

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 1919

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER, 1919.

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

QUESTIONS.

LOAN FROM AMERICAN SOURCE.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. Is it a fact that the Government have arranged, or taken preliminary steps to arrange, a loan with an American source?

"2. If so, upon what terms as regards interest, period, and other material terms; and what will be its amount?

"3. With whom has the loan been arranged?

"4. When will the money, or any part of it, be available, and for what purpose will it be used?"

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

"1 to 4. The Government is not at present in a position to make any statement in respect of arrangements for the raising of a loan."

STATE MOTOR-CARS FOR CONVEYANCE OF WOUNDED SOLDIERS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Premier—

"1. Have the inquiries promised by the Acting Premier on 14th August, as to whether any of the twenty State-owned motor-cars stationed in Brisbane had been used for the conveyance of sick or wounded soldiers from the Central Railway Station to the Kangaroo Point Hospital, yet been made?

"2. If so, what is the result of these inquiries?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. State motors have been so used on various occasions."

AGREEMENT FOR PURCHASE OF QUEENSLAND SUGAR CROP.

Mr. SWAYNE asked the Treasurer—

"1. When does the agreement with the Commonwealth Government for the purchase of the Queensland sugar crop terminate?

"2. Does the agreement include any of the 1920 sugar output?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1 and 2. I would refer the hon. member to clause 1 (a) of the agreement, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House on the 9th July, 1918."

PURCHASE OF LYNDBURST STATION, ETC.

Mr. SWAYNE asked the Premier—

"1. What was the sum paid for Lyndhurst Station?

"2. How much of this was paid for the country?"

"3. How much was paid for the stock?"

"4. How much was paid for the improvements?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. £170,000, the purchase price, including the stock, leases, improvements, and plant.

"2, 3, and 4. See answer to No. 1."

STATE SHOPS ON NORMAL SCHOOL SITE.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*) asked the Minister in charge of State enterprises—

"1. Is it a fact that it is proposed to erect State shops on the area of land occupied by the Normal School buildings?"

"2. If so—(a) what is the nature of the shops proposed; (b) what is the estimated cost; (c) when will the work be commenced?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. The intention of the Government will be disclosed at the proper time."

STATEMENT IN "BRITISH AUSTRALASIAN" RESPECTING QUEENSLAND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. SIZER asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to an alleged interview with himself appearing in the 'British Australasian' of 27th March, 1919, page 10, over the signature nom de plume of a State Government employee, in which he is quoted as saying—

In Queensland unemployment does not exist. Workers are in receipt of good wages and are protected against the profiteer on lines already indicated?"

"2. Has he at any time made all or any of the statements quoted above?"

"3. Will he take steps to have the above misrepresentations made in his name corrected?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Fihelly, *Paddington*) replied—

"1. No.

"2 and 3. These are covered by answer to No. 1."

GOODS DEBITED TO LOAN ACCOUNTS OF SOLDIER SETTLERS.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*), on behalf of Mr. Warren, asked the Minister in charge of repatriation—

"1. Is he aware that considerable confusion and dissatisfaction has arisen among settlers on soldiers' settlements through their not receiving proper invoices at the time of receiving goods debited to their loan account?"

"2. Will he order the following procedure to be adopted in respect of such debits—(a) That a detailed invoice shall be given with each parcel of goods; (b) that with all animals, vehicles, plants, trees, implements, machinery, or any goods purchased outside the State store, the settler shall receive an invoice

showing from whom the articles were purchased, price paid, or to be paid by the State, and price recharged to the purchaser; (c) that monthly or three-monthly the settler shall be furnished with an account of goods purchased during the preceding term liable to be charged against loan, and with a full account of his indebtedness to loan account with the State?"

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

"1. No.

"2. (a) and (b) Each settler now receives a detailed invoice; (c) each settler's account is open for inspection by him, and he can always obtain a statement of accounts on application."

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY WORKS.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. Did he say, in a speech delivered at Barcaldine on 29th March, 1915, that if the Labour party were returned to power—

"an agricultural machinery works will be established to protect the men on the land from the rapacity of the agricultural implement trust?"

"2. Have such works been established; if so, where are they situated?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. These works have not yet been established, but will be during this Government's term of office. I am pleased to note the interest the hon. member shows in the beneficial policy of this Government."

MINISTERS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Premier—

"1. Is it a fact that Ministers now draw travelling expenses at the rate of £3 3s. per day, in addition to ordinary free passes on railways, etc., when travelling away from Brisbane?"

"2. If so, when did it first become the practice to draw such expenses?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. No.

"2. See answer to No. 1."

STORE AND FAT CATTLE SOLD AND SLAUGHTERED.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Premier—

"1. What are the numbers of State—(a) store cattle; (b) fat cattle, which have been auctioned at the Enoggera saleyards during the two years ended 30th June, 1919?"

"2. What quantities of State cattle were—(a) slaughtered at the Government meatworks at Charleville; (b) slaughtered at private meatworks for the Government?"

"3. How was the meat killed under these two headings disposed of, and at what price per pound?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1 to 3. The hon. member was advised on the 19th ultimo, by the Acting Chief Secretary, that all necessary information relating to sales of cattle by State stations, or supplies of meat to State butcheries, will be furnished in the report of the Trade Commissioner to be submitted to Parliament shortly."

AUCTIONING PRODUCE IN SMALL LOTS AT RAILWAY YARDS.

Mr. JAMES (Logan) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Will he take steps to provide for the auctioning or satisfactory handling of produce in lots of less than 1 ton at the Roma Street railway yards?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"Lack of accommodation prevents the department agreeing to the suggestion, but no doubt if such lots were consigned to the State Produce Agency the difficulties at present existing could be satisfactorily adjusted."

STATE BUTCHERS' SHOPS ON NORMAL SCHOOL SITE.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (Bremer) asked the Premier, without notice—

"With reference to the proposed State butchers' shops to be erected upon the site of the Normal School, have representations as to the desirability of erecting those shops been made to the Government by the hon. member for Brisbane?"

The PREMIER replied—

"Yes, representations were made to the Government by the hon. member for Brisbane." (Laughter.)

PAPER.

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

Report of the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding for the year ended 30th June, 1919.

INCREASED PRODUCTION IN SECONDARY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (Drayton), in moving—

"1. That, in the opinion of this House, increased production in the secondary industries of the State, by manufacturing the raw material into saleable goods, is essential to the profitable employment of the people and the creation of a higher standard of living generally among the working classes.

"2. That, in order to assist increased production and enable industrious workers to own their own factories, and thus obtain the full result of their labours, and as a means of wealth production, the Government be requested to amend the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914, in a direction so as to include the manufacture of all raw materials into saleable articles within the Act; that such alterations or amendments be made in the Act as are necessary to enable

industrious workers to become the owners of their own co-operative factories, or to enable workers to co-operate with capitalists in an approved system of co-operation or profit-sharing that will give the workers the full results of their labours, and the capitalist a fair return on his investment"—

said: It is only fair to hon. members, and to the community at large, who are not thoroughly acquainted with the provisions of the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act, to briefly explain its provisions. That Act was left to the end of the session, and I, in addition to other farming members, had a good deal to do with the passing of it. Briefly speaking, the Act provides—

Mr. SMITH (Mackay): I rise to a point of order in regard to this motion. I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to paragraph 2 of the motion, particularly the part which reads—

"That, in order to assist increased production and enable industrious workers to own their own factories, and thus obtain the full result of their labours, and as a means of wealth production, the Government be requested to amend the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914 in a direction so as to include the manufacture of all raw materials into saleable articles within the Act."

My first point is that the hon. member is anticipating a matter that is already before the House.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No, no!

Mr. SMITH: You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister for Agriculture has already introduced a Bill to amend the principal Act. That Bill was introduced in Committee and read a first time, and it is due for its second reading on Tuesday next. I would like to quote from Sir Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice," twelfth edition, pages 248 and 249, which has some bearing on this point. "May" says—

"A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, whether it be a Bill or an adjourned debate upon a motion."

I contend that that covers the motion moved by the hon. member, and on that ground the second part of his motion is out of order. Then, again, the motion seeks to provide for something that is already provided for in the principal Act.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No, no!

Mr. SMITH: I wish to quote from the statutes in that connection. I find that the matters dealt with under the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act are as follows:—

"Primary products.—Butter, cheese, milk, bacon, flour, cornflour, cotton, grain meal, jam, and preserved fruits, and such other products of the soil as the Governor in Council may from time to time declare, by Order in Council published in the 'Gazette,' to be primary products within the meaning of this Act."

It will be seen that that definition is fairly wide, and covers everything intended to be covered by the motion. Further on the definition of "works" is given as follows:—

"Works.—Any works or factory for the manufacture or cold storage of primary products and the by-products thereof, together with all machinery and

Mr. Smith.]

appurtenances used therein or in connection therewith, and all tramways leading thereto, and the site of the works and all land used in connection with any such tramway."

I claim that, on these two points, the second portion of the motion is entirely out of order. My second point shows, not only that the motion is out of order, but that it is quite unnecessary, and shows also that the hon. member has not made himself acquainted with the provisions of the principal Act which he desires to amend.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It does not include secondary industries at all.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would like to point out that the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914 provides for encouragement to agricultural production, while the motion moved by the hon. member for Drayton provides for the manufacture of the raw material into saleable articles. The principal Act does not provide for the manufacture of raw materials into saleable articles.

The SPEAKER: Does the hon. member say that preserved fruits are not manufactured from the raw article?

Mr. MORGAN: I certainly say preserved fruits are manufactured from the raw article; but in that connection I would point out that the Act does not provide for the manufacture of hides into leather; it does not provide for the manufacture of cotton into cloth, nor does it provide for the manufacture of wool and numerous other raw articles. I certainly think the motion goes further than the principal Act, and therefore it is perfectly in order.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I contend I am perfectly in order in moving this motion, as the principal Act does not go far enough. We are seeking an extension of the Act so that the same privileges as are enjoyed by primary producers can be granted to the workers in the cities. The Act referred to only applies to primary products, and the object of the motion is to extend the benefits of that Act to city workers, and thus enable them to own their own factories.

The SPEAKER: Can the hon. member do that in an Agricultural Production Act?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No.

The SPEAKER: That is what the hon. member is trying to do. You would not say that the establishment of woollen mills comes under agricultural production.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You could extend the co-operative principle. It is the co-operative principle I want extended.

The SPEAKER: Oh, yes! I do not want to waste the hon. member's time in arguing. I really do not think that the first point is sound, because it is quite possible that new matters might be introduced in the same session that are not contained in the present Bill. The Ministers might introduce another amendment of the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act with different objects from those aimed at by the Bill already on the business-paper, and consequently if he could do that any other hon. member may move a motion requesting the Government to do it. So I do not think the motion is anticipation. As to the second point, there is no doubt that the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914, which I have before me, provides for the manufacture of

raw material. Farmers may form co-operative societies to build factories and convert raw material into manufactured articles. The list given in the Act may be extended indefinitely by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council, may, for instance, say that tanning comes within the Act. The section of that Act defining "primary products," reads as follows:—

"Butter, cheese, milk, bacon, flour, cornflour, cotton, grain meal, jam, and preserved fruits, and such other products of the soil as the Governor in Council may from time to time declare."

The Governor in Council has the power to declare hides to be a primary product, and so the conversion of hides into leather might be provided for under the present Act.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: There may be some doubt about that. Certainly, the Act was only intended for primary production and has only been used for that purpose.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has explained that he desires to do something altogether different. He mentions woollen mills and general manufacturing. The hon. member should have made that the subject of a definite motion. I would suggest to the hon. member, and to other hon. members also, that when drawing up a motion they should seek the services of the officers of the House. The officers of the House are always prepared to help members to state definitely what they desire in a motion. This motion of the hon. member is nearly all made up of preamble and peroration. The essential thing is contained in these words—

"the Government be requested to amend the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914 in a direction so as to include the manufacture of all raw materials into saleable articles within the Act."

That is all the motion. The rest of the motion is really argument. The hon. member could get a broad enough discussion on the first portion of his motion. It is Thursday afternoon, and we do not want to lay down any very strict procedure regarding private business, but I would suggest to the hon. member that he confine himself to the first portion of the motion, which is broad enough to enable him to discuss the whole question he desires to cover.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, increased production in the secondary industries of the State, by manufacturing the raw material into saleable goods, is essential to the profitable employment of the people and the creation of a higher standard of living generally amongst the working classes."

My reason for moving this motion is the need for employment amongst our working classes of to-day. The Treasurer assured us yesterday that there was a very large number of persons out of employment. We have waiting for work numbers of returned soldiers and others, and our raw material is going away to other countries to be made up, and it seems to me that, practically speaking, there has been no effort to assist manufacturing in certain industries. I think that the Minister for Agriculture should give all the assistance he can to those persons who are willing to manufacture such goods, and so find work. I wrote to Mr.

[*Mr. Smith.*]

Groom, of the Federal Government, about this matter, and I maintain that if the Federal Government or the State Government had done some such thing they could have found work for the soldiers on their return, especially for many of those who are disabled. I think that they would be better employed even if they were only earning half what they are receiving. It would be very much better to have them employed at something rather than to have them waiting about and not knowing what they are to do, which is the case to-day. There are many men who are not fit for hard work, and who have not learned any trade or calling; they are in the same position as they were twelve months ago. They are not able to earn a living, whereas it might have been otherwise if the Federal Government had taken the matter in hand and established some workshop where such men could have learned trades and be employed. I consider that it is a national necessity that we should assist by co-operative means in this direction, so that we can employ our own people. If we go to-day through Queensland and look at the prospects of manufacture, we see that they are very dark. There is a feeling of insecurity. There is a feeling that people will not invest money in manufacture or anything else.

Mr. CARTER: There is a new woollen company with thousands of pounds.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It may be true that we are getting a little, but we are not getting one-tenth of what we ought to be getting. There is a very big reason for that. The production of the country is being injured in many ways. One of them, I contend, is the cloud which is hanging over our State by reason of the objective of the Socialist party, which practically intends to seize the means of production. There is also the insecurity of our transport. People are afraid to manufacture in the inland—they are almost afraid of producing, because at the present time transport is insecure. Both our railway and shipping routes are insecure. We cannot, under our present conditions, with the present party in power, who seem to have lost the reins of government and seem not to be able to govern at all, tell the day when an interruption may occur. Some individual, without any responsibility, practically speaking—because he knows he is quite safe from the Government side of the House and will not be interfered with—may get up and advocate a strike or call the railway men out and stop the highways of trade. It is this insecurity which in a big degree is preventing the manufacturing and the extension of manufacturing and, consequently, employment in our industries to-day, not only in the secondary industries, but also in the primary industries. I maintain that the worker should have the same opportunity of owning his factories as the farmer. We have educated our people to a certain point, where they, like myself, do not want to work for other people, but only for themselves. I think they are justified in that.

We cannot say that we have not [4 p.m.] got the men. We cannot say that our men are below the standard of the men who have done so much manufacturing—building ships and everything else—in other countries, because our men have proved on the battlefields that they are equal to anything, and if they had

the same opportunity and received the same encouragement, we are quite sure they would give the same result. With the aims and objectives of the socialist party as they are, there is no encouragement for the extension of manufactures. There is no encouragement, practically speaking, for a man to earn more money, or to own his own home or anything else, because the objective of the party is to bring everybody down to the same level, when they will be in receipt of the same wages. A man becomes practically a machine. We find the secrecy of the ballot-box is practically destroyed. If certain people will not vote in the way they are told, they are dismissed from their unions sometimes, and it is made very hard for them to live. A very big effort is made, after elections, to find out which way a man voted. Very often a man's living is taken away because he exercised his right in voting in the secret ballot which his forefathers, as labourers, fought for. We know perfectly well the results which followed the last election and others, when we had a heresy hunt and men were chased from one job to another and prevented from making a living on account of the way they voted. These things are public property, they are advertised in the Press every day. Under a system of that sort we cannot expect men to give their best. We cannot expect that a nation can prosper; neither can we expect anyone to invest money in a State where such a cloud is hanging over them. Though there are some people who are prepared to advance money to the State and to invest it, it does not amount to one-tenth of what it ought to be. Our industries are not increasing one-tenth of what they ought. I find that even in the Legislative Council Dr. Taylor advocated the same kind of thing—a policy of manufacturing by co-operation, where the workers should own their own factory. I find Mr. R. C. Ramsay practically advocates the same thing. If he does not advocate it, he says the other thing is impossible—that is, nationalisation or socialisation. We must look to the end of our journey and see what we aim at. To-day, international socialism is not fair to the Australian boy, or, for that matter, to the Australian girl. It sacrifices our own Australian girls and boys to foreigners. You can only have a limited number of apprentices. Everything is done to keep people from going into industries. In times that are past it may have been necessary to protect tradesmen from competition in certain ways, but now that we have our Arbitration Courts I contend there should be a change in some way or other. For instance, in apprenticing boys we can take only one boy where there are three workers. Suppose there are three married men in a trade and they have three boys each—that is not many—only one boy at a time can go into that trade. The unions have not solved the problem of what they are going to do with the other half-dozen boys. I do not know whether they intend to drown them, as is done in China, but no provision whatever is made. If engineering or any other trade advances, we find that there are no tradesmen to cope with the work. Therefore you are bringing foreigners from Russia and every other part of the world to Australia, and you are pushing them into the trades to occupy the places where our Australian boys should be. I consider that that is a very big disadvantage, and it is not fair at all to our

Mr. Bebbington.]

Australian boys and girls. The system I advocate is one of co-operative ownership, where the State shall deal with the workman exactly the same as it does with the farmer, by assisting him to build his own factory, and by advancing him money on the goods he has in stock. Under that system you would certainly pay the Arbitration Court wages and your apprentices would probably be the same in number, but at the same time you would have such an advance in trade and business that it would make room for our Australian boys and girls; instead of their walking about the streets as they are doing to-day, we should find plenty of employment for them. I understand that our Railway Department is sadly overmanned. Everyone admits that. At the Arbitration Court proceedings the representative of the Commissioner admitted that he would be unable to find work, even for the engine-drivers, if they were classed as engine-drivers. Not only is the Railway Department so greatly over-staffed, but there are 1,600 men yet to return from the war out of that department. When they return, what are we going to do with them? That is one of the difficulties with which the Railway Department will be faced. No Government, either State or Federal, has made any attempt yet to extend our industries and encourage the workers as they ought to engage in those industries. We had this scheme recommended on all hands. Writers in the Press are advocating it every day. Mr. Beeby, who was paid by the New South Wales Government to go to America, in portion of his report, said that by legislative and other action the Government encouraged the organisation of industry by the amendment of the arbitration laws in accordance with the Whitley scheme; then encouraged co-operative distribution to cope with the increased price of commodities, and also gave encouragement to profit-sharing and co-operative production, as well as making provision for national insurance against sickness and unemployment. We see that the people in other States are thinking about co-operation—you cannot have a meeting of employers or employees but what this subject comes up—and yet no Government takes any steps to assist the workers to start co-operative manufacturing. We have to compete with other countries with cheap labour, such as Japan. We must not forget that on our Northern borders we have Japan and China with their teeming millions of people. Then, we see nearly £100,000,000 a year going away to other countries for goods which might be manufactured in Australia. If only our State and Federal Governments would take some interest in these subjects and get the workers together to find out what could be done, there would be no unemployment or poverty in Australia, and we should have a brighter and better nation. We may ask how it can be done. People say that it takes working men all their time to make a living, and want to know how we are going to enable working men to own their own factories. Thirty years ago the farmers did not own a single factory. They had to take their produce to the storekeeper and get what they could for it. But to-day the farmer is able to manufacture articles and to sell his own produce. The farmers to-day own over 100 cheese factories, and many butter factories, costing thousands of pounds. Some of these factories cost £20,000. How did the farmer come to

[Mr. Bebbington.

own these factories to-day? Simply by using his brains. Some of them were able to get credit, and they took the responsibility on behalf of the others. I say that what they have done the workers can do. Labour is not the only means of producing wealth. Labour is useless, unless there are brains to direct it. The people who have the brains that we want are to be found amongst the working classes. There is no question about that. The man who uses his brains, by so doing increases his one talent to two talents. By using his brains he develops them. When you have got the brains and the labour together, the capitalists and the bankers—as they did with the farmer—will come forward and find the money, and there will be no necessity to worry as to where the money will come from. I think that both the Federal and State Governments should step forward and deal boldly with this matter, and then, instead of having our brains and labour walking about the streets, with no supper in the home, and the goods which we should manufacture coming from other countries, as the position is to-day, we should have a better and healthier nation. What has been done in the past can easily be done in the future. During the last three years over £400,000 was lost to the workers in Queensland through strikes.

