lasts until Mr. Hughes arrives back, he will be able to settle it in twenty-four hours, and he will settle it. And he will take the credit for settling it and take the opportunity of going to the country. I may be wrong in thinking that Mr. Hughes is going to be the hero in this matter, but I believe that the Nationalist Government could settle the matter easily in twenty-four hours by lending a sympathetic ear to the seamen, listening to their grievances and giving way a little here and there. Anyone who has studied the question of the seamen's hold-up knows perfectly well that the Arbitration Court is of no use to the seamen at the present time. It is no use for members of the Opposition to tell us that the seamen and other employees should go to the Arbitration Court when we know well that it cannot redress their grievances in a proper manner.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Is any Arbitration Court any good?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not going to say that any court can go the whole way. I do not think any Arbitration Court does go the whole way in settling disputes satisfactorily between employers and employees. We know that, according to a recent High Court decision, the seaman cannot have their wages increased by the Arbitration Court beyond an additional 2d. per day. That is the only reason why they refused to go to the court, and anyone who has studied the question must admit that the seamen would be fools to attempt to go near the Arbitration Court while that decision stands. Members of the Opposition, while they have criticised the Government in this matter, knew all the time that their criticism was not directed against the party responsible, because the Queensland Government have no control over the present shipping trouble. They have forgotten, too, that during 1917 this Government introduced and attempted to pass through the Legislative Council a Bill which was fought tooth and nail by hon. members opposite, but which would have given the Government the right to commandeer all ships in Queensland waters.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And the men, too.

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes, and the men too, to be fair in the matter, and enable the people in the starving North to get food to relieve their wants.

Mr. VOWLES interjected.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Dalby is attempting the same kind of misrepresentation as he tried when he brought up the Wando Vale affair.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You covered that up. You dropped it at a convenient time.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not going to enter into that question. The hon. member knows the findings of the Commission.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: When you blocked the witnesses.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Opposition did not come out of that matter in a very clean way

*Mr. Pollock.]*

at all. The proposal of the Government in 1917 was that they should be able to take control of the ships—not to commandeer them or their profits, but merely control them for the benefit of the people.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: And conscript the men.

Mr. POLLOCK: Not conscript the men, but utilise the men who were on them to man the ships in just the same way as the companies were doing. At that time the Opposition held the view that every man in Australia who was eligible to go to the front should be conscripted; yet they refused to give this Government any assistance in the conscription of inanimate things like ships, and everybody knows the tremendous advantage the people of North Queensland would be deriving to-day had the Queensland Government the power they sought to commandeer those ships and supply the people with the food they so badly needed.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They could not have commandeered interstate ships.

Mr. POLLOCK: There are boats lying there which the Government could have commandeered.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They would have cleared out while you were passing your Bill.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member again is on the wrong track, because he knows that, had we passed that Bill in 1917, we would now have been able to take control, without any warning, of ships that were being unlawfully held up while people were being left to starve. I merely mention this instance in order to show that the Opposition are not in any way sincere in their attacks on the Government, and they fail utterly in trying to throw on their shoulders blame which should be thrown on the shoulders of their confreres in the Federal Parliament.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Supposing you came to the rescue in that way, would you not show your weakness?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not afraid of any Government showing weakness who endeavour to adjust a dispute and see that the wheels of industry are kept going. I believe that the men—who I believe in this instance are mainly in the right—would go back to work if they had a reasonable opportunity; but it is the pig-headed attitude of those on the other side in the dispute, who adopt the same attitude as members of the Opposition always adopt, which prevents a settlement of this dispute, and will prevent it until they take a reasonable view of the matter. The hon. member for Aubigny, when he was concluding his speech and at the opening, made reference to what he termed the spread of discontent and class-consciousness among the general public and particularly among the workers. The hon. member must have known that discontent is not confined to Queensland, and that discontent can only be the result of something which is fundamentally wrong. Everybody knows that discontent cannot last unless it is over something which is very, very wrong.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Discontent has been very much greater under the Labour Government in Queensland than under any other Government.

