

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 1904**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

6. No tenders were called. The Government Store-keeper was offered a line in copying-books at little better than half the prices usually paid, and he bought them.

#### LOCOMOTIVE FOREMAN, MARYBOROUGH.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*), in the absence of Mr. Woods, asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. What amount has the locomotive foreman at Maryborough drawn in expenses and other allowances since 30th September, 1902, until 31st October, 1904?

2. For what services were such amounts paid?

3. Is the Minister aware that this gentleman was a director of a certain mine in Gympie, and as such devoted portion of the time, for which his services were paid by the department, in attending meetings of directors of such mine at Gympie, and in supervising the construction of machinery at Walkers Limited for the said mine?

4. What pay does the foreman fitter receive who does the work at Maryborough in the absence of the foreman?

5. If the locomotive foreman can absent himself for days at a time to attend meetings of the board of directors, does the Minister not think, in the face of the retrenchment that has taken place, that his services could be dispensed with?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. A. Morgan, *Warwick*) replied—

1. £69 1s. 8d.

2. Travelling expenses.

3. No.

4. 11s. 6d. per day.

5. I am informed that it is not true that the locomotive foreman absents himself for days at a time to attend meetings.

#### WORK AT NAMBOUR CENTRAL MILL.

Mr. LESINA asked the Treasurer—

Is it true that the employees at the Nambour Central Sugar Mill, recently taken over by the Government, work eleven hours a day for a wage of 20s. to 25s. per week and rations?

The TREASURER replied—

No. There are two shifts, working about ten hours each on an average, and work ceases at 1 o'clock on Saturdays. Wages range from 15s. per week and found for youths, up to 45s. per week and found for highest paid employees. Only officers, manager, bookkeeper, etc., exceed an average of ten hours per day, and some of these work fourteen and sixteen hours per day during the crushing season.

#### PAPER.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dulby*) laid the following paper on the table:—Correspondence relating to the granting of permission to Mr. R. R. Nugent to cut railway sleepers on Crown lands or reserves adjacent to the North Coast Railway line, between Caboolture and Gympie.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Mornton*): I would like to ask the Secretary for Lands if he has any objection to having these papers printed?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I have no objection if the hon. gentleman wishes them printed, but it is an expense we do not wish to go to if it can be avoided. I would ask the hon. member to read the papers, and if he again wishes them to be printed I shall move that they be printed.

#### BANK HOLIDAYS BILL.—GRACEMERE CEMETERY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

#### THIRD READINGS.

These Bills were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

*Hon. J. T. Bell.*]

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 15 NOVEMBER, 1904.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir A. S. Cowley, *Herbert*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

### QUESTIONS.

#### SUSPECTED CASE OF LEPROSY AT DUNWICH LAZARETTE.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Home Secretary—

Is the white woman recently removed from the Mackay district to the lazarette suffering from true leprosy?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. P. Airey, *Flinders*) replied—

Yes.

#### BOOKBINDING IN GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*) asked the Treasurer—

1. Is it a fact that an order has recently been placed outside the Government Printing Office for the supply of press copy letter books to the Government Stores?

2. If so, (a) why; (b) what quantity has been ordered?

3. Is it not a fact that such goods have been hitherto supplied by the Government Printing Office?

4. Is it not a fact that the bookbinders at the Government Printing Office are not and have not been for some time past employed full time?

5. Are the goods as to quality of work and material of equal standard to that hitherto supplied by the Government Printing Office?

6. Were tenders called for the said goods; if so, what are the particulars of tenders received?

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—

1. Yes.

2. (a) Because it was cheaper to do so; (b) 258.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. The quality of the work was equal, and the material was good enough for the purpose.

## ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

The PREMIER, in moving—

That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 3 o'clock p.m. on Monday in each week, in addition to the days already provided by Sessional Order; and that Government business do take precedence of all other business on that day—

said: If we are to entertain any hope of finishing our business here before Christmas, it will be necessary to sit on Mondays during the remainder of the session. I may point out to hon. members that in addition to the Bills appearing on the paper now—five in number—we shall have to deal with quite a number of important measures. [Hon. R. PHILP: What are they?] I will indicate them to the hon. member. We propose to deal with a Stamp Duties Bill—that is one of the financial measures of the Government—also a Bill dealing with probate and another dealing with the imposition of gun licenses. In addition to these there will be a Land Bill—an important measure—and also a Bill to amend and extend the operations of the Agricultural Bank Act. [Honourable members: Hear, hear!] Also a Bill to continue the Marsupials Destruction Act, and a Bill dealing with rabbits. It is also desired to pass the two private Bills now on the paper before the House rises. Altogether there are twelve measures which will engage the attention of the House. [Hon. R. PHILP: Is that all?] I make no definite promise as to any more. Those that I have mentioned are all that are in sight now, and that we have serious intentions of passing. Of course, if there is time before Christmas we may be able to supply further measures for consideration, if the House so desires; but I repeat that, if we are going to get through this programme in the five weeks available before Christmas, it will be necessary to sit on Mondays—every Monday in each week, making altogether twenty-five days available for business. I am very loth to ask hon. members, especially country members, to sit on Mondays, because they can only do that by putting themselves to a great deal of inconvenience. It will also put Ministers to a great deal of inconvenience; still it will be absolutely necessary in order to get through the business I have indicated before prorogation. I beg to move the motion.

HON. R. PHILP: It is rather a surprise to members of this House that we are asked to sit on Mondays at this early stage of the session. We are now called upon to sit five days a week; but we have really nothing before us. There is now on the paper really only the second reading of one Bill. We were told that the Government had all their measures ready, and they ought to be on the table now. The Stamp Duties Bill should have been passed with the other financial measures which we passed. I say that for two months this House has been marking time. [A Government member: Who are you speaking on behalf of?] I am speaking on behalf of the Opposition, and also on behalf of the other side. We are really not confronted with any important measures, and yet the Premier asks us to sit on Mondays, because he says he has so much to give us. I say that we should have had these promised measures on the table of the House long ago. The Registration of Clubs Bill should only take about half an hour to put through the second reading. We are promised a Land Bill, a Stamp Bill, and a Gun License Bill, which is a very important measure; but the other Bills are trifling measures—what would be called on the goldfields “tripe.” Where are the measures to give employment to

[Hon. A. Morgan.

the unemployed and to advance the progress of the State? There are none. They are nearly all measures of taxation. We will see what this Bill dealing with the betterment values of land is when it comes along; but otherwise there is nothing to keep the House sitting a fortnight, let alone five weeks. Of course we will have to deal with the Estimates, but in New South Wales and Victoria they have been passed in a few hours, and we might with advantage follow their example in Queensland. [Mr. KERR: You had to put on the “guillotine” to pass some of them once.] Some hon. members have wasted time on the Estimates in talking about a policeman who had been retrenched and about another man whose salary had not been raised, and nothing comes of all the discussion. I say that the Premier should have placed all the Bills he has mentioned on the table before this. [The PREMIER: You will not have to wait for Government measures.] There is nothing in front of us whatever. [The PREMIER: You have not been idle since we started.] There is only one Bill in front of us now, and yet we are asked to come here on Mondays. Personally, I do not object to sit on Mondays; but this is the earliest time that we have been asked to sit on Mondays. I never kept the House waiting for business—I always had too much business ready, and we always wanted to get through the business. I see by the Press that there are three railway Bills to be put through. That may not be true. The Premier has not given notice of them. It strikes me that we will be expected to rush through business in the last week, and I suppose we will have suspension of the Standing Orders, and all we can do is to protest. When the business-paper is congested is the time to ask us to sit an extra day; but the Premier wants the House to take the Government on trust. I for one do not trust them, and I think that the people are beginning to lose faith in the Government. Even some of the Government's own supporters the other night talked solidly for two or three hours on a certain clause, but when the whip went round, they all subsided and none of them even called for a division. I think the Premier is very unfair when he does not take the House into his confidence and tell us what Bills he intends to put through.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I think the House generally will welcome the proposed measures and the proposal to sit on Mondays. [An honourable member: Why not sit six days a week?] I see no reason why we should not sit on Saturdays, unless my Hebrew friend from Gympie objects—[laughter]—and I do not see why we should not sit in the daytime. The Premier has outlined twelve measures, and we will have twenty-five days to consider them. That will mean two days for each measure. Well, I want to know what kind of legislation we will get under such circumstances? There is no doubt that there will be a necessity to bring in half a dozen amending Bills, and that there will be a waste of public time and public money, and we will get wretchedly bad legislation. I am leaving untouched the fact that we will have to deal with the Estimates; and we all know that, under the Estimates, we should be able to bring up many grievances. I myself have a list of grievances as high as myself that I wish to ventilate, and what hope have I of ventilating them in twenty-five days before Christmas? It is absurd to expect the House to do work well under such conditions, and I protest against Bills being taken quickly from one stage to another, and then dropped into the waste-paper basket. The Premier has mentioned a number of Bills; but I say let us take the measures which are urgently required—the

financial measures and others—and then let us tackle the Estimates, and give hon. members an opportunity of ventilating their grievances.