Mr. WHITFORD: How long have you been an advocate of co-operation?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: There is not only the loss of wages involved in a strike, but a great many other losses. For instance, take the strike of the waterside workers or the railway men. Fortunately, we have very few railway strikes; our railway men are sensible men, and I think it would take a good deal to get them out in the South. In connection with the seamen's strike, not only the loss of £400,000 in wages, but the losses to the producer have to be considered; altogether the losses would possibly come to over £1,000,000. In the strike in 1912, which is the only one I have any record of, as far as the producers are concerned, the producers lost over £60,000 worth of produce in about nine days. With the money represented by these strikes we could easily start factories and employ our workers. The hon. member for Burrum asked how long I had been an advocate of co-operation. I might state that I was connected with the first co-operative company in Queensland. I have been a director of a co-operative company for twenty years. I have pledged my own place as security for advances more than once, and to-day my name is security in two banks for the overdraft on factories. I have seen the sum of £19 deposited in the bank to start a factory, which has been going for seventeen years, and has never missed its payments of nearly £1,000 a month to its suppliers. If the farmers can do these things and become the owners of their factories, and independent, why cannot the workers do them? I say they can do them. But there is a power to-day that is misleading the workers, using them for political purposes, and trying to blind them, saying that co-operation is no use, and that nationalisation and socialisation only are good. They talk about a co-operative Commonwealth. Let us take our railways, which to-day are £1,400,000 behind. Who is going to work to pay off the deficit? Suppose you follow this thing right to the end, as hon. members opposite say, and the State owns everything. Let us take the one country that has tried it. On 26th March

last, in Hungary, the people went to bed as usual owning everything they had, but on the 27th March, when they got up, they found that the Soviet Government had passed a law confiscating everything and abolishing private ownership. What had they got? They have abolished private ownership—what hon. members opposite are trying to bring about. On the morning of the 27th March last every man and woman in Hungary was on the same dead level. Private ownership was abolished. Hon. members cannot deny that the abolition of private ownership is the platform of the international socialist; and, as the Premier came here direct from the conference of the international socialists, what can we think but that he and his party are connected with the international socialists? If we trace the thing right to the end we see that it means bringing down everybody to the same dead level. Where does the intelligent worker come in then? He will simply have to work to support the loafer. I think it is about time that the workers opened their eyes and realised what international socialism really means.

Mr. BUTLER: What loafers are you referring to?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am not referring to anyone in this Chamber as a loafer; we are all on the same level here.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: No, we are not. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We all draw the same salary, and I hope we all earn it. (Laughter.) What I said was that the intelligent worker has to support the loafer. According to an article that appeared in the "Worker" in February last, the only things that any person should own are his clothes and his toothbrush. Just fancy a community in which no citizen owned more than his clothes and his toothbrush! That is the doctrine taught by hon. members on the other side. As opposed to that, we on this side advocate the system of co-operation, which hon. members opposite tried to block this afternoon, because there can be no question that the hon. member for Mackay was practically put up to block the motion so that the workers should not be able to read the discussion or to get the benefits of co-operation. I contend that the party opposite are working directly against the interests of the worker, and that they are trying to mislead him. I maintain that the principle of co-operative manufacture and ownership of factories by the workers, which we on this side of the House are advocating by this motion, is the right principle. For the sake of argument, let me take the case of a worker in a State enterprise that is fortunate enough to pay its way and make a profit. Of course, we have no State enterprises of that kind up to the present; but, supposing we had one which made some small profits, who would get those profits? Would it be the men who earned them? No. The men who earned those profits would have to share them with every loafer, as well as with every middleman and every rich man in the State. Under the system of co-operation which we advocate, whereby the worker would own the factories, the workers would divide all the profits amongst themselves. It was to prevent this view of the matter being placed before the worker that the hon. member for Mackay was put up to raise a point of order, the object being to prevent the motion being

discussed. That shows that the interest of hon. members opposite in the worker is purely political, and that they are only interested in him for what they can get out of him for their own ends. I have much pleasure in submitting the motion to the House.

Hon. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): In rising to second the motion of the hon. member for Drayton, permit me to say that I think hon. members are indebted to that hon. member for the initiation of many an interesting debate on industrial and economic questions. The motion which has just been submitted to the House for consideration is of the highest importance to every member of the community who has the interests of the community at heart. It deals with the establishment of secondary industries and the employment therein of a large section of the people who are not employed in, or who have no taste for employment in, the production of primary products. Queensland, in common, perhaps, with the other States of the Commonwealth, is particularly fortunate in being able to produce a large number of raw products; and the sole question in many instances is that of converting the raw product into a manufactured article. We know the large number of persons who are employed in the production of butter and sugar in this State. We all know the large amount of money that has been returned to the State from overseas from the sale of those articles, and that that money goes into circulation for the benefit of every person in the State. Our wool has a ready sale in the overseas market; but, if that wool could be manufactured in this country, how many hands could be employed here?

Mr. GILDAY: We believe in that.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I am very glad to hear the hon. member say so; he should record his vote in favour of the motion. Every hon. member can join in congratulating and commending the hon. member for Drayton for giving hon. members the opportunity of expressing their views upon a subject of the highest importance to the community.

Mr. GILDAY: Why this sudden conversion at the eleventh hour?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: If the hon. member will only look back, he will admit that, when I had the opportunity, something was done in this direction by me. If all the wool we produce in Queensland could be converted into the articles which we now import from overseas, what a number of persons might be employed in the industry, and what an amount of money would be retained within the State, and would go into circulation for the benefit of those who reside within its boundaries. We all have to realise that it is absolutely essential that production should be increased. We are faced with the tremendous burdens which have been brought about by the great war which has just been concluded; and the only way by which those burdens can be liquidated is by increasing our production, not alone of our primary products, but also in connection with our secondary industries. (Hear, hear!) We know what other countries have done. One has been specially mentioned—Japan. We know that since the war commenced Japan has more than ever entered the markets of the world, and is now exporting large quantities of manufactured goods to the Commonwealth of Australia. We know that the conditions

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

under which those articles are manufactured—the low rates of pay given to the producers or manufacturers of those articles—cannot commend themselves to [4.30 p.m.] any thinking member of the community who has the interests of his fellows at heart. That alone should be a reason why we should deal with this matter with one common purpose, and do all that we can, by legislation or otherwise, to effect the establishment of secondary industries, so that it will not be necessary to allow goods manufactured by a race who, however they may be commended for their thrift, and however thankful we may be to them for the way in which their warships protected our boys on their voyage to the scene of strife, do not live under the same conditions as the people in Australia enjoy. We realise that there is a difference between our race, between a white Australia, and the Japanese. Their whole methods of life and their ideas of life are absolutely different from anything that we can approve, or that any Government which directs the affairs of the State can approve, and their methods are absolutely different from any methods which we can adopt for the improvement of such industries as are mentioned in this motion. We all know that our secondary industries are allied to our primary industries. There are many products that we cannot export because they are produced in other countries, and unless we can find a means by which those products can be manufactured and utilised in our own country, it is not worth while producing them in this State. Many of our primary products are neglected, but would if they received attention do well in Queensland because of the suitability of her climatic conditions. Owing to this neglect several avenues for the employment of men in our country districts are closed, and we are, perforce, compelled to import the very products, the raw material of which we could produce quite easily. We are compelled to import the manufactured articles when we could produce a superior primary product for their manufacture. Is not an effort to encourage such production one which should commend itself to every member of this House, and every member of the community who desires to see the progress, prosperity, and happiness of the people of this State? We all know that all men have not the inclination to go upon the land. There are some men who are physically unfit for a life upon the land as primary producers, while they are fit and have the inclination to engage in our secondary industries. Then, why not afford them the means by which they can be so employed? We do not get the articles which are manufactured by cheap labour at a cheaper rate. Unfortunately, owing to the conditions which exist to-day, those articles, which are sometimes manufactured at a fraction of what it would cost to manufacture them here, we are compelled to use and to wear. I venture to say that if our own people produced those articles we should receive articles which would be very much superior to the shoddy articles which are now put upon the market. Those articles are produced—I will not say by an inferior race, because they have the good qualities which I have already indicated—but they are produced by that race at a cost at which no white man should be asked to produce them. If we are to settle this great country and improve the conditions of the people, the primary and the secondary industries must

go hand in hand. It is to the country that we must first look. It is an old truism that it is not the town which makes the country, but that it is the country which makes the town. It is the produce of our primary industries which enables people to live in comfort in the cities. We have only to look at the history of other countries for the proof of this statement. Those countries were in the first instance merely primary producers, and while they were primary producers they never became wealthy. The amount of money which was in circulation among their people was comparatively small, with the result that wages were low, and the comforts and conditions of life were not what they should be. There is a striking example of that in connection with the great enemy whom we fought and whom we subdued. I refer to Germany. It is but a short time ago that Germany was simply a producing country—an agricultural country—but a few years ago she became a manufacturing country, and by becoming a manufacturing country she was able to improve the conditions of life among her people, and to increase her towns. She became such a wealthy country that, so far as wealth is concerned, she was practically equal to our own country. That absolutely proves my contention—that, however necessary and important it may be to improve and foster our primary industries, we must remember that if we are to succeed we must do all we can to establish secondary industries on such a basis as will encourage our primary producers to produce the raw material we require. We should see to it that every effort is made to increase and improve our primary production, that we produce the raw material required for our own manufactures, and that a market for such products should be found in our own country. We should then have a product which in every way would be superior to the imported article. Of course, I know that some hon. members sitting on the Government side of the House have a theory that all happiness might be gained by the division of the present existing wealth. But if that theory was brought into operation, the proposed division would allow only a very small amount of money for the share of each individual in the State.

Mr. COLLINS: Who believes that?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Hon. members on the other side of the House are very fond of quoting theory. They give us theories, theories, theories, but they are not practical in their proposals. When hon. members speak in this House they ought to have something more than theory to lay before their fellow members and before the people of the State; they should have something which is not only good in theory, but is likewise good in practice. I venture to say that the proposition contained in the motion is one which is good in practice. Is it not better to produce new wealth by increased production rather than do, as I said the other day, "Chase the shadow and lose the substance," such as talking of the division of the wealth already accumulated? We must all realise that brains are not the exclusive property of the wealthy members of the community. As a matter of fact, the contrary is the case. When any member of the community who, like myself, is a native of this State and a native of this very city of Brisbane, looks round and sees the men who have made a success of life, who are large employers of labour, who have done a great work in the

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

settlement of this State in promoting the development of this State, and in promoting the happiness of their fellow men, he finds that every one of them were workers. As a boy I have seen them start on the lowest rung of the ladder, and what they can do—what has been done in years gone by—can still be done. I have that opinion of my fellow men that I think the brains are there, that the energy is there, that the desire is there, but there should be no shackles imposed upon them to restrict that desire to improve their condition. In a young land such as this, where opportunities are equal, where the educational facilities are open to every member of the community, no restriction should be imposed upon any unit, and, if an individual succeeds in life, to my mind he is a man worthy of being looked up to as an example of what can be done by brains, by energy, and by thrift.

MR. GLEDSON: What about the employee? He is to have equal opportunity to starve?

MR. BUTLER: We cannot all be employers.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Unfortunately not, because, unfortunately, we are not all born equal. When I say not born equal I mean we are not all endowed with the same brain power; we are not all endowed with that desire to improve our condition. I have no doubt that the very hon. members who interject have seen men start on equal terms—perhaps one started on even better terms—and one has become an employer and the other will always remain one of the employed. That is as we are born. So we came into the world, and that is the world as it is to-day. We realise in our legislation that equal opportunity should be afforded to all. Take our scholastic institutions. Why do we give scholarships? Why do we give bursaries? Every boy cannot win a scholarship. Every boy cannot win a bursary. But because every boy cannot win a scholarship or a bursary, or cannot acquire the distinctions which are given in our educational establishments, should no boy receive a scholarship? Should no boy receive a bursary? Should no boy receive academic distinction? We know that to him who merits it the palm should be given, and to deny our manhood because they make a success in life is a fallacy which should not be entitled to commendation from any member of this House and will not be commended by any member of the community.

THE PREMIER: Are you blaming us for that?

HON. J. G. APPEL: The Premier knows that I am not. The stand I take is this: That this is a subject which should commend itself to every member of the House and to every member of the community, but I find hon. members sitting on the other side of the House who designate as a profiteer or a thief any one of their fellows who, by means of his thrift, and energy, and ability, rises in this world.

MR. GLEDSON: If he has trampled on the workers.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Because he has risen by the means I have indicated, he becomes a thief. It is a criminal action, in the eyes of some hon. members sitting behind the Government, to succeed in life. What is the object of our scholastic institutions if it is

not to give those who desire it an opportunity to improve their condition?

THE PREMIER: That is misrepresentation. You really do not say succeeding in life is profiteering?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I do not, but I say that hon. members sitting behind the Government, by interjections, frequently refer to their own members who may have improved their position in life as profiteers, as thieves—practically as criminals—because they have taken advantage of the opportunity which the State afforded. I do not regard them as profiteers. If any of my fellows have made a greater success of life than myself I am proud of them; I do not look upon them with envy.

THE PREMIER: Do you believe in profiteering?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I do not. I would sooner that the Premier had brought in a measure dealing with profiteering than some of the legislation which he is attempting to place on the statute-book, and which will not be of benefit to the community as a whole.

THE PREMIER: You admit that there is profiteering.

HON. J. G. APPEL: There is no question about it, and if the Premier is bonâ fide he will forthwith bring in a measure to deal with profiteering, and he has the assurance from me that, so far as my humble support is concerned or so far as any power of speech that I may have—

THE SPEAKER: Order! Order!

HON. J. G. APPEL: You will realise, Mr. Speaker, that I have been led astray. (Laughter.) I do not like to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and when he leads me off the path sometimes I digress as I should not. I realise that, and regret having done so. But there is a method by which can be effected all that is aimed at in this motion. It has been touched upon by the hon. member who moved it, that is, the method of co-operation. Of course, we know that the individual has succeeded. We know that groups of individuals have succeeded—unquestionably we have had it proved in the State that by means of co-operation members of the community have made a success of the particular business in which they have been engaged. To my mind it is better than State ownership of our industries, because the State becomes a profiteer. I notice that it has been claimed that various State enterprises have made large profits. Those profits are not distributed amongst the workers, whereas in a co-operative undertaking every halfpenny of profit is distributed among the members of the co-operation, and to my mind that is one thing which makes it commendable. Then there are no strikes in connection with our co-operative factories. In our Government institutions—perhaps I am wrong in calling them institutions if they are business undertakings—we find strikes even there. In our great public utility, the railways, we find there are strikes. In the State butchers' shops we find there are strikes. But in our co-operative factories we never find a strike. Why? Because every member of that co-operative factory is interested in its success; every member knows that he will receive every halfpenny of profit made by that factory. That, to my mind, is why co-operation is the solution of the

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

difficulty. Hon. members opposite generally claim to be the only ones who desire to see the advancement of their fellows—so long as they do not rise above a certain level—no tall poppies are permitted. I say that if they are honest in this matter they will give every assistance to it. They will urge its adoption—although I do not know whether they have the power of urging, because we know that there is an outside influence to which they have to respond. I would ask them to reflect. They have frequently given expression to beautiful theories. I have often listened with pleasure to the theories which have fallen from members sitting on that side of the House; but I have yet to see any practical result from the theories which they have submitted. If the theory be good, put it into practice. Here we have the opportunity of dealing with what we know is a success. We know that it is absolutely necessary that secondary industries should be established. We know that with the establishment of secondary industries under the conditions which guide rates of wages in the State, a decent wage can be paid, and if the wage which is paid is not sufficient let a greater wage be paid, and let us be prepared to pay more for the article, because, if those who are engaged in those secondary industries are honest—and they can be honest—and produce the article which they can produce, the value of that article and the wear it will give will be of such a character as will make it well worth the higher amount in comparison with shoddy goods manufactured by cheap foreign labour, and will entitle those workers so working for their own benefit in co-operation to receive such remuneration as will enable them to live in comfort. Do not we all aim at that—to see every individual comfortable? That has always been my desire. Does any hon. member think that because members sit on this side of the House they desire to see people existing under wretched conditions? I, for one, do not; I prefer, as I said before, to see my fellows improve their conditions; and if they can live better and more comfortably—and many of them live better and more comfortably than I can afford to do—I point to them with pride as examples of what can be done in this State of mine, an object lesson to those whom we desire to assist us in its development. I trust that hon. members will give this motion—or that portion of it which we are discussing—their hearty support; and again I say that the thanks of the House are due to the hon. member for Drayton for giving us the opportunity of expressing our views on what is, to my mind, one of the most important matters that can possibly be discussed in this or in any other Legislature.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): I desire to amend the motion of the hon. member for Drayton by adding to it the following words:—

“That a full standard of living will be reached by securing the full results of their labour to all workers; and to secure this it is necessary that the workers own and control the means of production, distribution, and exchange; that production be for use, and not for profit; and that this desirable end can best be reached by the realisation of the objective of the Australian Labour Party.”

In speaking to the words I propose to add to the motion, I desire to point out that the motion of the hon. member and the speech

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*

of the hon. member for Albert are just additional evidences of the fact that the world generally is to-day recognising, has been forced to recognise, a movement that is as old as labour itself. The great events Europe and the whole world have just passed through have brought to the minds of all people the absolute knowledge that something must be done, and done speedily, for the people who through all the ages have produced the wealth of the world, but have received but a very, very small portion of it. You find such evidences in all walks of life. In all countries, in all sections of the community, people are saying now, “Something must be done.” We find an honourable and learned member of the Upper House moving in the direction that “something must be done.” We find the hon. member for Drayton suddenly alive to the fact that “something must be done,” and the hon. member for Albert seconds his good intentions—which, of course, so far as members on the other side are concerned, I am forced to believe are merely intentions, and will be but further flagstones on that broad road that leads to that well-known and favourite pleasure resort of certain people who will do evil things. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I have been working for that end for twenty-three years. (Laughter.)

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I understood that the hon. gentleman had other intentions.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I mean co-operation. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I wish the hon. gentleman would not work so much in the dark, but would come out more into the open so that we might see his good works. Of course, we take his word for the good works, but words are not always evidence, and, as a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, it is merely hearsay evidence in this case, and I and others are not bound to accept it. The hon. member for Albert said that, although he had heard beautiful theories from this side of the House, he would he had more practice. Ever since labour has been labour, ever since the worker has been toiling, ever since the perspiration has been dripping from his brow

[5 p.m.] that somebody else might share the fruits of his labour, the worker has been endeavouring to better the state of society; he has been everlastingly urging his own claim, being suppressed, being kept down, being told that he is quite a subordinate being by all sections of those people who have ruled—the church as well as the others. The part of the church to which I am supposed to owe allegiance—the Church of England—has something in its catechism to the effect that we shall be satisfied with that state in which it shall please God to call us. You will find that ninety-nine out of a hundred clergymen of the Church of England and others interpret that to mean that you shall be satisfied with that state in which it “has” pleased God to call us. So far as I am concerned, the reading is “in which it shall please Him,” and I do not know to what state it shall yet please Him to call me. Why should I be satisfied with this present state when I do not know what He might have in store for me? There can be no question that it has been a world-wide idea that we should be very, very satisfied; very, very humble; very, very lowly, asking for nothing more than is given to us, being satisfied with our lot

and generally thankful that we are alive. I see that hon. members, even on this side of the House, are still wearing the forelock a little long which their forefathers wore long in order that they might bob reverently to the squire as he wended his way along the highway built by the labourer. It is nearly time we cut our front locks and asserted our own individual opinions upon this matter.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: To satisfy the hon. member for Albert, I desire to say that our endeavour to right the wrong is not a thing of to-day; it is not a thing of yesterday. It has been going on for ages and ages. One of our old, old leaders wrote something to the effect that—

"When Adam dived and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"

He had notions that things were wrong in those days. Once upon a time, we were told, we asked for bread and we got a stone. Those things have not altered very much to-day. To-day we ask for a loaf and they give us a little slice, and by means of their profit-sharing they are hoping to come out every twelve months and give us, perhaps, a cream puff with a little bit of crinkled paper on it—some little attractive thing to take our mind off the full thing that should be the worker's—the full result of his labour; some little platitude, some little gewgaw, some little thing that will satisfy him. Even the church has given us a tract when we have asked for bread. Labour, struggling in its endeavour to reap the full result of its labour, is now throwing off its shackles, is now endeavouring to lay the foundation of a solid civilisation that we ought to have had long centuries ago. The hon. member for Albert said that hon. members on this side believed in the division of the wealth of the world. No greater fallacy was ever stated—that we are the dividers-up; we are the accumulators, the people who want to bring the wealth into the one fold that all may enjoy. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are the dividers-up; they are the representatives of the people who want the whole world to labour, and they to take the bigger division of it. I believe that if the world honestly made an earnest endeavour it could very easily settle the great problem of poverty, the great problem of wretchedness, and the great problem of misery. We have a wonderful brain. It is not that there is any difference in the brains of the community. The hon. member for Albert made some remark that he knew the brains of the world were not possessed by the rich. As a matter of fact it is not a question of brain so much as a question of brain development; and that is what we aim at on this side of the House, to develop the brains of the people, to cultivate their brains, to enlighten them, to give them knowledge. We know that when the great bulk of the community have knowledge, when they have learning, when they have understanding—knowledge of their own power and understanding of the true position—there will be no need for us further to debate this great problem, because it will be settled, and settled effectively. We have no desire to level down. Our great desire always has been to build up.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Science will come to our aid, as it has come to the aid of other things. We have a wonderful knowledge of certain things. We know the depth of the sea, we know the habits of the creatures that live in the sea, we know the things that are at the bottom of the sea. We know the habits of the birds of the air and the beasts of the field. We have instruments with which we can weigh the sun. We know the size of Jupiter. We can tell you to a second when the eclipse and Jupiter's moons will occur.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Do they have co-operation there?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: There is in the solar system a mighty co-operation that keeps it going. I say we have brains that allow us to understand that co-operation, but we have never yet applied them to a co-operative system which will give us an ordinary, complete, and amicable arrangement upon this earth the same as exists in the solar system. The hon. member ought to know that if we made an honest attempt to solve the problem, we could do so.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is what I told you; you could easily do it, but you don't.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am coming more and more to the opinion that the hon. member is the true and original phonograph. If he told us that, it is something that he heard from this side, and he is merely giving us back words that came from us long enough ago. I do not intend to delay the House at any length, because I know there are a number of hon. members who want to speak upon this most important question, but I would like to read one or two little things to show that we have endeavoured for many years to right this great problem. Carlyle said—

"All true work is sacred; in all true work, were it but hand labour, there is something of divineness. Labour, wide as the earth, has its summit in heaven. Sweat of the brow, and up from that to sweat of the brain, sweat of the heart—which includes all Kepler calculations, Newton meditations, all sciences, all spoken epics, all acted heroisms, martyrdoms—up to that 'agony of bloody sweat' which all men have called divine. Oh, brother! if this is not 'worship,' then, I say, the more pity for worship, for this is the noblest thing yet discovered under God's sky."