Mr. POLLOCK: Let me explain that. I will admit, for the sake of argument, that

[Mr. Pollock.

discontent has been greater under the present Government. The people in 1915 returned the Labour party with a substantial majority to carry out certain legislation, and the people and the workers particularly who were responsible for the return of the Government, believed that they were going to get something good out of the Government. Yet we know that the Government have been prevented from giving that something good for the worker because of the continued existence of a body which is hostile to the expressed wishes of the workers—that is, the Legislative Council. They have time and again thrown out legislation which this Government intended and attempted to pass in order to improve the conditions of the workers of Queensland. And is it any wonder, after they had returned a Labour Government and had expected to get a fair deal, after they had looked for legislation which they asked to be passed, that discontent should break out when they find it is not given to them? I say that the present Government must take the discontent as a warning in connection with the Upper House, and the Opposition must take it as a warning that the parliamentary machine is on its trial, and that it must be proved to be a successful method of dealing with the everyday problems of life or else it must go.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: All good government is on its trial.

Mr. POLLOCK: Good government is not on its trial at the present time. The administration of laws which existed prior to the coming into office of the Labour party is on its trial.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Are you with the parliamentary machine, or on the opposite side?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am with the parliamentary machine so long as an opportunity is given the people to use a parliamentary machine that is efficient. I am the same as every other man who wants results—if the parliamentary machine will not get them, something else has to get them.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: What is that something else?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am trying to give a warning to the hon. member that there is only one alternative to parliamentary Government.

Mr. VOWLES: Revolution?

Mr. POLLOCK: That is the word. There is only one alternative to refusing to give the people what they desire. That is what happened in Russia. Nobody believes that a revolution would have occurred in Russia had it not been for the one outstanding fact that the people could not get what they wanted by parliamentary government. The same condition of things will apply in Queensland in a few short years—perhaps in a few short months—if the people are not able to secure, by their votes, what they are entitled to, and what they want.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: On what side will you be?

Mr. POLLOCK: That depends on circumstances. I am certain I will never be on the same side as the hon. member, unless he changes his views.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You are quite a prophet.

Mr. POLLOCK: One does not need to be a prophet to see those things. They are plain for everybody to see who studies the ordinary, everyday problems of life. You have no need to be a wizard to discover that, if men cannot get things by fair means, when they are right in their demands and want them sufficiently, they are going to get them by foul.

Mr. VOWLES: It is just as well to know these things.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is as well to know them. It is as well that the Opposition should wake up to the fact, and endeavour to give the Government some assistance in the abolition of the Upper House, to enable them to get on with the work they were put here to carry out. I said that no Government could do anything unless they had perfected and made efficient the parliamentary machine. The present parliamentary machine is not efficient. No man can say it is efficient when a body of men are returned here to carry out certain objects and are deliberately prevented from doing that by a nominee, autocratic body. That condition of affairs is not different, except in degree—and a very slight degree—to that which existed in Russia and in Germany, because the men in the Upper House who resist our legislation are no more entitled to be the autocrats, the dictators, of Queensland than is any king, kaiser, or czar. I repeat, there is only one alternative to having a perfected parliamentary machine that can carry out the wishes of the people, and that is a scheme that will do it by force. It is the only alternative I know of; and, if the hon. member for Warwick knows of any other, I shall be glad to hear it from him. The big bulk of the people are stirred up to discontent, and are talking direct action.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You are encouraging them now.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not encouraging them, but I am giving a warning to those who are blocking them from getting what they are really entitled to; and a warning at this stage, I think, is not out of place.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Your Administration has been inefficient so far as controlling things in the North is concerned.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not talking about the Administration. I am talking about the parliamentary machine, and the facilities that the working men have for getting what they desire. Let us keep to that point; I do not intend to be drawn away from it by any interjection. The Government have once tried to abolish the Legislative Council, and failed. They failed because the people of Queensland, while they wanted certain legislation, did not think sufficiently, in my opinion, to enable them to get rid of the body that was blocking that legislation. It is probable that the people did not realise fully the facts of the case. It is probable that many other issues were submitted at the time this referendum was submitted which militated against its success. But it does not alter the fact that the Government, seeing that the people desire certain objects, and knowing that the other Chamber stands in the way of securing those objects, should lose no time in saying to the people, "There is the way to do it—by abolishing the Legislative Council."

