

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 1935**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 22 NOVEMBER, 1935.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. G. Pollock, *Gregory*) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO ENTERPRISE  
GOLD MINE.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

“ In reference to the reported proposal to wind-up the company operating the Enterprise gold mine at Gympie—

‘ (1.) What is the total amount of advances or grants by the Government towards this enterprise—(a) prospecting and/or mining; (b) other purposes, including treatment plant, machinery and equipment.

‘ (2.) What was the amount of each advance or grant (showing whether an advance or a grant), and the date of approval of each?

‘ (3.) Has the Government been requested to send a geologist to report on this mine, and, if so, is it proposed to have a geological or other investigation into the cause of the failure of the mine to produce up to expectations based upon assay values?

‘ (4.) Will he lay on the table of the House all papers and correspondence relating to assistance to this company?’ ”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*), for the SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*), replied—

“ 1. (a) Nil; (b) nil.

“ 2. See answer to No. 1.

“ 3. Yes, a geological inspection of the mine was requested and an inspection made by a departmental geologist, when values of from 1 dwt. to 7 dwt. of gold to the ton were disclosed. On the very limited exposures, however, it was not possible to assess the value of the reefs. Only a very small tonnage of ore was proved, and a great deal of development was required before an estimate of tonnages or values could be made. This request and inspection were subsequent to a geological inspection carried out by a private geologist. An application for assistance to do certain development work was made to the department, but was not granted.

“ 4. The papers are available at the Department of Mines to any member who may wish to peruse them.”

## SINGLE UNEMPLOYED IN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*), for Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*), asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“What was the number of single unemployed who received intermittent relief work pay or rations during the week ended on the last Saturday in July, August, September, and October, 1934 and 1935, respectively?”

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) replied—

	1934.	1935.
“ July ...	12,979	12,068
August ...	12,365	11,694
September ...	12,112	12,102
October ...	11,917	12,177”

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL.

## INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend ‘The Local Authorities Acts, 1902 to 1934,’ in certain particulars, and for other purposes.”

Question put and passed.

## INSANITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend ‘The Insanity Act of 1884’ (as amended by subsequent Acts) in certain particulars.”

Question put and passed.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS’ ORGANISATION  
AND MARKETING ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL.

## INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend ‘The Primary Producers’ Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1932,’ in certain particulars.”

Question put and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.

## INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Hanson, Buranda, in the chair.*)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*) [10.33 a.m.]: I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to further amend the Constitution of Queensland by restoring to certain persons, formerly members of the Legislative Council (abolished by ‘The

Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1922’) certain privileges of which they were deprived by ‘The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2.’ and to repeal such lastmentioned Act accordingly.”

Hon. members will remember that in the Act to amend the Constitution of Queensland by abolishing the Legislative Council, which was assented to on 23rd March, 1922, it was provided in section 3 that—

“The Governor in Council may, by notification published in the ‘Gazette,’ declare that the existing members of the Legislative Council shall, during life or for such period of time as is fixed in such notification, retain and continue to be entitled to exercise the privilege of a free pass upon the railways of the State and the use of the Parliamentary Library, and such other existing privileges of such members as may be mentioned in such notification. Every such notification shall have the same effect as if it were enacted in this Act.”

Subsequent to the passing of that Act a notification appeared in the “Government Gazette” of 31st March, 1922, which provided—

“His Excellency the Governor, with the advice of the Governor in Council, doth hereby notify and declare that every existing member of the Legislative Council shall during life retain and continue to be entitled to exercise the privilege of free passes on the railways of the State of Queensland and the use of the Parliamentary Library.”

Mr. MAHER: What services did they render in exchange for that privilege?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am coming to that. They rendered a very valuable service to the people of this State. They enjoyed these privileges up to 1929. In that year the Moore Government introduced a further amendment to the Constitution by which the rights of certain of those ex-members were abolished. In fact, the whole of the rights of the Labour members of the Legislative Council were abolished. Section 3, subsection 3, of “The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2.” provided that the free railway passes of those men who were ex-Labour members of the Legislative Council were cancelled and determined, and the privileges of the Parliamentary Library withdrawn.

Mr. BRAND: How long had they served in Parliament?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: At present I am explaining the Bill. I will answer the hon. member’s question at the right time and in the right way. Under this Bill it is proposed to restore those rights and place those men in the same position in which they were prior to the passage of “The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2.” Ex-members of the Legislative Council will enjoy the privilege of a free pass on the Queensland railways and access to the Parliamentary Library, such as ex-members of the Legislative Assembly and some ex-members of the abolished Legislative Council now have.

There is no doubt that when the Moore Government were returned to power they were intoxicated with success. They were mad drunk with power, and cared nothing

for the statutory or moral rights of ex-Labour members of the Legislative Council. They ruthlessly proceeded to destroy the rights enjoyed by those persons, and did the job so cleverly that no supporter of their party was deprived of any privilege.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Why?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Because they were Tories.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is not true.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Every man who lost his privilege under that Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2, was a Labour supporter. It is interesting to point out that twenty-four men were affected. Five of them have since died, three now enjoy passes because of their positions in other spheres of public activity, and two have left the State; so that fourteen men are affected by the measure that I am introducing. These ex-members of the Legislative Council enjoyed those benefits under what I consider to be a binding statutory contract. That contract was broken immorally and unjustifiably by the Moore Government. Hon. members opposite talk glibly about the sanctity of contract!

Mr. MAXWELL: Do you believe in it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Of course, I do. Hon. members opposite talk glibly about the sanctity of contract, but the Act passed by the Moore Government was a repudiation of a statutory contract—a piece of class legislation of the worst possible kind. It was the most vindictive and splenetic measure ever passed through any Assembly in Australia. In it the Moore Government paid no regard to the equity of the position or the rights of those men. The Act was a deliberate, preconceived, pre-determined insult to every Labour elector in Queensland. The people of Queensland over and over again returned a majority of Labourites to Parliament with a mandate to destroy the Upper House.

Mr. MAHER: You took a referendum on that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The less hon. members opposite say about the referendum the better. Everybody knows that the Labour Government tried to take a referendum, and on fair conditions. What happened? The Tory Party, of which hon. members opposite are the lineal descendants, applied for and secured an injunction from the Supreme Court of Queensland against the taking of a referendum, and it was only on the evening before the date for taking the referendum that we were enabled to get the High Court of Australia to establish our rights and dissolve the injunction. It was only by the most hurried telegraphic communication that we were able to get the returning officers to hold the poll. Because of the uncertainty of the situation we were unable to get among the people and to explain the way to vote and why to vote, and that is why the referendum had the results hon. members opposite imagined it had. The fact must be recognised that subsequent to the referendum and prior to the abolition of the Legislative Council the electors of this State, in the most emphatic way, gave mandates to the Labour Party to abolish it. That was in the forefront of our party's platform in 1918 and in 1920 when we went to the country. We got those mandates after the referendum.

Mr. BRAND: Did we not get a mandate to take these passes away?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No, the Opposition did not. The question was never raised in an electoral speech by the Leader of the Opposition. Not in one speech did he say he was going to play this trick of abolishing gold passes.

Mr. MOORE: Did you go with me everywhere? The only place you went to was Charters Towers—to make a disturbance.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not need to be with the Leader of the Opposition to tell what he says to the electors. I know his tricks too well. One of the tricks he did not resort to on this occasion was saying: "I will be the strong man and abolish these passes." I want to tell hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Toowong who harps on this question so much, that this was gross repudiation of the worst form. The present Bill will restore those statutory rights of which these men were wrongly deprived and will remove from the statute-book an injustice—a blot on the honour of the country. Not only that. It is also a recognition of great service. Do hon. members know that by abolishing the Legislative Council we have already saved the taxpayers about £100,000? We have saved over £100,000 in the various costs of maintaining an Upper House. These men who object to giving a few men the privilege of passes on the Queensland railways for life did everything in their power to continue the old Upper House for ever, and to give passes to its members for all time. What an illogical position! Not only that, Mr. Hanson, but these men who object to a few Labour men getting passes for great service to their country, during their accidental three years in office deliberately set themselves out to create an Upper House whose members would not only have free passes but salaries. Hon. members opposite wanted to create an irremovable Upper House, with a constitution that could not be altered for nine years after its establishment.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where did you get that from?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: From the record of hon. members' doings, because they were not loyal to one another. They sought to enslave the electors of Queensland by introducing an Upper House that could not be abolished except by its own consent. There were to be salaries for everybody in this new Upper House, which was to consist of thirty-one members, sixteen of whom—including the President—would be nominated by the Government and the remaining fifteen—not elected by the people—elected by economic interests. What a lovely incubus they tried to foist on to the people of this State! Fortunately, they were not game to go on with it. At the very next opportunity the people gave us such a convincing mandate that there were unmistakable signs that it was their intention that the Tory Party should never have another chance of pursuing such a nefarious course.

There seems to be some misapprehension in the Press concerning the Bill. I read an article in one of the leading newspapers yesterday morning wherein it was implied that it would grant free passes over the Australian railways, whereas it confers the same privileges as were conferred by an

*Hon. J. Mullan.]*

earlier Act—free passes over the railways of the State of Queensland.

There is no need for me to labour the Bill.

Mr. MAXWELL: You have not told us anything.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If I were to speak all day I could not inform the hon. member very much.

Mr. MOORE: You have said too much already.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Leader of the Opposition does not look a bit comfortable.

Mr. MOORE: I am.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I can well understand.

Mr. MOORE: You are the one who should feel uncomfortable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He is just as uncomfortable to-day as when the proposal to establish an Upper House to enslave democracy was turned down by his masters. The people of Queensland should write in letters of gold the names of the Labour men who were responsible for abolishing the Upper House. The people are grateful to these men for their self-sacrifice and their loyalty. These men and their efforts on behalf of the democracy of Queensland will never be forgotten by our grateful people.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [10.53 a.m.]: I realise that no objections that I may make to the Bill will make any difference, but I intend to give some reasons for them. The Attorney-General indulged in wild flights of imagination when he purported to tell the Committee what happened in a certain caucus meeting.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Do you deny it?

Mr. MOORE: There is no secret about the suggestion to establish a new Upper House. As Leader of the Opposition I am prepared to accept suggestions for the amendment of the Constitution of this State from anybody who is competent to give them. There was nothing wrong in the suggestion to establish a new Upper House. A member of the university put forward certain suggestions in that connection, but there was no secret about it. I can give the Minister a copy of those suggestions.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Thank you very much, but I have a copy already.

Mr. MOORE: Is it not interesting? There was no suggestion that the people should be enslaved. It was suggested that industry should be represented in that House, and as industry is the most important factor in the prosperity of the State, there is nothing extraordinary in the suggestion that it should have a voice in the legislation that will affect it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was to be class-conscious.

Mr. MOORE: That is untrue. I believe in a Legislative Council and I have always believed in it.

Mr. WATERS: You were not game to carry it into effect.

Mr. MOORE: That might be a very clever remark, but I believe in keeping my word. We gave a definite pledge that we would not legislate to reconstitute the Legislative Council without first taking a referendum. It is all very fine to cast aspersions

on the Government of the day, but we stuck to our promise to the electors. No matter what nasty innuendoes hon. members may fling across the Chamber, that is the plain truth of the matter.

I took exception to the whole business when the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which provided for the abolition of the Legislative Council, was introduced in this Assembly in 1929. At that time an amendment was moved to place the ex-members of the Legislative Council that this Bill affects on exactly the same plane as other members of Parliament. I voted for that amendment, which was defeated. The clause itself was then put, and we as a party voted against it. We endeavoured at that time to secure the adoption of an amendment to do exactly what we did when we came into power—to place them on the same plane as regards privileges as any other member of Parliament.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You proposed an amendment that specially excluded all Labour members of the Legislative Council.

Mr. MOORE: It was not our fault that all the members affected by the amendment happened to be Labour supporters.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was not your fault, but it was your intention.

Mr. MOORE: It had nothing to do with the appointments. No names were mentioned at all. Those members who were deliberately appointed to the Legislative Council to vote for its abolition had no right to be placed on a pedestal. In my opinion that was wrong. Those members were appointed to the Legislative Council for what? To carry out their duty as part of the Constitution of Queensland—that was, to assist in the legislation of this State. They took an oath that they would be loyal to the Constitution. They afterwards voted to abolish the very institution to which they were appointed and which they took an oath to uphold. Judas Iscariot betrayed the trust placed in him for thirty pieces of silver. He offered to return the thirty pieces of silver, the price of his betrayal, but the church refused to take the money. It was then used to buy a potter's field in which to bury strangers. I am merely pointing out what has happened to people who have betrayed the trust reposed in them. (Government interruption.) If these members did not betray their trust they were not loyal to their oath, which is infinitely worse, because it shows that they were definitely appointed to the Legislative Council at a price. If that was so, they went in to do a nefarious work. If they accepted an appointment to the Legislative Council to vote themselves something worth £100 a year for life, irrespective of what the Constitution set out, then that is infinitely worse than betraying a trust. It means, then, that these men deliberately placed themselves in a position to vote themselves privileges worth £100 a year for life as payment for work done.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If you left Parliament to-morrow you would be entitled to a free railway pass for life.

Mr. MOORE: I have served the requisite time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is a question of law.