That is Carlyle's estimate of the dignity of labour—the dignity, unfortunately, of the people whose labour has not been yet decently recognised by the people of the world. Labour, I know, is honourable. I know there is great dignity about labour. What I am striving for is to get those people who talk of the dignity of labour and the honourableness of labour to recognise the dignity of the labourer and honour the toiler. I want the gentlemen who talk like that from their pulpits and public platforms to see that the very front pews are kept for these dignified people who do the dignified work; to see that they are not hustled into the back corner of the church and kept waiting in the porch until the rich contributor is comfortably seated. As one of the things to show we are in earnest in endeavouring to solve these great problems, we might show our decency.

Mr. MORGAN: People generally like to get into the back pews of the church.

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am sorry to hear the hon. member say that, because that is a train of argument I should be very loth to adopt. I am sure the hon. member will think over it, and see that he does not always try to get to the back pew of the church. I knew one gentleman who always sat there because it was the last pew the plate came to, and he was able to hang on to the three-penny piece a little longer. (Laughter.)

The objective of the Labour party is to secure to all the people who work the full results of their labour. To work does not necessarily mean that you should use your hands only, but it means that you should do useful work for the community, either with the hand or brain, or with both, because no man can use his hands without exercising his brain, and it must be only those workers with the hand and the brain who are to enjoy the fruits of labour. The pure parasite—the man who takes wealth that he does not produce, or lifts no finger in producing—must have no place whatever in the scheme of things. It does not mean that the big manager is a loafer, or the big director is a loafer, but the big shareholder or the big moneyed-man, who only allows his money to operate for him, is one of the big parasites of society, and there are others. I think Mirabeau put the thing plainly to us when he said—

“I know but three ways of living in society: you must either be a beggar, a robber, or a wage-worker.”

There is the whole thing in a nutshell; put long ago by Mirabeau, and taken as a heading to one of his chapters by one of the great writers upon the cause that we have so much at heart—by J. Morrison Davidson. I would recommend this volume, although it was printed some few years ago, to the notice of hon. members opposite. They will get from it a full grasp of the great trials and tribulations through which the toilers have come in their endeavour to reach something like decency, something like a proper state of living; to get something more for their toil than the beggarly pittance they get to-day; because the breadwinner goes out in a morning and does not know whether there will be work for him next month, next week, or next day. Everlastingly there hangs over his head the knowledge that if he was suddenly called away his women-folk would be left to labour, to worry, and, possibly, to degradation. Tom Hood saw all this staring the worker in the face when he wrote these wonderful lines—

“Work, work, work,
Till the brain begins to swim:
Work, work, work,
Till the eyes are heavy and dim!
Seam, and gusset, and band,
Band, and gusset, and seam,
Till over the buttons I fall asleep
And sew them on in a dream!
O! men with sisters dear,
O! men with mothers and wives,
It is not linen you're wearing out.
But human creatures' lives!
Stitch, stitch, stitch,
In poverty, hunger, and dirt,
Sewing at once with a double thread
A shroud as well as a shirt.”

Although Tom Hood wrote those lines many years ago, the despair is not finished yet, the danger still hangs over the heads of our womenfolk. We know not what a day will

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.

bring forth so far as that is concerned, and it is a terrible thing to think that, after all our years of boasted civilisation and of Christianity, we have not come to a better state of being than that we do not know of a surety our position for to-morrow. That is the whole object and idea of the great labour movement—to make living secure; not to rob anybody, not to take from anybody that which is his, but to give to everybody the full fruits of his labour. It is to make sure that the life which has been given to us will be enjoyed by us. What is life given to us for? Is it given to us to be the mere slaves of other people? Did the great God, when he designed the universe and provided for the settlement of this little part of it with these intelligent beings—did he design that the very few were to have the fruits of labour, while the great multitude were to be in grinding poverty all the days of their lives? Surely hon. members opposite will see when they reflect that no such thing was ever intended! Let them think of the wonderful way in which the Messiah met all objections that were raised. I quote again from Morrison Davidson. He says, talking of the Messiah—

“In a word, He preached and practised the most absolute collectivism, and beyond His teaching, no Proudhon, no St. Simon, no Marx can possibly go. Is it ‘rent’ that is in question? What of the birds of the air? They do not gather into barns or produce ‘surplus value’ for landlords. Yet are they fed by the Almighty without vain anxiety about the future. Is it a question of ‘interest’? Then ‘lend hoping for nothing again, and your reward shall be great and ye shall be the children of the Highest.’ Is it a question of ‘profit’? Then ‘do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.’ To all other philosophies Christianity, even if it is estimated only as a philosophy, is as the sun in the centre of the planetary system. If I know aught of political economy, aught of philosophy, aught of the horrors of so-called pagan civilisation, the declaration of the Master: ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life’ is indeed nothing strange. The world of to-day, it is true, is far from Christian, but it is far more Christian than it wots of. We have among us secularists, agnostics, comtists, theosophists, and the rest; but, so far as there is anything of value to suffering humanity in their writings, it is clearly taken at second hand from the gospel of the Nazarene. They have, so to speak, rent His seamless robe and divided the fragments among them.”

Putting aside all His divinity, He dignified the teaching that He gave us. No man has expressed in better language the idea that the whole world was given for all that all might enjoy it. Let me take the hon. member for Drayton as an example. I know he has some knowledge of dairying. I believe I am right in saying that, at one time, he had fifty cows. I ask him, in all seriousness, if he would have put two of those cows in a mighty paddock and let them roam at large upon the very best pasture, and put the forty-eight on a bad patch? Of course not. He has got too much knowledge for that. But he has unwittingly, I believe, been supporting a system in this world that has been putting 98 per cent. of the people upon a bare living in

order that 2 per cent. might live in luxury—might live in all the grandeur, with everything at their beck and call that they desire. It is not that by bringing in the objective of the Labour party we are going to injure anybody. There is an old saying—

“Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.”

I believe that saying was given utterance to, not because the very little tin thing at the top of the head made it uncomfortable, but because it represented something that was unjust at that time to a certain section of the community.

Mr. VOWLES: You are stonewalling.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am not stonewalling. I only started at five minutes to 5 o'clock. The hon. member knows nothing about cricket. The batsman who hits every ball to the boundary is by no means a stonewaller, and I think I am now driving about a bit. (Laughter.) When the hon. member speaks again, I shall certainly hit him to leg. (Renewed laughter.) I want to say that the objective of the Labour party is not to rob anybody, but to so organise society that everybody may live in comfort and happiness. We want nothing more than that. We want to see nobody in penury, nobody in misery. I say the capitalist will be better off under a socialistic system. What worries him to-day? The great worry is that he is going to lose his cash, and if he loses his cash he loses his living. Under a socialistic system, as part of the system he will be one of the enjoyers of the work of the community, and he cannot starve or want. He will have everything that decency demands, and live in decency and comfort. If it were possible to use any other illustration, I would not use this. We all need air that we may live, and the only reason why the capitalistic system has not a monopoly over the air is because they do not know how to do it. If they could corner the air we should be going along to the pure oxygen air company and buying our 14 gallons of air to-day, say, for the week end, as we have to do with regard to kerosene, rice, and sugar. We have to buy the very necessities of life to see us over the week-end. They have cornered water in some parts of the world, and I believe they have cornered other liquors that may not be quite so nutritious but are more exhilarating. However, that is by the way. But there is this in the illustration about the air, that the necessities of life—the things that everybody needs—should be free; they should be within the reach of everybody, and nobody should suffer for lack of them.

Mr. MORCAN: That is why the Government should give us cheap fish.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Perhaps it would be a good thing if the Government would supply members of the Opposition with cheap fish. There is a certain amount of phosphorus in fish, and phosphorus is a brain food. (Laughter.) I am sorry to say, however, that the Treasurer's deficit would be immense, because of the enormous amount of phosphorus that some hon. members opposite would need. (Renewed laughter.) I just wish to say, in conclusion, that the Labour party work not so much for to-day as for to-morrow. We are not asking for anything for ourselves. We know that it is a very steady task; that we have to go step

by step, yard by yard. We do not think that by the turning of a switch, or by the straightening out of a little kink in the minds of the people, we can bring about the millennium to-morrow. I believe we are suffering to-day because we have been part and parcel of a system that has existed for hundreds and hundreds of years; a system which is ingrained in the minds of the people so to speak, that we have to correct, and that we have to improve systematically. That objective will be obtained by steady steps, making our advance absolutely secure, that we may not recede and get back to the old position. We do want to secure for the labourer something like the results of his toil, that he may have some happiness, that he may have that dread removed from him that ever hangs over his life—not so much for himself as for his womenfolk and for his children. These words are the words of Elizabeth Barrett Browning—

“Do you hear the children weeping, oh, my brothers,

Ere the sorrow comes with years?

They are leaning their young heads against their mothers,

And that cannot stop their tears.

The young lambs are bleating in the meadows,

The young birds are chirping in their nests,

The young fawns are playing with the shadows,

The young flowers are blowing towards the West;

But the young, young children, oh, my brothers,

They are weeping bitterly!

They are weeping in the playtime of the others,

In the country of the free!”

That is a picture in startling colours. There is a magnificent illustration of the absolute freedom of the beasts of the field and the birds of the air, while the children of men are suffering bitterly. They are in want; they are in penury; they are in misery. Why? Because of “man's inhumanity to man,” and because man has not had sufficient common sense to delve deeply into this problem, to bind himself together, to make the great resolve that he will go on and improve the condition of himself, the condition of his fellow man; not that he may get the great benefit for himself, but that those who come after him may not suffer the things that we have had to suffer, and that those who belong to us have had to suffer, and possibly will continue to suffer until we render them impossible in the future. I trust the motion will be carried with the amendment added to it that I have moved, because I believe that we can attain perfect justice, perfect liberty, and perfect freedom, if we make an honest and earnest endeavour to do what we can. I believe that the Australian Labour party is one of the manifestations of the desire of the people to attain that perfect justice, that perfect freedom, and that perfect liberty to which the people are entitled.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

The TREASURER: I second the amendment pro forma.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): The amendment moved by the hon. member for Bremer

Mr. Payne.]

embodies a principle that is agitating the minds of the people in every country more to-day than ever previously. There has proved to the thinking people of all countries that the old order of things to some extent must go, and that the production of the world must be more evenly distributed among the great masses of the people in all countries. I believe with the mover of the amendment that it is quite possible, quite feasible, and quite easy, to bring about such a condition of affairs if the people of all countries would only have a little common sense and show less selfishness. Life is short, even for the healthiest of us, and the war has proved to any man who is worth the name of man that the time has arrived when we should adopt some system that will, to some extent, remove the great causes of misery and trouble which at present exist. It would be only idle talk for any hon. member to rise in this House and say that there is not poverty even in Australia. Some people will say that poverty has been brought about by the people themselves. That may be so in some cases. If some people did not drink so much grog and looked better after the money they have earned, they might be in a better position; but, taking everything by and large, without going outside Australia to the more thickly populated countries of the world, I think it will be admitted that the drink that is consumed by quite a number of men is consumed simply to kill their sorrows. What hope is there for any man in Australia who is rearing a big family, an honest, hardworking man, when he comes to balance the ledger at the end of the week, and finds himself in a very much worse position than he was in ten or twelve years ago, despite the increased wages that he has been receiving of late? Is that not enough in itself to make him grow desperate? Unless the principle set out in the amendment is carried out by the Governments of Australia, I shall not be a bit surprised if the number of direct actionists in this country greatly increases. There are some who think that direct actionists are confined to a few nomads, to a few irresponsibles; but anyone who thinks that is greatly mistaken. For the last four years I have been travelling all over Queensland in connection with the Public Works Commission, and I have come in contact with a great many thinking people in every part of the State. I find that it

[5.30 p.m.] is the honest, sober-minded working man who has a wife and family to look after who is growing more discontented than any other person in the community. Why? Because after working week after week he finds that he is not in the same position to-day as he was ten or twelve years ago.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Is that because a Labour Government has been in power?

Mr. PAYNE: It is not because a Labour Government has been in power. All that I ask is that the thinking people of Queensland and Australia will think out the matter for themselves. In what way has the advent of the Labour Government to power been the cause of the existing state of affairs? Everyone knows that the fixation of prices, if that is what the hon. member alludes to, was taken up by the Government of this State, and that during the time they had the control of the matter they reduced the cost of living in Queensland. Then the

[Mr. Payne.

Federal Government, under the War Precautions Act, took the matter out of the hands of the State Government, with the result that up went the cost of living in every direction. Since then the matter has been controlled by the National Government, and with what result is well known to every hon. member. The principle involved in the amendment by the hon. member for Bremer should agitate the mind of every man in Queensland and in Australia at the present time. If something is not done in the direction he indicates, I am not prepared to say where things will end. We read a good deal about revolution. We have revolution in Russia. What has caused the revolution in Russia? Is it not the system which has been in existence for all time under the control of that great tyrant, the Czar—a system under which the nation has been born and bred under tyranny? The trouble is that, when those men get the upper hand, we do not know where they will stop; and the trouble in Australia to-day is that, unless something is done to give the average man an opportunity of providing for his wife and children better than he did ten or twelve years ago, there is no knowing where things will stop. As far as our secondary industries are concerned, I think that is a matter which really comes within the province of the National Government. I fail to see how any State Government can take up secondary industries and be successful. Such industries must be taken up by a Government who can adopt protection. I have been a protectionist all my life. I do not know how we are going to develop our undeveloped resources and establish secondary industries unless we impose a stiff tariff. If I had my way, I would protect every article that is consumed in Australia, if it could be reasonably produced in Australia. I would put such a tariff upon articles of that kind that it would be an utter impossibility to bring them into the Commonwealth.

Mr. MORGAN: You are a prohibitionist.

Mr. PAYNE: I am a protectionist, and I would not allow anything to be imported which could be manufactured in Australia. We know that England was built up on protection for a number of years, and that Germany was built up on a stiff protective tariff. As an Australian, I am a protectionist. I have been told that, as a protectionist, I would not give the workers of the old country fair play, or, in other words, that I would prevent the raw material of this country going to England to be manufactured.

Mr. MORGAN: Why don't you protect native bears?

Mr. PAYNE: There is a good deal that needs protection besides native bears. It has been argued that the people of Australia who believe in a protective tariff want to starve the old country. I do not think I have ever heard such a blind argument. If the people of the old country cannot find employment in England, let them come out here, where there is any amount of room for them. It has also been said that we have no people here who can undertake the manufacture of woollen articles. Is it not a lamentable thing to see that we grow the finest wool in the world, and yet have to export our wool and then get the worst of it back in a manufactured state? If we have not people here who can carry on woollen manufacture, let us bring out people here to

teach our manufacturers their business. We are not at the present time manufacturing a sufficient quantity of such goods for our own requirements, although we produce all the raw material that is required. We talk much about the establishment of an iron and steel works here, and we say that it would be a good thing for us to establish such works in Queensland. But how can we possibly succeed with iron and steel works if we give decent conditions to the men who are working in that industry? How can we establish iron and steel works in Queensland unless we have a protective tariff? Do you want the workers of Australia to get down to the level of the workers of Japan? How can you develop our undeveloped resources if you have to compete with cheap coloured labour all the time?

Mr. MORGAN: Would you protect the wheat-grower against the people of the world?

Mr. PAYNE: That is a peculiar question? I was told lately that, as far as the copper and iron industries are concerned, the workers in America are paid a bigger wage than they are in Australia. There is a lot of "bosh" talk about the high wages that are being paid in Australia. There is no chance of our resources being developed unless their development is assisted by a strict protective policy. I believe that any country which has not got its people rooted on the land is not worth the name of a country. But, running side by side with the placing of people on the land, there should be a development of our secondary industries, which will create a population to consume what is produced from the land. I am satisfied that there has been too much talk about developing the resources of this country, and too little done in that direction. If we had an Australian National party in power in the Federal Parliament which was purely Australian in sentiment, I think that in a very short time we should see a very great increase in our secondary industries. What would be the position of Australia to-day if twenty-five years before the war which has just concluded we had adopted a high protective tariff? What position would we have been in to assist the old country in this war? We need not have sent them men. We could have sent them material and everything they wanted. A country that depends on other countries for the necessaries of life is not worthy of the name of country. Any man who travels over Australia, or even over Queensland, and sees the wonderful resources—mineral, timber, and very fine agricultural land—lying in an undeveloped state, if he is worthy of the name of an Australian, he must be a protectionist; he must advocate the building up of our secondary industries and the settlement of people on the land, and thus make this country what it ought to be—one of the most thriving portions of the British Empire.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): It is extremely unfortunate that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Drayton should be sidetracked by the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Bremer. The motion deals with the only practical question facing us; indeed, it is the practical question in the whole world to-day, and yet we find hon. members opposite jumping up and striving to amend what was distinctly a matter that should have commanded the earliest attention of every member of this Chamber. It is not good enough for hon. members to be forced to listen to theoretical disquisitions on

various matters that have no connection whatever with the practical work of to-day.

Mr. SMITH: It is too practical for you.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Not a bit too practical. The hon. member for Bremer pathetically said that we looked for nothing ourselves, and yet yesterday, to-day, and for weeks past, nearly every hon. member on the other side of the House has been breaking his neck in order to seek some higher position.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not so.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am ready to admit that there may be noble exceptions to the rule, and that the hon. member for Bowen is one of them, and probably the hon. member for Bremer is another; but generally speaking, there has been an eagerness and an intense earnestness for a higher position, and there is no objection to it. It is that kind of thing that has made the world what it is; but when hon. members opposite turn round and attempt to dub those in other walks of life who strive to do their best in life and succeed—when they have to meet criticisms such as those levelled at them in this Chamber, then you commence to question the real sincerity of hon. members. The Government should not allow a private member to bring in a motion like this. In no other land under the sun to-day is this question allowed to be introduced by a private member. It should have been taken up heart and soul by the Government, and there is a strong indictment against them for neglecting the opportunity which should be theirs, and is theirs to-day. Another indictment comes from the member for Mitchell—and it proves that the whole regime and the whole administration of this Government for the last five years has been an utter failure—who said that the workers to-day were in a worse position than they were ten or twelve years ago. Of course, you could not expect much else under the Administration that this State has been subject to during the last five years. The condemnation comes from one of the Government's staunchest followers, and one of their most thoughtful men. An indictment coming from a source like that needs no further words from me to prove the condition of things which exists to-day, which is largely the result of faulty, mischievous, and interfering administration on the part of this Government during the last five years. We should have been distinctly on the upgrade to-day. We have information from New South Wales that they have a surplus of £200,000, and we know that in our own State we have gone to the bad completely, although we have imposed extra taxation to an exceedingly large sum. I again assert that there is no bigger question for us to direct our attention to in this Chamber, or for any body of men to direct their attention to, than the development of production and our secondary industries. Yet this Government has done nothing, and is doing nothing, and will never do anything so long as they stick to the platform to which they have been wedded; so long as this Government interfere with enterprises there is no likelihood of their doing anything for development. Even the hon. member for Mitchell, in his closing remarks, emphasised the vast importance of the development of our industries; but what is the use of developing our industries when you are striking everlastingly at anyone who may seek to do something in connection with the establishment of such industries? The opportunity possessed by this land to-day is so great that

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

this Government, and every other Government, should be called upon to state what they intend doing; to come down to some definite purpose, and to so shape things that they will be in tune with what is going on elsewhere in the world. Only on 19th August this cable came from London—

“The removal of the restrictions on investments abroad is likely to result in the early establishment of new industries in Australia and New Zealand. Bankers and financiers have received numerous inquiries, especially since the armistice, from British manufacturers regarding the possibilities of opening up business in Australia, but hitherto the restrictions have precluded action being taken in that direction. Several prominent Australian business men now are in England in furtherance of this object.”

The point I wish to make is this—what has this Government done, or what is it doing, in order to place before the British public or the British lender the great potentialities of our land? The hon. member for Mitchell dealt with the very wide opportunities there are, with the extent of our riches in various directions, but what is this Government doing?