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The people will refuse to give you the power.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the people refuse to abolish the Legislative Council, it is their funeral. I, for one, am not going to be guilty any longer than I can help of being responsible for preventing the people from doing something they are entitled to do.

Mr. VOWLES: You are trying to coerce and intimidate those people now to vote your way.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am trying to induce the people to believe that their interests lie in the direction of abolishing the Legislative Council.

Mr. VOWLES: No, you are trying to coerce them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am trying to point out that the danger in this country from Bolshevism lies in the continued existence of a Chamber which will not allow the people of Queensland to govern themselves. I am quite sure it is only those who wish to misunderstand me who can misunderstand me.

Another question which the Government have included in the forefront of their sessional programme is that of dealing with profiteering. The profiteer is a man who should be dealt with in the manner in which every Government should deal with criminals. The profiteer is a man who is literally taking the bread out of the mouths of those who are working for a living, and is entitled to no better treatment than the average criminal. When we look around and discover how many young women are working in Brisbane for £1 a week—girls, in most cases, entirely without relatives, who are compelled to keep body and soul together, and dress themselves, on £1 per week at the outside—it makes one wonder that there are not more women eager to abolish the Legislative Council. It makes one wonder that there are not more females employed in these big warehouses who are anxious to come forward with some scheme for their own betterment. It makes one wonder why it is they have been so long in attempting some satisfactory form of organisation to enable them to secure something which will enable them to live decently.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Where is your Arbitration Court, under a Labour Government? Why do they not carry out the law?

Mr. POLLOCK: My point is that, before the Arbitration Court came into existence in Queensland, a lot of these girls were working for 7s. 6d. a week. It is true their wages have been increased over 100 per cent., and it is also true that the cost of living has gone up out of all proportion.

Mr. WHITFORD: Three hundred per cent.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not going to attack any particular individual over the increase in the cost of living, but I do say that the increase in wages is not sufficient to justify such an increase in the cost of necessary commodities—in the cost of clothes and in the cost of things that we use every day of our lives. Consequently, there must be some undue profits, or, in other words, there must be profiteering. Arbitration has not, as the extremist says, been proved a failure, because it has never been really given a trial. It is no use a Government passing an Arbitration Act which will merely give judgment upon the question of the price of wages.

*Mr. Pollock.]*



The Arbitration Court should have power, at the same time, to fix the cost of commodities as nearly as possible for the period over which the award extends, and if the court has that power, then there is no doubt that the employees will become much more satisfied with the system of arbitration. If it does not get that power, then more and more dissatisfaction is going to be expressed with the decisions of the Arbitration Court; more and more profiteering is going to be indulged in, as was instanced by the bakers' case in Brisbane not long ago. When a further slight increase in wages of about half-a-crown a week was granted to the employees, bread went up  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per loaf. Undue profiteering was indulged in in that instance.

Mr. WHITFORD: Legalised burglars.

Mr. POLLOCK: Perhaps that is as good a name for them as any other. Profiteering is going on in connection with almost every line of business. It seems to me that it has not only become a habit, but has become a particular virtue amongst the traders to "pass it on." Every time an award is given, they merely laugh, and say, "The public must pay." And the public are the workers; and when I say the workers, let me remind hon. members that there are a good many men in this House who receive only their £300 per annum, and it is those men who are compelled to live on £5 15s. per week who realise just how much the cost of living enters into the ordinary calculations of the working man. Perhaps it would be a good thing if more members of Parliament received nothing but their parliamentary allowance and were compelled to live on it, as, perhaps, they would then wake up to the necessity of doing something to cope with the question of the increased cost of living. I do not know, and I have gone into the question fairly closely, how the average man receiving £4 per week, with a wife and family to keep, manages to live at all. I do not care whether it is a condemnation of this Government or not; the fact remains that it must be very hard for those men to scrape along, and it is time that the Government introduced some measure that would afford relief to those who are suffering. I realise that the question of the fixation of prices is something which cannot be dealt with by the Government of Queensland satisfactorily. I realise that it is largely a Commonwealth matter, because Queensland cannot fix the wholesale price of commodities which are not produced within the State. It can only fix retail prices for clothing and other articles, and for foodstuffs which are produced outside this State. But it can fix prices for certain articles that are produced locally, and can fix them satisfactorily either by some method of arbitration or by a board of control which is able to hear evidence and determine what is a fair and just price for such commodities. Until some effort is made by the State to deal with this question, one cannot expect the Tory Government in the National Parliament, which is the friend of the profiteers, to attempt to deal with it.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What have your Government done in the last five years? Only taken the farmers' butter.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not going to defend what the Government have done or have not done. This is one of the occasions when every hon. member, realising that the cost of living is entering largely into the homes