Mr. MOORE: I have served the requisite time to secure the pass. I have no objection to that. What I object to is the fact that

[*Hon. J. Mullan.*]

people who were appointed to the Legislative Council to serve the people of Queensland and failed to do it should be placed in a privileged position not enjoyed by other members of Parliament. I can see no reason why they should be placed on a pinnacle.

We should not be proud of the Government for restoring this privilege. There is no suggestion that anything wrong was done by the Moore Government in abolishing it. It is significant that it was not put definitely in the Bill that abolished the Council. It was only provided that it could be given by Order in Council for such specified time as was set out by the Order in Council. The Government at that time were afraid of what public opinion would say if they boldly declared that they were going to give these privileges for life, and so they did not do it in that way, but in the underhand way by Order in Council. We definitely opposed the clause at that time, and moved an amendment to the effect that these people should be put on the same basis as other members of the Legislative Council and members of the Legislative Assembly. Having failed to carry it, why should not we carry out our desire when we got the opportunity to do so? There was nothing dishonourable about our action. To my mind it was the only open and honest thing to do, and I can see no reason for altering my opinion.

I can understand the pressure that is being placed on the Government, and the use that they will probably make of their action, but I can see no reason to justify it. Most of the members who will receive a pass, namely, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Colborne, Mr. J. F. Donovan, Mr. T. J. Donovan, Mr. W. F. Finlayson, Mr. H. G. McPhail, Mr. J. S. Hanlon, Mr. G. H. Thompson, and Mr. R. J. Mulvey were appointed in 1920, and thus were members for only about twelve months. Why should they be paid by the people of Queensland for that? Why should they get free passes on the railway?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Some of your Ministers have a pass over the whole of the Australian railways, and they were only Ministers for three years.

Mr. MOORE: I did not introduce that Act of Parliament.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You did not abolish it either.

The HOME SECRETARY: You delayed the 1932 election for a longer period than is laid down in order that they would be eligible to obtain a pass.

Mr. MOORE: That is the type of mind the hon. gentleman has!

The HOME SECRETARY: It is the truth.

Mr. MOORE: I know the type of mind the hon. gentleman has, and I did not expect anything else. I expected that sort of remark from him. That is the sort of thing he always thinks. It is a pity, but I cannot help it. I know hon. members opposite are very sore at having to justify something that is unfair and unjust to the people of this State. They cannot justify it in their own consciences from any standpoint, and it is natural that they would be sore about it. So they throw dirt.

I had nothing to do with the fixing of the conditions on which parliamentary passes are issued. Those conditions are common throughout Australia. As a matter of fact,

personally, I do not agree with it. I do not agree that a member of Parliament should get a pass after he leaves Parliament, but that has been the custom throughout Australia for very many years. It seems to me that if an individual who has been in Parliament for a certain number of years gets the benefit of a free pass he is at an advantage in competition with his neighbours for a position that necessitates travelling.

I cannot see the reason for this Bill unless the men affected went in on a definite pledge to do something for which they were to be paid. Can anybody justify a member of Parliament's doing that? Can anybody justify his doing anything against the Constitution he was appointed to support, in return for payment? If he did not go in under those terms what right have the Government to say, "We are going to pay you for what you have done."

Mr. DUNSTAN: You were going to put sixteen members in the Upper House with salaries.

Mr. MOORE: Who said there was any salary? Hon. members are endeavouring to draw red herrings across the track by putting up suggestions that there was going to be payment of the members of the suggested Upper House, and all sorts of things.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: You were not game!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: No; I was not game to break a pledge I had given to the electors.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You broke thousands of pledges. (Government interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: I did not. Each man definitely pledged himself. If hon. members like to put it that way—that we were not game to do it—they may have it that way. There is nothing wrong with that, and there is nothing to be ashamed of. I have been criticised for not doing it, but I am prepared to stand up to it all, because the pledge was given. But I am not prepared to stand up for giving a bribe to people or payment to people to come in and do certain work that they were pledged not to do—or if that is not the case they went into the Legislative Council on a wrong basis altogether. If these men went in definitely on the understanding they were to be paid for something they were to do, nothing could be worse. If they went in to uphold the Constitution and carry out the work that a Legislative Council should do and they betrayed the trust reposed in them, that is almost as bad. In either case they were paid to do it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Your party was the only party that had any connection with a conviction for bribery.

Mr. MOORE: This party was never concerned with that. It was admitted in this House by members of the Government that the party had nothing whatever to do with it. The fact that the hon. gentleman says that it was the only party that was connected with a conviction shows that other parties have done it, and if the hon. gentleman likes to be placed in that position I do not mind. (Government interjection.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

*Mr. Moore.]*

Mr. MOORE: Very unpleasant suggestions can be made in all sorts of ways. I do not repeat the rumours I hear from day to day. All sorts of rumours and suggestions are made, and if we were to take notice of them we should get nowhere.

Mr. WATERS: As a matter of fact your Cabinet held a special meeting to extend its term. You bribed—

Mr. MOORE: You know, absolutely nothing about it.

Mr. MAXWELL: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove accused us as a Government of bribery. I ask that he withdraw.

Mr. WATERS: Ridiculous!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not entitled to accuse another hon. member of being bribed. I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. WATERS: I did not accuse the hon. member of being bribed.

Mr. MAXWELL: You accused the Moore Government. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw. It is out of order for an hon. member to make an allegation of bribery against another hon. member.

Mr. WATERS: I never accused the hon. member of being bribed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member denies the suggestion.

Mr. McLEAN: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition whilst speaking has stated that this Bill was being brought in as a bribe for services rendered by those members who were appointed to the Legislative Council. I consider that that is offensive, and I ask him to withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The term was not applied to hon. members of this House, and if it was applied to ex-members of the Legislative Council I cannot find anything objectionable in that.

Mr. MOORE: I said that if they came in expecting a bribe for doing that, it was wrong, and if they came in without that then they betrayed the trust that was reposed in them, and it was equally wrong.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: They were all Labour men.

Mr. MOORE: A good deal was made of the fact at the time that these men had been Labour men, but what has that to do with it? Absolutely nothing. Irrespective of what party they supported, whether Labour, National or Conservative, they went into the Upper House to uphold the Constitution of Queensland.

Mr. POWER: They were good Labour men.

Mr. MOORE: I do not care what they were. Whether they were good or bad Labour men, it does not make the slightest difference. They went in there for a specific purpose. The Legislative Council was not a party House. It was a chamber of review. (Government laughter.)

Mr. POWER: A chamber of horrors.

Mr. MOORE: It was a chamber of review so that the electors would not be the sufferers from legislation rushed through the Lower House. It gave the people outside an opportunity of seeing what was being done.

Mr. WATERS: It was a class-conscious House.

[Mr. Moore.

Mr. MOORE: All sorts of objections have been raised to the Upper House, but it was necessary. It must not be forgotten that the State is paying about £300,000 a year extra in interest because the Upper House was abolished at that time. The people of Queensland have been suffering ever since.

The whole fact of the matter is that the Legislative Council was a very useful chamber. It was a house of review, so much so that when the first Bill to abolish it was brought down the Government proposed a method of review.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Why was it that your Government and your predecessors always appointed strong Tory supporters to that House?

Mr. MOORE: Those men were appointed on account of their experience, knowledge, and civic service, and because of similar considerations.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is a difference between this and that House. That was a one-party House.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman may say that, but what happened? A review of events will show that the Labour Government appointed good Labour men to that House, some of whom when it came to a question of its abolition discovered that the House was serving a very useful purpose and voted against its abolition. We know that Labour men who were appointed to the House refused to vote for its abolition because they recognised that it was serving a very useful purpose. Those men did not go into that House as Labour men. Their political views may have been Labour, but they genuinely accepted the responsibility placed upon them, and offered very useful criticism of Bills. Nobody could accuse the late Mr. Sumner of not speaking his mind; he was one of the Labour men, and he did exceptionally good work.

This measure is introduced for the purpose of paying those men who betrayed the trust reposed in them by voting for the abolition of the Legislative Council. No excuses need be made for having taken away these privileges because at the time the Bill to abolish the Council was brought in we objected to the principle and submitted amendments to delete it, which were of course defeated. I object strongly to the principle being reintroduced for no reason whatever.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Rockhampton*) [11.13 a.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition suggests that hon. members on this side of the Chamber are being forced by the Cabinet to support this measure.

Mr. MOORE: Not by the Cabinet, but outside influence.

Mr. LARCOMBE: That is entirely out of accord with truth.

Mr. BRAND: How do you account for the four years intervening since its abolition?

Mr. LARCOMBE: I will discuss that point later. No measure was more readily and spontaneously supported by hon. members on this side of the Committee than was this one. The Act passed by the Moore Government was discriminatory and one of the most vicious pieces of legislation ever passed through the Queensland Parliament. It was vindictive and persecuting and it

denied ex-members of the Legislative Council the rights to which they were entitled. It was victimisation to deny those rights to men who were entitled to enjoy them in common with other ex-members of Parliament.

The hon. member for Isis asks how we account for the lapse of time between the action taken by the Moore Government and this proposal to restore the privileges that were then abolished. There are two points of reply to that question. One is that the relative urgency of legislation must be considered. All Bills cannot be passed at once, and the Government introduced first the legislation that was most urgent at the time. Another argument is that justice knows no limitations of time.

It is not a question of chronology; it is a question of justice or injustice. That is the point involved. It is a matter of principle. It is useless and ineffective to raise the point of the lapse of time. The question we have to discuss is whether the measure is just or unjust, not whether the Government have waited three or four years.

Mr. BRAND: You said we persecuted the men.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Yes.

Mr. BRAND: For four years you have continued to persecute them.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It is a question of relative importance of legislation. There are many other persecutions for which the Moore Government were responsible that we have remedied in the meantime, and it would take a long while to remove all the other persecution, victimisation, and injustice that can be laid at their door. The Government must be allowed to order their legislation according to its importance and their own convenience. The fact that a considerable time has elapsed before the introduction of this measure is not an effective reply to the merits of the proposed Bill. The sole question is whether it is just or unjust.

Mr. MAHER: The caucus of the last Parliament turned that proposal down.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The hon. member is saying something that is entirely incorrect. How can he know anything about what caucus did in the matter? How does the hon. member presume to speak for caucus? He was not a member of it.

Mr. MAHER: The Attorney-General was able to speak of our caucus this morning.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It is useless for the hon. member for West Moreton to make fishing interjections of that kind. The party was never more unanimous than it is on the restoration of this undoubted right. Hon. members opposite talk about class consciousness and of Karl Marx. They have out-Marxed Marx. Their viciousness in discriminative measures exceeds anything I have ever read of. The measure that took away this right was so unjust that I am pleased it is to be altered in such a way as to remove what is undoubtedly a blot on the legislation of this State.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about pressure from without. Just imagine the Leader of the Opposition, a man associated with monopolistic interests, talking about pressure from without! When he was Premier of this State the hon. gentleman dis-

cussed legislation with the lobbyists here at Parliament House, yet he talks now about outside pressure! We know the money power made the demand that Labour should not be recognised in the legislation that was passed through Parliament, and that Labour members should be excluded. The pressure came from outside and not altogether from Parliamentarians. Many members of the present Opposition revolted at the repudiatory legislation passed by their own Government. The power from without was the money power, the power of vested interests that wished to stifle the criticism of Labour ex-members of the Legislative Council and penalise them for voting for the abolition of the Council.

The question of expense has been raised by hon. members opposite.

Mr. MAHER: Ministerial expenses?

Mr. LARCOMBE: The expense of this proposed measure; let us discuss one point at a time—the hon. member for West Moreton will destroy the architecture of my speech. The talk of expense is too farcical for words, because the amount involved would be very small. Unfortunately, some of the members of the Legislative Council who would benefit from this measure have passed into the Great Beyond. Others have gone to other States, while others have Federal or State Parliamentary passes. The cost will be small because the number of members concerned will be small.

Mr. MAHER: The principle is wrong.

Mr. LARCOMBE: There lies the difference in viewpoint. I say the principle is absolutely sound. But just imagine the objection of expense coming from members of a party that was responsible for a deficit of £3,600,000! They committed such appalling blunders that the State lost £3,600,000 in the three years of their administration and now they object to the expenditure of a few hundred pounds for a very just purpose. They appointed useless royal commissions—including one to inquire into the railway system—costing thousands of pounds; and now they object to an act of justice that will cost only a few hundred pounds at the most.

Mr. MAHER: Are you referring to Mun-gana?

Mr. LARCOMBE: I have heard something about secret commissions in the dairying industry, but I am not going to discuss them now. The legislation that was placed on the statute-book by the Moore Government to deprive ex-Labour members of the Legislative Council of their privileges was very ingeniously devised in that it provided that only those ex-members who had served so many years in that Chamber would be entitled to retain their privileges. That was only a nominal excuse for the measure, under which only one ex-Labour member—the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe—was entitled to retain his privileges, and as he was residing in another State at the time the legislation meant that no ex-Labour member was eligible to claim those privileges.

The Labour members who were appointed to the Legislative Council carried out their duties constitutionally just as well as any anti-Labour man. They had had long and honourable associations with the industrial and political life of the State. They are men at whom hon. members opposite cannot

*Mr. Larcombe.]*

point the finger of scorn, men mentally, intellectually, morally, and in every way, qualified to be members of the Legislative Council and to discharge their duties there in accordance with their conception of them. As Parliamentarians they discharged their duties as faithfully and well as any other member of that body. But because they did their duty faithfully and well in the interests of the State they were deprived of their rights. They helped materially to govern this State efficiently, economically and with expedition, and after a lapse of thirteen years since the abolition of that Legislative Upper Chamber, Queensland is the admiration of the other States and economies throughout the world.