Mr. RIORDAN: What is the Upper House doing—in regard to the State steel and iron works, for instance?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Why do the Government not do their part? I read a letter the other day from the manager of the steel and iron works which indicates that it will be some years before he is ready. The position is that the opportunity is offering and the Government are still silent—are actually doing nothing in the direction of the development of our industries. On the contrary, nearly every Bill that enters this House, and nearly all their administration, are chilling and preventing any efforts being made in the directions I have named. I have made the statement that other States and other lands were engaged deeply in giving attention to this matter. To-day's “Telegraph” indicates that Mr. Beeby has laid on the table of the Assembly of New South Wales a report in which he deals with this very matter. It says—

“Mr. Beeby's report on his inquiries into the industrial conditions of Great Britain and America was tabled in the Assembly last night. ‘The system of capitalistic production and the wage system is on its trial,’ he remarked. He recommends the organisation of industry to be encouraged on the lines of the Whitley report. He suggests that normal working hours should be eight per day on five days, with a Saturday half-holiday. He considers the present arbitration laws should be maintained with such amendments as may be deemed necessary. He recommends that profit-sharing and co-operative production be encouraged.”

The important part is the last sentence, and that coincides entirely with the sentiment of the original motion as proposed by the hon. member for Drayton. If we are to do our duty as a State, on us falls the responsibility—and on the Government of the day the extreme responsibility—of so shaping things that the industries of this land, which know no limit, so far as we can conceive them, shall be rightly encouraged and developed.

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

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

AYES, 33.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Lennon
„ Bertram	„ Lloyd
„ Butler	„ McLachlan
„ Carter	„ Mullan
„ Collins	„ O'Sullivan
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Payne
„ Cooper, W.	„ Riordan
„ Coyne	„ Ryan, D.
„ Fihelly	„ Ryan, H. J.
„ Foley	„ Ryan, T. J.
„ Gilday	„ Smith
„ Gillies	„ Theodore
„ Gledson	„ Thompson
„ Hardacre	„ Whitford
„ Kirwan	„ Wilson
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Larcombe	

Tellers: Mr. Carter and Mr. Gilday.

NOES, 16.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Moore
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Morgan
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Petrie
„ Bebbington	„ Roberts
„ Elphinstone	„ Sizer
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Taylor
„ Hodge	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the affirmative.

At 7 o'clock the House, in accordance with Sessional Order, proceeded with Government business.

DAIRY PRODUCE BILL.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council returning this Bill, with certain amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the Assembly.

The consideration of the Legislative Council's amendment in the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

SPEECH BY HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR FLINDERS.

AUTHORITY TO PUBLISH.

On this Order of the Day being called,

Mr. VOWLES said: Mr. Speaker,—I desire to rise to a point of order. I am of the opinion that the motion is not in order, and I desire to give the reasons why it should not be dealt with by this House. My reasons are these—

“That the authority to publish sought by the motion is contrary to parliamentary practice and procedure for the following reasons:—

Firstly—Because it authorises an hon. member of this House to have printed as a parliamentary paper a speech which contains untrue and defamatory matter, and the publication of which would be a criminal offence if not privileged by the order of this House;

Secondly—Because it authorises any person or persons other than the hon. member to publish the said defamatory matter under privilege from this House;

Thirdly—The power of publishing parliamentary papers is intended for the benefit of the members of this House and not for public distribution;

Fourthly—The effect of this motion, if carried, would be to bring about a repeal of the Criminal Code as far as the hon. member and certain publishers are concerned, without the concurrence of the Legislative Council in such repeal."

Now, the hon. member made a speech in this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has risen to a point of order. He must show clearly in what way the motion is out of order. That is the only matter he can deal with.

Mr. VOWLES: It is contrary to parliamentary practice.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will be in order in proceeding to show in what regard it is contrary to parliamentary practice.

Mr. VOWLES: First of all, to establish the point of order, I must show you that this speech contains defamatory matter, because the point of order is based on that. I think there is no getting away from that point.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman will read section 371 of the Criminal Code he will see that special provision is made for such a motion being moved.

Mr. VOWLES: An absolute protection. I am quite aware of it.

The SPEAKER: Then, the hon. gentleman surely cannot say the motion is out of order?

Mr. VOWLES: I am going to give you English authorities to show that it is out of order, and all I ask is that I should be heard.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman, but he must keep to the question that the motion is out of order.

Mr. VOWLES: All I ask you to do is to pull me up when you think I am out of order. I must establish, first of all, that it contains an offence. Now, you, Sir, have quoted the Criminal Code. The definition of "defamatory matter" in that Code is well known to everybody. It is—

"Any imputation concerning any person, or any member of his family, whether living or dead, by which the reputation of that person is likely to be injured—"

and so on. Defamation, under the Code, is a subject-matter of both criminal and civil proceeding.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must prove that it comes within the provisions of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. VOWLES: No. I will give the latest authority, and perhaps you will see, Sir, the effect of it. I know the contention will be that this House has the power to do anything by motion. I say it has not—that there is a limitation. I propose to read you that limitation. I am quoting from Anson on "Law and Custom of the Constitution," page 153. It says here—

"It is not true to say that because a matter has arisen concerning the House, and has been adjudged within the House,

such a matter cannot be considered elsewhere, if it affects rights exercisable outside and independently of the House. It is strictly true to say that the House has the exclusive right to regulate its own internal concerns, and that, short of a criminal offence committed within the House or by its order, no court would take cognisance of that which passes within its walls."

I propose to show that statements have been made in this House which, if made outside this House, would be criminal. It is not for you, Sir, I submit, to find as a fact whether they are criminal or whether they are not; any more than if murder were committed in this House, if a man were shot, it would not be a question for you to decide whether there was provocation or whether there was insanity. You have simply to deal with the statements that have been made here, and then it is for you to decide whether the privileges of this House are going to be extended in the direction sought here to give a license, not as regards what has already been said, but to the public generally, to publish and perpetuate that defamatory matter. That is what is asked for.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: It is a shame.

Mr. VOWLES: There is no question about it, there is an object in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Would not that be a matter for the courts?

Mr. VOWLES: If you want to come to the question of the courts, you can go back to the case of Stockdale v. "Hansard," which was decided on a principle going right down to a Bill introduced in England to make the matter clear. The only protection that the public have here is contained in the Criminal Code, which says that if Parliament does certain things it is a complete reply to a charge of defamation. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the rules of this House give a license such as is sought in this motion for people to continue and perpetuate a crime or a criminal offence. I do not think there is any doubt that the words that are used here are defamatory, because in the beginning of the article the speaker speaks of certain persons—he speaks about "profiteering political pickpockets"—and mentions a list of names. He goes further, and likens their practices to certain practices which were known in America.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is making remarks which are not relevant to the point of order. The hon. member must show that the motion is out of order and not properly moved. The defamatory language has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. VOWLES: If it is within the volition of a majority of the House to bring about an amendment of the Criminal Code, it may not only be with regard to defamation but it might apply to sedition, treason, or any other matter that the Government decides.

The PREMIER: There is no criminal act in this speech.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. gentleman knows that defamation is the subject-matter either of a civil or criminal prosecution. It is no use the hon. gentleman trying to get away from that position.

The PREMIER: I say there is no criminal act in this speech.

Mr. VOWLES: Is there defamation in it?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. VOWLES: I am astonished at a gentleman, who has been trying to protect his own character about a trifle, saying that to use the words "profiteering political pick-pockets" is not defamation.

The PREMIER: You have your remedy.

The SPEAKER: Order! This crossfiring must cease.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not want to crossfire. I want to deal with you, Mr. Speaker. You say that there is no point of order. Your contention is that this House, by a majority, can do anything at all. I say that a motion moved in this House asking for the sanction of the House, and which is going as an act of Parliament to make something legal which, in fact, is illegal, is not within the powers of this House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: If I rule the motion out of order, and the House disagrees with my ruling and carries the motion, where will the hon. gentleman's argument be?

Mr. VOWLES: The House may disagree with you, or may not disagree with you. I take it that, as you are supposed to have a superior knowledge of parliamentary procedure, the House, as a body, would be guided by your opinion in matters of this sort of procedure. We would not have a party vote. That is one of the things we expect as far as procedure is concerned—that there will be no party spirit—and if you decided that it was wrong I do not think the Premier would ask for a division. I consider that the procedure which is being adopted here is contrary to the spirit of our Constitution, and contrary to the usages of Parliament. I have a case here in reference to a similar publication which was tried by Chief Justice Cockburn, and he points out—as I am pointing out here—that a person may have the privilege of stating certain things in the House under cover of parliamentary privilege, but if he carries his argument to a person or set of persons—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is discussing the case as if he were in a court house. He is now dealing with the procedure of Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: I know I am not in a court house. If I were I would know where I stood. I do not know that there is any desperate hurry to get rid of this argument. What I would ask for is your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I shall certainly give my ruling if it will save any further argument. I do not want to stop the hon. member, or any other hon. member, from debating the subject, but I want him to discuss the question—which is the point of order.

Mr. VOWLES: I am doing that, and I am giving you my authority for it—the authority of judges—which surely ought to be taken into consideration.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member will give me authority for procedure in other Houses of Parliament, that is authority which will help us.

Mr. VOWLES: You are taking up the position that this House, by a bludgeoning majority, can do anything whatever; that it does not matter what they do, it is legal as

[Mr. Vowles.

far as the House is concerned. Your contention is that the only persons who can object to it is the people outside. But the House is permitting to be done something which will give a license to perpetuate an offence. This decision here says—

"There is obviously a very material difference between the publication of a speech made in Parliament for the express purpose of attacking the conduct of an individual—"

And he puts this in italics—

"and afterwards published with a like purpose or effect, and the faithful publication of parliamentary reports in their entirety, with a view to afford information to the public, and with a total absence of hostile intention of malicious motive towards anyone."

What is the position here? A statement has been made in this House which is capable of bearing a defamatory construction. Defamation is criminal, and, in order to perpetuate that charge, the individual is not prepared to do it outside the walls of this House, but seeks a motion here which will give him the privilege, and I say that by getting that privilege he is getting a license. He, as an individual, may have that license in an extreme case; but this goes further still, and it gives a general license to anybody who may like to perpetuate that charge to do so. As you are hostile to my contention—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the hon. gentleman a quarter of an hour. He knows what is allowed by the Standing Orders.

Mr. VOWLES: You have not given me all that time; you have interrupted me to such an extent.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman must keep himself in order. He will not keep within the rules of debate.

Mr. VOWLES: I think it will be just as well if you listen to these things and give your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that he has not dealt with the question at all.

Mr. VOWLES: I have dealt with the question. I say that this is contrary to parliamentary procedure. We are guided by precedent in all these things.

The PREMIER (Hon. T. J. Ryan, *Barcoo*): I would like to say a word on this alleged point of order. The hon. member who raised it must know that there is nothing whatever in the point.

Mr. VOWLES: Yes, there is.

The PREMIER: He has cited no precedent or authority in support of his contention. He has alleged that the speech delivered by the hon. member for Flinders contains defamatory matter, and that this motion is intended to enable him to publish that defamatory matter outside the walls of this House. It is quite obvious to hon. members that he has endeavoured to get in a suggestion to the public without putting any argument to you, Sir, on its supposed point of order. I regret that he has taken the course which he has done, because there is no defamation in the speech of the hon. member for Flinders.

Mr. MORGAN: Why all these words?

The PREMIER: There is nothing defamatory in it. I want to inform the House before the debate is over that, if it is suggested that there is defamatory matter in that speech, I will at once appoint a Royal Commission to investigate it. (Opposition laughter.) This point of order is only raised to endeavour to deceive the public outside, and I am determined to see that the public are not deceived either on this point or on the defamation point.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: In my opinion, the point or order raised by the hon. member for Dalby has not been sustained by the hon. member. He knows quite well that this House has a perfect right to do what it pleases. So long as the motion is couched in parliamentary language, the House has a perfect right to give a decision on it. What the hon. member has said with regard to the law on the question has nothing whatever to do with the case. The hon. member also endeavours to place upon me the responsibility of deciding something that the courts of Queensland should decide. If the motion is carried, then, if it injures someone outside, that person has recourse to the courts; but that has nothing whatever to do with the procedure adopted in Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: That is the reason why this motion is brought forward—to protect them from the legal consequences.

The SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this House. The hon. member might argue from that standpoint on the motion, not on the point of order at all. I have no hesitation in ruling that the motion is quite in order, and that this House has a perfect right to deal with the matter.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! That ends the matter.

Mr. VOWLES: I want to move that your ruling be disagreed with.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must give notice of that.

Mr. VOWLES: I wish to give notice.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): I think these can be claimed to be redletter days. Ministers are coming and going; hopes and aspirations are being consummated or dashed to the ground. Yesterday the House was in a perturbed state, divided into small camps endeavouring to settle by "peace by negotiations" what evidently appeared to be a very disturbed state of mind—probably trying to carry out in practice what was preached at Perth. The man of the hour on this occasion is the inoffensive and unassuming member for Flinders. He has suddenly sprung into prominence on this particular matter. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in what the hon. member for Flinders said in his speech. I do not think that is a matter we need be concerned about at all. He has made a speech in this House which has been reproduced in "Hansard," and which has been reproduced almost word for word in the "Standard;" and, for my part, I do not mind in the least what use is made of that speech for the purposes of propaganda work.

Mr. FOLEY: It does not affect you, anyhow.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It does not affect me in the least. But one thing I am interested

in is that the privileges of this House should be made use of for the purposes of party propaganda work. That is the only complaint I have to make in regard to the matter. The speech of the hon. member has been made public; it is open to the hon. member to make it more public still. The Premier has said that the hon. member for Flinders is going to spend his money on spreading his speech throughout Queensland. By all means, let him do so; he is entitled to do so as much as he wishes, just as we can do the same. If we think we have something good—something that we consider is in our interests, in contradistinction to the interests of the party opposite—we make the fullest possible use of it; and members on the other side are fully entitled to do the same. If there is anything in the speech of the hon. member for Flinders that is going to fortify the other side of the House to our detriment, by all means publish it as broadcast as you can. But why come to this House and make use of the privileges of this House to give it a kind of hallmark of the studied opinion of this House—to send it out with the parliamentary brand upon it? That is what we on this side object to. The course that is proposed to be taken, in my opinion, is open to very grave objection and to very grave abuse, because, once the precedent is established, what is to prevent any one of us asking for a similar privilege? It all depends on whether we have a majority behind us or not whether that privilege is going to be granted or not. We are forced to look for motives in the matter. Why is it that the Premier is moving in this direction? One is almost forced to the conclusion that there is something in the speech which, if circulated in the ordinary way in its entirety, would lead to some complications which would not be agreeable to the hon. member for Flinders, and therefore the permission of this House is sought to get a motion like this bludgeoned through so that the speech may be circulated broadcast through the country, and the hon. member be protected. So far as I can see, that is the only conclusion we can come to in the matter. This procedure has already been adopted in a previous instance in this House, and it was evidently going to be done again. It seems to be a pity that we should so degrade the standing of this House as to utilise it for purposes of that description.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am not concerned on the point that was raised yesterday as to whether the Premier treated us with discourtesy or otherwise. I do not think the Premier had any intention of treating us with any discourtesy, and I am not going to dwell on that point. I am simply dwelling on the point that I think it is a pity that this House should be degraded by being asked to spend its time in discussing a motion of this kind, because it should not be brought forward here. I would just remind the Premier that last night, in another Chamber, an hon. member asked that a petition signed by a number of men interested in the fishing industry should be printed. The petition asked that certain regulations issued under the Fish Supply Act should be amended. When the hon. member who presented the petition asked that it should be printed the Government refused the request, and it was only when a division was taken that the necessary authority to print the petition was obtained. Just at the time that

Mr. Elphinstone.

the Premier was demanding the right to use the privileges of this House to have a certain speech printed, the Government were refusing permission in the other House to treat a petition in exactly the same way. The inconsistency and insincerity of the Government in the matter are obvious.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is no comparison. The country would have to pay for printing that petition.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The difference is that there is a big majority supporting the Government here, and there is a majority against them in the other House. I am merely pointing out the inconsistency of the position—that, whereas the Government is using all its powers to force the publication of this particular speech in this House, it refuses the right of the fishermen to have a petition that was presented to the other House printed—a petition that is free from libel and free from abuse.

Mr. SMITH: The Government will have to pay for printing that petition.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If that was the only point at issue, I have no doubt that those who are interested in having the petition made public would be just as ready to pay for having it printed as the hon. member for Flinders is to pay for the printing of his speech. There is another point worthy of comment—a statement appeared in the "Courier" to-day which, I think, it would be very useful if we on this side had a majority behind us to bludgeon through a similar motion, so that the resolution which was come to by the Trades Hall Council on 22nd August should also be printed by the permission of this House, and sent broadcast throughout the country. I propose to read an extract to show the people of Queensland the control which is endeavoured to be exercised over the Government by the Trades Hall Council, and which is, no doubt, behind this particular move at the present moment.

The fiat has gone forth that the [7.30 p.m.] speech of the hon. member for Flinders is to be reproduced, because they think it is going to be excellent propaganda for an election which may, or may not, take place in the immediate future. This is the resolution that the Trades Hall Council passed, on 22nd August last—

"The following resolutions, moved by Mr. R. Carroll (A.S.E.), were unanimously adopted:—'This council, having in view a recent statement of the Home Secretary to the effect that revised regulations for prisons and penal establishments are to be issued soon, requests the Government not to issue or put same into operation until a committee appointed by this council has had an opportunity of considering such proposed revised regulations, and making such recommendations relating thereto as may be approved by this council.' 'The foregoing resolution to be taken as an instruction to the council's executive to take the necessary steps immediately.' 'This council requests the Parliamentary Labour party to keep the council fully informed, through its executive, of all proposed new industrial legislation, or amendments to existing industrial legislation, and allow the council through its parliamentary committee a reasonable opportunity of considering such proposals

[Mr. Elphinstone.

before introducing them to the House, so that organised Labour, as represented by the council, may express its approval or otherwise, and suggest such alterations as may be deemed desirable in the best interests of Labour.'"

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: What is wrong with that?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am not saying that there is anything wrong with it. What I say is that if the Government are going to use the privileges of this House to issue the matter which they propose to publish under the hallmark of the House, and distribute it throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, we ought also to have a similar opportunity to issue other matter to show the people of Queensland what is proposed to be done by the Labour party. We know that hon. members opposite are controlled and dictated to by the Trades Hall, and one cannot read the paragraph I have quoted to the House without coming to that conclusion. (Interruption.) The interjections and interruptions are evidence that I am treading on some persons' corns. If hon. members opposite, because they have a majority of two to one, endeavour to prostitute the privileges of this House, and use them in order to publish the matter in the speech of the hon. member for Flinders for the benefit of the people of Queensland, why do they not give the people of Queensland the benefit of some of that stuff which emanates from the Trades Hall, in the same manner as they propose to give publicity to matter which emanates from the Employers' Federation?

Mr. GUNN (Carnarvon): I think this is a rather important motion, because if it is passed it will lay down a precedent not only for the Parliament of Queensland, but also for all Parliaments, under which they will be able to get propaganda matter into "Hansard" that ought to be left out. The sentiments expressed in the document quoted by the hon. member for Flinders I agree with. There is no harm in them at all. But I object to the hon. member inserting his remarks in between the statements contained in that pamphlet, remarks in which he said that the people who framed those resolutions were scoundrels, thieves, and so on, or words to that effect. In doing that the hon. gentleman is doing something which is not right, and by this motion the Government are endeavouring to cloak those expressions under the rules of Parliament. Five or six years ago there was an Employers' Federation started, but it broke down, for some reason or other. The other day the unions of Australia proposed to bring into being the one big union. The one big union is, in my opinion, a very dangerous thing. The workers of Australia are quite right, if they think fit, to amalgamate all their little unions into one big union, but the objective of the proposed one big union is one which every right-thinking citizen should condemn. I shall refer to that presently. The Employers' Federation has been formed in order to combat what they consider is a very harmful union. The hon. member for Flinders quoted Mr. F. Ranson as being the secretary of the Employers' Federation. I took the liberty to-day to go and interview Mr. Ranson, because I wanted to understand how this suggested employers' union got its birth. I knew nothing about it before. When I went to Mr. Ranson, he said to me, "I am not the secretary of this

union at all; whoever stole that information got information which is false in that respect." Mr. Ranson then gave me the name of the secretary.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: Who is the secretary?

Mr. GUNN: I do not remember his name, but there is no secret about it. The hon. member for Flinders, at page 232 of "Hansard," is reported to have said that the Employers' Federation laid it down that the vital issue was "law and liberty." Surely to goodness there is nothing to be said against "law and liberty"! The hon. member for Flinders quoted this paragraph in the document that he read to the House—

"The vital issue is 'law and liberty' versus 'lawlessness,' and it is the plain duty of every employer of labour to do his full share in support of any organisation whose purpose is the preservation of industrial liberty, the maintenance of the law of the land, and the promotion of goodwill between master and man."

What is wrong with those sentiments?

Mr. WHITFORD: The masters don't give the men a fair deal.

Mr. GUNN: I do not care how much the hon. member for Flinders publishes those sentiments, but I do not want to have published with them the remarks of the hon. member and his quotations from some American commission which inquired into the malpractices of meat companies. With regard to the one big union, I know that many of the unions are not in sympathy with the objective of the one big union, and, surely to goodness, if the employers like to form a union to combat that one big union they have a perfect right to do so.