Mr. J. LEAHY (*Bullo*): It is not often that I have pleasure in agreeing with the hon. member for Clermont—[The TREASURER: Oftener than most people know.] [Government members: Hear, hear! ]—but I do so on this occasion. [Mr. LESINA: Great minds run in the same groove.] I was told the other day that I was running the Trades Hall, but this was new matter to me. We are not now discussing what affinity there is between different minds; we are discussing what is supposed to be a concrete motion which the Premier has submitted to the House, and whatever difference of opinion there may be between hon. members on other matters, there is no reason why we should not discuss this motion on its merits. The reason that I agree with the hon. member for Clermont is that I think there is no use discussing matters at all unless we discuss them carefully. This is called a deliberative Assembly, and we should have time to deliberate on matters carefully, so as to arrive at a just and deliberate conclusion. Measures have been brought before us recently and we have not had time to consider them properly. They were passed through the second readings and then forced through committee and the other stages and sent on to the other Chamber. It is impossible for any hon. member to carefully consider measures when they are so hurried through, and the result will be that instead of measures beneficial to the country we will have bad legislation, and very possibly wrongs will be done. We passed a measure the other night—I am not going to discuss the merits of that measure—I am only giving an instance—we passed the Dairy Bill, and now we find that there has been a meeting of dairymen in Brisbane and they passed resolutions plainly expressing their disapproval of matters that the Minister in charge of the Bill told us they approved of. What is the result of this hurried legislation? The Premier is now endeavouring to get legislation passed in a hurried way. [Mr. DUNSFORD: Do you object to sitting on Mondays?] Yes. I do not object to sitting on Monday [4 p.m.] during the last week or two of the session, if it is necessary to put measures, which have already been carefully considered, through their final stages. I do not object to that with such measures as Appropriation Bills, or things that there cannot be a great deal of discussion about, but which, under the forms of the House, require time to put through. But we are asked to sit an additional day to discuss certain measures of which we do not even know the rudimentary principles. Here is a Land Bill supposed to be brought in to-day, and we may be asked to put it through committee to-morrow. What time will there be for hon. members to consider that and other measures intelligently? As the hon. member for Clermont said, there will be amending Bills necessary next session, or it may be necessary to recommit them half a dozen times, as we had to do in connection with a Bill just passed, and even then they may not be perfect. Is that the way to get the best legislative results? Is it anything more than an idle mockery asking hon. members to force business through when we are not given proper time for discussion and consideration? [Mr. MURPHY: You are getting an extra day now.] For what? That extra day should be a day given for the study of the details of measures laid before us. The day that we have had for that purpose up to the present is now to be taken away, and we shall be in ten times a worse position than we are in now. It is not a good thing that Bills should be passed without

proper discussion, and there will be no time for discussion. I have been in this House for about twelve years, and I know of no instance in which the Government have asked the House to sit five days a week at this stage of the session. We have only sat about thirty days this session. If we are to close the session before Christmas—[The PREMIER: I did not tell you it would close.] Well, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it would likely close before Christmas. That is the difficulty we have in dealing with anything that falls from the hon. gentleman. He gives us to understand a certain thing—probably he does it purposely—and he immediately tells us that he never said any such thing. There is no dealing with an hon. gentleman who is built on those lines. I venture to say that every hon. member understood the hon. gentleman to mean that the session would close in about five weeks. [The PREMIER: No. I said it was necessary to sit on Mondays if we wished to finish before Christmas.] Well, is it necessary that the session should close before Christmas? If business is so pressing, it is better to let what legislation we have been dealing with up to that time have some consideration, and, if necessary, meet after Christmas and prevent bungling our legislation. It is absolutely impossible that measures can receive adequate consideration in the manner in which it is proposed to bring them before this House, if we sit five days a week. How are measures of great importance to be considered if we get no notice of them. In the olden times a Bill would frequently remain on the notice-paper for two or three weeks after its second reading before it was dealt with in committee. Every hon. member then had an opportunity of studying the details, and if he did not it was his own fault. There is no opportunity of that kind now. So far as I am able to gauge, the Treasurer has to-day given notice of a Bill whose consequences will be very far reaching, but we will only have a day or two to see how its provisions are likely to work out. [The TREASURER: It is simple.] I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman considers it simple until it is criticised. It will be as simple, perhaps, as the Income Tax Bill, of which the hon. gentleman knew nothing at all. Of course, if a person knows nothing of a thing, the most abstruse scientific problems that would puzzle an expert would be perfectly simple. The race of politicians we have at the present time, with perhaps one or two exceptions, are men who know nothing, and for that reason the Treasurer may be pardoned for the remark he made about the simplicity of a thing that I venture to say will be very far-reaching in its consequences. [The TREASURER: I meant that it would be simple to a brilliant mind like yours.] The hon. gentleman is not competent to speak for me on a matter of this kind. I would ask the Premier whether we are going to have any other measures than those which he indicated to the House? What has become of some of the measures that we have heard a great deal about in the past? Is there any chance of their being passed this session? There are measures regarding which hon. members on the other side have made this House and the country ring for years. What has become of their professions, and, if their professions in the past were sincere, what has happened since? I would like to know when we are going to get the Arbitration and Conciliation Bill. Does the Premier propose to bring it down this session? [The PREMIER: You had better bring it down yourself.] I know the hon. gentleman is extremely anxious to have an opportunity of expressing his views on the subject, so that I might bring in a Bill; but we have only half a day a week for private business, and on every occasion

Mr. J. Leahy.]

the hon. gentleman's followers get up and talk out private business that emanates from this side. (Government laughter.) We never talked out their measures. [Mr. KERR: What about the Shearers' Accommodation Bill?] I challenge the hon. member to say that I ever talked that Bill out. [Mr. KERR: Your friends and your colleague talked it out.] I thank the hon. member for his interjection. I would ask is that Bill to find no place on the Government programme this session? There are a great many more sheep to shear this year than there were last year, and next year there should be twice as many as there were last year. Is it not necessary to have that Bill this year if it was necessary last year? [Mr. MURPHY: Isn't that namesake of yours running the Machine Shearers' Union properly?] I do not know anything about him. I never saw him in my life. He is no relative of mine, although I believe he is a very smart fellow—he is too clever every time for the fellows he is placed against. The hon. member for Barcoo tells us that the Government are dealing with the Shearers Bill. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the Constitution does not allow him as a private member to speak for the Government, and that he can only speak with authority on such matters when he occupies a seat on the Treasury benches. But I pass over that Bill for the present. Then we have heard a good deal about a Workman's Compensation Bill, which the hon. member for Gympie created almost a scare and panic over a couple of sessions ago. Is that going to find a place in the legislation of the Government? [Mr. RYLAND: It will come in time.] It was certainly regarded as an urgent measure last year and the year before. If the House is called upon to grant an additional sitting day, we should know whether these important measures are to be brought forward on that additional sitting day. I want to know whether these measures are to be introduced, and, if not, what has caused the Government to change their mind. What has happened since hon. members sat on this side to cause them to think those measures are of less importance than they were? [The PREMIER: That measure was denounced by you.] The hon. gentleman is wrong. A Workman's Compensation Bill was introduced by the Government of which I was a member, and was obstructed. The hon. gentleman was indulging in a lot of underground engineering at that time.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. J. LEAHY: I have every desire to keep order.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House has nothing to do with underground engineering.

Mr. J. LEAHY: I was referring to what took place outside the House. The hon. gentleman was underground engineering outside the House at that time.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in referring to that subject.

Mr. J. LEAHY: I am referring to a time between the dissolution and the election of the new Parliament, during which the hon. gentleman was not a member, and these things were going on then, and have been going on ever since. I only refer to the matter because the hon. gentleman said I stonewalled that measure. [The PREMIER: No one said you did.] What did the hon. gentleman say, then? Is there any meaning at all in the words he used? [Mr. KERR: You are like the man with a guilty conscience.] The hon. member is like a man without a conscience at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the motion before

[*Mr. J. Leahy.*]

the House, and I must ask hon. members to allow the hon. member for Bulloo to proceed without these unseemly interruptions.

Mr. J. LEAHY: That is exactly the point. I am exceedingly obliged to you, Sir, for asking hon. members to do what I have invited them to do—allow me to make a few remarks on the motion in the shortest possible manner. But interjections are sometimes a useful means of conveying information, and I have no objection to them.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member confine himself to the motion before the House?