Hon. members may have read in the "Telegraph" last week of the remarks of a student from the Oxford University, who eulogised Queensland as being the most up-to-date State of Australia constitutionally. He admired the simplicity of the system and the manner in which government is conducted with expedition and economy. The very members who helped to achieve those very proud results were penalised because of their assistance in abolishing the Legislative Council!

This fiendish attack upon working class representatives reminds me of the Tory attacks in the dark industrial days upon the workers in the West, when black lists were issued and Labour men were persecuted in every way. It is pleasing to me to know that the present Administration have the courage to pass a Bill restoring a measure of justice to a deserving body of men.

We have been told that we have been in office for four years, and failed to take this step, but the question of time is not an important consideration. The question of expense also is small. The real question is whether the measure is right or wrong, whether it is just or unjust. Let hon. members opposite face that question. Never mind side-tracking it by the extraneous issues raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He referred to Judas Iscariot, but there was no Judas Iscariot amongst the Labour men who were appointed to the Legislative Council. They carried out their work well, and with credit to the State. I hope that the measure will be carried by a big majority, and that the blot placed on the statute-book by the Moore Government will be speedily removed.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) [11.25 a.m.]: During the course of this debate the Attorney-General stressed the point of the sanctity of contract. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat took up a somewhat different attitude. His argument was that the Leader of the Opposition never attempted to argue that the gentlemen affected by this legislation were not fitted to be members of the Legislative Council. I would remind him that there are ways and ways of doing things. What the Leader of the Opposition said and what I say is that the Government of the day adopted a very wrong method of doing what they did. They put men sworn to uphold the Constitution in a position where they deliberately wrecked it. It was because they did so that they were rewarded with certain parliamentary privileges.

It is no use the Attorney-General saying that candidates for parliamentary honours

[*Mr. Larcombe.*

under the auspices of the Moore Government did not say on the hustings that they would deprive these men of those privileges. We did declare on the hustings that when the opportunity presented itself we would abolish them. We did not attempt to shield ourselves in the matter. What we did was perfectly legitimate and in accord with our honest and truthful statements.

It is funny to hear the Attorney-General talking about the sanctity of contract. I call to mind a very estimable gentleman, now gone to his well-earned rest—I refer to the late Mr. Justice Rea—who stood at the bar of this House pleading with the Labour Government of the day to honour the contracts that had been entered into between the Government of the day and the judges of the Supreme Court. That was an instance where a contract was not honoured. These are the people who talk about sanctity of contracts! When it suits them they will observe a contract. The judges of the Supreme Court who were retired at that time by Act of Parliament were supposed to hold that position for life, or so long as they were mentally capable of discharging their duties. No one can say that these men were not mentally competent to carry out the duties they undertook under their contracts. That did not matter with hon. members opposite. It does not matter this morning so far as the Attorney-General is concerned. He only believes in the sanctity when it suits himself and his party. It was wrong for the Moore Government to abolish the special privileges accorded to these men, but it was not wrong for the Labour Government to dishonour contracts entered into by their predecessors with estimable judges of our law courts.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In 1929 your party entered into a contract with the electors of Queensland to find them 10,000 jobs and £2,000,000.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not dealing with the electors of Queensland in 1929, but I remember that the Smith regime promised the electors in 1932 to bring sunshine and happiness into their homes. Did they do so?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. MAXWELL: They brought that sunshine and happiness into their homes by paying them twenty-seven "bob" a week! (Government interjections.)

I only wish that some hon. members opposite would try to live on 27s. a week. Let me draw attention to some statements made by the Labour Party and their mouthpiece, the "Daily Standard." The Attorney-General is misleading the people when he says that the only people who were penalised by the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1929, No. 2, were good Labour men. He did not go far enough. He did not tell this Committee that there were conditions in that Act, and that those conditions were similar to the conditions that apply to members of the Legislative Assembly—that is, a member of the Legislative Assembly who has served in three Parliaments, or seven years in all, is entitled to a free pass over the railways.

I am not going into the merits or demerits of the case; but let me remind the hon. gentleman and some of his colleagues of a statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier in

1929. At page 2081 of "Hansard" for 1929 the following record appears:—

"CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL OF 1929, No. 2.

"INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

"(Mr. Roberts, East Toowoomba, in the chair.

"The PREMIER (Hon. A. E. Moore, Aubigny): I beg to move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to further amend the Constitution of Queensland by amending 'The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1922' in certain particulars."

This is quite a short Bill of four clauses. The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1922 provided that the members of the Legislative Council as at 23rd March, 1922, were to receive the privilege of life passes on the railways and such privileges of this House as were published from time to time in the 'Gazette.'

"Mr. Stopford: That has been enjoyed since the Constitution has been a Constitution. (Government dissent.)

"The PREMIER: Many of the gentlemen were nominated to the Upper House, not for the purpose of carrying out functions specified by the Constitution of Queensland, but for the definite and avowed purpose of abolishing that Chamber; and they did that in spite of the fact that a referendum had been taken which had decided against the abolition of the Upper House by over 66,000 votes. (Opposition interruption.)"

This is the portion that I desire to emphasise—

"The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Constitution so as to place members of the Legislative Council as at that date in exactly the same position as members of the Legislative Assembly—that is, that these privileges will be restricted to those members of the Legislative Council who had occupied that position for seven years prior to 23rd March, 1922."

Mr. McLEAN: Read further on what the present Secretary for Public Lands said.

Mr. MAXWELL: He said it was camouflage. That is the statement by the then Premier. He stated that the members of the Legislative Council were to be placed on the same basis as members of the Legislative Assembly.

In reference to this matter I wish to quote from a leading article that appeared in the "Daily Standard" of 22nd instant entitled, "Righting an Injustice." The article reads—

"There are features associated with the legislation to restore to ex-members of the Legislative Council the rail passes taken from them by the Moore Government which the electorate should understand. Those ex-members to whom justice is about to be done were given their original commissions for a life tenure, and those commissions carried with them certain rights."

The same paper was silent on the matter of the smashing of the contract that had been entered into with judges of the Supreme Court!

The article goes on to say—

"One of those rights was the railway facilities enjoyed by a member of the Legislative Assembly, who is given a pass over the whole of the Australian railways."

A member of the Assembly is not given a pass over the whole of the Australian railways. After a member has served a period of seven years he is entitled to a pass over the Queensland railways.

The article further states—

"It should be remembered that the Moore Government, in its legislation, withdrew their rights only from those former members of the Legislative Council who were appointed by Labour Governments and who had voted for the abolition of the Council."

Certain conditions are laid down when these passes are given.

As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the Labour Government put wreckers into the Legislative Council to wreck it after the people had declared by a majority of 66,000 at a referendum that the Legislative Council was not to be interfered with. With the Leader of the Opposition, I say that the abolition of the Legislative Council has been most detrimental, financially and in other ways, to Queensland, and I wish it were possible to have it reinstated to-morrow. If my vote would do it hon. members can rest assured that it would do it. They know where I stand. (Government interjections.)

I uphold the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition this morning that men were put into that Chamber for a certain specific purpose—to eliminate it. They were to smash the Constitution that we have sworn to uphold. Yet the Government desire that they shall be given back their gold railway passes and that they shall be recompensed for what they did—these wreckers.

During the speech of the hon. member for Rockhampton the hon. member for Isis asked, "How do you account for the fact that in four years you have not reinstated them?" If a thing is right, it is right; if it is wrong, it is wrong. The Government have been nearly four years in office before restoring these privileges to these men. Why? The excuse given by the hon. member for Rockhampton is ridiculous and childish. He answered, "Because we had matters of greater importance that required attention." That might go down with unintelligent men, but not with members of the Opposition and the public. Unhesitatingly I say that the attitude of the Government this morning is on a par with other things that have been done. At the tail end of the session they bring forward this proposal, and the Attorney-General waxes enthusiastic about the injustice that is being done to these gentlemen—these wonderful and brainy men. I do not say they have not got brains. I know some of these men are very estimable gentlemen, but I object to any man's being made a tool of. These men were made tools of. They were told, "It is part of our policy to abolish the Upper House. You go in and do it." Of course the question was asked, "What are we going to get out of it?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You know that is unfair.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is not unfair. Metaphorically speaking, it was done. No doubt

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

they were told, "You will get a pass over the railways for life and other concessions."

We were told this morning by the Attorney-General of a scheme that had been put forward by the Moore Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Do you deny it?

Mr. MAXWELL: The Leader of the Opposition has admitted it. So far as the party is concerned they never considered or discussed it. I know several men who have never read it. As a matter of fact, I have never read it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A crisis was nearly reached.

Mr. MAXWELL: Don't be silly! The hon. gentleman is a man of the world, and has sense. I do not want him to get into an idiotic position. After all, in our political life we should play the game, irrespective of our political colour, but the game is not being played this morning. So far as the return of the gold passes is concerned we know it is all over bar the cheering, and the Government will soon be able to say to the recipients, "Look what we did for you. We gave you back your passes, boys. We, at any rate, have kept our word to you. You did good work because you eliminated the Legislative Council. Never mind if you did something with which the people did not agree."

The hon. the Attorney-General has pointed out that the abolition of the Legislative Council is one of the first planks of the Labour platform. So was the referendum! I ask hon. members on the Government side, "Did they take a referendum on the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council?" They did, and what was the result? A majority of 66,000 against it. The cause of the great war was the tearing up of a scrap of paper. Hon. members opposite tore up a scrap of paper. (Government laughter.) They thought it was worth nothing. It is all very well for them to cheer to-day, but before the end of the third session of this Parliament they will be like the little boy going through the cemetery at midnight—whistling to keep up their pluck. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe that the only means of obtaining the salvation of our country is by re-establishing the Upper House.

I should like to give a little advice to the Attorney-General. I advise him not to pay attention to the tattle we hear outside about what has taken place in caucus, because, as the Irishman once said, "there is not a word of truth in half the lies that are told." It is interesting to note that the Minister was extraordinarily enthusiastic about this measure this morning.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: Any sensible person would be.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hon. members with our long experience of the Minister's demeanour in this Chamber know that he does not exhibit such enthusiasm when introducing other Bills. I believe that his sentiments about this Bill are similar to those that have been expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and myself this morning. He said he believed in the sanctity of contracts, but I have shown this morning that that is mere twaddle and hon. members on the Government side who support this Bill do so for dishonest reasons.

[Mr. Maxwell.]

Mr. McLEAN (*Bundaberg*) [11.43 a.m.]: The hon. member for Toowong lashed himself into a fury, like a whale in shallow water. He declared that the purpose of this Bill is to compensate wreckers of the Legislative Council, and asserted that passes were given to ex-members of the Legislative Council in recognition of the services they had rendered in abolishing that House, and that they were only for the term of their appointment. The question of the term was the basis of the argument he set out to put forward, but in his usual vindictive, splenetic way, he stated that the persons to whom these privileges are to be accorded were wreckers, and not worthy of compensation.

Mr. BRAND: Are you not politically vindictive?

Mr. McLEAN: I am, and I am glad to know that the Labour Party to-day have backbone enough to give spoils to the victors. I also give credit to the Moore Government for having backbone enough to bestow favours upon their supporters. I have no hesitation, as a Labour representative, in supporting those who support me and my movement.

When speaking on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1929, No. 2, the present Secretary for Public Lands, as reported on page 2082 of the "Hansard" for that year, said:—

"Section 3 of 'A Bill to Amend the Constitution of Queensland by Abolishing the Legislative Council,' provided this among other things:—

"... that the existing members of the Legislative Council shall, during life or for such period of time as is fixed in such notification, retain and continue to be entitled to exercise the privilege of a free pass upon the railways of the State and the use of the Parliamentary Library, and such other existing privileges..."

Since that Bill was passed it is our obligation to pass this Bill. The privilege was taken away by the Moore Government in a vindictive spirit. One hon. member designated it as so paltry, so miserable and mean that it resembled the action of an able-bodied man stealing 6d. from a child who was going to the butcher's shop to purchase meat. That is a very apt description of what was done, and I contend that this Assembly is doing the right thing in restoring the right.

We have heard a great deal to the effect that this privilege was a bribe to the members concerned to abolish the Legislative Council. Allow me to remind hon. members of the fact that the prevailing opinion in this democratic country—even amongst supporters of the Opposition—is that the cost of legislation is too high. One of the most efficient acts to reduce that cost was the abolition of the Legislative Council by the Labour Party. It was an expression of commonsense and democracy. Supporters of the Country-Nationalist Party were allowed to retain their passes. The hon. member for Toowong endeavoured to defend that discrimination by saying that the Labour men did not have as long a membership as the former. That excuse is so absurd, so mean and contemptible to any man who will analyse it, as to indicate that only vicious discrimination could have brought it about.

I am pleased to know that the Labour movement has enough courage to restore the just rights of those men.