Mr. WHITFORD: Why object to their so doing, then?

Mr. GUNN: I am not objecting to their doing so. It is not a disloyal union like the one big union. Let me quote to the House an extract from the "Daily Standard" of the 19th August, 1918. The remarks I refer to were made at a trade union congress convened to consider the one big union proposal, and this is the extract to which I wish to direct attention—

"Mr. Ogden said the constitution that they were asked to adopt was the constitution of the I.W.W. It was just as well that every delegate should know that, so that none of them would be coming back by and by and saying they did not know."

The object of the one big union is the same as the object of the I.W.W., and I ask, is it not necessary that employers and employees should combine to fight the one big union? I have here a circular which was issued a short time ago by the National Democratic Council of Queensland, and I am not ashamed of it. It says—

"The extreme socialists and supporters of the I.W.W. movement are losing no opportunity to establish Bolshevism in Australia. As an illustration of this, at the one big union conference held in Melbourne recently, the following preamble was adopted:—

Capitalism can only be abolished by the workers uniting in one class-conscious economic organisation to take and hold the means of production by

revolutionary, industrial, and political action. 'Revolutionary action' means action to secure a complete change, namely—the abolition of capitalistic ownership of the means of production—whether privately or through the State—and the establishment in its place of social ownership by the whole community."

Hon. members opposite may believe in those sentiments, but I do not. If they adopt those sentiments they are going back to the conditions prevailing with the aboriginals of Australia—to chaos and distress. This circular goes on to say—

"The one big union movement frankly states that its object is to upset our present form of government, and by revolutionary methods take possession of all the means of production. If that is accomplished, there will be no private ownership of land, houses, shares, stock, vehicles, tools or implements. Not only banks, railroads, ships, warehouses, but every business, every factory, every trading concern, however small, farms, market gardens, orchards, dairies—every form of production—will be owned by the socialist community. All will be wage-earners, drilled and regulated by the Bolshevik machine, and its army of officials. There will be no incentive to individual thrift and enterprise; a dead level of serfdom will prevail.

"Here is the declaration of the secretary of the Sydney Labour Council—

We will work by the creation of workshop committees. By this means the men will be got behind the scheme and no officials can stand in the way. The methods adopted by the German Bolsheviks at Hamburg are very suitable for Sydney. I am starting to effect a scheme on the lines of the Hamburg Soviets. The Russian Soviets' system should be adopted here. We have already adopted it in our committees. We must start a propaganda school like that of the Moscow Bolsheviks. Our working class can only get emancipated through the one big union or, to give it its correct name, the workers' industrial union.

"The secretary of the one big union scheme in New South Wales stated that the receipts of the various unions in 1917, in the State were £263,000, while the total accumulated fund to the credit of organised labour in New South Wales was £170,000. He added that it was intended to expend £83,150 per annum on administrative officers and staff alone, in connection with the one big union campaign."

Hon. members opposite complain about the employers subscribing towards a hall, but have not the workers their Trades Hall? Did not the Kidston Government some years ago grant them the land on which to build that hall, and surely it is up to the employers to have a hall, too, if they wish it.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: They have been having a "haul" all these years. (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: I know that the workers of Queensland have had compulsory levies put upon them every now and again to support their Labour paper and the Trades Hall. The money for the employers' hall is not to

Mr. Gunn.]

be obtained under compulsion; it will be obtained by the issue of debentures which will be purchased voluntarily. What harm is there in that? I remember that the first year of the shearers' strike, Mr. Spence, the head of the Australian Workers' Union, said he wanted to meet the Pastoralists' Union. The pastoralists had no union, and he said, "It is no use talking to me individually; go and form your union." They went and formed their union. What harm is there in the pastoralists or any other section of the community having a union? It is only natural that they should have a union. Hon. members opposite cannot complain at the employers forming a union any more than they can at any other members of the community forming a union. I remember, too, that the Australian Workers' Union wanted to make a compact with the Pastoralists' Association, and said, "The Australian Workers' Union do not believe in 'scabs,' and neither do you graziers. You want all the pastoralists to join your union, and we will agree not to shear for any pastoralist who does not belong to your union if you agree not to employ anybody who is not a unionist." He wanted to make a compact, and why are hon. members opposite growling now because the employers want to form a union? Then again, one of the sentiments of this employers' union that hon. members opposite find fault with is this—

"EMPLOYMENT OF RETURNED SOLDIERS
AND SAILORS.

"So far as the resolution anent securing employment for all returned sailors and soldiers is concerned, representatives of the employers have met representatives of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League, and it is gratifying to be able to announce that in addition to returned sailors and soldiers being restored to situations occupied prior to going to war, through the influence of the Employers' Association, innumerable positions have been found others. Nevertheless, much yet remains to be accomplished, and to enable the display of further practical sympathy, subjoined will be found documents for circulation and consideration."

What is wrong with that? What harm is there in the employers trying to get returned soldiers preference? I cannot see a bit of harm in it—this National Democratic Council has a department, with a man in charge, to find employment for returned soldiers. If a returned soldier goes into that office there is a man there to look after him, and no matter what his politics are, they try to get him a job. What harm is there in that? All this waste of time in order to try and get some propaganda stuff into "Hansard" is not necessary, because hon. members have their unions outside who can attend to all those matters, but I am afraid that the privileges of this House are being very much abused, to the detriment of the people of Queensland.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am not at all interested in the work of the Employers' Federation, but I think they have a perfect right to build a hall if they wish it. They have a perfect right to conduct their own business in their own way, and what harm can there be in issuing debentures to provide funds to build a large hall in Brisbane, which will make work for the workers? Surely,

[Mr. Gunn.

there can be no harm in that? Then again, if we take their programme and their objectives—I am not interested in them, as the Farmers' Union paid my advertising expenses for the last election, and I paid the balance—we find they are for the benefit of the people of Queensland. I think it is more likely that hon. members on the other side got a great deal more money from the Employers' Federation than ever came to this side. We know that they promised not to interfere with the grog trade, and how much money went with that promise we do not know.

The PREMIER: It is not true, and you know it.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It may be true or it may not be true. I am only saying that the statement was made.

Mr. CARTER: You know that you got in on that in 1912. The money was found for you.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is not correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must keep to the motion.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The objectives of the Employers' Federation cannot be any worse than the objectives of the party opposite. One of their objectives is certainly to take the whole means of production.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will have to discuss the motion as to whether this matter be printed with the authority of the House.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: So far as printing the speech goes, I suppose we all have that opportunity, and quite likely we all have taken advantage of it. I have taken advantage of it before now. When I thought I would like to send a copy of my speech to my people I sent it, and no one would object to that. Neither would anyone object to its being done by the hon. member for Flinders.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Did anyone read it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Minister's own speeches were piled up 5 feet high in the offices all round here, but nobody wanted to read them, or would read them, and he sent them outside, and they were thrown into the street. If there were no more demand for my speeches than for his, there would be very little. If there is anything detrimental in that speech—one barrister says there is, and another gentleman of law says there is not, and I am not going to judge between them—apparently that is the reason that motion has been brought into the Chamber—to absolve the hon. member from any liability outside. Whether that is true or not I am not going to say, not being a lawyer, but I say that the opinion of the people outside and inside this Chamber is that the object in bringing in the motion is to absolve him from any liability outside. I say this House has no right to lend itself to any such proceedings. If, on the other hand, there is nothing wrong about it, then why publish it under this motion?

Mr. TAYLOR (Windsor): I would like to say a few words on this matter, because I think it is a very serious matter affecting the privileges of this House. It is the duty of every hon. member here to consider what the effects of carrying such a motion are likely to be, probably at any time in the near future. It has been pointed out by one or two speakers that a motion such as this may

have a boomerang effect, and that a majority on either side of the House, if they have a subject-matter which they want to place before the people of Queensland, can by a resolution such as the one which the Premier moved here last night have it distributed under the sanction of Parliament. I think that if there is one thing about which members of this House should be very careful it is that in no possible instance should the privileges of Parliament be abused or played with in a fast and loose manner. I certainly think that a motion such as this gives scope for such a thing to be done. Had there been any restrictions upon the hon. member for Flinders in the distribution of this speech, had he not been allowed to circulate it in the ordinary way, or through the ordinary channels, one could understand that there might be some justification for the motion. But we all know—and the Premier and the Government know perfectly well—that there are no restrictions whatever—that the hon. member has the fullest and freest liberty to print his speech in every language on God's earth if he likes to do so, and to distribute it where he likes, if only he is willing to pay the postage. Nobody can prevent him. Seeing that such is the case, why should the Premier bring forward such a motion as this? There must be something behind it. The Opposition are not responsible in any way for what the Employers' Federation have done in any shape or form—personally. I think they have no reason to be ashamed of what they have done—but if the Opposition had been responsible the Premier might have some justification for the action that he has taken. But there is nothing of that kind in the whole business. There must be something behind the motion, and whether it is that there is a certain fear that if the speech goes out as it is reported in "Hansard" the hon. member or somebody else may be liable in a court for a criminal action or not we do not know. It may be so, or it may not be so, but if that is the reason for the protection that is sought for the distribution of this speech I say again that I consider it is not a right and proper thing to do, and that it is an abuse of parliamentary privilege. If Parliament should stand for anything at all it should stand for the sacredness of the privileges which it enjoys, and it should do all it can to safeguard them, and not, as I said a few moments ago, play fast and loose with them. I certainly think the motion should be withdrawn, and as one who has great respect for the Premier I must say that I do not think that the motion is worthy of him.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: I think that if he considers the best interests of his party and of the country he will not go on with it. I am not afraid of the circulation of the speech at all.

Mr. CARTER: Why all the noise?

Mr. TAYLOR: If you would shut up your noise a bit we would get on much better. Of all the tinpot, hollow-drum noises we hear throughout this Chamber you about "take the bun." (Interruption.) You are always harping, harping, harping all the time.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I rise to a point of order. I want to know whether the hon. member for Windsor is in order in saying that the noises that come from you are the most tinpot noises that he hears in this Chamber.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: He did not say so.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: He used these words, "The noises that come from you are the most tinpot noises we hear."

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, you know perfectly well that that is not true—you do not want any denial from me.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I thought you were addressing the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not intend to add anything more in connection with this matter. I am one of those who believe that Parliament should set the highest standard throughout the land in the conduct of its business, and I contend that a motion such as we have before us to-night is not carrying out that function.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): I rise to protest against a motion of this nature, because it is an unusual thing, and it is establishing a precedent which we should not have. I have been in this House twenty-six years, and I have never heard a motion of this nature introduced before. If the Government are not frightened about the hon. member for Flinders or these others who are mentioned in the motion distributing the speech broadcast, why should they come here and try to get the imprimatur of Parliament accorded to it so that they will be protected outside the House?

Mr. CARTER made an interjection with reference to "tombstones."

Mr. PETRIE: I would make a tombstone for you. (Laughter.) If, as the Premier has stated—and I believe he is sincere in the statements he makes—if there is no defamatory matter in this speech, and there is nothing to fear, why do the Government ask for the privilege of Parliament to print and publish a pamphlet? I do not see any reason in it. Now, I have an amendment to move, and if the Premier and those behind him are sincere—and they have the majority so that they can bludgeon anything through—they will accept the amendment and put all this discussion to an end. I move—

"That the following words be added to the motion:—

'subject to the condition that any such authority shall not be deemed to secure to the publisher or any of them the protection of the privileges of Parliament in any particular whatsoever.'"

I think that that amendment will cover any doubt about the matter, and if they are not afraid of being pulled up for any defamatory matter, such as has been talked about, they will accept it. So far as I am concerned I do not care if the speech is issued everywhere. It will not affect me, and I do not think the Employers' Federation have anything to fear either. But, apparently, there is something feared by the Pre-

[8 p.m.] mier or the hon. member for Flinders and those "others" referred to there—who, I take it, are the Industrial Council, and probably the "Daily Standard," which has already published pretty fully, I think, the speech of the hon. member. He has had the privilege which every member has, of having all his speech printed in "Hansard." They have been distributed broadcast. I take it, and if he wants to get more why not pay for them and distribute them? Why should he or the Premier introduce a motion of this sort asking that the authority of Parliament be given to print this pamphlet? I say it is ridiculous and it is nonsensical. I do not

Mr. Petrie.]

see anything in it, excepting there is something at the back of it which they fear might take place outside this House. I think my amendment will meet the case, and if the Premier will accept it I am sure it will satisfy every member in the House. The hon. member can then publish his speech and do what he likes with it.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I rise for the purpose of seconding the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Toombul, and I trust, for the sake of the good name of the Queensland Parliament, that that amendment will be accepted. Without that, it simply means that not only is a member of Parliament seeking protection for doing outside Parliament what otherwise he would not be game to do or would be punished for doing, but it also confers upon anyone who is not a member of Parliament the right to utter defamatory words concerning his fellow-citizens. Members of Parliament have very great privileges in Parliament. We have the right to say things that, on ordinary occasions, we would not have the right to say. That trust is reposed in us in good faith, in the belief that we will prove worthy of it, that we will not abuse the power that is given to us, and that we will use that privilege only in the protection of the people of Queensland: not in paltry abuse, such as is contained in the speech of the hon. member for Flinders. Let me draw the attention of the House to some of those words. They are "those profiteering political pickpockets." We would not be allowed to use those words to one another in the House. They would be ruled out of order at once.

Mr. COLLINS: No one abuses the privilege more than you do.

Mr. SWAYNE: You may, on that side. That statement which has just been made is a reflection upon you, Mr. Speaker. I feel sure that if your attention were drawn to it you would not allow such words to be used in Parliament. If we are not allowed to use such words in Parliament, why should we be allowed to use such words to people outside Parliament? That is what is intended; and not only that we should be allowed to use such words outside Parliament, but also that anyone who likes—any unscrupulous political agent, any organiser—may go round the country branding these people as pickpockets. I think the motive underlying this motion is fairly obvious. We all know that during the 1915 election certain statements were made which, no doubt, at the time carried a certain amount of influence, and won a certain number of votes. We know that those statements were afterwards proved, in a court of justice, to be libellous and untrue. Still, for the time being, they effected their purpose. We have good reason to believe that an election is very close, and the object is to allow, not only certain hon. gentlemen themselves, but also anyone who is working in their cause, to go round the country libelling with impunity, without any fear of punishment. If this amendment is not accepted that is the only construction you can put upon the motion. I have not spoken on the question before, and I should like to call the attention of the House to one or two other features in regard to it. As far as the circular itself is concerned, leaving out these defamatory words, I do not think any objection can be taken to it. I do not think anyone is

[*Mr. Petrie.*

ashamed of it. Of course the idea is that, among the unthinking, there are a great many people who would not take the trouble to read the pamphlet through. They would simply see that certain men, whose names are given, are described as profiteering pickpockets. That is quite enough for them, without bothering to see whether there is any justification for the term. The mere fact of that epithet being used is quite sufficient, in some people's eyes, to brand them as pickpockets. As far as the pamphlet itself is concerned, what is there in it? It is simply adopting tactics which have been long in use on the other side. As has been pointed out, the erection of a building is simply an equivalent of the Trades Hall. The indemnity fund is on all fours with what was done at the time of the strike. As for this matter of publication, I would like to point out that the Labour daily three years ago attempted to bring pressure to bear upon members of this House for the purpose of injuring those who were opposed to it. I have here a letter that was sent to me. I think, by mistake. It is headed "Labour Daily Newspaper Company, Limited, proprietors of 'The Daily Standard,' 223 Adelaide street, Brisbane, 21st September, 1916." It is written for the purpose of urging members of Parliament not to spend any money with businesses which did not advertise in the "Standard." Those were their tactics three years ago. It winds up with these words—

"Spending your Labour-earned money with such concerns whose chief joy would be the extermination of this journal, is actually providing the enemy with ammunition to bombard us—and incidentally yourself as a Labour M.L.A.

"Without your patronage, direct or indirect, and that of other workers, the business community would cease to exist. May we look to your immediate co-operation to swell the advertising lists of the Labour daily, and thus help us to further finance and improve your paper, and the work that it is doing?

"If you find your cheques in payment of accounts going out to the tailors, grocers, drapers, etc., advertising in the daily papers of the city, that we are in competition with, and excluding us, we trust they will be accompanied with a reminder that the 'Daily Standard' advertising columns offer them wider and more valuable publicity, at least as far as your personal custom is concerned.

"Yours fraternally,
The Labour Daily Newspaper Co., Ltd.,
(Sgd.) ERIC H. COLLINGS,
"Advertising Manager."

Mr. MORGAN: What about boycotting there?

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes. What about coercion there? People on our side may have asked for financial support, but they never used coercion, and they never used force. They never said that people should starve if they did not support them. With regard to the establishment of a daily newspaper in Sydney some time ago, which never eventuated, I think they wrung something like £100,000 out of the worker, who I do not think has got his paper yet. The crux of the position is this: That right throughout the eastern part of Australia the worker is compelled,

whether he believes in a paper or not, at the risk of starvation to contribute to the paper. Yet, in the face of coercion and tyranny of the rankest kind, hon. members opposite start to squeal because people in a certain interest ask help from others in the same interest as themselves. Then, to make it appear as something dreadful, they use abuse which is worthy of the member who uttered it—the abuse that characterises his remarks. As an old member of this House, I should be very sorry if we set a bad precedent for other Parliaments, but unless we insert some safeguard such as has been suggested by the hon. member for Toombul that is what we shall be doing. Under cover of the great privileges in our hands for the public good, we shall be open to the accusation of abusing those privileges for petty political ends.

Mr. VOWLES: I thought, in face of what the Premier said a little while ago, that he would be prepared to accept this amendment.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: He told the House that there was no desire to create a special privilege in this case by giving a license to an hon. member, or any body of persons, to perpetuate certain words which, if uttered out of this Chamber, would be defamatory. When we are offering the opportunity in the form of an amendment he is silent, which seems rather strange.

The PREMIER: He talks at the right time. You will hear him directly. (Government laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: We were told last night that we were to have a full-dress debate, and I naturally expected to hear the hon. gentleman, in a top hat and in a loud voice, explaining to the Chamber how it happened that this motion was only put into his hands a few minutes before a quarter to 6 last night, and telling us where it came from, because, presumably, the leader of the Government knew nothing about it and nothing about the facts.

The PREMIER: You evidently do not know the procedure of Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: I know the hon. gentleman is in a very tight corner. Some person or persons forced this motion upon the leader of the House, and that was the apology he made yesterday afternoon for not giving it to me for perusal before it was put to the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must keep to the amendment; he is now speaking to the motion.

Mr. VOWLES: I am discussing what the Premier did yesterday afternoon, and I submit that I have every right to do it. I would like to know who the persons were, and why this motion, to which they seemingly attach such a great deal of importance, was to be brought before the House. Is there a force outside the House that controls the Government?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Of course, there is. (Government laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: Perhaps I should not say without the House, because I believe that a majority of them are in the lobby of the House to-night.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member for Carvon received his instructions.

Mr. VOWLES: Here we have an incident where the Government tell us they are not taking extraordinary procedure for the purpose of creating a privilege for a hon. member or some other person. If that is so, and they are honest about it, they have an opportunity of explaining. But the whole circumstances connected with this incident are peculiar. The hon. gentleman tells us of a document which is marked "private and confidential"; something which had no right to come into his hands, and which we can only assume came into his hands in a wrong way. Somebody must have stolen it and given it to him, and, if they did take it that way, he is just as guilty as the person who stole a private and confidential document.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Cheap law! Cheap law!

Mr. VOWLES: It is not unusual for things to disappear. That was the case where correspondence between the leader of the Opposition and myself—two letters disappeared about two months ago—and when private and confidential documents get into the hands of members opposite we naturally know what has become of our private letters.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that insinuation.

Mr. VOWLES: Insinuation!

The SPEAKER: That members of this House have been guilty of taking his private correspondence. The hon. member may say exactly what he intended to say now.

Mr. VOWLES: I say that a private and confidential document which has come, by admission, into the hands of a private member here—which has no right to be in his hands, and must have been given to him by somebody who took it—

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Did you say that he stole it?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not say that he stole it. I say that important letters between the leader of our party and myself disappeared, and it only makes one wonder what becomes of the letters.

Mr. GLEDSON: Is that a reflection on the officers of the House?

Mr. VOWLES: It is not a reflection on the officers of the House, but on the post office. Is there any reflection there on an hon. member?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is making no reflection now.

Mr. VOWLES: I think it is the rule of this House that the word of every hon. member must be accepted. The Premier said that it is not defamatory, neither is it in law, from the fact that it is under privilege, having been said in this House. That is what the hon. gentleman suggested. Surely he does not mean to say that to speak of a body of persons as have been spoken of here would be permitted to be done outside this chamber—to speak of people as "profiteering political pickpockets," and to mention their names, to speak of them here again—referring to the findings of a Commission in America in reference to a combine there—and state that they have practically made the same proposals as are referred to in the findings in the Commission? One of these proposals is this—Then he goes on to say—

"There is no doubt that this is the

Mr. Vowles.]

first step of the Employers' Federation to weaken the unions, and they would then continue in their wild career of profiteering on a scale never hitherto attempted. But the mask has been torn from their face, and this House and the country can now see this scheme in all its hideousness. There is no doubt that it is a deliberate scheme by the members of the Employers' Federation to smash Labour unions, to smash Labour papers, and ultimately, of course, destroy the Labour Government, secure power, and then embark on an orgy of profiteering."