Mr. J. LEAHY: Well, I would ask again in reference to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Barcoo—the Shearers' Accommodation Bill—whether the Government propose to bring it forward if this additional sitting day is granted? We are told further by the Press, which is generally well informed, that there are to be three railways brought forward. The House is entitled to know what they are, and to time to consider the conformation of the country, and whether such lines will pay or not. Then we come to the question of a minimum wage. The hon. member for Clermont takes an interest in that. Is there any intention of dealing with that question this session, and are hon. members opposite sincere in their professions of an intense desire to see the question dealt with? The hon. member asked a series of questions about the employees in the Nambour mill, and he has been told that they work ten hours a day, and on Sundays, for 15s. a week. I was astonished hear that the Government worked their employees for ten hours a day. If that is so, it certainly furnishes a reason why there should be legislation on the subject. Then we come to the question of old age pensions. Is that to be allowed to slip into another session? Where is the hon. member for Gympie who waxed so eloquent on the subject? Is it also to be allowed to slip by for another year? [The PREMIER: Give notice of the question.] I have an opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman, without notice. [Mr. LESINA: Why do you not move that the receipts from the sale of public lands be devoted to old age pensions?] Because I know very well I would not get any support from the other side. I should be exceedingly pleased to hear the member for Kennedy, the Chairman of Committees, on this subject. On former occasions he has been very eloquent, and has almost drawn tears to the eyes of members over the troubles and griefs of aged persons. That is portion of the policy of the party now in power, and I want to know whether such a measure is to be given effect to. Then, again, it has been ruled by the Chairman of Committees that it is perfectly legal to introduce certain provisions with regard to black labour into Bills we have been discussing—a matter which we have handed over to the Federal Government—and the Treasurer has expressed the opinion that it will be impossible to carry on the sugar industry without a continuation of the bonus on sugar. Is it the intention of the Government to bring in any legislation which will have the effect of settling that question?—that is, assuming the ruling of the Chairman is in order, which I do not think it is. Some of these questions are of far greater importance than the questions which the Government have been tinkering with this session and last.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is again departing from the subject before the House. I must ask him to confine himself to the question of sitting on Mondays.

Mr. J. LEAHY: I submit, with the greatest respect, that it is a matter of importance to know, before we grant this additional sitting day, what measures the Government intend to bring forward. Are the Government going to deal with any of the things I have mentioned? If they are, it is only fair that the House should give them an opportunity of carrying out the policy which the country returned them to power to carry out. It would be utterly unconstitutional to put obstacles in the path of the Ministry in carrying out measures which the country demands; but if they are taking an additional sitting day merely to carry out measures which the country has not asked for, we have every reason to offer obstacles to taking an additional sitting day, when it will deprive us of the opportunity and time of giving impartial consideration to the legislation before us. It is utterly impossible for members to give proper considerations to measures which are railroaded in and railroaded out of the House in the way some of the Government measures have been. I submit that the Government should show some reason to justify this motion before asking the House to grant an additional sitting day, and I hope the House will insist upon seeing that we have proper time for discussion and consideration of measures brought before us.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): After listening to the long windy speech of the hon. member for Bulloo, I must say that he has given the best reason why it is necessary to have an additional sitting day. [Government members: Hear, hear!] The leader of the Opposition has asked why we should take an additional sitting day, and his chief lieutenant has given the best possible reason why we should sit on Monday, and on Saturday as well, considering that we have a number of measures to deal with as well as the Estimates. If the hon. gentleman casts his memory back to the time when he was on this side of the House and asked for an extra sitting day, he will remember that when he was asked by the then Opposition what measures were going to be brought forward, the reply was that we would see "in due course." The hon. member for Bulloo has been one of the greatest wasters of time—he and the hon. member for Warrego, his brother, and others.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. KERR: They have wasted a good deal of time during the present session, and he asked the reason why the Government came down and asked for an extra sitting day. I [4.30 p.m.] say it is to get the few measures before the House placed on the statute-book. [Mr. J. LEAHY: I did not know you gave instructions.]

Mr. HAWTHORN (*Enoggera*): I think the motion is an absolutely justifiable one. We are now only five weeks from Christmas, and I am in hopes that we shall get through our business by that time, and not—unfortunately, as I think it would be—need to have a short session at the beginning of the year. I consider that would be a calamity. [Mr. FORSYTH: There is no hope of that.] Therefore, it is better that the business should be wiped off the sheet before Christmas. The Premier has given ample justification for the motion by stating the number of Bills there are to pass, and further than that, we shall have an opportunity to get on with the Estimates. I consider the Estimates are the most important item in the deliberations of this Chamber, and unless we have the extra Monday for going into the Estimates there is very little possibility of going into them as

thoroughly as we should do. Under all the circumstances I think the Premier is doing the very best thing by asking for the extra day even at this early stage in the session.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Carpentaria*): Personally, I have no objection to sitting on Monday, but if hon. members will refer to last year's proceedings they will find we started the Estimates on the 19th August. [The PREMIER: We met in July.] We met in July and we passed a considerable quantity of Estimates in the month of August, which was very different to starting them at the end of November, and even the present Government, shortly after they took office, actually started their Estimates early in October, and now we find that they are put down at the bottom of the business-paper. I am not raising any objection at all to sitting on Monday, but considering the vast importance the Estimates are to this House and the country we should at once have at least two days in the week for them. Why should we wait to pass all these little Bills which may be of no importance—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the hon. member that the question before the House is not the proposed Bills, but whether there is to be an extra sitting day, and he must confine his remarks to that.

Mr. FORSYTH: I was coming to that point, and that is the reason I have made the remarks which I have made. If we are to have all these Bills which are now on the business-paper—some of which are very contentious, and will take a considerable amount of time to get through—when are we going to get on with Supply?

The SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the hon. member that that is not the question before the House. The question is whether we have to sit an additional day or not, and he must confine his remarks to that.

Mr. FORSYTH: I have already said that as far as I am concerned I have no objection to an extra day, but I would like to know what it is for, and I would make a suggestion to the Government as to how that extra day should be utilised. I hope, in any case, whether they go on with these Bills or not, they will give the House at least two days with Supply, and start straightaway.

The PREMIER, in reply: My object in introducing this motion is because we require the extra sitting day in order that we may consider the business which we are anxious to submit to the House during this session, and if we are to conclude our business before Christmas I think it will be absolutely necessary to have the extra sitting day. If hon. members think that more time than remains between now and Christmas, sitting five days a week, is necessary for the consideration of that business, then the only alternative, of course, is to sit after Christmas. [Government members: Hear, hear!] [Hon. R. PHILP: You have to submit the business yet.] I can only say that we will submit the business in due course and at the proper time, of which we are the best judges. We are not going to allow the leader of the Opposition to dictate to us when we should submit the business to the House. [Mr. J. LEAHY: You might want two extra days.] It is necessary that we should have the extra day, and I can only say that it will probably be found necessary to have two extra days per week if the hon. member for Bulloo is going to take such full liberty of his rights as a member of this House as to monopolise so large a share of the time devoted to the discussion of business. The hon. gentleman has

*Hon. A. Morgan.*]

taken up this afternoon more time than all the other members of the House who have spoken upon this particular business, and most of the observations he had to offer were totally irrelevant. [Government members: Hear, hear!] [Mr. BOWMAN: It was a Yes-No speech.] [Mr. FORSYTH: When will you bring the Estimates on?] In due course; at present there is ample business on the paper to engage the attention of hon. members, and when that is disposed of there is ample important business to follow. The hon. gentleman complains, and the hon. member for Carpentaria echoed the complaint, that in his experience of this House he had never known a motion for a five days' sitting submitted so early. [Mr. FORSYTH: I did not say anything of the sort.] Does the hon. gentleman remember that the circumstances of the present session are wholly different to those of any previous session—that owing to the general election taking place in the third quarter of the year, when the House is usually in session, the House has had to devote its attention to business which usually comes before it at that period? We could not meet the House until 20th September, and the time remaining between the 20th September and Christmas is much shorter than the time intervening between the usual date of the meeting in July and the end of December. It is therefore necessary that, if we are to do the business which requires to be done this session, we must sit more days in the week, and sit on Monday earlier than we have been in the habit of doing. The reason the extra day is asked for is because it is required. Hon. members opposite have entirely failed to show that the request is an unreasonable one. [Mr. J. LEAHY: We have not had the reasons.] In addition to the Bills on the paper there are other seven important Bills, and it is absolutely necessary, if those Bills are to be disposed of before the close of the session, that the House should meet more frequently than it does now. That is substantially the reason, and one which I am quite sure will commend itself to the majority of this House.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Trooping*): I would not have spoken had the Premier not displayed such temper, and not only on that account, but because I think the objections raised on this side of the House are to an extent reasonable. I think it would be very much more reasonable if the hon. gentleman suggested that private members' afternoon should be wiped out and Government business continued on Thursday afternoon. That would have been a reasonable proposition. The hon. gentleman gets up and lectures this side and the House generally in a manner which a man only with a very large majority behind him could do. I think the proposal to sit on Monday afternoons an unreasonable one. It has been clearly pointed out that we require time to digest the measures put before us and to prepare for them. How can we prepare for them if we sit here five days a week and have Bills submitted to us at a few hours' notice? How can we prepare for intelligent discussion if measures are put before us in that way. I can quite understand members who do not take any interest at all—who are simply content to do as they are told—that such and such a mode of procedure is quite a correct one; but to men in this House who are desirous of doing their duty to the House and the country it is quite a different thing altogether. I protest against this manner of doing business. I do not want to move an amendment, and I will not take up the time of the House, but I do think it is not a matter which should be allowed to pass without protest.