[Mr. Pollack

of every member of the community who has to work for a living, should rise above Governments and above party, if necessary. A man should be prepared to go beyond the supporting of Governments, and go beyond loyalty to party, if necessary, in order to secure what he believes to be just treatment for those who have to work for a living and who are affected by the increased cost of living. I know that the Queensland Government did fix prices during the first few months after it came into office, and the fixation of prices resulted in a decrease in the cost to the consumer.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Certainly.

Mr. POLLOCK: And I know, too, that, so soon as the Commonwealth Government passed its War Precaution Act, wherever the Queensland Government fixed prices for certain commodities, the War Precautions Act, which superseded every other Act of Parliament in Australia, was brought into use by the Federal Government, and higher prices were fixed for those commodities, with the result that the Queensland Government were compelled to relinquish altogether the fixation of prices.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Did you attempt to fix the price of clothing?

Mr. POLLOCK: We did not get time before the War Precautions Act came into force. The Government did not get a chance to use the price-fixing regulations that they promulgated before the Commonwealth Government made it quite clear that nothing was going to be done to assist the State, but that everything was to be done to hinder it. I had fully a dozen cases in the Gregory electorate of overcharging on the Commonwealth fixed prices for meat and other necessary commodities, and I took those cases to Mr. Sumner, the Price Fixing Commissioner, and he said to me, "You are only wasting your time. It is no use asking for prosecutions. You know who is Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, and you know Mr. Hughes will not prosecute for any overcharging," and that was the end of it. I had to go away knowing that overcharging was indulged in, because I had proof of it, and yet knowing that no prosecution would be instituted, because the Government in power were the friends of the profiteer and the friends of the middleman.

Mr. BAYLEY: Prosecutions were instituted.

Mr. POLLOCK: How many?

Mr. BAYLEY: A number of them.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member knows quite well that in every instance where a prosecution was made it was only half-hearted.

Mr. ROBERTS: They were fined up to £20.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member knows as well as I do that only in rare cases, and where the demand of the public in the particular locality was insistent, was any prosecution instituted. It needed a tremendous amount of influence to move the Commonwealth Government to take action in this connection.

Mr. ROBERTS: Like the State Government, they move slowly.

Mr. POLLOCK: The State Government moved slowly, but the Commonwealth Government did not move at all, or not to any

appreciable extent. Not only was the fixation of prices absolutely stopped, but no attempt has been made during the past eighteen months or two years at the very least to reintroduce any system of price-fixing by the Commonwealth Government. Everybody knows that it is not until six months after the declaration of peace that the War Precautions Act expires, and only then will the Queensland Government have unlimited opportunity to proceed with the fixation of prices for local commodities, and it will be admitted by any man who desires to be fair in the matter, that the Queensland Government are now starting out at the earliest and first opportunity, in a genuine way, to put a stop to profiteering.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: They have done nothing yet; they have not started it.

Mr. POLLOCK: As I have already pointed out, it is only within the next few weeks that the War Precautions Act will expire, so that the Government will be [10 p.m.] able to go on with the system of price-fixing, knowing that it will not be hindered by the Commonwealth Government. The Government will attempt at the earliest opportunity to deal with profiteering and the fixing of prices.

Mr. GUNN: Will they fix the price of members' salaries?

Mr. POLLOCK: I did not intend to deal with that question to-night, but I have no objection to making a few remarks upon it. Personally, I have never left my constituents under any delusion as to how I stand with regard to an increase in salary. Before I went to the country at the last election, and on the platform at every place I visited, I told my constituents I was worth £500 a year, and that, if they did not think so, they had better elect the other fellow. They elected me.