The names of the individuals are mentioned there, and I say, without the slightest doubt, that there is a direct charge, because they are accused in another place. He said—

"It is specially provided that the Labour publications are to be boycotted, and all advertisements immediately withdrawn if they dare to oppose these people."

These gentlemen are charged with profiteering, with being pickpockets, with attempting to bring about something that would save them from taxation; they are to get control of the Taxation Department, and avoid payment of the taxes they are due to pay. The Premier says that statements like that would not be defamatory if made outside the Chamber. I think it is very easy for anyone to see the object of this. First of all, it is regarded as good political propaganda. If the Premier wishes to be honest about it, why not publish as a parliamentary paper the platform which was read out here by the hon. member for Flinders—publish that platform without any comment; it is the comment that we object to. Those comments are full of defamatory matter, and they are to be published broadcast. We have no objection whatever to the publication of the platform part of the speech. We are not identified with the authors of that platform. I am not a member of the organisation.

Mr. KIRWAN: Why wash your hands of it?

Mr. VOWLES: I know nothing about the organisation, and there is no branch of it in my electorate. The hon. member for Brisbane knows these people, because they are in his electorate.

Mr. KIRWAN: They don't subscribe to my election expenses.

Mr. VOWLES: In my electorate we do not receive any political support from these people. So far as I am concerned, they are absolutely unknown.

Mr. GLEDSON: What is hurting you?

Mr. VOWLES: The Government, having a majority, are bludgeoning through the motion so that the speech may be published for propaganda purposes.

Mr. GLEDSON: Are you afraid of it going out?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not care twopence where it goes to; but, if the party opposite want to be honest about it, they should consent—and we would consent—to the platform part of it being circulated, seeing that it was read in this House. But we strongly object to the defamation of men who have prepared a platform with patriotic and loyal objects, as they say distinctly in their platform. We object to their being defamed and having charges levelled against them upon which the hallmark of Parliament is to be placed; and they are to be precluded

[Mr. Vowles.

from taking any remedy for the defamation. If this motion is passed, any newspaper can publish this defamatory matter broadcast; any person may get up on a platform and make use of it; and we are permitting this by an abuse of the powers that are reposed in us as members of Parliament. The Government have no right to give a license such as is being given here to any person, or to any section of the community, to take advantage of. It would be bad enough if the statements made were true; but, when the charges are unfounded and the criticism is unwarranted, then it is a very serious breach of the privileges of this House; and I regret that the Premier and his Cabinet should allow some outside power to coerce them into doing what they are doing now. So far as we know, it is unprecedented. There is no record that we can find where any Parliament in Christendom has ever attempted to do such a thing; and now it is being done by a Labour Government, which pretends to be a just Government. It is this Government that is making use of the privileges of this House to protect a man in saying outside what, without the cover of that privilege, he could be charged criminally for saying.

Mr. COLLINS: Exposing the wrongs that exist; that is what we are going to do—exposing the villainy behind it all.

Mr. VOWLES: The writing is on the wall. If this is the sort of thing that the Government are going to do to try and get votes—this and the "flapper" vote—then they have fallen greatly in my estimation as individuals. I hope the Premier will assure the people of Queensland that there is no intention, under cover of this motion, to allow defamatory matter to be published merely for the sake of protecting the publishers. Let him say so, and agree to this amendment. If he does not do so, then he is not honest about it.

The PREMIER (who was received with Government cheers) said: I do not propose to accept the amendment moved by one hon. member and supported by two other hon. members opposite.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: One looking on at the proceedings in this Chamber last evening, and since 7 o'clock this evening, would wonder what it was that had excited the flutter in the House. They would wonder what it was that was disturbing hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MORGAN: What disturbed you yesterday?

The PREMIER: Last evening I was accused of discourtesy because I asked permission to move the motion without notice.

Mr. VOWLES: For not telling us what the motion was.

The PREMIER: I indicated what the motion was; and, if I did not indicate what it was, then it was the duty of some hon. member opposite to object to my getting the permission of the House to move the motion without notice. No one objected to my getting that permission.

Mr. MORGAN: You had to take a vote on it.

The PREMIER: I got permission. I was then immediately accused of discourtesy. I

at once offered to allow a full debate upon the matter.

Mr. VOWLES: You got it.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman did not want it. I offered to allow them to have a full debate on the matter; and what was the first thing that we were met with at 7 o'clock this evening? The deputy leader of the Opposition rose in his place and took what he alleged was a point of order in order to defeat the discussion of the motion. He asked you, Mr. Speaker, to rule that the motion was not in order.

Mr. VOWLES: I knew what the Speaker's ruling would be before I got up.

The PREMIER: If the point of order had been upheld, there would not have been one word of discussion upon the motion. The hon. member now suggests that he wanted a debate; but he raised the point of order, although he knew there was nothing in his point of order. He wished to convey an impression to the public of Queensland that the object of this motion was to enable certain false and defamatory matter to be circulated to the public of Queensland under the privilege of Parliament.

Mr. VOWLES: Quite true.

The PREMIER: He wished to convey that to the public under the guise of raising a point of order. Of course, as you pointed out, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in the point of order. I am sure every hon. member saw that there was nothing in the point of order and that there is nothing defamatory in the speech. Now, what is the next move?

Mr. VOWLES: Then, why this motion?

The PREMIER: I will come to that directly. The next move is to move as an amendment to my motion the insertion of these words—

“Subject to the condition that any such authority shall not be deemed to secure to the publishers, or any of them, the protection of the privileges of Parliament in any particular whatsoever.”

What is the object of that amendment? Parliament is asked, upon a specific motion, that it shall abandon the privileges of Parliament that have come down to it from time immemorial. (Uproar.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You are showing your hand now.

The PREMIER: We are asked to abandon those privileges in the interests of the capitalistic supporters of hon. members opposite.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition interruption.

The PREMIER: I can well imagine that there must have been a hurried meeting of the Employers' Federation some time to-day. I know that this amendment was not prepared by any hon. member of this House. I daresay it was prepared by some corporation lawyer outside—

Mr. PETRIE: Not true.

The PREMIER: And handed to an hon. member inside the Chamber with the object of carrying out one of the principles for which this secret committee stands. There is a clause in their little secret agreement that we are endeavouring to let the people of Queensland know about which provides

that they shall have an indemnity fund raised by a tax upon the wages they pay to the wage-earners of Queensland—

Mr. SWAYNE: The same as your union funds are raised.

The PREMIER: A tax amounting to one-half per cent. of the total amount of wages paid, and which will turn in to them the handsome income of about £25,000 a year.

Mr. SIZER: And you get five times that.

The PREMIER: One of the objects of this fund is stated in this memorandum—this private and confidential memorandum. It is stated that the fund is to be used for,

amongst other things, “testing [8.30 p.m.] the legality of any Act, proclamation, regulation, or order of the Federal or Queensland Parliament, or of any rule or by-law of any corporation, in either case of common application.” We are asked by means of the amendment to abrogate the powers and privileges of Parliament that have come down to us from time immemorial in order to enable this federation to test to the limit the motion we propose to pass. I am speaking upon a subject in which I have a deep interest.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Naturally.

The PREMIER: And a subject in which the people of Queensland will have a deep interest. And now I am about to proceed to tell you why I have moved the motion standing in my name. But first of all, let me ask what is the motion about? That is what “the man in the street” will want to know. What has this motion to do with? Why are the members of the Opposition so excited about it? Why have they made so many charges against the Government with regard to it? Well, it has to do with the “Report and recommendations of committee appointed at meeting of all employers' organisations held on 4th March, 1919.” The motion has to do with the report and recommendations of a meeting of representatives of all employers that was held in Brisbane on the 4th March, 1919. That is the first thing. What objection is there to the Employers' Federation and the members of that federation and the people of Queensland having this circular advertised for them?

Mr. VOWLES: None at all.

The PREMIER: None at all? And yet we have all these excited speeches from hon. members opposite! They have even suggested that this document has been stolen.

Mr. VOWLES: So it has.

The PREMIER: The document was circulated “privately and confidentially.” Why is it said that it was stolen?

Mr. VOWLES: Because it disappeared.

The PREMIER: There is another circular which was mentioned in this House last session or the session before. It was also “private and confidential.” It was a circular containing the minutes of a meeting of certain representatives of the Fire Underwriters' Association of Queensland and other insurance representatives. That document dealt with something that we know all about. It went through Queensland, and I am sure it surprised a great number of the people of Queensland. That private and confidential circular of representatives of the insurance companies tried to damage

Hon. T. J. Ryan.]

Government insurance and to keep up the rates of premiums paid by the general public of Queensland for the insurance of property and in connection with workers' compensation. What was the answer to that? It was said that the document was stolen. This document was not stolen; and, if it were stolen, does that make any difference to what it contains? (Hear, hear!) I put this to you, Mr. Speaker, and I put it to the people of Queensland, that, if this is an incriminating document, the person responsible for it will have to answer for it, no matter how it was obtained.

Mr. VOWLES: It was stolen.

The PREMIER: If a man is found writing an incriminating document, which contains a scheme that has been evolved in order to crush the workers of this State, it does not matter how that document was got, so long as we know what it is.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: What is the attitude of hon. members opposite with regard to this circular? We have had quite a number of speakers upon it. Some of them have carefully dissociated themselves from it. They have said that they did not know the Employers' Federation, or that they hardly knew the names of any of the men which appear on this list—they have never met them. (Government laughter.) There was only one member in the House who was bold enough to stand up and say, "I stand for these principles; I believe in them;" but he has announced that he is not going to stand for Parliament again. (Laughter.) I refer to the hon. member for Carnarvon. What is my main purpose in moving this motion?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Doing as you are told.

The PREMIER: This memorandum contains a very important statement of policy by a large section, or those representing a large section, of the public of Queensland. It represents the policy of those who support hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. VOWLES: Are you speaking on the amendment?

The PREMIER: Yes, I am speaking on the amendment. I am dealing with the whole matter, because I do not propose to make two separate speeches.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is in order in dealing with the whole matter.

The PREMIER: I say this document contains a statement of the policy of the representatives of a large section of the people of Queensland who support hon. members opposite. If this circular is to be made known to the people of Queensland, it is only right that those persons, as representatives of a portion of the people of Queensland, should have an opportunity of stating on the floor of this House and to the people of Queensland, whether they stand for the principles contained in the document or not. And that is the main purpose of my motion.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh! and dissent.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Flinders could make his speech on the floor of this House, and hon. members opposite could remain silent, and then say outside that they did not know anything about it. Well, now, they know all about it, and they have an opportunity of saying whether they stand for the document or not. Members opposite can repudiate the Employers' Federation if they like; they can repudiate those

who provide for them the sinews of war if they like, but I am going to give them the opportunity of repudiating those principles or standing by them. (Hear, hear!) Hon. members may laugh, but it is no laughing matter. They may pretend to enjoy it, but the cold fact remains that the document referred to by the hon. member for Flinders contains an indictment, not only of the Employers' Federation, but also of the party opposite. Members opposite had their opportunity last evening and this evening of facing the real issue. (Opposition laughter and interruption.) Why have they opposed the motion? Why have they not faced the position? Why have they not said whether they stand by the principles contained in the document or not?

Mr. VOWLES: We would have been ruled out of order.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows that he would not have been ruled out of order. Members could go through the whole of the speech of the hon. member for Flinders and quote any particular paragraph which justified them in opposing the motion. The hon. member for Carnarvon was not ruled out of order when he said he endorsed all that was contained in the document. Of course, he was justified in doing that, because he is not going to seek the confidence of the people again. What is the object of this document? In the forefront it recognises the necessity for secrecy and privacy in the deliberations of the federation. When they want to have a building set apart for themselves they say—

"The accommodation was packed to the utmost; yet the privacy of the deliberations were possibly not as well safeguarded as they would have been had the meeting been held in a building of the employers' own."

Mr. GUNN: That is quite evident.

The PREMIER: "The privacy of the deliberations were not as well safeguarded as if the meeting had been held in a building of their own." Why the necessity for the privacy of their deliberations? (Hear, hear!) Because there was something to be kept back from the people of Queensland, and this motion is going to make it available.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: The same as your caucus.

The PREMIER: What do we find? We find there is to be a black list of employers. There is to be a boycott. There is also to be an arrangement that they will not patronise hostile publications. The Labour Press are to be boycotted, and I notice that the sentence they use in dealing with the black list of Labour papers reads—

"When the nation's interests, or your own, are assailed for self-preservation, patronage of such publications should be instantly withdrawn."

This patriotic body says, "When the nation's interests or your own." Of course, they consider those terms synonymous. If their interests are assailed of course it is a breach of all the rules of loyalty to oppose what they stand for. Then, again, in this document is disclosed the fact that a very large indemnity fund is to be raised; a fund that I referred to a little earlier in my remarks—a fund which is to be used for downing the workers in every way that they can do it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

[Hon. T. J. Ryan

The PREMIER: I am expressing my opinion, and I think an opinion that will be shared by a very large majority of those who will finally decide the matter—that is the people of Queensland.

Mr. MORGAN: The fund is to down the parasites of the workers.

The PREMIER: If there was something laudable, something that could command public support, contained in this circular, it would be unnecessary to look for a room in which the privacy of the deliberations would be more safeguarded than in the room in which the meetings were held. (Hear, hear!) I often hear accusations made against the Labour party and their representatives because they do not tell the members of unions that they are to abide by the Arbitration Act. They say, "Why don't you tell them they must observe the law? Why don't you do this, and why don't you do that?" Now, this evening, we have had an opportunity of seeing how my hon. friends opposite are prepared to deal with their supporters; with those who placed them where they are—I think they will keep them there—(Government members: Hear, hear! and laughter)—with those who supply the funds for them, when they have the opportunity either of approving or condemning the action of that federation which held its meeting on the 4th March last. They referred to the fact that they had made some arrangement with the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League, which was referred to by the hon. member for Kurilpa. He said that the hon. member for Flinders was guilty of telling a falsehood when he passed his opinion upon certain officials of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League. There is no one who has a higher admiration than I have for the magnificent work of the Australian soldiers in the great war that has just ended.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: Since when?

Mr. VOWLES: Is that what you said at the Perth conference?

The PREMIER: And there is no one who has a greater contempt for the manner in which hon. members opposite, and those belonging to their party, are attempting to gain the support of the soldiers. Let me tell them this: There have been no men in this war that covered themselves with more glory than the Australian soldier. (Cheers.) There is no one who has done better; no one who has done more. (Renewed cheers.) They have shown their initiative, their grit, their capacity, their loyalty to their country; and the majority of them went forth from Australia supporters of the Labour party, and their experience in France and Europe has not made them deserters from the principles for which they stood before they left. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. SIZER: They are supporting Mr. Hughes.

The PREMIER: I am not referring to individuals, or who they follow. I am referring to the principles for which they stand. As long as they follow principles I am satisfied; but I say this: With all the attempt that has been made by hon. members opposite to capture the soldiers' vote, I am satisfied, when it comes to the time for them to

pronounce who shall be the Government of Australia, that they will be loyal to the principles for which they stood before they left this country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Why, I see the papers every day full of words, words, words—for one purpose—to obtain votes. Fortunately, the war is over and we can speak more plainly, perhaps, than we could speak during the war with regard to the action of the Government in Australia that had the conduct of that war as far as Australia was concerned. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, while, on the one hand, the Australian soldier is to be admired for the magnificence of his work, the Australian Government did not carry on the policy that was best suited to this country during the war.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: They carried on a reckless and jingoistic policy.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Is this the motion?

The PREMIER: I am referring to the soldiers' portion of it, because reference has been made to them, and an attack has been made on the soldiers. Australia gained nothing from the supply of material or food-stuffs. Australia sent more men in proportion to the number of her population, and sent them voluntarily. They were the real soldiers; the men who went forth because they thought it was their duty to go forth. Australia sent more men in proportion to her population than any other part of the Empire. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MORGAN: They did it in spite of you.

The PREMIER: And Australia has spent more money—far more than her proportion of money—compared with other parts of the Empire.

Mr. ROBERTS: Are you regretting it?

The PREMIER: There are some things I do regret. I regret, with regard to these 400,000 gallant soldiers who went from Australia to fight for the Empire, that there was a Government in power in Australia that failed to safeguard their interests. I say that the debt of Australia now arising out of the war is about £350,000,000, when you take into account the amount that must be spent in pensions. Compare that with Canada, with a population of 8,000,000, compared to our population of 5,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN: Are you dealing with the motion now?

The PREMIER: I am dealing with the soldier portion of it, and that is why you are sorry we are debating it. The more debate, the better it is for those who stand for democracy. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MORGAN: Why don't you treat the Speaker with proper courtesy?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member knows quite well that I allowed full latitude on the motion, and I certainly should allow it on the amendment. I allowed the hon. member for Kurilpa to deal with the whole question of the soldiers, if the hon. member will recollect.

Mr. VOWLES: We are dealing with the amendment only.

Hon. W. McCormack.]

The SPEAKER: The Premier did not speak to the motion.

Mr. VOWLES: He moved the motion and is now bound to the amendment.

The PREMIER: I can only reply to the amendment.

The SPEAKER: I have not allowed anyone any more privilege than anyone else, even the Premier, and I do not intend to do so now. I find that the hon. member moved the motion, and, of course, he must keep to the amendment now.

The PREMIER: I moved the motion, but I did not make any speech on it, and I am not asking for any latitude at all. I am replying to a speech of the hon. member for Kurilpa, who dealt with soldiers and said that the hon. member for Flinders had made an unjust attack on the soldiers. I am saying that, instead of making an unjust attack on the soldiers, the hon. member for Flinders is a member of a party that stands for the interests of the soldiers, and I am showing how he stands for those interests. We will leave that to the soldier. I depend on the intelligence of the soldier, and I shall be quite satisfied with the decision that is given at the ballot-box. Up to the present time—and it is now nearly four years since we have been in power—I have heard hon. members saying over and over and over again, "Wait until the people get a chance at you." But when the people get a chance to deal with us I find that our majority at the ballot-box increases. (Government cheers.)

Mr. MORGAN: Is this in order now?

The PREMIER: I am pointing out that the Australian Government, representing the party opposite and representing the gentlemen who were members of this committee, expended three hundred and a-half millions of money—I say out of proportion to what Australia was justly called upon to spend in comparison with other parts of the British Empire.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: What has this to do with the amendment?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Chief Secretary to keep to the amendment.

The PREMIER: I am proceeding to show that we have spent £175,000,000 more than our proportion, whereas the Government that is representative of gentlemen opposite and representative of the members of this committee—

Mr. VOWLES: I rise to a point of order. Notwithstanding the fact that you called the Premier to order he is not keeping to the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The hon. the Chief Secretary is confined to the amendment.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLEDSON: I rise to a point of order. I would draw attention to Standing Order 111—

"A reply shall be allowed to a member who has made a substantive motion or moved an Order of the Day; but not to a member who has moved an amendment—"

[Hon. W. McCormack.]

The SPEAKER: The amendment is before the House.

Mr. VOWLES (to the Premier): Give us your reasons why you do not want to accept it?

The PREMIER: This is only what I expected. Hon. members opposite endeavour to confine me. First of all they wanted to hear me; now they do not want to hear me. I am satisfied that I shall have many opportunities of getting on to the question that I was touching upon just now; and, judging by the discomfiture of my hon. friends opposite, I shall have to take an early opportunity of getting on to it, because I see it is not palatable to them.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: They are squirming all right.

The PREMIER: Now, I consider that at this time, when there is so much unrest in the community, when there is so much need for an applied knowledge and balanced judgment, it is absolutely necessary that we should take the whole of the people into our confidence—that all the people should know exactly what is being done by the organisations of capital on the one side and the organisations of Labour on the other. (Government cheers.)

Mr. MORGAN: Why the singular treatment?

The PREMIER: The organisations of Labour have their deliberations made public; their resolutions are made public through the Press and circulated. They are not circulated secretly. But these capitalistic organisations send round their private and confidential circular in order to defeat the aims and objects of the worker. Now, history has shown that after every war the capitalists endeavour to secure the reins of power.

Mr. MORGAN: Why all this tripe?

The PREMIER: I have before me the words of President Lincoln after the great American civil war, which are very appropriate to what is happening at the present time. He said—

"Yes, we may all congratulate ourselves that this cruel war is nearing its close. It has cost a vast amount of treasure and blood. The best blood of the flower of American youth has been freely offered upon our country's altar that the nation might live. It has been, indeed, a trying hour for the Republic; but I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money-power of the country will endeavour to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war. God grant my suspicions may be groundless."