Some of the ex-members who will receive these passes cannot be regarded as genuine supporters of Labour. Since their retirement from the Legislative Council, some of them have not proven themselves to be loyally behind Labour—a fact that is evidence enough that the privilege is not being restored because the recipients are Labour men. The sole intention is to restore to those men the justice that was denied to them by the vicious Government then in power.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [11.49 a.m.]: The hon. member for Rockhampton claimed that the question involved in this proposal was that of justice or injustice. I am going to argue that the question at issue is whether the members nominated to the Legislative Council gave service in exchange for the privileges accorded to them by the Government of the day. If hon. members opposite can show to the satisfaction of this Committee that the ex-members of the Legislative Council gave services worthy of such privileges, I will concede that they are entitled to them.

No one can properly draw a distinction between the services of what are known as Nationalist or Liberal members and the services of Labour members of the Legislative Council. The Nationalists or Liberal members had been members of that body for many years before it was abolished, and they had qualified for their passes in accordance with the same rule that applies to members of the Legislative Assembly, that they must have served for seven years or three Parliaments. I have nothing against the individual ex-Labour members, but they were appointed for the express purpose of ending the life of the Legislative Council, and consequently had only a short period of service. They had not qualified for these privileges in accordance with the rule that applies to every hon. member of this Assembly; therefore, they were receiving something to which they were not entitled. That is the basis of my opposition to the Bill.

To indicate the services that they rendered, I propose to quote from a speech delivered in this Assembly on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1929, No. 2, by Mr. Swayne, ex-member for Mirani, which is to be found at page 2097 of "Hansard" for that year. He said:—

"I find that in 1919 Mr. A. Skirving was appointed to the Legislative Council, and during his term in the Council he spoke five times. He stands out on his own in that respect. Then we had Mr. W. P. Colborne, who spoke twice; Mr. J. F. Donovan, who spoke once; Mr. W. J. Dunstan and Mr. W. F. Finlayson, who did not speak at all."

Mr. A. J. Jones interjected, "Mr. Finlayson did speak." Mr. Swayne further said—

"Then we had Mr. J. S. Hanlon, who spoke twice, one occasion being in reply to congratulations on his appointment; Mr. E. J. Hanson, who did not speak once."

(Laughter.) I will say this in favour of our Chairman of Committees, that he has per-

formed his duties with credit and with great capacity while he has been a member of this Chamber.

"Mr. T. L. Jones, who spoke several times; Mr. G. Lawson, who spoke once; and Mr. J. S. Collings, who spoke six times. Of the members who were appointed in 1920 by the late Government, Mr. H. G. McPhail spoke on six occasions; Mr. R. J. Mulvey did not speak at all, neither did Mr. J. G. Smith or Mr. G. H. Thompson, while Mr. Kilpatrick spoke twice. By 1922 they became extinct. It will, therefore, be seen that a large number of the men whom this Bill will affect and who were granted life passes over our railways, were absolute dummies."

I claim that these men did not give value to the people of Queensland for the privilege of life passes over the Queensland railways, and I do not think that any reasonable member of this Assembly could, in his own heart, say otherwise.

The Attorney-General declared that fourteen ex-members of the Legislative Council were involved in this Bill. Are all these fourteen men to be presented with a life pass over the Queensland railways at a cost of £50 a year each. If so the taxpayers of Queensland will have to find £700 a year for the purpose.

Mr. WATERS: That is not a fact. It will not cost £50 a year for each pass. Don't be ridiculous.

Mr. MAHER: This is the figure used by the Leader of the Opposition, as Premier of the day, when introducing the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1929, No. 2.

Mr. WATERS: Do you accept him as an authority?

Mr. MAHER: I have no evidence that the hon. member is an authority. It is safe to say that the Commissioner for Railways will charge the value of each life gold pass against the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I think it is £75 for each pass.

Mr. POWER: What will it cost Queensland?

Mr. MAHER: The Treasurer will levy on the taxpayers for that sum.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Is it not only a transfer of the vote?

Mr. MAHER: It is a direct levy on the people of the State.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is only a cross entry.

Mr. MAHER: It is not. The Commissioner for Railways debits the Chief Secretary's Department and the Chief Secretary in turn provides that amount on his Estimates.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You must not forget that there is a credit in the Railway Department of an equal amount.

Mr. MAHER: The Minister is astray: there is no credit in the Railway Department. The value of the pass is a direct impost on the Estimates and the taxation receipts of the State. If each ex-member of the Legislative Council involved in this Bill has an expectation of life of twenty years, this Bill will cost the taxpayers £14,000. That is a generous reward for a brief service to the people—and, as the ex-member for Mirani indicated, many of

*Mr. Maher.]*

these members only spoke once or twice, others five or six times, and some not at all. They merely adorned the seats of the Legislative Council and gave no service whatsoever to the people of Queensland. Yet this Government are prepared to make these fourteen men a present of £50 a year for life in the shape of a gold pass on the Queensland railways!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Were you in favour of the continuance of the Upper House?

Mr. MAHER: I most certainly was. The worst day's work the Labour Party did for Queensland—and a great deal of what it has done has been detrimental to this State—was the abolition of the second Chamber. It had the effect of not only causing capital to leave the State but also of preventing capital from coming into it and thus creating a great amount of unemployment. It has caused Queensland to retrogress. Everyone knows the position our secondary industries are in. They have gone back since that time. But that is beside the point. The point is whether it is right or wrong to restore these ex-members of the Legislative Council those passes that were taken from them—quite rightly—by the Moore Government under the Act of 1929. There is a very strong feeling outside Parliament in opposition to the granting of gold passes even to ex-members of the Legislative Assembly after they have given the State seven years' service. In many instances such men have given a lifetime of service to the people, but I venture to say if this Government submitted a question to the electors as to whether the privilege of a free gold pass should be extended to ex-members of the Legislative Assembly after they have completed seven years' service the proposal would be turned down by 95 per cent. of the people. Is it not tempting the fates to flout the people's will in this respect by introducing a measure of this nature to confer privileges on people who have not earned them? Ex-members of the Legislative Assembly, who have worked in the interests of the people for a period extending up to twenty-five years—in some cases more—and who on the whole have done their best for their country have some claim to a life pass, but there is no justification for the granting of passes to those individuals indicated by this measure. We are going to ask the people, who are opposed to the principle of gold passes altogether, to approve of the granting of privileges to men who have done nothing whatever in the interests of the people to earn those privileges.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is a libel.

Mr. MAHER: It is not a libel; it is the truth. Men who were appointed to the Legislative Council for a year or so with a definite mandate to abolish the Chamber and who have not served the people of Queensland by useful contribution to the debates in that Chamber are to be given a privilege, whereas many men who served for six and a-half years in this Assembly are not entitled to it. There are men in our community who have done unselfish and self-sacrificing work for the people, and whose achievements were immeasurably superior to anything that any member of this Assembly might do during ten years or more, yet their services are not recognised by the granting of a gold

pass. What of the returned soldier, the man who went overseas and risked his life in battle in order to preserve our liberties—which many members of this Assembly hold so light? There is no gold pass for him. Surely if anybody is entitled to a gold pass it is those men, many of them battle-scarred and broken in health. If there is largesse available, why give it to members of the Council who had a few months' service? Surely, the returned soldier, who has risked his life so that this country might live, is more entitled to it! I would cheerfully subscribe to that principle on the ground that he has done something—something outstanding for the good of his race. But—nothing for him! When he comes along to the Labour Party he does not even get the hearing he is entitled to.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: When you were framing your vindictive amendment of the Constitution to abolish these passes why did you give two ex-Ministers who served for three years gold passes over the whole of the Australian railways?

Mr. MAHER: We did not give them to them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You could have excluded them.

Mr. MAHER: We did not give these two passes to the two ex-Ministers. It was political fortune that these two men came into Parliament without experience and served as Cabinet Ministers for three years and so became entitled to that privilege. They were just lucky. At any rate they had given three years of their time as Cabinet Ministers and had usefully served the people of this State in their respective positions. This measure cannot be justified.

It is extraordinary that although the present Government have been in power for four years this measure has only now been introduced. It appears to me that there was some discord among the Government Party of the last Parliament over this proposal. It is certain that the interests involved would bring pressure to bear on the Government during the last parliamentary term to have these passes restored, and the fact that it was not done lends force to the view that the members of the Labour Party in the previous Parliament were not favourable to it, and perhaps it has been carried on this occasion by a very narrow majority.

I am definitely opposed to the principle involved in this Bill. It is an outrage on justice that these men can get these special privileges whilst many other deserving citizens of Queensland are denied them. It is flouting public opinion, which is definitely hostile to the gold-pass principle altogether, and when it favours only a few it is absolutely unjust.

Mr. WATERS (*Kelvin Grove*) [12.7 p.m.]: I am in favour of the Bill. It is only a measure of justice to restore to these people certain privileges that were filched from them by men of very narrow vision. The action of the Moore Government was one of the most mean and contemptible actions of which any Government could be accused. It could only come from men of stunted mentality and from a party that put a political confidence trick over the people at the election in 1929, when it said that it would provide £2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs for the citizens of this State. In order to cover

[*Mr. Maher.*]

up their misdemeanours they threw a smoke-screen over their track. They resorted to many devices. They brought about the Mungana inquiry. They passed an Act to make Labour men feel that they were getting something to which they were not entitled. Strangely enough, they did not overlook their political friends when this measure was being passed. Every Nationalist supporter in the Legislative Council had his gold pass secured to him. That alone justifies the assumption of the Labour Party that the action of the Moore Government was purely one of political vindictiveness and a calculated blow at the Labour members of the Legislative Council. Hon. members opposite cannot deny that the Moore Government extended the life of their Ministry by one month in order to qualify the members of the Cabinet for a life pass over the Australian railways. A special meeting of the Cabinet was held, and in order to secure the advantage of gold life passes the State elections were postponed for that period.

It is rather hypocritical for hon. members opposite to endeavour to besmirch the character of Labour men and suggest that we have been forced into this course of action. Personally, I should have liked to see this Bill passed in the first session of the last Parliament. The restoration of these privileges can be upheld as an act of natural justice, and if they are being restored late, it is a case of "Better late than never." The gentlemen who will receive the privilege are entitled to them.

When the Parliament of New South Wales had before it the abolition of the old Legislative Council in that State, it made provision for the granting of certain passes for a period of years. It did not take away those privileges covertly overnight, as the Moore Government did.

The hon. member for West Moreton sought to justify the actions of the Moore Government by stating that Tory members of the Legislative Council obtained passes because they had served the State for seven years. There is no analogy between the Council and the Assembly. The Legislative Council was a House to which a man was appointed for life, and a member of it had a definite contract that he would be a Legislative Councillor till he died.

The hon. member quoted an extract from the speech of the ex-member for Mirani, in which the latter detailed the numbers of the speeches delivered by Labour members of the Legislative Council during the years 1919 to 1922. I invite hon. members to read the volumes of "Hansard" for 1917. In that year, of a total of forty members of the Legislative Council, only about two of whom were Labour men—twenty members of the Opposition party did not speak at all, and if the records of "Hansard" are studied from that time until the abolition of the Council it will be seen that Tory members seldom spoke. Most of them had to be wheeled to Parliament in chairs. They hardly ever attended the House. Frequently, they did not have enough in attendance to form a quorum. It was not until Labour men were in the majority in the Legislative Council that that House was able to do its work in a satisfactory manner.

The hon. member for West Moreton also suggested that we should have a referendum

on this matter. On a conservative estimate, I should say that a referendum would mean an expenditure of something like £20,000. The hon. member for Aubigny estimates the value of these passes to be £50 a year. I have not obtained a value of more than £20 from my pass during the four years in which I have been a member of Parliament. It can be said with safety that £20 would be the maximum obtained annually from a pass by the average member of Parliament, no matter what district he represents—greater value cannot be had because members have not the financial resources to enable them to travel—and as only fourteen persons are affected by this Bill, the suggestion for a referendum is ridiculous. Estimating the passes to be worth £20 a year, the aggregate annual expenditure involved would be £280, so that it would be seventy years before the expenditure on these passes would equal the £20,000 that would be involved in a referendum.

Two members of the Cabinet of the Moore Government were Messrs. Macgroarty and Atherton. They served three years in this Parliament, and during that time did not distinguish themselves in any way. Hon. members talk about men who are forced into Parliament to do a certain job. A political whirlwind swept in Messrs. Atherton and Macgroarty, and in consequence those gentlemen are now entitled to a pass over Australian railways for the rest of their lives. Yet hon. members opposite have the effrontery to talk of granting privileges to Labour men! If they held firmly to the principle that passes and concessions should not be granted, the Moore Government as a matter of honour should have gone to the people on the 11th May, 1932, when they were due to do so. They extended their term of office deliberately and definitely to get the benefit of those passes, and I challenge hon. members opposite to deny the truth of that statement. There could have been no other reason for their action than to get the Australian pass.

The hon. member for West Moreton advanced the suggestion that if we are distributing largesse, we should give it to returned soldiers and sailors and others who contributed to the defence of our country during the war. That is a very interesting contention, coming as it does from members of a Government that cut down pensions and allowances of the widows of returned soldiers—women whose husbands went to the war and subsequently died through causes that would not entitle them to a war pension. Such people have the effrontery to criticise our action in restoring these passes, which is so much humbug, cant, and hypocrisy.

Mr. MOORE: You have nothing to think with. What are you talking about?