Question put and passed.

[*Hon. A. Morgan.*]

## LAND BETTERMENT ASSESSMENT BILL.

### COMMITTEE—PROPOSED INTRODUCTION.

The TREASURER moved—That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide for the collection of part of any future betterment in land values, and for other purposes.

HON. R. PHILP: This was a very important measure, and he thought the Treasurer might give them a synopsis of the Bill before going further. It was the most important measure which had been placed on the table of the House. [The TREASURER: You will have the Bill in two minutes in your hand.] He wanted some explanation of it.

The TREASURER: He had stated that the hon. gentleman would have the Bill in his hands in two minutes. [Hon. R. PHILP: I want some explanation of the Bill.] It was not usual at this stage to explain the provisions of a Bill before it was produced. [Mr. MACARTNEY: Yes; at the request of the House.] He thought that would be most irregular, and that it was much better to allow the Bill to be tabled, then read a first time, and after hon. members had had time to consider it, they could discuss it.

HON. R. PHILP reminded the Treasurer that on one occasion when he (Mr. Philp) moved a similar motion, he gave a long explanation of the Bill, because the Treasurer, who was then acting leader of the Opposition, insisted upon it. [A Government member: He was in Opposition.] And he (Mr. Philp) was now in Opposition. [The TREASURER: I am surprised that you should follow his bad example.] He did not know that any measure of this sort had ever been introduced in Australia before. It was a new departure, and it would be easy for the Treasurer to give a short explanation of the Bill. He was not going to follow the bad example of the Treasurer. If the hon. gentleman would give a short summary of the provisions of the Bill, he could promise that he would not create discussion—he would even try to prevent discussion. [Mr. DUNSFORD: You cannot answer for all your party.] He could.

Mr. J. LEAHY: The answer that the Treasurer had given to the leader of the Opposition went to show that the Treasurer wished to make the forms and usages of the House a farce. It would be absurd to expect the Treasurer to go into the details of the Bill, but he might give a short summary of it and the incidence of the taxation thereunder. It seemed that the hon. gentleman had got something up his sleeve in connection with this Bill. He might think that some people, through the sale of land, were getting too much of the unearned increment, and that the State was not getting enough, and he proposed to take, perhaps, half, or one-third, or one-tenth of the unearned increment. The Committee would agree to the resolution, and a Bill would be founded on it; but this procedure would simply mean that the Treasurer was the House—but he was not. The fairest and most orderly way was to comply with the usages of the House and the House of Commons. Let the Treasurer give them a short synopsis of the Bill, and, if any decency or observance of the forms of the House were to be observed, the Treasurer should do that.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The TREASURER: I move that this resolution be agreed to by the House.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Of course we are not supposed to know what transpires in Committee, but I contend that some reason should be given here why the resolution reported from the Committee should be agreed to. I know it is unusual at this stage to offer any objections, but I think that some reasons should be given. In Committee the Treasurer absolutely refused to give any reasons, and this resolution has been reported to the House as having been arrived at after mature consideration. Nothing of that kind happened; it was simply a bald resolution, and we should have some explanation given now.

Question put and passed.

#### FIRST READING.

The TREASURER: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a first time.

Question put and passed.

The TREASURER: I beg to move that the second reading of this Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Before that motion is put, I may say that I understood the Treasurer to say that the committee stage of the Bill would not be taken for a day or two.

The TREASURER: I have moved in the usual way that the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow; but it does not necessarily follow that the second reading is likely to take place to-morrow. Other business has precedence of that. The order of business for to-morrow is a matter which the Premier will announce to the House at the close of the sitting.

HON. R. PHILP: I rise to protest against this hasty legislation. The second reading should not be taken to-morrow—it should be delayed for three or four days or even a week, so that we can fully consider this important measure. If the Treasurer promises that he will postpone the second reading for a week, I will agree to that. [The TREASURER: You know that the Treasurer can't give any such promise; that he doesn't arrange the business-paper.]

Question put and passed.

### REGISTRATION OF CLUBS BILL.

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. R. PHILP: I agree with the title of this Bill, and I think it is a measure which is much needed, but it seems to me to be rather one-sided. I know it has been contended by licensed victuallers that it is not fair to allow these clubs—some of them mushroom clubs—to sell liquor every hour of the day and night, Sundays included. I agree with that, and I promised when I was in office to bring in a Bill with the same title as that of the Bill now before us. While I agree that the second reading of the Bill should pass, I think it could be improved in committee. [The HOME SECRETARY: You are not in favour of exemptions?] I cannot see that where the subscription for one club is £10 a year and the subscription for another is £2, that the two clubs should be treated alike. The Home Secretary has not told us of the mushroom clubs he says are in existence here. I think he should have done that. I have been told of them unofficially, but I think that there has been a great deal too much noise and sound about the matter, and not much truth. [The HOME SECRETARY: A good deal of truth.] It would be enough, I think, if clubs with a respectable number of members paid one or two guineas subscription and were under police supervision. I do not suppose for a moment that the Bill has

been brought in for the small amount of taxation it imposes, because I do not suppose

[5 p.m.] there are twenty clubs in the whole of Queensland that will come under its provisions, so that the amount of revenue that will be derived is very small. But, if licensed victuallers labour under any injustices as compared with clubs, we ought to try and right those injustices in a Bill of this sort. No good reason has been shown why there should be any distinction drawn between one class of club and another. [The HOME SECRETARY: I do not intend that there should be any distinction drawn.] Why should not a respectably conducted club like the Commercial Travellers' Club be placed on the same footing as any other club? I hope that this invidious distinction will be removed in committee. I shall support the Bill as a Bill, but, when it gets into committee, any amendments I shall propose will have for their object the making the measure as uniform and equitable as possible, and of making the fees high enough to prevent the springing into existence of any of the mushroom clubs of which we have been told so much. The Home Secretary spoke of one club whose membership fee was only 2s. 6d. Well, I know of one youths' club which is very well conducted. It has a billiard-table, and, altogether, the conduct of the club is well worthy of imitation by some of the bigger clubs. But there are other clubs that I have been informed are not well conducted, and the youths of this city are being inveigled there to drink, play cards, and gamble. One case was brought under my notice of a youth who was ruined by one of these clubs. We ought to have been told by the Hon. the Home Secretary whether, in his opinion, such clubs will be entitled to get registration under this Bill, or whether the Bill will prevent their registration, and whether any clubs that are not properly conducted are in existence at the present time. [The HOME SECRETARY: It is very difficult to prove that definitely.] The hon. gentleman has all the police and the detective force at his command, and the police ought to know if anybody knows. The president of the Licensed Victuallers' Association told me that such is the case, and, if that is so, the matter ought to receive attention. I can promise the Home Secretary that I shall assist him in making the Bill one which will stop these so-called clubs—these drinking and gambling clubs—from having the opportunity of misleading the youth of this State as they are said to do at the present time.

Mr. KENNA: I believe that this is a serious attempt to grapple with a very difficult problem—that is, the liquor problem; but this and all such measures which purport to deal with this problem are, after all, mere tinkering measures. Even if this Bill is passed, I do not think it will lead to any diminution in drunkenness, or in crime that results from drunkenness. Seeing that clubs are put on a different basis to hotels, it would have been just as well if the license fees for bar-rooms and billiard-rooms had been fixed at the same amounts as in connection with hotels. That would get over one of the difficulties of the position. I cannot see why any co-operation of individuals should be entitled to privileges in the way of dispensing grog, or in the way of billiard-tables, that are not also granted to licensed victuallers. There is no doubt a wide distinction between a club and a hotel, inasmuch as a genuine club is not run for private profit. It is a co-operative concern, using the co-operative profits—[Mr. COOPER: A club is purely socialistic.] [Mr. J. LEAHY: They like to have a good balance-sheet at the end of the year, all the same.