Those were the words of President Lincoln, after a great war, not so great a war as the one from which we have just emerged, and in the midst of dangers threatening his

country that were not so great as the dangers that now threaten our country. In so far as I am able, and in so far as the people of this country will allow me to hold the position I hold, I shall take every opportunity of making known to the people what is going on secretly behind the walls of these committees, and I shall see, too, so far as I am able and with the support of my hon. friends behind me, that the customs and privileges and powers of Parliament shall not be abrogated at the behest of this committee. (Government cheers.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. the Premier has been most successful in dodging the issue that is really before the House. Not a single man on this side of the House has objected to that particular publication going out, but men have objected, and object now, to hon. members availing themselves of certain privileges to allow defamatory matters to be sent out in order to protect the hon. member for Flinders. The hon. the Premier absolutely dodged the question. (Opposition cheers.) We are not here to-night to refuse to allow anything that has been published in that way to go out, but we do say that it is completely dragging Parliament into the dust to do it in this way, and I am amazed that the Premier should be a party to it. Who is responsible for his doing it? I am satisfied that the gentleman himself is against anything of that kind.

MR. FOLEY: Are you dealing with the amendment?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, I am, and I say to-night that there should be done in connection with this matter what the amendment suggests. If there is no defamatory matter—I want to ask every hon. member sitting on that side—then why any exception, why any objection to allowing it to be carried? If members on the other side are

[9 p.m.] so certain of their ground, why should they object to the protection being removed which this motion is going to give if it is carried as it has been moved? It seems to me that the Premier and gentlemen on the other side of the House are going to get on the stump, and they are going to enlarge upon things which have been said here, and said by the party to which they refer in that particular circular. The object will be to increase a hundredfold what has been said. We know how statements are made wildly outside. They are going to prostitute Parliament by asking it to carry the motion moved by the Premier. Of course, their numbers will carry them through—here is the Premier making a big noise, coming along and saying that he is prepared to do it. If any person will read the remarks made by the hon. member for Flinders, I am quite certain they can come to only one conclusion—that they are absolutely defamatory. Either they should be cut out or the hon. member and others should not have the protection of Parliament. They would not hold water if they were uttered outside. I want to ask: What are the privileges of Parliament? I always had an idea that they were privileges which, at any rate, would protect its honour. But this is something that is dragging its very honour into the dust, and it is certainly something of which we, as members of this Assembly, ought to be ashamed. By this amendment it is asked that, if there is no feeling and no fear whatever in the matter, it should be allowed to go out without any

protection whatever—no protection as far as freedom from justice is concerned. Is that what we call Labour justice? Are these the evidences of a refusal to grant what is right as far as justice is concerned? Is there a refusal on the part of this House to grant what is included in this amendment? It is perfectly certain that the Premier deliberately and wilfully has dodged the issue to-night, because it seems to me he is preparing for a poll. He has such a party behind him, who are all seeking office and billets, that he is trying to get out of that difficulty and also the State's financial difficulties, by attempting to place something before the public and sidetracking the issue. It will not be so very easy to sidetrack the issue. What is the position? Is there an action threatened already against some of those who have published this information, which has been sent broadcast? Is this going to be retrospective so that those people will be protected—that the "Daily Standard" and others who have published it shall be protected—or is it that the hon. member for Flinders has been threatened with a writ by reason of his extreme utterances. I appeal to the House to do the right thing—to the hon. member to do the right thing—to play the man and to be fair, at any rate, in this particular matter. I want to point out what may happen. Presume, for the sake of argument, that the majorities are changed in this House.

MR. FOLEY: That is a silly presumption.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If that were so, may not someone come along deliberately and ask that that quotation which the hon. member for Dalby read from the "Westminster Gazette" the other day should be published throughout the country? The Premier spoke of what had happened, and we all rejoice at the end of the war and the way in which it has been ended. But I want to say deliberately on the floor of this House that the Premier, who now is posing as being so loyal, was the man who went to Amsterdam—the Amsterdam Premier. He is the man who went and shook hands with De Valera, the enemy of England, and who was seeking and is now seeking its overthrow. (Uproar.)

THE SPEAKER: Order! Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: This amendment that has been moved is a proper amendment. I hope that even at this late hour the Treasurer, who usually is very fair, will say, "Well, I would not like to have my conscience soiled with something like that going out, and I will not give any protection to it."

HON. J. G. APPEL: I had hoped that when the amendment was moved the leader of the Government would have accepted it. The Premier, in supporting his motion, has asserted that the speech in question contains no defamatory matter. If it contains no defamatory matter, I want to know why the amendment cannot be accepted, and why the protection of Parliament should be accorded to it, to the hon. member who made it, and to the publishers? The hon. gentleman, in addressing himself to the amendment, appeared to be suffering from a very considerable amount of excitement. In fact, I confess, I have never seen him so excited before. I feared that he was going to have a fit. (Laughter.) I do not know what caused his excitement. However, practically, he let the truth out, and that was that this speech contained an indictment of the Opposition, which

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

he wished to bring under the notice of the electors of Queensland. Then, he expects that we, as an Opposition, shall consent that that indictment shall bear the seal of Parliament. A great deal has been made of the Traders' Association—I think that is the association which is referred to. I do not repudiate them. I can only repeat that I know nothing about them. It has been suggested that they have found funds for members of the Opposition to fight their elections. I only wish they would offer me a subsidy to assist me in fighting mine. I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if they offered me a cheque for that purpose it would be readily accepted. It was actually suggested that the amendment was prepared by the solicitor of the association. The leader of the Government got quite pallid with excitement at the idea. I can tell the House the truth about it. It suggested itself to my mind this morning. I came in and saw the deputy leader of the Opposition, and, together with the hon. member for Toombul, the amendment was formulated, and it was decided to take the action which we have taken this evening—a very proper and fitting action, indeed, as the result has proved. Last night the Premier threatened the Opposition. He knows that, as far as voting power is concerned, we are absolutely at his mercy, and he practically shook the bludgeon of his majority at us. I think hon. members opposite will find before long that the Opposition have got their rights. They have always endeavoured to expedite the business of the State, and, if they are not given an opportunity to digest the matters brought forward, hon. members opposite will find that there are methods which still belong to the Opposition, and that it is the duty of the Opposition to take advantage of every form the House affords to get a full and complete discussion on every matter, so that the electors of the State can learn the true position of affairs. I do not intend to refer to any matter which I consider to be outside the main question, but I repeat that, if this amendment is not accepted, and the original motion is forced through, it simply amounts to this—that we are prostituting the functions of this House and permitting them to be used by a party, having a sufficiently large majority, for its partisan purposes. I think it is a matter which, boomerang like, will react upon them. I trust that, even at this late stage, the Premier will reconsider the matter. If the words proposed are added to the motion, there can be no possible objection to it being agreed to. If there is defamatory matter contained in the speech in question, this House should not be used for the purpose of protecting any member who is making a charge of defamation against any person in the community. We have no right to do it—it is not just—and if Parliament is to occupy the high position which it should do, such a thing should not be permitted on the part of any member of the House, whatever his own feelings may be.

Mr. SIZER: I would like to add my quota after the speech which has been delivered by the Premier. The Premier made a lot of noise, and sidetracked the subject-matter of the amendment from start to finish. He never referred to defamation or anything in the speech which was liable to the construction of being defamatory, which is the only concern of the Opposition. He tried to make out a case against the Employers' Federation. He is quite at liberty to do what he

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

likes about the Employers' Federation, but we on this side are not going to surrender our functions and allow motions to go through the House which will condone offences in the way of indiscreet remarks which anyone may make here as a member of this Assembly. If we allow this motion to go through without the amendment, would we not be in order to quote the whole of the evidence given in the Ryan case in Sydney, and have it embodied in "Hansard," and then ask for the official sanction of Parliament to be given to it? If this is established as a precedent, we will be justified in quoting the whole of that evidence as I have said, and sending it all over Queensland. If we attempted to do that, we expect the Government would oppose our efforts, and they would be justified in doing so, just as we are justified in opposing their efforts at the present moment. We might also ask that the speech delivered by the hon. member for Dalby, which contained an extract from the speech of one De Valera, an intimate friend of the Premier's, a disloyal speech—

Mr. MORGAN: A rebel.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Loyal to his country.

Mr. SIZER: A rebel. We might ask that the official sanction of this Parliament should be given to it, and send it all over Queensland. Then, the Premier made a song about the employers' indemnity fund. The first I heard of it was in connection with his speech. He says it is illegal, or something to be ashamed of, to test the validity of certain Acts passed by the present Government. Is it not a fact that the Premier himself used the Crown to test the validity of certain Acts of the Federal Government? Did he not recently appear in the Full Court of Queensland to test the validity of the War Precautions Act, and use the State funds in the interests of people outside?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: To see that no injustice was done under a questionable Act.

Mr. SIZER: Is it not a fact that the Premier has done the same thing that he has condemned other people for attempting to do?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And used other people's money, but not his own.

Mr. SIZER: If the Employers' Federation has established an indemnity fund they will be paying for any litigation out of their own pockets. In the case in which the Premier appeared he was being paid by the people's money.

Mr. MORGAN: He briefed himself.

Mr. SIZER: He briefed himself.

Mr. WELLINGTON: You say that.

Mr. SIZER: Here is the question and answer on Tuesday last. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to make a speech on that occasion—

"Mr. Vowles, pursuant to notice, asked the Attorney-General—

"1. Have any moneys been paid, or are any moneys payable by the Crown, in respect of the red flag case recently heard before the Full Court in Queensland?

"2. If so, how much and to whom?

"3. Are the services of the Crown Solicitor available to all classes of prisoners who desire to appeal from their convictions?

"4. Did Mr. Ryan appear in this case as Attorney-General, or merely as counsel for Taylor?"

"5. If he did not appear as Attorney-General, why was the Crown Solicitor instructing him?"

"Answer.—The hon. member is evidently referring to the case of the King against Archdall and others, *ex parte* Taylor, in which a returned soldier was applicant to the Supreme Court for a writ of prohibition. These proceedings were taken to test the validity of the War Precautions Regulations of 1918, No. 235 (27 B B), dated 11th September, 1918, and the prohibition of the Minister of Defence issued thereunder, dated 21st September, 1918, in order to ascertain whether this returned soldier was lawfully imprisoned in the State prison. Section 120 of the Commonwealth Constitution imposes an obligation on the State, and consequently the State of Queensland was interested in the matter, and it was quite a proper proceeding to make available the Crown Solicitor and counsel for such purpose. I would refer the hon. member to the case *Rex v. Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1903, 1 K.B., 289, where he will be able to learn something with regard to the practice of the Crown Law Office in England in making the Treasury Solicitor available, of which he is evidently unaware. The Attorney-General appeared with Mr. Macrossan, on behalf of Taylor in the ordinary way, and on the usual conditions with regard to the employment of counsel."

That shows clearly that the very offence which the Premier endeavoured to condemn to-night he himself committed only a few days ago, but 100 times worse than the offence which he alleged had been committed in this connection; and his offence was aggravated by the fact that he briefed himself and took Crown money.

Mr. COLLINS: What has this to do with the motion?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What fee did he get?

Mr. SIZER: I don't know; I suppose 100 guineas or so; but that is a mere matter of detail.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What has this to do with the amendment?

Mr. SIZER: It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. MORGAN: It has a lot to do with the Premier's speech.

Mr. SIZER: Let me now deal with another point raised by the Premier. He tried to say that we had been imputing that the document was stolen. That construction is open to anyone. The document was marked "Private and confidential," and it got into the hands of a member on the other side.

Mr. COLLINS: You supported the Government in the Commonwealth that used to open all our letters. They opened mine.

Mr. SIZER: Seeing the document was marked "Private and confidential," it is reasonable to suspect that it was stolen by somebody, and, as a matter of fact, the Premier emphasised that it was stolen.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. SIZER: And he said that they were quite justified in stealing it. In fact, he admitted that even a breach of the Criminal Code is permissible to help the party on the other side.

Mr. WINSTANLEY and GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: He did nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIZER: He said the stealing was justifiable.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIZER: He said that, if it was stolen, it was justified.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He did not say so.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: He signified his approval, anyhow.

Mr. SIZER: He said that, if the document was stolen by the hon. member for Flinders or any other person, they were quite justified in stealing it, so long as it helped the party on the other side.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no! and interruption.

Mr. SIZER: That was the purport of the whole of his remarks.

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Nundah justified in saying that the Premier, when delivering his speech, said that, if the hon. member for Flinders or any other member on this side of the House, stole a document, they were quite justified in so doing? Is it in order for the hon. member to make that statement, which is untrue?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Premier can give a denial of the statement in the House, and the hon. member for Nundah will have to accept it.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He is not here to give a denial.

Mr. SIZER: It is not my fault that the Premier is not here. I suppose all the staging has gone, and the hon. gentleman has gone with the audience. The dress circle has left. I made a special note at the time, as I thought it was a remarkable thing for the Premier and Attorney-General to commend, or even to condone, an offence such as stealing.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He never did that at all.

Mr. COLLINS: You tell lies wholesale over there.

Mr. SIZER: I sincerely hope that the amendment will be accepted, because, if there is anything in the contention that there is nothing defamatory in the speech of the hon. member for Flinders, seeing it has already been published, and that those who have published it are not liable to an action for defamation, then there should be no objection to the acceptance of the amendment. If it is accepted, so far as we are concerned, the matter will be dropped. We shall only be left then to make our protest against the procedure. I hope that the amendment will be accepted, and that the House will proceed with its proper business.

Mr. MORGAN: Never before in the history of this House have members sitting opposite to a Government been entertained to the extent that we on this side were entertained by the Premier to-night. I would not have missed it for many shillings. It

was better than any play or circus that I have attended for many years.

Mr. KIRWAN: You don't usually squeal at a circus; you laugh.

Mr. MORGAN: Hon. members who were so unfortunate as to be sitting at the back of the Premier missed the spectacle that was enjoyed by those sitting in front of him. Had they seen what we saw, they would have enjoyed it quite as much as we did. Of course, we on this side escaped the splash, but I feel sure that those who were sitting close to the hon. gentleman must have been smeared with froth. Right throughout his speech the Premier endeavoured to mislead this House. He endeavoured to show that things were altogether different to what they really were. First of all, he told us that, before we gave him permission to move his motion, we had the right to ask him what he intended to move. Now, under the Standing Orders, we are prohibited from doing that. Standing Order 50 reads—

"A motion may be made, without notice, by leave of a majority of the House, to be decided without debate."

Therefore, the very moment the Premier asked for leave to move the motion without notice, we were debarred from speaking or from asking a question. The only thing we could do was to call for a division.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The Premier did say what the motion was about.

Mr. MORGAN: He did not.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: He did.

Mr. MORGAN: First of all, he got up and asked the Speaker if he could move a motion without notice; but he never mentioned what the motion was about.

The TREASURER: He did.

Mr. SMITH: It shows the extent of your understanding.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can assure the hon. member that the Premier, when asking for leave to move the motion without notice, stated that it was a motion dealing with a speech made by the hon. member for Flinders.

Mr. MORGAN: I think you, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. member here will agree that we knew nothing whatever about the contents of the motion. The first thought that ran through my mind when the speech of the hon. member for Flinders was mentioned was that the intention was to have that speech expunged from "Hansard" altogether.

The TREASURER: Just this moment you said the Premier did not refer to the speech at all. It shows how accurate you are.

Mr. MORGAN: I accept the explanation of the Speaker in connection with that matter. The Premier endeavoured to induce the House to believe that we had a right to ask him what the motion contained, and to demand from him a statement on the subject. But that is not so. The Standing Orders prohibit hon. members asking for such information. I doubt whether any Premier previously ever moved a motion

without notice without first of
[9.30 p.m.] all placing a copy of the motion
in the hands of the leader of the
Opposition. I feel sure that, during the
period when the present Premier was the
leader of the Opposition, never once did a

[*Mr. Morgan.*

Liberal Premier ask permission of the House to move a motion without notice without first of all handing a copy of motion to the hon. gentleman, so that he could see exactly what that motion contained. That was the commencement of the abuse of the privileges of this House in connection with this matter. Then, to-night we had the Premier, right throughout his speech, dealing with matters that he had no right to deal with in connection with either the motion or the amendment. The Speaker was placed in a humiliating position by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I honestly think you think as I think. (Laughter.) When the Premier moved the motion, he had a right, if he so desired, to explain the motion, but he did not do so. He simply moved the motion, and left us entirely in the dark as to its object. I believe the hon. gentleman thought he was springing a surprise on the Opposition, and that the motion would be carried on the voices. But he afterwards promised that we would have a full-dress debate on the subject. An old fable tells us how a frog once swelled himself out to represent an ox, and the hon. gentleman swelled himself out to-night until he nearly burst. At any rate, he appeared to do so to members on this side of the House. As far as his speech was concerned, the hon. gentleman repeated what he had said on four different occasions since he returned from England, as to the number of soldiers who represented Australia at the recent war, and the expenditure the Australian Government had incurred to win the war, and the indemnity that Australia should get for the assistance it had rendered the allies. It is extraordinary that he should have repeated the speech which he delivered, first of all in Western Australia, then in Adelaide, and again in Melbourne, and on two or three different occasions in Queensland. To those who have to listen to his speeches it is very monotonous to have the same speech repeated on so many occasions.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is what he must have done before the Privy Council, when he won his case.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not want to touch upon that case, because if I touched upon that and numerous other matters that I could refer to, the Speaker would call me to order. I do not want to do what the Premier did to-night—take advantage of the Speaker—and I do not want to offend against the Standing Orders. Evidently the Premier is feeling very sore and disappointed over the fact that the allies succeeded in winning the war; over the fact that so many hundred thousands of soldiers represented Australia at the war, and over the fact that so many millions of pounds were spent on the war. If he is not disappointed, and is not sore in regard to those matters, why does he refer so often to our sending men and spending money in order to win the war? Why all these reiterations? The hon. gentleman is now apparently disappointed because the indemnity that Australia is likely to get has not been announced. Yet, at the Perth conference he practically favoured getting no indemnity whatever, but of bringing the war to an end and calling it a draw.

Then the hon. gentleman talked about secret meetings of the Employers' Federation. We all know that the Labour party meet in

caucus at the Trades Hall, in Brisbane, frequently. I have no objection to raise against the men who assemble at the Trades Hall expressing a desire to prevent the Press being present. But the leader of the Government attacks this party and others for adopting the same kind of tactics as are pursued by the Labour Government and their Labour supporters. If you meet an enemy and he has only a bare fist, you meet him with your bare fist, but if he has a stick you will get a stick, and if he has a gun you will get a gun and face him with his own weapon. It has been discovered throughout Australia that we must fight an enemy with his own weapons. But the Premier attacked the Employers' Federation because they desired to have a hall of their own, ignoring the fact that the Trades Hall people had a free grant of land on which to erect their hall, and that members of the Opposition had no objection to unionists having a place of their own in which to meet. Neither have we made any objection to the secret meetings of Labour supporters of the Government. Therefore, the hon. gentleman has no right to object to the Employers' Federation doing the same thing. With regard to boycotting, you have only to pick up a copy of the "Standard" of a short time ago and you will repeatedly find paragraphs asking unionists and supporters of the Labour party not to support any firm who do not advertise in that particular paper. Is that not boycotting of the worst description? Of course, it is. Yet the Premier imputes motives to the Employers' Federation simply because they propose to adopt the same tactics as have been followed by the Labour party and the Labour Press for years and years. In any district in Queensland through which you may travel, you will find that if there is an hotel there run by a good unionist the Labour party will only spend their money at that hotel because he is a supporter of their party. They boycott every other business just the same as the "Standard" advocated the boycotting of all persons in Brisbane who did not advertise in the columns of their journal. Yet the Premier got very excited over a certain circular which proposed to adopt a similar policy.

Hon. W. N. GILLIES: Do you believe in that policy?

Mr. MORGAN: Whether I believe in it or not the Assistant Minister for Justice—or the new Minister for Agriculture—is evidently a believer in the policy, because he owes the position he occupies to-day to that policy. Such a policy is nothing new, as far as the Labour party is concerned, but has been in operation for years and years. But it is something new for the Employers' Federation to adopt that policy. That it is something new, as far as that association is concerned, is shown by the fact that it was only brought to light a few weeks ago. If this policy had been in vogue with the Employers' Federation years ago it would have been proclaimed from the housetops long ago, but it was only discovered by the hon. member for Flinders when he got hold of the document which he read to this House.

We do not object to the hon. member for Flinders circulating as many thousand copies of his speech as he desires. He can do what every other member has the right to do; go to the Government Printer, and order as many copies of his speech as he likes, and they will then be printed as extracts from "Hansard," and can be circulated broadcast

throughout Queensland. I would tell the hon. member for Flinders that I will read that speech at every political meeting I hold in my electorate, because I am quite satisfied that when it is known that it is a confidential document, or a stolen document, it will reflect no credit on the man who used it and no credit on the Government which endeavours to make so much out of its contents. If there is nothing in that document of which the hon. member for Flinders is afraid, or of which those who are going to circulate it are afraid, why the necessity for this motion? That speech could be circulated broadcast in Queensland if it is so desired, without the sanction of this House at all, and why is it necessary to obtain the sanction of this House? Simply because the hon. member for Flinders and the Premier have apparently discovered that there might be a libel action and therefore damages. There might be trouble ahead of them, but I feel sure that that would not in any way worry the Premier, because he generally has a finger in the pie when there is any money to be made in connection with legal fees. As already stated by the hon. member for Nundah, the Premier made a great deal of fuss because the Employers' Federation was obtaining money with a view to testing the validity of certain Acts of Parliament. What a terrible thing to do! Fancy men meeting together in secret and having the temerity to endeavour to raise funds for the purpose of testing the validity of an Act of Parliament or regulations! Still we find that the Premier, according to his answers to the questions of the hon. member for Dalby, did not use his own money, but used funds from the Treasury for the purpose of testing the War Precautions Act, and endeavoured to show that it was wrong in connection with a certain red flag case. What happened in that case?