Mr. WATERS: Mr. Hanson, the hon. member for Aubigny has never distinguished himself at any time as a man of thought or action. He is a man with a putty mind, and other people have made up his mind for him when the need arose. Any public servant of standing who had any dealings with the hon. gentleman can tell you that he was the most hopeless person who ever graced the high office of Premier of this State—one of the most deplorable types that Queensland has ever known, possibly worse than Joe Lyons, who has the audacity

*Mr. Waters.* }

this morning to take up the cry of political morality and shudder with horror at this dastardly action. If the hon. member for Aubigny examined his political conscience carefully he would find that one of the worst of the exhibitions of self-interest that characterised his regime was the extension of the life of Parliament by a month in order to gain for himself and his colleagues a pass on the Australian railways. That action alone destroys any argument that the Opposition could advance this morning.

Mr. MOORE: They did not grant me that. I was entitled to it before.

Mr. WATERS: His colleagues were not entitled to it in any case. Whether he wished to postpone the election or not, his colleagues decided that he was in favour of it, and with his co-operation extended the life of Parliament so that they could gain an advantage over the people of this State.

Mr. BRAND: That is not a true statement of fact.

Mr. MOORE: It is a deliberate lie, and you know it is a lie.

Mr. WATERS: It is a fact that cannot be controverted. The Opposition, when in power, extended the life of Parliament by a month in order to help themselves to the Treasury, and those two members of the party that were not entitled to passes on any consideration—Messrs. Atherton and Macgroarty—succeeded in obtaining them, with other members of the Ministry who would be entitled to passes over the State railways after seven years' service as members of Parliament.

Mr. MOORE: I was entitled to it, as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WATERS: You were not.

Mr. MOORE: I was.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not a Commonwealth pass.

Mr. MOORE: Of course I was.

Mr. WATERS: There were nine members of the Moore Ministry who pillaged and plundered the Treasury of this State in order to gain a political advantage for themselves, and they did it by extending the life of Parliament. They adopted a course of action that no one can deny had for its object the gaining for them of a position of self-interest, and they benefited considerably. On the admission of the Leader of the Opposition nine members of the Moore Cabinet helped themselves to £100 a year at the expense of the people of Queensland. What a lot of "Simon Pures"! Probably they will get up in this Chamber and continue to assert that their action in depriving ex-Labour members of railway passes was in keeping with political morality. The people of Queensland should know where they stand. They should be informed of the action they took and their record should be exposed at every possible opportunity. The people of Queensland should know just what they are. If I were to call them what they are I should be called upon to withdraw. Yesterday I referred to them as a lot of humbugs, but that expression is regarded as unparliamentary, and I am not allowed to use it. There is no doubt that they are guilty of the greatest amount of cant it is possible for a man to have, and

the people of Queensland should be made aware of it. Hon. members opposite should be exposed on every possible occasion as the "Simon Pures."

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [12.22 p.m.]: The suggestion by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove that the Moore Government extended the life of Parliament so that some of their Cabinet Ministers would be entitled to life passes over the Queensland railways is absolutely untrue. There was no necessity to do that to give the members of the Moore Cabinet these passes. In the first place seven members of the Cabinet were entitled to life passes over the Queensland railways because of their length of service. We were returned to power on 11th May, 1929. The Constitution provides that the life of Parliament may be prolonged for two months beyond three years. If we had gone to the country on 11th May, 1932, exactly three years would have elapsed since our return to power, and that would have entitled members of the Moore Cabinet to the passes.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: There was no need to extend the life of that Parliament. We could have gone to the country on 21st May, 1932. We did not cease to be Ministers of the Crown until about a fortnight after the elections in that year, so that there was no need to extend the life of Parliament for a month so that some of the Ministers could qualify for life passes, as was suggested by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove. A Cabinet Minister would have been entitled to a life pass after three years. Every member of the Moore Cabinet, with the exception of two, was entitled to life passes over the Queensland railways, so that there was really no need to extend the life of Parliament. The matter of extending the life of Parliament for this purpose was never discussed at any Cabinet meeting that I attended. The question of fixing the polling date was left entirely with the Premier. I had nothing to do with it, as a Cabinet Minister. In fact, I did not know the exact date until it was announced by the Premier.

The hon. member for Rockhampton said he was pleased to find the Government possessed of enough courage to introduce this measure. That is tantamount to an admission that the Government that held office in the preceding three years had not. Evidently the matter had been brought up in caucus. There is no doubt that caucus endeavoured to bring pressure to bear on the previous Government, and that the majority of the party decided not to introduce a Bill of this description. That shows that the last Government did not consider that these ex-members of the Legislative Council were entitled to a free pass. The scene has changed. There has been an election and a considerable number of new members have come in. It is evident that they are of sufficient strength to cause this Bill to be introduced.

I oppose this measure because I do not think the ex-members of the Legislative Council who were deprived of their passes were entitled to them. They had served only a few months in the Legislative Council. They were sufficiently paid by reason of the fact that they had the free use of the Queensland railways for a period of seven years before being deprived of the privilege.

[*Mr. Waters.*]

Considering that these men had served a few months only in the Legislative Council they were well treated.

I will always support the rule that a man who has served this State in Parliament for seven years or three Parliaments, as laid down in our Constitution, is entitled to a free pass for life over the Queensland railways. I will always vote in favour of that privilege, irrespective of what people say. If a man has given that service to the people he is entitled to it. I have no objection to giving ex-members of the Legislative Council who were not paid for their services, the right to a free pass, provided they serve the required time, but those who were appointed by the Labour Government for the sole object of voting for its abolition only served a few months, and were not entitled to a pass for such services.

Some hon. members have contended that the value of the pass is only a book-keeping entry, and therefore does not matter, because the people do not pay for it. The suggestion is ridiculous. When the Moore Government came into office I, as Secretary for Railways, reviewed all the free passes that had been issued by previous Governments. I was surprised to learn of the number of people who had been granted life passes on our railways. I did not think it right that the Queensland railways should be called upon to carry those people round Queensland free of cost. I took the subject up with Cabinet, and at my suggestion Cabinet agreed that a certain value should be placed on those passes, and that a certain sum should be paid from consolidated revenue to the Railway Department for those privileges. Speaking from memory, the amount was somewhere in the vicinity of £12,000. In support of my statement I would refer hon. members to the Estimates for 1935-36, which have just been passed. The Estimates for the Legislative Assembly contain the following item:—

“Railway passes to members and ex-members of Parliament and their relatives, £9,432.”

The amount last year for the same purpose was £9,350. That is proof positive that the amount involved in these passes is budgeted for and passed by the Legislative Assembly. It is paid from consolidated revenue to the Railway Department. It is all very well for hon. members to say that this item is only a book entry or a cross entry. The Railway Department is not indebted to the Chief Secretary's Department or any other department. At one time all Under Secretaries had gold passes. The railways carried them free until I made that alteration.

As a result of that alteration the Railway Department receives a certain payment in respect of every free pass held by a member of Parliament or Government official. Unless the practice has been altered since the present Government assumed control, the Railway Department gets a certain amount for all passes that are used, except those of its own employees.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: How will that affect the revenue as a whole?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The point is that the money is coming out of consolidated revenue. The Railway Department is

not losing one shilling in revenue as a result of the gold passes, and will not lose in respect of any passes to be issued if the system instituted when I was Minister still operates. Different values are placed on passes held by different people. A pass held by an Under Secretary is valued by the Railway Department at £50, and a pass held by a member of Parliament at £75 a year. The respective departments pay the Railway Department for the passes held by their officials. For instance, the Home Secretary's Department may pay £1,000 a year in respect of passes.

Mr. POWER: That improves the revenue of the Railway Department.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Yes, and it is entitled to it.

The hon. member for Bundaberg cold-bloodedly admitted he believed in the principle of spoils to the victors. I think that is a frightful admission to make. If that policy were carried out universally it would mean that if there was a change of Government and we discovered that certain Under Secretaries and other officials had Labour leanings we would adopt the American principle of sacking them.

Mr. KANE: You adopted it.

At 12.35 p.m.,

Mr. KING (*Maree*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: We did not. The only man I know of that was victimised was my private secretary, Mr. Low. He was in a highly classified position, and when the Labour Government got into power they victimised him by putting him in an unclassified position because he had been my private secretary.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the resolution under discussion.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I was replying to the statement made by the hon. member for Bundaberg.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not entitled to reply. He must confine himself to the resolution.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: On principle, these passes should not be granted. I am solely influenced by the small amount of the service these men gave to the people of the State. There has always been an understanding that members must serve a certain period, and all the Moore Government did was to place the Legislative Council members on a similar basis to members of the Legislative Assembly. If these men are entitled to the restoration of these privileges, it can be justly said that men who lose their seats in Parliament because the electorates they represent have been wiped out are also entitled to them. In the exigencies of government the boundaries of electorates are altered and some are abolished. The men who have represented those electorates may have held their seats for from three to six years. They have served their country for that period, but under the Constitution they are not entitled to any privileges. On the abolition of the Legislative Council, men who had sat in that Chamber for only a few months were given privileges to which they were not entitled. Of

*Mr. Morgan.]*

course, if a definite promise was made to them that they would get passes if they supported the abolition of the Legislative Council, the promise had to be honoured. But even if a promise is made by a Government, that is no reason why a subsequent Government should be bound by it. If the measure before the Chamber were designed to secure privileges to persons who had given long service to the State as members of Parliament, I would not object to it. A man who has given fifteen or twenty years of his life to the State in Parliament is entitled to certain privileges. He should not be thrown out of Parliament without something in return for his long service. I should have been better off financially had I never come into this House, and had I my life to live over again I would not enter politics or public life. A man who eschews politics and devotes his energies to his business is, in the end, much better off financially. The men who will receive these benefits are men whom I admire and respect; but it is not a matter of personal feelings; it is one of principle. Did the proposed recipients serve the State long enough to entitle them to these concessions? I say they did not. Had they served for seven years they would be entitled to some consideration, but not after a very short period of public service.

Mr. POWER (*Baroona*) [12.39 p.m.]: This Bill can be correctly called "A Bill to repeal the Moore Repudiation Act of 1929 with regard to appointees to the Legislative Council of Queensland." After having victimised every person in the public service who was known as a Labour supporter, the Moore Government sought fresh fields and pastures new and introduced legislation taking away the rights of men appointed to the Legislative Council by a Labour Government. It is well known that those men were appointed for life, and as a result of the decision of the Labour Government to abolish that House provision was made to give them life passes on the railways, with certain other concessions that were enjoyed by every other ex-member of the Legislative Council.

The hon. member for Toowong rose in a frenzy this morning, threw his arms about, and castigated the Government for desiring to restore the privileges that were wrongly taken away. We know that the policy of the Moore Government was to victimise Labour supporters at every possible opportunity, and I am confident that if they ever again adorn the Treasury bench of the State that policy will be continued.

The hon. member for West Moreton said that certain members of the Legislative Council did not speak in that Chamber. Not only did many members appointed by anti-Labour Governments not speak; they also did not attend meetings of the Council. We know that many were too old and infirm to attend to the business of the Government of the day. Visitors to the Legislative Council could see those men creeping into corners because of their old age. Many of the appointees of anti-Labour Governments to the Legislative Council were political rejects, who were appointed for the purpose of looking after vested interests—and vested interests alone.

I offer no apology for supporting this measure. It should have been introduced long ago, but the hon. member for Rockhampton has explained the reason for the

delay. The men affected by this Bill have rendered services to Queensland that the people of the State will never forget, and, instead of receiving passes on the Queensland railways only, they should receive them over the whole of the railways of the Commonwealth.

The Legislative Council existed for the purpose of blocking the desires of the people. The elected representatives of the people passed legislation, which was later submitted to the Legislative Council, and those men who were rejected by the electors said that such enactments could not be put into effect. The actions of the men who abolished the Legislative Council will go down in the annals of Queensland history, and if I had my way I would give them passes over the whole railway system of Australia.

The hon. member for West Moreton said that he would give passes to the returned soldiers, who rendered great service to their country on the other side of the world. I appreciate the services rendered by those soldiers, but the hon. member for West Moreton is not sincere. The Government of which he was a member refused to grant intermittent relief work to returned soldiers when that scheme was first introduced, if the latter were receiving pensions for the services they rendered on the battlefields of France and other parts of the world.

The same hon. member also stated that the retention of the Upper House would have been of benefit to Queensland, because its abolition has adversely affected the financial position of the State. It might be of interest to the hon. member to know that bank deposits in Brisbane alone increased in 1935 by £30,000,000. One has only to read the balance-sheets of the various firms in Queensland to see that the State to-day is in a prosperous condition. I say without hesitation that if the Legislative Council had not been abolished Queensland would be in a state of chaos.

I do not intend to go further in the matter, as I rose only to say that I am entirely in accord with the Bill, and I believe that the people who rendered service to Queensland by abolishing the Upper Chamber should have returned to them what was taken away by a vicious Government.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [12.46 p.m.]: This measure takes us back to 1921, when the Legislative Assembly passed a measure that had for its object the abolition of the Legislative Council. We remember that on that occasion in this House thirty-six members sat behind the Government of the day, and thirty-five in opposition, with an independent Speaker. At the 1920 elections the Government were returned with a minority of votes of the people of Queensland. Just prior to that they had appealed to the country to abolish the Upper House by means of the constitutional method of a referendum, and the people threw out the proposal by a majority of 66,000 votes. That in itself was sufficient to indicate to the Government of the day that the abolition of the Legislative Council was not desired. It indicated that the people of Queensland still believed in British tradition and that they were prepared to recognise the British Parliament as their model of Government. When the Government abolished the Legislative Council, they had a minority of the electors of Queensland

[Mr. Morgan.]

behind them, yet quite a number of men were appointed to the Council by that Government for the purpose of abolishing it.