Mr. GUNN: Don't you think members of Parliament ought to go before the Arbitration Court, like anybody else?

Mr. POLLOCK: I have so much faith in arbitration that I would have no hesitation in trusting the fixing of my salary to an Arbitration Court, like other working men, provided the prices of necessary commodities were also arbitrated upon. The Opposition would not be prepared to go before the Arbitration Court. If an award were based upon efficiency, members of the Opposition would have to go out somewhere else to earn a crust, as they would not earn enough here. I contend that the Government, at the earliest opportunity, should take steps to give some relief to members in country constituencies. I have a constituency 97,000 square miles in area. I am compelled to live on my salary as a politician. I make a job of it, and I do it, I hope, thoroughly, and I expect to be paid for the work that I do. I am in attendance at the House every day. I do my work as well as I am able to do it, and I am always at the beck and call of any constituent who desires my assistance, and I expect to be paid a reasonable amount for my occupation. But, apart from the meagre salary which is allowed to members of Parliament, there is also the question of a travelling allowance to members to be considered. I maintain that, if I were to receive £500 a year, I would not be in nearly as good a position as a city member would be on £400 a year, because of the necessity to

travel. A man coming from a western or far northern constituency naturally, after a few years, if he does not visit his constituency must get out of touch with the requirements of the district. Even letters cannot keep you posted up in the requirements of a district as fully as repeated visits, and every member of Parliament should have the opportunity of going to his own constituency to find out just what is needed there, and be able to come back to the House and attempt legislation accordingly. No allowance whatever is made to members of Parliament for that purpose. Many people really believe that members receive a travelling allowance; and that, if they go into remote portions of their electorates, they receive coach or motor-car fares, or are allowed motor or some other method of conveyance by the Government. This is a good opportunity to point out that none of these privileges are given to members of Parliament, and it is high time that the Government provided every country member of Parliament with motor-car fare when travelling in remote portions of his constituency, or paid his coach fare. It is impossible to do the travelling necessary on the salary. I have a good many constituents at Boulia, the nearest railway station to which I can travel on my railway pass being Winton. That necessitates a trip of 240 miles by car or coach each way, at an expenditure of anything up to £50. Then another place is Urandangie, 150 miles from the nearest railway. It is a big pastoral centre, with a good many inhabitants in the township. That journey costs anything from £25 to £30. Kynuna is another place, 105 miles from any township, and that takes another £25. There are several other places which it is necessary for me to visit. No one can expect a member to visit those places on a salary of £300 a year, but that is what I have had to do. It has been, and is now, recognised in every Parliament in the world that payment of members should exist; and, if we admit that the principle is right, then the only question that remains is as to whether the payment should be adequate. If you expect a man to do his work thoroughly, you must give him adequate payment. I do not stand for low wages to the working man, and by the same token, I do not believe in low wages to myself. I believe that increased efficiency would be obtained by an increase in salary to members of this House. I believe that you would get a better type of men. There are a good many men who will not take on the position of a member of Parliament for £300 a year, because they know that the work would take up most of their time, and that they cannot enter into any other business. A Labour man knows that it is only fair that he should be paid for the work that he does, and not be compelled to accept two jobs to make a living. It seems to me that a man should receive a payment which will enable him to live in ordinary comfort. A man who gives the best that is in him to Parliament for nine or ten of the best years of his life should be entitled to leave this House with something saved, and to help him in his old age.

Mr. GUNN: He has got Dunwich.

Mr. POLLOCK: I have no desire to go to Dunwich, or any other charitable institution, and the hon. member will never go there, because he has feathered his nest sufficiently well not to have to go there.