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth let him out as soon as we got through the Full Court, so that we could not go on.

Mr. MORGAN: That is only an excuse. I know that you were sorry you could not go on, because it would have meant more money for yourself. You, as barrister for Taylor, were drawing fees, not from Taylor himself, but from the Treasury of Queensland. The Premier is also Attorney-General, and the Crown Solicitor briefs the Attorney-General and Premier to appear in that particular case, and it is Treasury funds that they use. That is prostituting the privileges of this House, and the privileges of the Crown Law Department. Every time the Premier wishes to earn more money or to increase his revenue he has only to trump up a case of some description, appear for the Crown, and draw his fees. Is that a proper thing to do? If ever there was an illustration of Sergeant Buzz-Fuzz we had it to-night. The Premier was brow-beating the Opposition, but what was the effect? It was so much wind; so much talk. He cut no ice. He proved nothing, and he endeavoured to sidetrack the whole issue. He has not told us why he refused to accept the amendment. As a matter of fact he never dealt with the amendment at all. The Premier said we would have a full-dress rehearsal. We have not had a full-dress rehearsal. We have only had one member of the company. We have only had the comedian and the rest of them are dumb. When are we going to hear the clown? The hon. gentleman was certainly

Mr. Morgan.]

most amusing, and everyone on this side of the House enjoyed it immensely. If only a moving picture could have been taken of the Premier in his different attitudes it would be worth thousands to anyone who reproduced it.

The PREMIER: It would be worth thousands of votes to us.

Mr. MORGAN: There is not one thing in that circular that has not already been adopted so far as the present Government is concerned. At the present time more than one-half of the unionists are contributing, against their will, to the fighting fund of a Labour party. They are coerced into those contributions, and it is only necessary to mix with the unionists to find that out. If they fail to make those contributions the law is put into force to compel them. A non-unionist is compelled to pay a poll tax for the right to work; for the right to provide food for his starving wife and family. Then as regard all these utilitarian principles we hear so much about from hon. members opposite, they are only human providing the person is a unionist. If he is a non-unionist he is only fit to be kicked from pillar to post and knocked about, as the unionists are endeavouring to knock about those returned soldiers who are engaged in the meatworks up North.

The PREMIER: What has that to do with the motion?

Mr. MORGAN: No doubt the Speaker is allowing me a certain latitude because you took a latitude you had no right to take. So far as I am concerned—and, no doubt, every other hon. member on this side of the House will speak as to his attitude—I do not care a snap of the fingers if it is circulated in every household in my electorate. It is a well-known fact that every party endeavours to raise funds to fight political campaigns. The Labour party have not denied that they are subsidised by numerous big, wealthy corporations. They never denied what the present Senator Reid made public in a way for which he could have been prosecuted—he did not wish for the privileges of Parliament, but openly and straightforwardly stated that he could prove that the licensed victuallers of Queensland subsidised the Labour party's fighting funds. What is more, I challenged the Premier at one time to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into that matter. That was before Mr. Reid announced it from the public platform. I had similar information at my disposal to enable me to make that challenge, and the "Daily Mail" had a leading article in which they said that the Premier ought to appoint a Commission so that the thing could be proved or otherwise. Nothing has been done, even since the charge was made public; and it shows that the licensed victuallers did subscribe, and that fund was at the disposal of hon. members of the present Ministry. There is no doubt about that. Why the silence now in connection with proprietary racing? Is John Wren doing what he did in other States? Is he using his funds to silence hon. members on the opposite side, who have the power now, if they so desire, to bring about an abolition of proprietary racing? Has he subscribed to the funds of the present Labour party with a view to nothing being done to interfere with what he possesses? Everyone knows he possesses a monopoly. But the Government, who are

[Mr. Morgan.

supposed to be against monopoly, are allowing it to exist year after year. We know the tactics of the man—they have already been published in "The Lone Hand," which showed what he was capable of doing. He never fought his opponents. He adopted the American principle of buying his opponents, and there is no doubt that he bought silence from hon. members opposite, simply because we hear nothing about it now, although at one time they advocated the abolition of proprietary racing. Their silence has been procured in some manner. We also know that it is only necessary for certain individuals to subscribe to those political fighting funds and for the time being they are not interfered with. Some time they will be, but for the time being nothing is done. We have never heard one hon. member on the Government side refer to the suggested amendment of the Liquor Act, although some reference is made to it in the Governor's Speech. Why? Simply because support is coming from that direction. And yet the Premier has the temerity to get up to-night and blow himself up to double his actual size in his indignation—in fact, I thought he was going to take an apoplectic fit. If he is not careful he will burst, to use a vulgarity. I advise him not to take things so strenuously—to be calm, cool, and collected. I know that there were excuses. The galleries were full. The word had gone forth to the "boys" of the Trades Hall to come along—where they decide what is to be done. Did they not decide in this particular case? Did the Premier not admit that he got it only ten minutes before he moved it? Why did he not give it mature consideration?

The PREMIER: I gave it consideration for ten minutes. It does not take me ten days.

Mr. MORGAN: We may admit that the Premier is clever in that particular regard, but perhaps the matter had been provided for him, as it is often provided for him and his officers.

The PREMIER: I drafted it myself.

Mr. MORGAN: At any rate, something he never expected was handed to him. He walked into the House and never showed the Opposition the customary courtesy that a Premier should show them. And yet he complains about the tactics of these individuals. It is a wonder that the circular from the Graziers' Association has not been read, in which they asked for a contribution based on the number of stock each man owned. I do not mind handing the Premier a copy of that circular. He would not have to steal it, nor would his party have to steal it. But that contribution is voluntary. If we do not like to contribute we are not kicked about from pillar to post—we are not told that we can starve, as the non-unionist is told. There was nothing in that circular to the effect that the employer would be blacklisted, boycotted, or knocked about or injured in any way if he did not contribute. That is what happens in connection with the Liberal funds at all times, and I say that we have as much right to have fighting funds as the Labour party. They endeavour to magnify the funds we have at our disposal. I am game to ask the Premier, if he so desires, to have a Royal Commission on the cost of running the last election. Let all the funds be audited—all the money spent by the employers, or the Liberal party, and the money spent by the workers' political organisations and other Labour organisations. You will find that in

connection with the last campaign for every £1 the Liberal party had the Labour party had £2.

The PREMIER: Are you asking for a Royal Commission?

Mr. MORGAN: I am leaving that entirely to the Premier's judgment. We are not afraid of a Royal Commission; if the Premier did appoint it I would not object to it in any shape or form. He will find that these gentlemen who have been connected with the funds are prepared to have them audited and give the information if the Government desires it. We also want the Royal Commission, if one is appointed, to find out how much money was obtained by "Liberty Fair," that gambling organisation that went throughout Queensland ruining the morals of the young people. We want a Royal Commission on all matters. We do not want a one-sided Royal Commission like those the Premier is generally guilty of appointing. If there is going to be a Royal Commission there must be a decision between hon. members on this side and the Government side as to what it is to inquire into.

It must be a fair, honest Royal [10 p.m.] Commission, not one which the Premier would like to appoint. We know that the Premier, in appointing Royal Commissions, restricts their scope, so that many matters cannot be inquired into. That was done in connection with Wando Vale and other Royal Commissions which have been appointed.

The PREMIER: What about a Royal Commission on the matter we are discussing now?

Mr. MORGAN: What would a Royal Commission disclose in connection with Mount Hutton? It would be something which would not be creditable to those who were connected with the purchase of that station. When what happened in connection with that becomes generally known, the people will say that, whatever happened in connection with Wando Vale, Mr. Vowles was on right grounds when he asked for a Royal Commission in connection with both matters.

The PREMIER: Do I understand you have no objection to a Royal Commission to inquire into the funds used at the last election?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: All the funds.

Mr. MORGAN: Let the Premier put in writing what he desires a Royal Commission to inquire into, and we will consider it. We must have it in writing. I would not take the Premier's word for that. It has been proved that we cannot rely upon that gentleman, although we should be able to rely upon his word as Premier of this State. I will guarantee he will get an immediate answer. There will be no indefinite reply: there will be nothing like "in due course": it will be "Yes," or "No."

The PREMIER: I want your answer now.

Mr. MORGAN: If the Premier thinks I can consider a matter of that kind in one moment he makes a mistake. (Government laughter.) We are not afraid of anything we have done in connection with this matter. The cause of the whole outcry and the manifest grief is that the Employers' Federation have adopted the tactics of the Labour party. The Labour party thought they had a monopoly of those tactics. They forgot to patent them, and there is no law to prevent their

being used. We are meeting them at their own game, and fighting them with their own weapons. We had an illustration to-night of the annoyance that has been caused.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I wish to support this amendment. If it is not to protect a man who has made in this House a speech which, in my opinion, contains defamatory matter, I see no reason why the speech should not go out. In fact, I would rather like to see it go out, because it will wake up the people of Queensland to the absolute necessity of getting a union to protect themselves. We saw this afternoon, in the debate which took place in this House, and the amendment which was put, voted for, and carried by a large majority, that it is up to the owners, the employers, and everybody who has anything in Queensland to organise and protect themselves.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: I think it is absolutely essential, and if this speech in being circulated throughout the country is going to wake the people up to the absolute necessity of protecting all they have, it is going to do a very good thing.

The PREMIER: Wake them up to what is going on—that is all I want.

Mr. MOORE: I would like to quote a few paragraphs to show what we are up against, what we want to fight against, and what is the reason for organisation and for employers combining together to protect themselves—

"Significant revelations were made last month in regard to Bolshevism and the activities of its engineers. The secretary of the Sydney Labour Council, who is taking a leading part in the promotion of the one big union, gave an astonishing statement to Sydney 'Sun,' in which he explained the plan of the revolution. There has been a painful silence ever since in the Labour newspapers, so that the secretary has probably let the cat out of the bag by mistake."

Further on, it says—

"Enlightenment on the proposed plan of action came from Adelaide, when delegates from a conference in Melbourne submitted a report to the local Trades and Labour Council. The Press report said that one delegate, named Williams, in answer to a question, told the council this—

The one big union advocates social ownership for the whole of the community.

It wants the workers to own and control the industries of the country.

A Delegate: Does the word 'take' in the preamble mean that we repudiate the national debt?

Mr. Williams: Yes, in my opinion.

Mr. Howard (also a delegate) said the one big union wanted to take industries by force.

Mr. Hill, M.L.A.: What will be the position if the Trades and Labour Council rejects the proposals?

Mr. Howard replied that the conference decided to carry on propaganda work in spite of any decision of the council.

Mr. Gunn, M.L.A.: Is it the intention of the one big union to make use

Mr. Moore.]

of the present political machine until it captures it, and then adopt something like the Soviet form of government?

Mr. Williams: It will use the present political machine until it is in a position to control it.

Note the last answer. The revolutionaries will capture the workers of Australia in a mass, appropriate their huge political machine, and then discard parliamentary action altogether."

It goes on to show the sort of Parliament they want—

"The following have no voting rights, nor can they be elected, regardless of fulfilling the requirements of the above-mentioned categories:—

(a) Persons employing hired labour for making profits;

(b) Persons living on unearned incomes, as dividend from capital, income derived from business undertakings, and from property, etc.;

(c) Private traders and commercial agents;

(d) Monks and the clergy of all churches and religious sects.

"The Labour Council One Big Union secretary said: 'I contend that it is one of the finest declarations the world has ever had. I support it fully.'"

Is not it time that the employers of Queensland, and anybody who owns anything, started to organise, to get a building where they can hold their meetings, either in secret or in public, to defend themselves against an insidious propaganda such as that?

Mr. BUTLER: What paper did you quote from?

Mr. MOORE: I quoted from the "Fighting Line," of 21st February.

Mr. BUTLER: Who published it?

Mr. MOORE: The Sydney "Sun" is the authority for it. (Government laughter.) This is not a secret circular; it is published for people to purchase. If they want to deny this statement, it is open for them to do it. This is not published under privilege of Parliament, which is what is being attempted to-night. It is not the sort of thing hon. members opposite are trying to send out, under privilege, where a man shall not be held responsible for what he says. These people are prepared to stand up for what they say. It is necessary that we should be organised when we are fighting a machine such as this, when they are prepared to disfranchise very nearly half the people of Australia so that they can carry out in Australia the nefarious designs which are being openly advocated. The Labour Council one big union secretary said—

"I contend that it is one of the finest declarations the world has ever had. I support it fully."

Is that the sort of policy the Labour party to-day is agreeing with, and is that the sort of thing we have to fight against? Can any body of men be blamed for organising and building a hall where they may protect themselves?

Mr. BUTLER: What is the name of that secretary? Is he a member of the Labour party?

[Mr. Moore.

Mr. MOORE: The secretary of the Labour Council. I have not got his name. Then, going on further, he says—

"I am starting to draft for our committee in Sydney a scheme on the same lines as that of Hamburg. I say the soviet system in Russia should be adopted here, the same as we have adopted it on our committee in Sydney."

Surely, those sort of things show which way the wind is blowing?

The PREMIER: Is there any need for secrecy? That is all I object to.

Mr. MOORE: No; absolutely no secrecy whatever. Why were the sittings of the Perth conference so secret? Why was the Press not admitted? There is nothing that need be secret in the meetings, as far as I know. I am quite prepared to stand up for anything for which I organise.

The PREMIER: All I want is to have the light of day on the matter.

Mr. MOORE: We want the light of day on it, too—where a man will have to stand up for what he says; not have the privilege of Parliament if he makes a defamatory statement. He shall have to stand up for those statements when they are published broadcast throughout the country.

The PREMIER: So he will have to do.

Mr. MOORE: We know perfectly well that, if these statements are published under privilege of Parliament, he will not have to stand up for them. If the Premier really believes what he says, let him accept the amendment. Then we will know perfectly well whether he is *bonâ fide* or not, or whether the speech he made is pure bluff. He never got on to the real details of what he was going to tell us. He said he was going to explain the reasons for sending out this circular, but all he did was to make a speech born out of due season and delivered in the wrong place. (Laughter.) If it had been delivered on the hustings before a sympathetic audience it would have gone down very well; but he never told us a lot we wanted to know about it.

Mr. BUTLER: He told you a lot you did not want to know.

Mr. MOORE: Most of it was an exordium on the brilliant work of the soldiers, and we thoroughly agree with that. But it had nothing to do with the motion we are discussing. I am sorry he did not tell us what he wanted to get this circular out for.

The PREMIER: All I want to get it out for is that everybody shall know what is going on.

Mr. MOORE: The Premier said he was not going to accept the amendment. If the amendment was accepted, I would be prepared to accept the statement of the Premier. But here I want to read section 371, subsection (3) of the Criminal Code—

"A person does not incur any liability as for defamation by publishing, by order or under the authority of either House of Parliament, a paper containing defamatory matter."

The Premier never told us that that was the reason for this motion. All he admitted was by way of inference when he said that he would not accept the amendment.

The PREMIER: I specifically denied that that was the fact.

Mr. MOORE: The most specific denial he can give is to accept the amendment, which will prove his bona fides. Until he does that, I am going to have my own opinion, and I think that the people outside will have their own opinion. I am pleased the debate has taken place, because it will enable the people outside to realise that Parliament is being used for the benefit of an individual rather than for the benefit of the country.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I would not like this debate to close without the House and the country understanding where I am in this matter. I have no objection whatever to the statement of the hon. member for Flinders going in, so long as his comments regarding certain individuals and certain things are omitted from it. The privileges of the House have no right to be used in order that a man may have full fling in giving vent to defamatory and lying statements, and that is what it amounts to.

Mr. FOLEY: Strong language.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The language is strong. The Chief Secretary, in commencing his speech, made a statement something like this: "One looking on would wonder what the flutter was about." I can assure him that there was not only a flutter later on when he commenced to speak, but we witnessed a perfect tornado, and no one knew as to what the flutter, or tornado, was about. But there was perfect evidence of it—there was a full gallery which had come along to see the action of the Premier with regard to the message received only yesterday. I want to take exception to the new order of things. In this House we have been accustomed to a messenger coming along and standing at the bar of the House, and saying, "Mr. Speaker, a message from the Governor." The new order of things is this: "Mr. Speaker, a message from the Trades Hall." Only a few minutes ago the Premier indicated that when messages of that kind came along it did not take him ten days to consider what to do; he could decide in ten minutes what to do. Surely here is an alarming state of things! A message from the Trades Hall has only to be in the Premier's hands ten minutes, and then it is given forth to the world as an instruction having been received in regard to which instant action must be taken. This side of the House stands here to state that that kind of thing is not going to continue, and must not continue, in a free land. The only parallel we have witnessed in connection with an incident of this nature was something which took place a couple of years ago, when consternation reigned in the Trades Hall in connection with the meatworks. We know that, instead of coming here on that occasion and presenting their message to the Chamber, the Premier went along to the Trades Hall and explained himself, and a Bill was presented to the House in twenty-four hours which satisfied the Trades Hall. It is in connection with matters of that kind that I take my stand and say to the Government: "You are free to publish the speech of the hon. member for Flinders, but you have a right to except therefrom the statements made which were not true. That is our only concern. State what you like, and we will state what we like in presenting our propaganda to the people of Queensland, and the people of Queensland will judge."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment, for the

reason that it would clear away any idea that this Chamber was being used to save people from the effect of the law outside. We are in honour bound not to use the privileges of this House to the disadvantage of people outside. If that is so, why will the Premier not accept the amendment, and give the public the satisfaction of knowing that that is not the reason why the motion has been brought forward? The Premier complains about the secrecy of the Employers' Federation. He knows that he came straight from the International Conference on the other side of the world, and went to an Interstate Conference in the South, and when it was proposed to alter the Federal Labour platform and to have a straightforward socialistic platform to take over the means of production and bring about confiscation, the Premier said, "No, do not alter it; let it stand as it is. We have to face the electors, and Hughes and Holman will pull it to pieces if we alter it." Why did the Premier want that secrecy?

Mr. COLLINS: Tell us how you know it.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It was published in the Labour papers. The Trades Hall and caucus meetings are not open to the public. You do not admit anyone. Let the Premier deny what I have said if it is untrue. He wanted to deceive the whole of the people; and now he complains about other people holding meetings in private and deciding how they shall spend their own funds. Surely the Employers' Federation have not trespassed as far as the Premier did, seeing they only proposed to spend their own funds, whereas the hon. gentleman was spending the funds of the community. I maintain that there is a big difference in principle between the two. If this is going to be the way the Government are going to use State funds—to shield lawbreakers—and worse than that—disloyal lawbreakers—and try to get them out of prison—then why object to the Employers' Federation using their own funds for their own protection? And the hon. member for Aubigny has conclusively proved that that is all they had in view. We have not to go further back than this afternoon to see, in the division list, hon. members on the other side proclaiming themselves international socialists, whose aim is to take and hold all the means of production in preference to co-operation. They have made a public declaration, through the journals of this House, that they are on the side of the international socialists, and that they believe in taking and holding the means of production, not for sale but for use. President Wilson said that an international socialist cannot be a good American, and we on this side say that he cannot be a good Australian. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

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

AYES, 16.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Moore
" Barnes, G. P.	" Morgan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Petrie
" Bebbington	" Roberts
" Elphinstone	" Sizer
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Taylor
" Hodge	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. G. P. Barnes and Mr. Petrie.

Mr. Bebbington.]

NOES, 32.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
" Bertram	" Lennon
" Butler	" Lloyd
" Carter	" McLachlan
" Collins	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" O'Sullivan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan, D.
" Fihelly	" Ryan, H. J.
" Foley	" Ryan, T. J.
" Gilday	" Smith
" Gillies	" Theodore
" Hardacre	" Wellington
" James	" Whitford
" Kirwan	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Butler and Mr. James.

Resolved in the negative.

Original question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Land
" Bertram	" Lennon
" Butler	" Lloyd
" Carter	" McLachlan
" Collins	" Mullan
" Cooper, F. A.	" O'Sullivan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan, D.
" Fihelly	" Ryan, H. J.
" Foley	" Ryan, T. J.
" Gilday	" Smith
" Gillies	" Theodore
" Hardacre	" Wellington
" James	" Whitford
" Kirwan	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Carter and Mr. Gilday.

NOES, 16.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Moore
" Barnes, G. P.	" Morgan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Petrie
" Bobbington	" Roberts
" Elphinstone	" Sizer
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Taylor
" Hodge	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Hodge and Mr. Moore.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The PREMIER: I desire to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Premier be allowed to make a personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I understand that while I was out of the Chamber the hon. member for Nundah made a reference to my speech. The hon. member said that I said that if the document was stolen by the hon. member for Flinders, or any other hon. member, they were justified in stealing it so long as it helped the party on this side. I did not say that, or anything like that. I think I made my attitude perfectly clear—that the document was not stolen, and in proceeding to discuss the contents of the document I desired to know how did it affect the nature of the contents of the document whether it was stolen or not; and the hon. member for Nundah must have known that.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. MORGAN: Wait till we see "Hansard."

The House adjourned at twenty minutes to 11 o'clock p.m.

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