*Mr. Kenna.*]



Quite so. A club is co-operative rather than socialistic. The profits are employed co-operatively in the case of a club, whilst in the case of a hotel, they go entirely into the pockets of individuals. [An honourable member: Into the pockets of the brewers.] I believe that under the "tied-house" system the larger proportion of hotels in this and the adjoining States are run by breweries, and that the publicans are merely figure-heads. But, whilst I would place clubs on the same footing as hotels in regard to fees, I would exempt them from some of the more prying provisions of the Licensing Act, inasmuch as the exclusion of the element of private profit will prevent the adulteration of liquor prevailing to the same extent as in connection with hotels. I am one of those who hold that no amount of legislation of this sort will ever be more than a spoonful of water out of the ocean in grappling with the great problem of the liquor traffic. There are two great factors which have to be recognised in connection with the traffic. The first is that an inherent desire for grog exists to a very large extent in the community. That desire, I believe, is due to a very large extent to the stress and strain of modern life. The over-worked man—the man who has been working twelve or fourteen hours a day, whether manually or mentally—has exhausted his energies by the end of his day's work, and he flies to some temporary stimulant to bring him back from the state of depression into which he has fallen. The long hours which prevail in various branches of industry, the insanitary conditions under which many people are compelled to work, the undue exhaustion of their nervous energies causing them to have recourse to a stimulant, are largely the reasons for this inherent thirst for grog. Where these conditions are not removed or ameliorated by wise legislation such as that which the Labour party have always advocated—the restriction of the hours of labour and the making the conditions of labour as healthy and sound as industrial conditions will permit—this taste for grog will continue to exist, catered to by private individuals selling grog for whatever profit they can make out of it; and while that state of affairs is allowed to exist the great liquor problem will remain just where it is to-day. [Mr. FORSYTH: Does not the man who works eight hours a day want his glass of grog just as much as the man who works ten hours a day?] If the statistics upon the question are gone into, it will be discovered that the eight-hour man drinks much less than the ten-hour man. There is a book in the library on "The Eight Hour Day," which proves that the legal reduction of the hours of labour in England has been accompanied by a decrease in the amount of drunkenness and an increase in night schools and mutual benefit societies. The statistics are given in connection with certain mining and manufacturing districts, and they show that the invariable accompaniment of a legal reduction in the hours of labour has been a decrease in drunkenness, and side by side with it a decrease of crime. [Mr. J. LEAHY: There is not the same strain on the system.] That is the point. I think that the only way of solving the liquor question is by the nationalisation of the traffic. There is no other method of dealing with the problem, and these measures which attempt to patch it up a little here and a little there can never do any good. Until this or some other Government in a whole-hearted fashion goes in for nationalising the trade, we will never get any "forrarder" in the matter. The industrial conditions to which I have alluded on the one side, and the private ownership of hotels ministering to this desire on the part of the populace for the sake of profit on the other, are the two elements that, brought into conjunc-

[Mr. Kenna.

tion, are responsible for a great deal of the misery, drunkenness, and crime that exist in the community. What are our hotels to-day? Gilded palaces to attract youths and others to drink the grog that they dispense there—that grog being more or less good or more or less bad. We had, only yesterday, an illustration of the evils effects of that unrestricted competition so often praised by hon. members on the other side run riot in connection with the liquor traffic. The adulteration of liquor is entirely due to the private profit element in its dispensation. If, as in places where the traffic has been nationalised or municipalised, hotels were to be abolished, and shops instituted in which single glasses of grog could not be bought, in which individuals would have to take away a whole bottle and to sign a declaration when taking it away, in which there is no inducement for persons to spend their time, and in which the person behind the counter had no personal interest in selling grog, a very different state of affairs would exist. I have recently read a book entitled, "Sober by Act of Parliament," which shows the great decrease in crime and drunkenness effected by the almost total prohibition of liquor in some of the American States. It bears out exactly what I have said—that, if you do away with the allurements which the private hotel offers to individuals to go and pass their time away—if you can eliminate the element of private gain—you will legislate in the right direction. While I think it is a good thing to do away with bogus clubs, I do not think this will lead to any appreciable reduction in the drinking habits of the people. Those youths who, at the present time, imbibe in clubs will, if they do not get drink there, go elsewhere, and possibly get a worse class of liquor. I hope one day this liquor question will be tackled in a whole-hearted and thorough fashion, and that the private hotel will become a thing of the past; that the element of private gain in the disposal of liquor will be wiped out; and that the conditions which minister to the taste for grog on the part of a large section of the community will be modified very considerably by wise industrial legislation.

Mr. COOPER (*Mitchell*): I have carefully gone through this Bill, and think that on the whole it is an extremely good measure. A properly managed *bona fide* club is an institution the property of which is the individual property of each member—an institution which at regular intervals elects its committee for the year, who manage both the financial side and the catering of the club. That is a *bona fide* club, and so much is it a part of the national character that even in this House it is often said that we use it as a club. The arrangement of our parliamentary refreshment-rooms and billiard-room are similar to those of a well-ordered club. The rule in reference to gambling in well-ordered clubs is that no gambling is allowed, and the majority of clubs have a fixed rate of stakes for whist, bridge, and so on. It must be limited. In some clubs they are pretty well able to play for higher stakes than in others, and the rule in reference to the bridge table is that the stake may vary from anything from 5s. a point to 2s. 6d. a hundred, and a man can choose exactly what he wants to play for, but on complaint to the committee that gambling goes on, it is immediately put down. I do not want to see legislation passed which will interfere with good clubs, because I am certain that a well-managed club is an exceedingly good thing for a young man of twenty-one or twenty-two to join. It brings him in contact with his equals, and with men of experience; and, in conversation

with them, I am sure he is likely to gain more than if he is forced to frequent public-house bars. The clubs which this Bill aims at putting down—and which I hope it will put down—are the proprietary clubs which are run entirely for the benefit of individuals, and as such are unlicensed public-houses, without the safeguards with which the law surrounds the ordinary licensed victualler. I have heard several people mention that their sons and relatives have been ruined by belonging to bogus clubs. The hon. member for Bowen referred to the liquor trade, and I think he drew a comparison which is not quite correct. It is undoubted that the English nation is a hard-drinking nation, but that is not caused so much by long hours of labour. I think you will find the reason if you compare the English public-house with the Continental public-house. I have always heard it said that the English nation drink so much because of the unattractiveness of the public-houses. A man goes into a gin palace, with its glaring lights, and drinks his grog standing at the bar, and without any comfort. The Frenchman goes to his café in the afternoon, and there he meets his friends. It is a nearer approach to our clubs than anything else. In summer he sits outside in the shade discussing the affairs of State, and has his glass of cognac or cup of coffee or glass of wine, and he plays dominoes or cards without any restrictions. Speaking generally, he is provided with more amusement. I should not like to see any hindrance placed in the way of establishing workmen's clubs under this Bill. In the old country I know they do a vast amount of good, and I should like to see a clause inserted providing that the Governor in Council can give permission for workmen's clubs to be established without entrance fees so long as evidence is brought forward that they are formed for *bonâ fide* purposes. In the majority of the clauses of the Bill there will be very little to alter. In fact, the rules for which they provide are already in existence in every well-organised club, the rules under the Bill being, indeed, more lenient than in the majority of clubs. As an instance of that I might mention the time for which a new member's name must be posted before election. The idea is that members living at a distance may have notice of a certain gentleman's name being up, so that if they know anything which deters him from associating with respectable people the reasons may be placed before members. Another point is that, I hardly think it fair that country clubs should be charged the same registration fee as city clubs, and I hope that will be altered in that respect in committee. I shall give the Bill my support.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Carpentaria*): I think the Government are to be commended for bringing forward a Bill the object of which is to suppress bogus clubs, and I have no doubt that if the provisions are carried out it will have that effect. Some of the reasons given by the hon. member for Bowen why people drink so much I do not think can be borne out by facts. The hon. member thought the drinking habits of the people were caused by long hours of labour, and the shorter the hours the less they drank. As far as Australia is concerned, the people drink as little as in any country, and they actually consume less spirits. My own impression is that drinking depends entirely upon the prosperity of the country. I have in my hand the statistics supplied by "Hazel's Annual" in reference to the consumption of liquor in the old country, and if you go back for thirty years, and compare the consumption of liquor then against the consumption now, you will find that just as the people get more money, and just as the times are