It had been a recognised custom that every member of Parliament, whether of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council, was entitled to certain privileges after serving in three Parliaments or for seven years in all. Those privileges include a railway pass and the right to the use of the Parliamentary Library. I submit that the period of seven years was specified to include members of the Legislative Council. As has been pointed out, they were appointed for life. If a Legislative Councillor resigned before he had served seven years in this Parliament he was not entitled to those privileges. The argument advanced by members on this side of the Committee is that we should not declare that the service of a Legislative Councillor is superior to that of a member of the Legislative Assembly. If any Chamber is the deliberative one, it is the Legislative Assembly, and if there is any need to recognise the superiority of one over the other, the Assembly should have the preference. The arguments of hon. members on the Government side this morning would indicate that service in the Legislative Council was superior and entitled members of the Council to privileges greater than those of members of the Legislative Assembly. The Leader of the Opposition has stated quite definitely that his 1929 legislation was brought in for the purpose of putting both on the same basis.

Mr. JESSON: With the intention of getting his own back.

Mr. BRAND: Not of getting his own back, but of recognising that service in either of the Houses of Parliament was of equal value, and that in consequence the privileges given for service in each should be equal. No names are mentioned in the Act. It definitely states that these privileges were not to be enjoyed by any member of the Queensland Parliament until he had served the recognised period of seven years. There was nothing wrong or mean in that.

It has been stated by hon. members opposite that the members concerned agreed to vote for the abolition of the Upper House without reward, that they did it to uphold the principles of the Labour Party. If hon. members opposite can show that a demand was made by these men for the privileges before they were appointed to the Upper House, then they have some claim in this respect. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove said that they were appointed for life, which is true, but they did not remain there for the specified period of seven years or longer so as to qualify for the privileges. The hon. member has submitted the only argument from the other side in favour of the Bill. We must remember that the men concerned voted themselves out of office and thereby deprived themselves of the privileges. There was a rumour current in the parliamentary lobbies at the time that they had made a demand for the privileges before they would agree to abolish the Legislative Council. The Minister is not prepared to say that that is correct and therefore there is no argument in favour of their contention that the privileges should be restored to them.

The justice of the 1929 Act is proved by the inaction of the present Government, who failed for four years to return the privileges. They contend that the 1929 Act amounted to victimisation and persecution, but why have they remained inactive for four years? The hon. member for Rockhampton explained that it was because more urgent business had to be dealt with, thereby implying that the Bill is not an urgent one and should not occupy the time of this Chamber until all other matters have been disposed of. His argument is unsound. We have not been overworked during the past four years and there has been ample time to bring forward this legislation. I contend that unless it can be shown that the men concerned made a demand for these privileges before they would take certain action to carry out Government policy, we should not place them in a different category from members of the Legislative Assembly, who have to serve for seven years or longer before they are entitled to railway passes. That is the paramount issue. Hon. members opposite should recognise that in abolishing the Upper House they have recognised the Legislative Assembly as the all-important body and consequently we should not pass legislation that implies that the ex-members of the Legislative Council are entitled to prior consideration.

It is just as well to say this morning that the real reason behind this legislation is to provide free railway passes, and not so much the privileges of the library and refreshment-room, to help Labour organisers and supporters throughout the State. It would be unnatural if this side of the Committee did not oppose the proposal. We say definitely that no person should have the right to propagate the political principles of his party among the people of the State with the aid of Government money. If they wish to do so then they must use their own money. A free railway pass over the Queensland railways costs money, and if these men are granted free railway passes they will be relieved of certain expenditure that they, themselves, now meet, and pass it on to the Treasury. That is the real reason for the granting of this privilege, and not—as hon. members opposite will tell their supporters outside—because they say it is the right and just thing to do.

We say that the action of these men in 1921 was wrong, that they abrogated the privileges of the people of Queensland. The Government of the day did not have the confidence of the majority of the electors, although they had a majority of representatives in this Parliament. Nevertheless they appointed these men to the Legislative Council who, after two years' service, voted themselves out of Parliament. Therefore, they are not entitled to the privilege which is enjoyed by Parliamentarians under the well-known rule.

Hon. members opposite have spoken a great deal of what they term the viciousness of the legislation passed in 1929. Almost every hon. member opposite said that it was the result of a vicious campaign launched by the Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition. I make bold to say that there was no viciousness in the Premier of 1929-32. No one can charge Arthur Moore with any viciousness. Rather are hon. members opposite likely to charge him with not doing those things for his supporters that the Labour

Mr. Brand.]

Government do for theirs. The fact of the matter is, and it was recognised at the time this legislation was passed through the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council, that it was unjustified. The Leader of the Opposition and members of his party, who at the time numbered thirty-five out of seventy-two members in this Chamber, solemnly voted against the giving of this privilege to members of the Legislative Council who had not served a full period of seven years. Having opposed the proposal then, we claim that we are consistent in opposing it now.

At 2 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): The Government have accused the Opposition of repudiation. There was no reason why we should have kept a promise made by the Labour Government to give free passes to these members of the Upper House. The reason why they got the passes is quite plain. These gentlemen were put into the Upper House with instructions to abolish it, and when they got there they refused to vote for its abolition unless they got a promise of a gold pass for each member. They held the Government up; they had to be paid their price. (Government interruption.) The Labour Government were forced to pay these men a price in the form of free passes because they would not keep their promise unless they got them. There was no reason why the next Government, who did not believe in the abolition of the Upper House, should keep that bargain. Because these people were able to extract a promise of free passes from the Labour Government is no reason why the Moore Government should honour it. How can anyone justify the extraction of a promise from any Government?

Mr. WATERS: You believe in repudiation.

Mr. DEACON: That was not repudiation. These people exacted a promise of a certain privilege before they would vote for the abolition of the Upper House.

Mr. BEDFORD: That is false.

Mr. DEACON: It has been admitted.

Mr. BEDFORD: That is false; I was one of them.

Mr. DEACON: I am sorry to have drawn the fire of the hon. member for Warrego. If the hon. member took advantage of the position I am not blaming him for it; but why should the next Government, who were totally opposed to the abolition of the Upper House, be expected to honour that pledge? We wiped out the passes to these gentlemen, and we take credit for doing so, and when we get into power next time we will do the same thing again.

Mr. POWER: You are a super-optimist.

Mr. DEACON: How do you know? In 1929 the Government were sure of victory. Young members should guard against the belief that any Government are secure for life.

Many people in the Government service lost privileges during the period of depression, but this privilege was not taken away on account of the depression; it was taken away because it was never justified. Many other Government servants that have served the State faithfully have lost privileges, and they have not been returned. The officers

of this House had the privilege of a railway pass when they were on holidays once a year, and during the depression that privilege was taken away as a measure of economy, but not as a permanent thing. There would be some justification for the restoration of such a concession to employees of the service who have always enjoyed it. Under this Bill certain persons are to receive free railway passes for life for services that were never worth anything. They were appointed to the Upper House for one reason and one reason only—to vote for its extinction. That service is not worth the price that is being paid for it.

Mr. POWER: It was the best service ever rendered to the people of Queensland.

Mr. DEACON: I do not think much of any man who entered the Upper House on that condition (Government interjections), and held up the Government of the day.

Mr. WATERS: Now we know why you took the passes away.

Mr. DEACON: Why should we not? (Government interjections.) The people of Queensland would not be very much concerned if the hon. member for Kelvin Grove were not here.

Mr. WATERS: Possibly they would not care if you were not here.

Mr. DEACON: But, at the same time, what has that got to do with it. What has the hon. member's opinion of me or my opinion of him got to do with it? This is a public matter. Why should the people of Queensland be asked to pay the price of keeping a promise that was forced out of the Government of the day, simply because they were in such a position that they must give it in order to have the Upper House extinguished? And they were pledged to do that. This is a matter upon which those outside of this Chamber will hold only one opinion, and that is the opinion of the Opposition.

If the members of the present Government wish to keep a promise given by their predecessors they should do it with their own and not with public money. Up to the present the speeches from members on the Government benches have contained nothing but abuse of the Opposition. Hon. members on that side have not advanced one argument justifying the paying of this money.

Mr. WATERS interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEACON: All they did was to abuse the Opposition and to hurl insults at us for our work during our administration. That is entirely beside this question, and their arguments should be confined to the measure before the Committee.

Mr. WATERS: It would not suit your purpose, and that is why they don't matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEACON: It does not matter, and would not matter one iota. If the hon. member for Kelvin Grove could only see himself as we see him—

Mr. WATERS: Why did you extend the life of your Parliament?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Kelvin Grove should observe my call to order. If he does not I shall have to deal with him.

[*Mr. Brand.*]

Mr. DEACON: Hon. members opposite accused the Moore Government of prolonging the life of Parliament so that two members of the Ministry might get life passes, and used it as justification for what they are doing. If they take the trouble to make investigations they will see it was not possible to hold the elections at a certain time. A meeting of the Loan Council was called for April. (Government laughter.) The Premier and the Treasurer had to be there. (Government interjection.) Hon. members do not like being reminded of this fact. They have made so many excuses for their Ministers, who have run away to London and other places during recess and delayed the meeting of Parliament. Nevertheless, those are the facts—we could not hold the election. Of course, members of the then Opposition wanted us to do so when we were not prepared. They wanted to shorten the time at our disposal for the preparation of the case we were to put before the people.

Not one member on the Government side, from the Attorney-General down, has advanced any argument to justify this measure. Their speeches were nothing but abuse of the actions of the Moore Government. They justify this Bill to give life passes to their friends by abusing the Moore Government!

The HOME SECRETARY: You have your life pass in your pocket now, have you not?

Mr. DEACON: I have. I have earned it because I have been a member of the Legislative Assembly for fifteen years.

Mr. POWER: That is fifteen years too long.

Mr. DEACON: Have a "go" at putting me out. Have a "go" at it up on the Downs.

Mr. POWER: You are too old.

Mr. DEACON: The hon. member would be too old when he had finished the attempt. Hon. members who now possess passes received them under a long-established rule, and it would have been fair play to apply the same rule to members of the Upper House. If members of the Legislative Council had served a certain time in that House their passes would be justified, but the members concerned in this Bill were appointed for one purpose. The taxpayers of the State will be justified in saying they are being robbed of the money that is being used to pay for these railway passes. Hon. members on the Government side will hear a good deal about this action at the next election, and they will certainly find it very difficult to justify it.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [2.13 p.m.]: It is the principle rather than the money that concerns the Opposition. As I understand the circumstances surrounding the abolition of the Legislative Council, the idea was that it was of no benefit to the people, and that the Assembly should take full responsibility, as directly representing the people. The Council was looked upon as a nuisance, the abolition of which would also save the country a good deal of money. In addition, it was stated—and with a reasonable amount of truth—that the Assembly was quite capable of doing all that was necessary in the way of legislation for the people of Queensland. This important Legislative Assembly, then, agreed that a gold pass should only be granted to a member of

Parliament who had been a member for seven years or three Parliaments.

The hon. the Minister referred to this pass as a privilege. If, in his opinion, the Council were of no use to Queensland, why talk about privileges? The Minister also said that the Bill was to restore certain rights. What rights? Can men who are of no use or benefit to Queensland have any privilege or rights?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The men who abolished the House were of great service.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The Minister, when introducing the Bill, gave as the Moore Government's reason for doing away with the passes that this was the more important House of the two. Why should members of the old House, therefore, not be subject to the same conditions as the members of this House? That is the principle involved.

The Minister said that the Moore Government were mad drunk with power when they wiped out these privileges and rights. I claim there were no rights and no privileges at all, and that if there were, the members themselves wiped them out. When I realise that the restoration of these so-called privileges has been allowed to wait for four years, I ask immediately is it because this Government are mad drunk with the majority they got. How is it that in their previous three years of office no attempt was made to restore them? After listening to the speeches this morning we can easily see where the request and pressure came from.

It seems to me that class legislation of this kind is hampering the development of the country. It is said that the Act of 1929 was a blot on the statute-book. I venture to say that the blot—if it is a blot to deprive these people of these concessions—has been put there by themselves, for they wiped themselves out.

It is said that those people were appointed for life, and that the Moore Government broke a contract. Can we not logically argue that if people are given a life tenure in a legislative body, and deliberately wipe it out of existence, their rights and privileges should pass away with it.

Mr. WATERS: No.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Of course. If they wipe themselves out—themselves breaking the contract they entered into—there is no obligation on the rest of the community to continue a privilege that should die with that House. Hon. members talk about a blot. I say there is a blot on any man who is prepared to use that pass when he is not qualified in the customary manner to possess it. I am not complaining about the cost that will be involved, nor do I care who the individual members are, but I do object to the restoration of these privileges after four years of inaction on the part of the Government at a cost of increasing the expenditure of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [2.20 p.m.]: This is a matter of such great public interest that we should express our views on the question without becoming excited, as the Minister did when he worked himself up into a frenzy and exhausted his vocabulary by describing the action of the Moore Government as splenetic, vindictive, mean, miserable, and so on. Has this grievance smouldered in his breast all these years?