*Mr. Pollock.]*

This question has not received the consideration which it deserves. Last year £200 additional money was given to members of this House to pursue a referendum campaign, and that campaign I pursued faithfully, spending on it more than the £200 which was allotted to me. And I believe that many other members on this side of the House have done the same thing. Although I spent over £200 in carrying on that referendum campaign, I did not cover nearly one-half of my own constituency. Hon. members can take that as a sound fact. Members of the Opposition have always been somewhat hypocritical over this matter. With a couple of exceptions, practically every member of the Opposition either spoke or voted against the appropriation of that money when it was being passed by the House, and yet we find that they were there with their hands outstretched when the money was made available by the Treasury. If a member does not believe that he is worth £500 per annum, and votes against the money being granted, he should not take the money. But the Opposition made a great deal of political capital out of the matter, saying that the Government did what they could for their own supporters, and yet they were there when the money was handed round, and I doubt if any of them has made a serious attempt to go out into the country and spend that money in urging the electors to retain the Legislative Council. I doubt if any member of the Opposition has spent any of that money for the purpose for which it was allotted. I have faithfully performed my part of the bargain, and I think that most of the other members of this party have done the same, so that by the time the campaign is over the members who received that allowance will have done their best to place that question before the people in the manner in which it was intended it should be placed before them.

Before I conclude, I should like to congratulate the Government upon the assistance they have given to miners in the Duchess and Cloncurry districts. There is no doubt that with the closing down of the Cloncurry mines, with the subsequent slump in the price of copper and the consequent unemployment in the Cloncurry district, there was no hope of employment for men in North Queensland. Hundreds of men were thrown out of work, everything would have looked particularly bad, and hundreds of men would have been starving, especially in the Cloncurry district, if the Government had not come forward with their scheme for giving assistance to copper-gougers and copper prospectors. The Government, by advancing money to those men, have kept hundreds of homes going—have kept the wolf from the door—and, judging from the attitude of the men in the Cloncurry district, I believe they value and appreciate the assistance given them by the Government. I know, as the hon. member for Flinders knows, that every man who received that allowance has been able to continue on in his show and has been a producer all the time, so that the Government will not be at any loss in the matter. I believe also that a disastrous calamity was averted in the Cloncurry district by the granting of those allowances. The Government cannot expect to bring in surpluses continually, when they have always to carry out things which need expenditure, and when they run industries which need expenditure and do not produce much revenue. The

[Mr. Pollock.

grants or loans to which I have referred run into a very considerable sum. In some cases perhaps some of the money will not be repaid, but, taking the matter as a whole, I believe the State will get more than value for the money expended. The Government, in their annual expenditure on hospitals and in their annual expenditure on education, are paying out and incurring a big dead loss. They run the railways for the public convenience. The old schoolboy method of making the railways pay can be introduced by any Government. Put the freights up high enough and the railways will always pay, no matter what wages you pay the employees.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Oh, no!

Mr. POLLOCK: I guarantee that, if the Government give me a free hand to fix fares and freights, I will make the railways pay. But the railways are run as a public convenience, and, like other concerns of a similar nature, they involve the continual expenditure of public money. This means that the Government have to spend, spend, spend. I would not mind that so much if the members of the Opposition did not raise such a howl when the Government go in for nationalising an industry which will produce a certain revenue. If the Government are to make ends meet, they must be able to nationalise things which will return a revenue, as well as things which involve an annual expenditure. The Government have no need to be afraid of the financial position. The credit of Queensland is good, and money can be obtained, if it is necessary. I am not here to say that it is urgently necessary to raise large sums of money for Queensland at the present time. As far as I can see, the Government, in pursuing their present policy, are going on sound lines. I believe that more State enterprises should be started. I believe also that the Government should endeavour to secure as many men as possible as administrators who are in sympathy with the policy of the Government, or who, if not actually in sympathy with that policy, are prepared to carry out the policy of the Government, no matter whether it is in accordance with or against their own wishes. Unless they do that, the Government cannot make these industries the success which they desire. I say, without fear of contradiction, that there is a tendency to have at the heads of Government departments men who not only are not in sympathy with the Government's policy, but who refuse to carry out their policy. I am not so keen on having as administrators only the all-wool and a yard-wide Labour men. I do not care whether a man is a Labour man or a Liberal—he has a right to his own policy—but we should have in those positions men who are prepared to carry out the Government policy, no matter whether it is in accordance with or against their own personal views. Many of our State servants would be wise to take warning that a time must come when the Government, for its own protection, must deal with those who are disloyal to the policy endorsed by the people.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at twenty minutes past 10 o'clock p.m.