prosperous, so more liquor is consumed. Compare England now with what it was in 1896, 1897, or 1898, and you will find that the consumption of liquor was less in those years because the purchasing power of the people was less. I find that in 1902 the total expenditure on liquor in the United Kingdom was £179,000,000, and the increase in 1899 as against 1898 was no less than £10,000,000. No one need tell me that the reason why more liquor was drunk was because the hours of labour were longer. No doubt short hours of labour are a good thing, and if a man has short hours and good pay he will probably drink more. If he has more time on his hands he will spend some of it in the public-house. I do not use that argument in favour of longer hours of labour—I believe in short hours—but I wish to show the fallacy of the argument of the hon. member for Bowen that short hours of labour mean less drinking. I think it essential that this Bill should have been brought in for the purpose of suppressing those bogus clubs which evade the law, and the Government are perfectly justified in closing them, for they are carrying on the business of drinking and gambling clubs, and saving the license fee of £30 and the billiard-table license of £10. Of course, the publicans have to provide accommodation; they are under very strict rules to do all sorts of things before they can [5.30 p.m.] get a license, for which, in the towns, they have to pay £30, and if they go in for a second bar they have to pay £10 extra for it, and also a fee of £10 for every billiard-table they have. [Mr. NELSON: Their hours are limited.] Yes; their hours are limited to 11 o'clock. While I am in favour of any measure which will stop these bogus clubs, I think, on the other hand, that some of the clauses of this Bill are somewhat drastic. In clause 31—which I understand was inserted in the other place—there is an exemption by which a city club, which pays an entrance fee of £10 and an annual subscription fee of not less than £4, get off altogether, with the exception of the registration fee, and I understand from the Home Secretary that he proposes to make the registration fee upon the basis of £15 per annum and £10 for the billiard-table license. I cannot understand why, because a club pays a higher entrance or annual subscription fee, they should be exempt, while clubs which pay a smaller fee, such as 10s. or £1, should not be. These clubs are not for the purpose of drinking saloons at all, but for meeting together and discussing business and other things; but, because the fee is less than I have stated, these clubs have to come under the provisions of clause 13, which larger clubs with a larger subscription are entirely exempted from, but have to pay something which they do not pay now—first of all the annual registration fee of £15, and for every billiard-table £10, which I think is too much. We must bear in mind that we cannot bring hotels on the same lines as private clubs, because hotels have a large number of customers—perhaps, in some cases, a population of 100,000 people—and they are not restricted to members and guests. But the people to whom clubs can supply liquor is restricted. The Home Secretary said that some clubs had as many as 600 members, some 100, and some less. I know some in town with probably under 100—some under fifty; so that we can easily see that the amount of liquor supplied to these people and to guests taken in by members is limited. I believe there are one or two clubs which do not receive more than £10 or £20 a year for liquor, and in their case it is unfair to put on a heavy fee like this. I have not discussed the question with those affected; but from a common-sense point of view it appears to me that we are

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

going to impose a very drastic measure on clubs which we all know to be social clubs, and that a registration fee of £15 is altogether too much. At the present time they are paying £5, which is only paid once, and is not annual, and some have thought in addition to escaping the £30 license fee, which the hotels have to pay, they would be able to carry on at all hours of the night. I hope this Bill will carry out the objects the Government have in view in bringing it forward. I believe we should have absolute proof of membership, which I think the Bill provides for. I think the provision to pay subscriptions in advance is somewhat drastic, as we all know that there are very few clubs the members of which pay their subscriptions in advance, the payment being generally made a week or ten days afterwards, as the case may be. There is no doubt that these bogus clubs are very objectionable, and exercise a bad influence on young men, because there is no restriction whatever upon furnishing liquor, and they can do anything they like. Hotel-keepers, on the other hand, have to undergo certain routine as far as inspection is concerned, and I think the clubs are working against them. With regard to the accommodation required to be provided by subsection (ii.) of clause 6, there are some people who believe that sleeping accommodation for the members is implied; but I do not believe that at all. [Mr. J. LEAHY: No club does it.] Yes; the Queensland Club has accommodation for its members. [Mr. J. LEAHY: All its members?] Oh, no. I think no other club in Brisbane provides sleeping accommodation at all. What does accommodation mean here? Some people think that they must have a certain number of beds. I suppose it means the usual accommodation apart from sleeping accommodation. It speaks also of meat and drink. There are some clubs which do not go in for that at all, although anyone going in at 10 o'clock could have a glass of beer and a sandwich. I do not know exactly what it means, but if meals must be supplied in the usual way to the guests of the club, then I think it should be left optional with the club. This will bring in a little addition to the revenue, but when we get into committee we may be able to reduce the amount of the registration fee, but not to such an extent that it would fall in the object aimed at of suppressing bogus clubs; and I think the provisions with regard to inspection and other matters will be ample for the purpose in view. I think we shall be able to improve the Bill in committee; meanwhile I shall support the second reading.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): I am in favour of the Bill to a certain extent, as it endeavours to do away with a grievance; but whether it will really do any good is another question. There is one aspect of the proposed legislation which I would like to point out to the Home Secretary, and that is that by doing away with the clubs the cry will be raised for the necessity for more hotel accommodation. There are great vested interests in connection with the liquor traffic, and every new license granted is a monopoly to the individual. I agree with the hon. member for Bowen, that we will never get the liquor traffic under control unless by nationalising the traffic, and I think we should go on the same lines as Western Australia at the present time. When a new goldfield springs up there they do not grant any new licenses, but start State hotels. If we in this Bill remove a certain number of clubs, there will, perhaps, be applications for new licenses on account of the increased hotel accommodation required. The Home Secretary has not full control of the granting of licenses—it is a question for the licensing bench—but I hope we shall follow the good

[Mr. Forsyth.

example of Western Australia in this matter. They acknowledge that the liquor traffic cannot be supervised, and although we may do our best to keep it within the hours provided by the Act, there is a great temptation to work overtime, as it were. There are two agencies at work here—the people wanting to drink and knowing there is a possibility of getting it, and the question of keeping the hotels under proper control. If the trade was carried on by the State they would know very well from the experience of the civil service that they would not work overtime. There would be no use in going after the time, for the place would be shut up. The civil servant always has his work done when it is time to go home, and his bag ready, to go off to his family. He won't stop behind to catch any trade. Neither will he be anxious to work Sunday morning or evening to oblige customers. He would not be there but he would be at church or somewhere else. I have great sympathy with the hotel-keeper, because I think he is the victim of circumstances. He wants to make some profit in order to pay his rent, for if there is a rent-grinding concern in the world it is in connection with the liquor traffic. According to a report of a Select Committee in Sydney lately, 97 per cent. of the hotels there were tied houses, and the publicans were working their "innards" out to pay the rent to the breweries. It would be far better that these men should be working for wages than working half their lifetime as slaves to the breweries. I hope the Home Secretary will stand firm and say that no more new licenses shall be given to private individuals. I think that something more will have to be done in the matter of State supervision of hotels. Deputation after deputation—two or three times a year—have waited on the Government asking that there should be better supervision of hotels with regard to the hours of opening, the adulteration of liquor, and so on, but every Home Secretary and every Government have found it practically impossible to prevent all abuses. The great profit is the locks, in which the great strength lies, and, Samson-like, until their locks are shorn there will be no improvement. I think it would be a step in the right direction if we gave the State this monopoly. With regard to the consumption of drink, I have noticed that they consume more drink per head in England than they do in Australia. And also that the men here work shorter hours than they do in England. Many people try to make out that it is the working-men who make the big drink bill so large, but it is not the working men who drink the most. [The HOME SECRETARY: They do their little best.] That may be; but the higher classes out-drink him ten times over. It has been assumed that the reason why the people in Ireland are so poor, is because they drink so much whisky; but that is not the case. In Ireland we find the amount is £2 4s. 1d. per head, while in England it is £4 7s. per head. [Mr. NIELSON: What about the private stills?] There are none of them there. And in Australia it is £3 14s. 6d. per head. Then, look at the drinking of the landlords—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member will see that he is wandering from the Bill into a discussion of the liquor question generally. I trust that he will not proceed further on those lines—that he will confine his remarks to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. RYLAND: I was pointing out how some of the abuses in the liquor traffic could be done away with, and I wish just to say that in Ireland one landlord drinks as much as 125 tenants. So it is not because the Irish working classes drink so much that they are poor. If that

were the case, the landlords should be 125 times poorer than the tenants. I am going to support this Bill, which, at the same time, I think only touches the fringe of this great subject. I again hope that the Home Secretary will not grant any more new licenses, and if, by local option or otherwise, people decide to have more hotels, let them be State hotels.

Mr. HAWTHORN (*Enoggera*): I consider that if the provisions of this Bill are properly carried out, that it will be of considerable benefit to the community, but it will have to be carried out on different lines to the present Licensing Act, and in that particular connection, I may point out that the present Act provides for the registration of clubs, and it should provide for the proper supervision of these clubs. In that respect I consider that the Act has been a dead letter. There is no doubt that the experience in Queensland and right throughout Australia—and generally throughout the British-speaking world—has been that in a great many towns there are a number of bogus clubs. In Glasgow, where an Act was brought in last year, this was found to be particularly the case. Out of fifty-two places, forty-one declined to apply for licenses or certificates, and of the remaining eleven, eight were denied certificates and the remaining three were allowed to have certificates, with a caution that unless they improved their mode of operation they would run the risk of losing their licenses. I consider that this Bill should deal with such clubs. We know that there are some clubs of good standing that should not be interfered with, as they are not likely to attempt any evasion of the law. Then I do not think that athletic clubs and clubs for social purposes, where no liquor is sold, should be interfered with. I do not know whether the Home Secretary intends to apply the Bill to these clubs. With regard to the question of fees, I think the Victorian system is a good one, under which there is a graduated scale. If a club has not more than 100 members, the fee is £10; if over 100 and not more than 200, £20; if over 200 and not more than 300, £30; if over 300 and not more than 400, £40; and so on up to 1,000 members, when the fee is £150. I do not contend that we should in any way harass *bonâ fide* clubs by charging high fees, but I think that the fees should be fixed on a sliding scale, because we must remember that this is not supposed to be so much a revenue-producing measure as a Bill to regulate the sale of liquor. We must also remember that *bonâ fide* clubs do not cater for the general public, neither can they, under this Bill, carry on at a profit, so that it seems to me that they should be treated on a different basis to licensed houses in regard to fees. The Bill is very comprehensive, and should go a long way towards securing that clubs are *bonâ fide* by insisting upon certain restrictions

[7 p.m.] as to accommodation and otherwise, and later on it makes it absolutely impossible for a club that is not *bonâ fide* to carry on. One good provision is that which insists upon a certain interval between the nomination and election of members. I have heard of instances where bogus clubs have been in existence in which a man has gone in, and he has been proposed as a member by a waiter, seconded by a porter, and become a member in about five minutes. [The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.] That is one of the abuses that will be prevented by this Bill. I would have liked to see the clause as to registration carried out more on the lines of the English Act, which provides—

The secretary of a club which occupies a house or part of a house or other premises which are habitually used for the purposes of a club and in which any intoxicating liquor is supplied—

That is the part I would like to see in—

to members or their guests shall cause the club to be registered in the manner provided by this Act.