*Mr. Russell.]*

What did he do in the last Parliament from 1932 to 1935 when he and his colleagues had an ample opportunity of paying off this grudge? No reference was made to the matter in the policy speeches of the Premier in 1932 or 1935. It is apparent that throughout the last Parliament Cabinet was satisfied to let sleeping dogs lie. It was not keen about reviving this ancient grudge, but all of a sudden its members have awakened to new life. Have they been stirred up by the hotheads of the party and so have trotted out this grievance to-day? Hon. members opposite have made many extravagant statements concerning the Moore Government. I was surprised to hear the Home Secretary give utterance to such an absolutely stupid statement that the 1932 elections were postponed so that Ministers in the Moore Cabinet could claim their gold passes. It is the first that I have heard of it, and I say it is absolutely untrue. Let us analyse the situation. I was not in Parliament when this trouble arose, and therefore I can claim to give an unbiased opinion on the whole situation.

Mr. POWER: You are not capable of doing that.

Mr. RUSSELL: We shall see.

Mr. POWER: You are politically biased.

Mr. RUSSELL: The hon. member is one of the most warped men in the Chamber. He is cockeyed in his political outlook. I like to analyse both sides of every question. I do not deny that there is some truth in some of the assertions made by hon. members opposite. Some parts of their policy are quite good, whilst others are quite bad. Hon. members opposite say that nothing good can emanate from this side of the Chamber, and we have to listen to all the epithets levelled at us by hon. members opposite—that we are Tories and blood-suckers—but we possess the same humane principles as hon. members opposite. We are not going to be stampeded by all this balderdash. Let us analyse the situation.

It has been said that we penalised a number of Labour men when we took away these privileges. They were Labour men, simply because up to 1915—seven years before the abolition—no Labour Government had occupied the Treasury benches, and naturally the party in power, in making appointments to the Upper House, appointed men who they thought would be favourable to their policy. Every appointment to the Upper House after 1915 was that of a strong Labour man. I remember very well that under the Kidston regime some members who were appointed to the Upper House had no pronounced Labour views at all. Can anybody say that the Hon. T. C. Beirne was a dyed-in-the-wool Tory? The Hon. Frank McDonnell was a man with very liberal views. But since 1915 every appointee was either a union secretary or a strong supporter of the party in office.

In 1917 the Labour Party made thirteen appointments to the Upper House. They consisted of such well-known advocates as the hon. member for Warrego, Mr. W. R. Crampton, Mr. W. H. Demaine, Mr. Lewis McDonald, Mr. G. Page-Hanify, Mr. W. J. Riordan, and Mr. R. Sumner. I am not saying anything against these men personally. I know some of them, and some of them are very good friends of mine. I can be friends with a very strenuous political opponent so long as he is decent, but I have no time for the man who abuses his privi-

[Mr. Russell.

leges in this Chamber or elsewhere. I know most of these men and have a strong regard for them. I can always hold sincere respect for a man even if he is an opponent in politics, because I regard him from what he is as a man. In 1919 the Labour Government made a further batch of appointments to the Legislative Council, including Mr. R. J. Carroll, Senator J. S. Collings, the late Mr. W. J. Dunstan, Mr. J. S. Hanlon (the editor of the "Worker"), and Mr. T. L. Jones. I have the greatest regard for my friend Mr. Jones. He is one of the whitest men in the Labour movement—a man who was never appreciated by the Labour Party, because he happens to be a capitalist. He is one of the most sincere men in the movement that I know of. There are many others I could name. I am not saying anything against those gentlemen who were appointed at that time, but I do want to refute the statement that we have discriminated between Labour and non-Labour men in our legislation of 1929. I have already pointed out that the appointments to the Upper House prior to 1915 were made by Governments opposed to Labour. We must bear in mind that the Labour Party is of quite recent growth. Prior to its advent we had two other parties fighting for supremacy—the Liberals and the Conservatives. The contests between the McIlwraithians and the Griffithites are well known. Naturally, when these parties came to fill vacancies as they occurred in the Upper House their choice fell on their respective supporters. That was the principle followed by Labour after its advent to power in 1915.

It was certainly amusing to listen to all the excuses made by hon. members opposite for this restoration of certain privileges that had been denied these gentlemen since 1929. Many of the references of the Minister were not to the point at all. He talked about repudiation. If we pursued that line of argument over any period of time the Labour Party would come in for a rather bad time. I need only remind hon. members opposite of the famous repudiation Act in regard to the pastoralists introduced by the then Premier, Mr. Theodore, and the disgraceful repudiation of the agreement with the Brisbane Tramways Company Limited, when the Government deliberately set out to destroy the value of the enterprise by refusing any permission to increase fares, although later on, when the business of the company was taken over by the Brisbane Tramway Trust, that body was allowed to charge any fares it liked. Then we have the repudiation of election pledges. Both parties made pledges on the hustings, many of which they could not carry out. The Premier made many promises in his policy speech in Mackay in 1932.

The HOME SECRETARY: And they were all honoured.

Mr. RUSSELL: Of course they were not. A party may honestly think it can carry out a certain programme and may set out with the best intentions, but it may be prevented from carrying out those intentions by matters beyond its control. That is no analogy to the present matter under discussion at all.

I think the Leader of the Opposition has very clearly outlined the motives that actuated our party in denying those privileges to certain men appointed to the Upper

House. The Labour Party was bent on abolishing the Upper House. That was part of its platform, and its members are entitled to their opinion. Being defeated at the referendum, they fell upon the expedient of stacking the House. That is an expedient of very doubtful morality. There should be a certain ratio in the numbers of members in an Upper House and a Lower House. During two years the Labour Government stacked the Upper House to the extent of nearly thirty new members, with the declared object of abolishing it. There is no doubt that in the latest appointments a promise was extracted from the appointees that they would vote themselves out in exchange for certain privileges.

Mr. BEDFORD: That is untrue.

Mr. RUSSELL: That is all very well. The hon. member was not in the last batch; he was in the 1917 batch.

Mr. BEDFORD: It is untrue.

Mr. WATERS: It is a lie.

Mr. RUSSELL: I ask that the hon. member for Kelvin Grove be made to withdraw that expression. I am entitled to my opinion and I object to the disorderly conduct of the hon. member for Kelvin Grove.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Kelvin Grove to withdraw the word "lie."

Mr. WATERS: I am not concerned about the hon. member for Hamilton, but in deference—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw without reservation.

Mr. WATERS: I withdraw.

Mr. RUSSELL: If the hon. member cannot make a speech let him shut up.

Mr. WATERS: I rise to a point of order. If you are going to preside over this Chamber in an impartial manner, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to curb hon. members opposite who may use unparliamentary language.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. WATERS: I am drawing your attention to the hon. member for Hamilton, which I think I am justified in doing under the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL: After the 1917 batch were appointed the Government were doubtful as to whether they would have a majority in the Upper House; and there is no doubt some of their appointees were not keen on its abolition. I know from conversation I had with some of those members they were not enamoured of the alteration; and in order to make sure another batch were appointed in 1919, with the result that when it came to a vote the Government had an overwhelming majority for the abolition of that House. If a pact was made with these men and they agreed to vote themselves out in return for privileges, it was an immoral pact and should not be honoured.

Mr. BEDFORD: It was not made.

Mr. RUSSELL: That is the view we take.

Mr. BEDFORD: It was not made.

Mr. RUSSELL: It is for the Minister to disprove it. If that pact existed it should not be honoured.

As several hon. members pointed out, why should the members of the Upper House be entitled to greater privileges than members of the Lower House? None of us can expect to get a railway pass unless we have had seven years' continuous service. Was any proposal made after the 1932 election that those members who lost their seats owing to the redistribution scheme should be compensated with railway passes? Is not their case on all-fours with the case of the members of the Upper House? If it was good enough to give disgruntled members of the Upper House passes for life because the House was abolished, is it not fair that those members who were pushed out in 1932 owing to the redistribution scheme should have the same pass?

The whole matter has been in abeyance for four years. The last Labour Government evidently were satisfied that the right action was taken by the Moore Government. How then can we account for the sudden desire to return these privileges? Is it not fair to assume that some influence has been pushing the Ministry? The Attorney-General this morning tried to bolster up a bad case by attacking the Moore Government for their alleged breaches in regard to policy matters.

Boiled down, the whole situation is this: That if that contract was made it should not be kept. Why should the State be put to such an enormous expenditure year after year? One hon. member stated that it would cost the country nothing, that the Chief Secretary's Department would pass £700 a year to the Railway Department, and that department would benefit by that amount of revenue. The revenue of the Railway Department is to benefit at the expense of another Government department—the Chief Secretary's office! They have forgotten that if these gentlemen did not have these gold passes and were called upon to travel over the railway system they would have to pay out hard cash for their railway fares. As it is, the Chief Secretary's Department must find the money, and it must be paid over to the Railway Department; and that money must be raised by way of taxation on the people.

I am sorry that the Government have brought along this measure. It is not demanded by the people, nor has it appeared in any of the policy speeches of Labour Premiers or been discussed at Labour conventions. If it were put to the vote the people would declare solidly against it.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*) [2.36 p.m.]: This Bill is intended to wipe out one of many meannesses that characterised the Moore Government. During the time they were in power, for the purpose of getting at a political opponent and to make absolutely certain that he should have no chance with the law, they altered the Jury Act, the Crown Remedies Act, and the Official Inquiries Evidence Act. In that same mean spirit they wiped out the passes of these Legislative Councillors, who deserved well of their country for ridding the State of the Legislative Council excrescence. Really, the irritating factor of the whole position was that the present Senator Joseph Collings talked too loudly in the billiard room when giving his honest opinion of the Moore Government in the presence of a member of that Government. It was decided by these

*Mr. Bedford.]*

great, fine, mean, statesmen that it was necessary to shut up Joe Collings, at least to stop him from criticising them in their presence. But I do not think there is any power on earth other than death that will make that gentleman shut up. However, it was impossible for these people to do it, and the next best thing that they could do was to ensure that he did not come between the wind and their nobility. That was the real occasioning cause of the Act of 1929.

Mr. MOORE: Never heard of it.

Mr. BEDFORD: Never heard of him?

Mr. MOORE: No; who is he?

Mr. BEDFORD: Never heard of Senator Collings?

Mr. MOORE: Never heard of his having made these remarks in the House.

Mr. BEDFORD: He resembles the hon. gentleman inasmuch as he has a white thatch, but that is where the resemblance ends, because Joe Collings is alive with intelligence. Had the Moore Government any sense of humour at all it would have laughed itself out of office before the public kicked it out—(Government laughter)—and that before erecting as monuments to its incapacity a large quantity of broken promises and making a mean attempt to get at a political opponent by altering laws that had been in existence for fifty or sixty years previously. Their lowest action was this mean thing of wiping out the recognition of the services of men who had saved this State a tremendous amount of money. The fact remains that the Legislative Council has been out of existence for fourteen years and has not been missed in legislation. The whole system of a Legislative Council should never have existed in the same place as adult suffrage. It was a scheme based on the old Crown Colony idea, when there was no Legislative Assembly, and the Legislative Council consisted of nearly all nominees. That was an imitation of the system of the House of Lords, which has proved itself so immeasurably wrong for so long that it is quite possible that after this election the British people will see that it gets its quietus. In the House of Lords, which was the pattern on which the first Legislative Council in Australia following responsible government was built—that of New South Wales—there was a number of brilliant men, slightly past their prime, maybe, mellowed by experience, but weakened by age, and a large number of hereditary incompetents, and for the rest it was an asylum and a harbour for those who had fallen by the wayside by popular election and had to be put somewhere.

Mr. MAHER: Good men, nevertheless.

Mr. BEDFORD: It is quite possible that that little pink prattler, Malcolm MacDonald, will go there. The hon. member would say so, having the inferiority complex of the colonial as compared with the ordinary intelligence of the Australian. It was really William Charles Wentworth—who fought transportation, but ceased to do so when he became a large landowner—who strongly supported the idea of the Legislative Council as the Second Chamber in New South Wales, because he intended that it should carry a colonial peerage, but apparently dyed in the wool Dukes, Earls and Viscounts on the other side, or the political accidents who had been rejected at elec-

tions, and then given handles, decided that the Duke of Woolloomooloo, or the Baron of Pymont would bring their particularly stupid titles into disrepute, so a compromise was made by which appointments were to be for life, with the result that Australia's legislation has been hampered ever since 1854—and it is still hampered in some of the other States—by a legislative excrescence, which we, happily, removed.

For the people who helped in that removal, this Bill is, on the one hand, a recognition of their good services, and, on the other hand, a repudiation of the meanness that wiped out that recognition. We have only to look at the Legislative Councils of the other States to see its effect. In New South Wales they have made it almost impossible of abolition by making it elective on the most restricted suffrage that can be had.

Mr. MAHER: As a result of a referendum of the people.

Mr. BEDFORD: It is one of the most restricted suffrages that can be. In Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia it is also elected on a very restricted suffrage. In Victoria its existence has had the effect of making the factory laws of that State so far behind those of Queensland that the cottage manufacturer is still permitted with whatever sweating is consonant with that system. Also consonant with that is the fact that the cheaper production in Victoria, made possible by sweating or half sweating of the cottage manufacturer, adversely affects the manufacturer in Queensland. The Legislative Council that we had here was a House representative of half maimed and warped minds, and men far past their time. Some were eighty-six, some were carried in, some never came to the House, and generally everything went well, because if the Tory lost in the Assembly he would win in the Legislative Council.

The statement that was made by the hon. member for Hamilton this afternoon that there was some compact by which the vote for the abolition of the Upper House was secured on the promise of passes for life is absolutely untrue. There was never any compact. Every man who went into that House signed the pledge of the Labour Party, which pledged him to the abolition of the Legislative Council without fear and without reward. It is only mean minds that could imagine that somebody was going to do something against his own convictions and against his conscience for the purpose of getting a railway pass that he might never use. Every man knew before he went in that he was pledged to the abolition of the Council without fear of penalty or hope of reward. Apparently hon. members opposite cannot believe that any man can have an honest belief in anything, or any honest intention of keeping a pledge. They apparently do not know that although this party has had rats in it at times, the majority of its men have stood by their pledges for the whole of their lives; they have been born Labour men, and died Labour men.

The Opposition have attempted to gloss over the fact that they did this mean thing—this was their nature as a Government—by contending it was done to save money. Yet, in order to give gold passes over all the Australian railways for life to men who

[Mr. Bedford.]

had been tried in one Parliament and found wanting, so that the people fired them at the first opportunity, they went to the expense of extending the life of a Parliament for a month. They wanted to extend it for five years. A section of the present Opposition insisted that that should be the price of their consent to reconstituting the Upper House. Many of them realised that the reconstitution of the Upper House after it had been out of existence from 1921 to 1929 would be so utterly unpopular that they could not face the electors, and their price was that they should have a five-year Parliament.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is all supposition.

Mr. BEDFORD: I have been told by three or four members of your party. (Inter-ruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BEDFORD: Two of them are not now members of this House.

Mr. NIMMO: They have been pulling your leg.

Mr. BEDFORD: They have not. I will give your leader their names in confidence if he wishes. Everybody here knows that I do not lightly make statements that I cannot stand up to. The abolition of the Legislative Council was simply the removing from the body politic of a legislative body that had had no business here except as a long-distance, long-winded delayer of legislation. During the last fourteen years there have not been any such errors of legislation as could not be altered by this Parliament without any reference to a Legislative Council that does not now exist and never should have existed. The abolition of the Council was one of the most progressive legislative steps in Australia, the closing of a local House of Lords—an institution that has been due to go for the last fifty years and will go very shortly.

This Bill is merely a recognition of the meanness of the Government that cancelled these privileges and a recognition of the sterling service of those members of the Legislative Council who abolished it and gave Queensland government by a single chamber.

Mr. BROWN (*Logan*) [2.50 p.m.]: The members who took part in the abolition of the Upper House are entitled to these privileges for having conferred a great benefit upon the people, even if they had only been there for five minutes. I recollect the occasion when the late David Bowman defeated the late John McMaster in the Fortitude Valley electorate. The people of Fortitude Valley had decided that certain legislation should be passed in their interests, and so they returned David Bowman with a thumping majority. What did the Tory Party do? No sooner had they met in Parliament than they appointed John McMaster as a member of the Legislative Council to undo there anything that might be done by David Bowman in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. RUSSELL: The Labour Government did the same thing with Alf Jones.

Mr. BROWN: He resigned his seat to go there. The action of the Moore Government in depriving the ex-members of the Legislative Council of their privileges was mean, low, and contemptible. These members were

appointed to the Upper House with the one object of abolishing it, and not with the object of securing railway passes.

Hon. members opposite asked why we had not restored these privileges ere this, but my reply is that it has taken us three years to clean up their mess, and that we have not finished yet. We are doing it bit by bit. Time and time again the people of Queensland returned the Labour Government to power with a mandate to abolish the Upper House, and that is why the Labour Government appointed a sufficient number of members who were pledged to abolish that Chamber. That important work was accomplished, and the people are indebted to them for their excellent service. Prior to 1915 all the appointees to the Upper House were defeated Tory politicians. If they were defeated by Labour candidates they were immediately appointed to the Upper House to nullify there the actions of the successful Labour candidates in the Legislative Assembly.

It is not necessary to have a revising Chamber. It is not even necessary to have a Senate, which I should like to see abolished. During the fourteen years Queensland has had the unicameral system of Government legislation has been passed in a proper manner. With the exception of that enacted from 1929 to 1932, it has all been to the benefit of the people. If a second Chamber can be justified at all, it can only be justified if its representatives are elected on a universal franchise, not on a restricted franchise as in other States. The Governments of other States will not be able to abolish the Legislative Councils because of the restricted nature of their franchises. Queensland was fortunate enough to return a Labour Government then that gave effect to its platform, and the action of the Government in introducing this legislation to restore free railway passes to those men who helped in that good work is one that meets with my approval. They are justly entitled to the privilege, which should never have been taken from them.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [2.57 p.m.]: I protest against the introduction of this Bill. The passes involved should never have been granted to the men concerned. They were appointed to the Upper House for the express purpose of voting for its abolition. We all remember how some Labour men were nearly killed in the rush to secure those appointments. I question very much whether any Government are really honest in granting free railway passes unless those passes are used on the business of the State, and these men got them without rendering any service to the country. I honestly believe that the object behind this move is to enable these passes to be used for political organisation purposes. There is no doubt that they will be used extensively for those purposes. No one will assert that our railways do not need all the revenue they can possibly get, yet one seldom enters a railway carriage without finding some person in possession of a free pass.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: No wonder Parliament gets into disrepute when you make statements of that character.

Mr. WATERS: You know that is not true.

Mr. NIMMO: There is no gainsaying the truth of my statement, and it is not the

*Mr. Nimmo.]*

utterance of truthful statements that brings Parliament into disrepute.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: Parliament gets into disrepute when you make foolish statements like that which are not true.

Mr. NIMMO: I am making a statement that is in accord with fact. To-day we find an amount of approximately £10,000 appearing on the Estimates to cover the cost of free railway passes issued to members of Parliament, ex-members and their relatives. That is altogether wrong.

The hon. member for Logan made the statement that if he had the power he would abolish the Senate. Such statements only emphasise the necessity of reinstating the Upper House in Queensland as soon as possible. Every hon. member recognises that we are in a very much better position economically in Australia to-day because of the stand of the Senate some three or four years ago. The Senate was successful in preventing the fiduciary note issue proposed by the then Labour Government. If that note issue had been issued it would have done irreparable damage to the credit of Australia, and prejudiced our subsequent loan issues.

In my opinion the Upper House is a safeguard against hasty legislation; and for that reason the abolition of the Upper House in this State was a great disservice to the people.

I wish to register my protest against the restoration of these passes to men who had no right to them in the first place; and to say that I do not think free passes should be granted except to those travelling on the business of the State.

Mr. H. WILLIAMS (*Windsor*) [3.1 p.m.]: I support the introduction of this measure, which makes provision for the restoration of passes to ex-Labour members of the Upper House who were deprived of them by the political spleen of the Moore Government.

The hon. member for Oxley stated that many Labour supporters were nearly killed in the rush for appointment to the Upper House. Probably the hon. member has had considerable experience of these rushes as a result of attempts he may have made to get himself appointed to the Upper House when a Tory Government was in power. The hon. member neglected to state that his Government remained in office one month longer than the usual period in order that two or three Ministers would become entitled to free passes even if they were defeated at the election. Hon. members opposite had an opportunity of altering the Constitution so that a Minister would have to serve seven years before he would become entitled to a life pass but did not do so. However, they were weighed in the balance and found wanting, and the people turned them out.

The hon. member for Oxley has suggested that the passes will be used for political organisation purposes. Apparently the organisation of our friends opposite must have broken down, judging by the remnant of the party that is left.

The hon. member for Toowoong talked about the sanctity of contracts. Hon. members opposite should be the last people to talk about such a thing. The party opposite made promises and deliberately broke them when they got into power. These are the gentlemen who stood on the public platform

[*Mr. Nimmo.*

and said, "We will find £2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs." Instead they rendered 10,000 jobless. Yet these gentlemen have the temerity to criticise the Government for restoring something to ex-Legislative Councillors of which they were wrongly deprived. The men who voted for the abolition of the Upper House deserve to have their names placed on an honour board; they did a great work for Queensland.

I compliment the Attorney-General upon bringing down this measure.

Question—"That the resolution (*Mr. Mullan's motion*) be agreed to"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr. Brassington	Mr. Jesson
" Brown	" Larcombe
" Bulcock	" McLean
" Clark	" Mullan
" Copley, W. J.	" Pease
" Dash	" Power
" Donnelly	" Taylor
" Dunstan	" Waters
" Foley	" Wellington
" Funnell	" Williams, H.
" Gair	
" Gledson	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Hanlon	" Bedford
" Hislop	" Hayes
" Hynes	

NOES, 13.

Mr. Bell	Mr. Plunkett
" Brand	" Russell
" Clayton	" Walker
" Deacon	
" Maher	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Maxwell	" Nicklin
" Moore	" Nimmo
" Morgan	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bruce	Mr. Edwards
" Collins, H. H.	" Muller

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a first time."

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 29.

Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hynes
" Brassington	" Jesson
" Brown	" Larcombe
" Bulcock	" McLean
" Clark	" Mullan
" Dash	" Pease
" Donnelly	" Power
" Dunstan	" Taylor
" Foley	" Waters
" Funnell	" Wellington
" Gair	" Williams, H.
" Gledson	
" Hanlon	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Hanson	" Copley, P. K.
" Hayes	" Copley, W. J.
" Hislop	

NOES, 13.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Plunkett
" Clayton	" Russell
" Deacon	" Walker
" Maher	
" Maxwell	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Moore	" Bell
" Morgan	" Nicklin
" Nimmo	

PAIRS.		
AYES.		NOES.
Mr. Bruce	Mr. Edwards	
„ Collins, H. H.	„ Muller	

Resolved in the affirmative.

SECOND READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*): I move—  
 “That the Bill be now read a second time.”  
 Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 28.		
Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hayes	
„ Brassington	„ Hislop	
„ Brown	„ Hynes	
„ Bulcock	„ Jesson	
„ Clark	„ Larcombe	
„ Copley, P. K.	„ Mullan	
„ Copley, W. J.	„ Pease	
„ Dash	„ Power	
„ Donnelly	„ Waters	
„ Dunstan	„ Wellington	
„ Foley	„ Williams, H.	
„ Funnell		
„ Gledson	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Hanlon	„ Gair	
„ Hanson	„ McLean	
NOES, 13.		
Mr. Bell	Mr. Nimmo	
„ Brand	„ Russell	
„ Deacon	„ Walker	
„ Maher		
„ Maxwell	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Moore	„ Clayton	
„ Morgan	„ Plunkett	
„ Nicklin		

PAIRS.		
AYES.		NOES.
Mr. Bruce	Mr. Edwards	
„ Collins, H. H.	„ Muller	

Resolved in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Hanson, Buranda, in the chair.*)

Clause 1—“*Short title*”—agreed to.

Clause 2—“*Restoration of certain privileges of former members of the Legislative Council*”—

Question—“That clause 2, as read, stand part of the Bill”—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.		
Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hynes	
„ Brassington	„ Larcombe	
„ Brown	„ McLean	
„ Bulcock	„ Mullan	
„ Clark	„ Pease	
„ Copley, P. K.	„ Power	
„ Dash	„ Taylor	
„ Dunstan	„ Waters	
„ Foley	„ Wellington	
„ Funnell	„ Williams, H.	
„ Gair		
„ Gledson	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Hanlon	„ Donnelly	
„ Hayes	„ Jesson	
„ Hislop		
NOES, 13.		
Mr. Bell	Mr. Plunkett	
„ Clayton	„ Russell	
„ Deacon	„ Walker	
„ Maxwell		
„ Moore	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Morgan	„ Brand	
„ Nicklin	„ Maher	
„ Nimmo		

PAIRS.		
AYES.		NOES.
Mr. Bruce	Mr. Edwards	
„ Collins, H. H.	„ Muller	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 3—“*Repeal of the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2*”—agreed to.  
 The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

THIRD READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*): I move—  
 “That the Bill be now read a third time.”  
 Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 28.		
Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hislop	
„ Brown	„ Hynes	
„ Bulcock	„ Jesson	
„ Clark	„ Larcombe	
„ Copley, P. K.	„ McLean	
„ Dash	„ Mullan	
„ Donnelly	„ Pease	
„ Dunstan	„ Power	
„ Foley	„ Waters	
„ Funnell	„ Wellington	
„ Gair	„ Williams, H.	
„ Gledson		
„ Hanlon	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Hanson	„ Brassington	
„ Hayes	„ Taylor	
NOES, 13.		
Mr. Bell	Mr. Plunkett	
„ Brand	„ Russell	
„ Clayton	„ Walker	
„ Maher		
„ Maxwell	<i>Tellers:</i>	
„ Moore	„ Deacon	
„ Morgan	„ Nimmo	
„ Nicklin		

PAIRS.		
AYES.		NOES.
Mr. Bruce	Mr. Edwards	
„ Collins, H. H.	„ Muller	

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 3.35 p.m.