Showing distinctly that it is not intended to apply to any club which does not cause liquor to be supplied or sold to its members. The clause which throws the onus of proof on the club when liquor is found there is becoming a very common provision, and it is one which is needed. I do not see any provision as to appeal, but presumably it will be governed by the provisions with regard to appeals in the Licensing Act. One thing which should be altered is limiting the power of persons to object to the registration of a club to the licensing inspector. That is the provision in the Victorian Act; it is quite full enough. The power of objection might be given to municipal bodies, but I do not think it should be granted to any ratepayer, freeholder, or leaseholder, as that may lead to clubs being harassed by persons who fancy that they have a grievance against that particular club. The system restricting objections to the inspector has been found to work well in Victoria, and it is also the system in vogue in Great Britain. On the whole, I think that the Bill is very well drawn. It seems to embody the best provisions in both the English and the Scotch Acts, and if it is carried out thoroughly, bogus clubs will soon be put a stop to. *Bonâ fide* clubs—and there are many of them in Brisbane—will not be affected, and I do not think they will have the slightest objection to coming under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. LESINA: Three or four years ago the late Government appointed a Royal Commission, and sent that commission round the Western country to ascertain how the Licensing Act was working. They put in several months travelling and sampling all kinds of grog in every part of Queensland. They were paid £2 2s. a day, and were allowed travelling expenses, and, after being away some months, they returned to Brisbane with a report weighing 13½ lb., and containing over 30,000 questions and answers. Their report was laid on the table of the House and has been there ever since. The commission made certain recommendations, not one of which has ever been carried out, either by the late or by the present Government. So far, every Government has lacked sufficient backbone to tackle the whole liquor question. The commission returned to Brisbane with grog blossoms on its nose.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LESINA: Well, if it did not, it was astonishing, seeing they sampled liquor in every town in Queensland, I believe. However, this report is lying on the departmental shelves to-day. About an inch and a-half of dust has accumulated on its covers, and nothing further has been done. I do not know whether the commission dealt with the question of clubs in their report, which is altogether too voluminous for a person whose life is only the ordinary three score years and ten in length to attempt to master its details. But, if the report does refer to clubs at all, the chances are that this Bill is to some extent based upon the recommendations of the commission. If that is not so, then apparently the Government are going outside the recommendations of the commission. I believe that some measure dealing with the registration and control of clubs is necessary. Anyone who goes about Brisbane with his eyes and his ears open knows that certain clubs have been established which have become veritable nuisances. They are simply grog saloons and gambling dens, and they ought to be put down. It was never contemplated by the Licensing Act, which deals with clubs, that

*Mr. Lesina.*]

such institutions should spring up. But I do not altogether blame the persons who have brought these clubs into existence. They have been brought into being by two or three causes. First of all, they are due to our need of an up-to-date Licensing Act. Some time after a new Government comes into office it makes an attempt to enforce the Sunday closing provisions of the Licensing Act, and the moment the pubs are shut, sly-grog shops and bogus clubs spring up as a result. Another reason why some of these clubs have sprung into existence is by way of protest against the quality of the liquor supplied by many of the hotels. It is a well-known fact to men who knock about town that you can get better liquor at one of the clubs than this Bill appears to be aimed at than you can get in one-half of the hotels in Brisbane. [Mr. FORSYTH: Are you speaking from personal experience?] No; I am speaking from the experience of those who have told me. I was talking only to-day to the manager of one of the biggest whisky-importing houses in Brisbane, and he told me that the very club which the Bill is aimed at sells better liquor than any of the hotels. [Mr. FORSYTH: Which one is that?] That is the Bodega Club—the one under the pavement. [The HOME SECRETARY: This Bill is not aimed particularly at that club.] It is aimed at clubs of that description—those clubs which provide billiards, a little drink, and perhaps opportunities for gambling, and that are not really clubs in the sense that the Queensland Club, the Johnsonian, and the Commercial Travellers' Clubs are clubs. I have been in most of these clubs. [Mr. FORSYTH: Have you been in the Bodega?] Yes. When legislating on a matter of this kind it is just as well to examine these institutions, and see how they are conducted. At present a club gets a license on payment of a fee of £3, and that license is continued during such time as the person running the business keeps himself within the law, and, when he does not, of course the license is cancelled. Under this Bill it is proposed that clubs must renew their licenses annually, and they must be subject to certain conditions. They will be subject to periodic supervision and inspection in the same way as licensed victuallers. I do not think that can be objected to. It will not affect the legitimate club, while it will certainly do away with the bogus clubs. Some time ago, in Great Britain, a Royal Commission inquired into the matter very fully, and the secretary of the commission made some remarks about clubs, upon which subject the commission took a considerable amount of evidence. According to a book entitled "The Temperance Problem and Social Reform," by Messrs. Rowntree and Shernell, which is the most comprehensive and reliable work on the subject to date, it is said—

It has been well said that "no licensing reform, however complete the restraint it places on public-houses, will accomplish much unless at the same time it deals with the club evil. There is to-day, in every large town, a considerable and rapidly increasing number of drinking dens, subject to no control, paying no fees, requiring no licenses, and allowed to keep open all day and every day, Sunday and week day alike."

They then give a return showing the enormous number of these clubs established throughout England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. Evidence was also given before the English Royal Commission on the growth of brewers' clubs, and I expect that one of the results of this legislation will be the gradual springing into existence of brewers' clubs in this country. They say on that subject—

By means of these the licensing authorities are not unfrequently set at defiance, as in a case mentioned in the House of Commons in 1895. The license of a certain village public-house had been taken away because

[Mr. Lesina.

of the misconduct of the publican, and because the place was not required. Thereupon the brewer who owned the building opened it as a club, making the former publican manager. The rules were carefully drawn up, with the aid of counsel, to keep the house open to as many as possible; an entrance fee of a few pence was fixed, and the club was in a position to accommodate almost all its old customers. It had not to observe any of the regulations imposed on the regular drink shops, and, consequently, did twice as much business as before its license was taken away.

[Mr. HAWTHORN: That would be met under this Bill.] That is a kind of thing which is quite possible here now; but under the Bill, as introduced, it will be rendered impossible. It is very pleasing to know that, because there are a considerable number of hotels in Brisbane which are in the hands of the brewers. This question is a perfect scourge in New South Wales—no less than 97 per cent. of the hotels there being in the hands of the brewing companies. Here the same system is gradually springing up, and I believe that is another reason why the recommendations of our Royal Commission should be carried out, and the Government undertake the passage of a comprehensive measure dealing with the tied-house question. Now, this volume from which I have quoted deals with the whole question of the club evil, and the authors lay down in detail the provisions which should be made for the right conduct of clubs. They lay down certain principles, which I believe are covered by this measure. The question has raised a very large amount of controversy, and a large amount of evidence was taken by the commission in England, and on page 610 I find the following:—

But apart from the detailed proposals which that commission may make there is a growing and widespread conviction that any scheme of reform must include the licensing of all clubs in which liquor is sold. It is probable that the abuse of drinking clubs would be brought into narrow limits if it were provided—

(a) That all clubs in which liquor was sold should be annually licensed.

(b) That the licensing authority shall be empowered to attach to each license such conditions as it deemed necessary.

(c) That all licensed clubs should be open to the inspectors of the licensing authority.

(d) That the licensing authority should have power summarily to cancel the license of any club if, in the opinion of the licensing authority, the provisions of the license had been seriously violated.

They point out that provisions of the kind recommended would tend to suppress mere drinking clubs. It is pointed out in another place that visits of inspection to such clubs might be considered as an interference with that personal liberty and freedom which every man considers he is entitled to, and it remarked that clubs are not the only institutions the inspection of which places restriction on individual liberty. It has been said that clubs are corporate bodies of individuals who join together for the purpose of holding aloof from the general public and who establish within the four walls of their own building an institution where they can smoke, and drink, and read, and play cards just as they are accustomed to do in their own home; that club life is an extension of home life, and that the appointment of inspectors would be just as indefensible as if an inspector were sent round once or twice a year to a man's private house, and he was expected to throw open his drawing-room, or library, or smoking-room for inspection. There is something to be said in favour of that view, but the point has been met in the following manner by Captain the Hon. G. Anson, the Chief Constable of Staffordshire, when giving evidence before the Royal Licensing Commission. He was asked—

Whether there would be any very strong opposition to the power of entry from social and political clubs of

high standing, and from the far larger number of working mens' clubs, which are conducted in a perfectly regular and proper manner, and how often the police would enter a well-conducted club? He replied, "I should think a visit once or twice a year would be ample. They could easily find out whether anything irregular was going on in a club with a number of members, and they would not enter unless there was some reason for doing it as a rule. It is to be remembered that all the large factories of the Kingdom are now under inspection, and those which are well conducted experience no annoyance from the occasional visit of the inspector."

Now, in that sense, this legislation, although it is of a piecemeal character and is merely dealing with the effect and does not get down to the primary cause of the evils incidental to the drink traffic in clubs, bogus or otherwise, is satisfactory. As a matter of fact, no legislation will be satisfactory which does not tackle the whole question, root and branch, and, as other speakers have pointed out, the whole question of the private manufacture and sale of liquor for private profit will have to be dealt with. These writers, Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, advocate the elimination of private profit as the easiest way out of this great difficulty—that the liquor question should be nationalised, as it is in some Continental countries, and as it is proposed to nationalise it in South Australia. [MR. FORSYTH: Apply the betterment principle.] There is no reason why the betterment principle should not be applied. There is a gradual increment in value in licenses, and in this work on the temperance problem they give several illustrations of that, and point out how hotels which forty years ago were worth very little are to-day of enormous value. They show how properties upon which for many years not a shilling has been spent have risen to a value of £30,000 and £40,000 through the natural growth of population and the increased consumption of liquor. Side by side with the wonderful development of temperance work, the consumption of liquor has steadily grown since 1840. The hon. member for Carpentaria, in reply to the hon. member for Bowen, has, in that respect, supported the attitude of Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell. They show conclusively that in 1876, which was the highest point reached during the big commercial boom, the consumption of liquor per head of the population has gone up by leaps and bounds. The shifting of the tax upon corn and the introduction of the excise laws would, one would think, have the contrary effect. The price of liquor has steadily gone up, but the consumption has increased tremendously, until in the years of greatest prosperity we find the consumption is at its highest point. In 1898 the British nation spent no less than £157,000,000 in liquor, or considerably more than is paid in rent throughout the kingdom. This is a big problem, and legislation like this does not go to the fundamental basis of the thing, and cannot have very much more than a merely temporary effect. [MR. FORSYTH: Nationalise all industries.] Well, I would not mind nationalising all industries in the hands of monopolies, which, under present conditions, do incalculable harm. There are three reasons why clubs have sprung into existence. First and foremost, dissatisfied business men join clubs because they get better liquor than in the hotels, which under the pressure of competition very often supply spurious grog. The case of the man Sizer, fined yesterday £200, is the only evidence I want of that. The Lord only knows how much of the crime and cruelty and assaults that are committed are directly attributable to the influence of adulterated liquor. Dr. Ham, in his report, gives particulars of some of the seizures made by his department; and Mr. Gabriel, the inspector

under the Excise Act, can give conclusive evidence upon the same matter. I say, therefore, that in dealing with the question of clubs, although we may be suppressing an evil, we are not going to the very root of the evil surrounding the whole liquor traffic, we do not touch the internal rottenness of the whole thing. Again, others joined these clubs in order that they might be able to get liquor on Sundays. If the recommendations of the Licensing Commission were embodied in a comprehensive measure, and people were permitted within reasonable hours to get liquor on Sunday, half of these clubs would never have come into existence at all. Now, I do not know whether this Bill proposes that all clubs should sell the best possible class of liquor. Our licensing laws provide punishments, and people are punished, for selling inferior liquor, but, nevertheless, a considerable amount of bad liquor is sold, and I do not know that clubs are particularly responsible for that. In some of these clubs the profit on the sale of liquor goes into the hands of certain persons, and those persons will find it to their interest to sell the best possible kind of liquor. [MR. FORSYTH: Clause 13.] Clause 13 lays down the conditions. If that is so, I am satisfied that considerable good will be done, [7.30 p.m.] and *bona fide* clubs will not suffer.

I would like to see precisely the same energetic action applied to the control of the liquor supplied in the hotels of Brisbane. Certainly a considerable amount of good work is being done at the present time, as is evidenced by the seizure of that poisonous stuff at Sizer's the other day, which I believe was destroyed, and some action took place in regard to the people who run the Broadway Hotel at Woolloongabba. But there are half a dozen hotels in the main streets of our city selling liquor which is not calculated to do anything else but injure the persons who consume it. One of the commonest practices of hotel-keepers is the refilling of bottles bearing popular brands with inferior liquor. It is a thing that pays and is instituted by the stress of modern competition. The unscrupulous trader who desires to get ahead of his more scrupulous rival resorts to the practice of filling bottles bearing popular brands, such as Buchanan's whisky, which is in constant demand by experienced persons whose palate has been carefully nursed upon the better quality of liquor with liquor of an inferior quality. Take any brand in the market to-day which bears an extra reputation, and sells for a tiptop price. One of these inferior clubs which is established under the Bill, and fulfils all the conditions under it, might yet not be fulfilling the conditions in this respect, and it is a question whether it would be possible under this Bill or the Licensing Act to punish those persons. [MR. J. LEAHY: They are not selling it to anybody else; they are selling it to themselves.] Their members are consumers. When a man joins a club he should not forfeit any rights he possesses as an ordinary citizen, and if that club substitutes for a brand of whisky a member is partial to an inferior brand of whisky, I do not see why they should not be punished by losing their license, or by some other method directed by law. I know it is a difficult matter to tackle; but possibly some way will be discovered by the Minister in charge of the Bill, or by some hon. member in committee, when we discuss the various clauses. I know it is a common practice in the hotels in Brisbane, and I should like to see the Government introduce a comprehensive measure to prevent that kind of thing. Certain whiskies could be bought in bond at 3s. 6d. a gallon, while other whiskies sell as high as 4s. or 5s. Take the whisky at 3s. 6d. a gallon in bond. The duty on that would be about 15s. 6d., so that it would

cost about 19s. 6d. a gallon. That would be about 6 per cent. overproof, and under the licensing law the purchaser is permitted to break it down by 25 per cent. of water to bring it down to 18 per cent. underproof. At 15s. 3d. a gallon, two gallons would be about 30s. 6d. A reputable brand would cost 48s. or 52s. [Mr. J. LEAHY: Not in bond.] No, the duty will be paid by the importing firm. If a firm sells a case of Buchanan's whisky at 52s. a gallon, and it is sold to an hotel-keeper who keeps this cheap stuff, when he empties their bottle, he pours in the inferior stuff at 15s. a gallon. That kind of stuff is being poured into bottles bearing the labels of half a dozen popular firms to-day, and yet they cannot be punished. There are firms advertising in the newspapers for months and months warning their customers against this practice. [The HOME SECRETARY: You must make some allowance for the powers of the committee.] There is a news letter in a Sydney paper at present from a large company warning persons against the use of their bottles with this inferior stuff, so that in a club, although the committee may take every precaution possible, their members and visitors may not receive pure liquor. I believe the real evil after all is not so much in the drinking of liquor as in the consumption of adulterated stuff—which has been called "sudden death," "chain lightning," and so on—which is the cause of most of the trouble, saps the life out of a man, and robs him physically and mentally of his energies. The same thing applies to Wolff's schnapps; that can be bought, I believe, at 55s., but inferior stuff is manufactured in London out of all sorts of objectionable refuse, and sent out to tropical countries for consumption. The hon. member for Gympie, who poses as an authority on this subject, and who, by his fearsome revelations in this Chamber some two or three sessions ago, scared half the members of the Chamber into teetotaliers, demonstrated to his own satisfaction, and I believe to the satisfaction of others, that during his rambles on the Continent of Europe he discovered a distillery in France where they were manufacturing first-class three-star brandy from nightsoil. (Laughter.) Hon. members will remember those sensational revelations, the result of which was that our refreshment-bar trade fell 50 per cent. in a week, and brandy has been under a cloud ever since. In connection with schnapps precisely the same kind of thing takes place. This cheap patent spirit is manufactured out of maize, rice, damaged grain, potatoes, and even vegetable refuse, according to the London *Daily Mail*, which recently made some inquiries into the whole thing. [Mr. J. LEAHY: Is that schnapps you are talking of.] Well, patent spirit; it is really manufactured for the purpose of blending with other spirits, and can be put upon the market in a week or a fortnight, instead of maturing for eight or ten years in wood, when a proper flavour is acquired. Instead of that, this patent spirit is coloured, rectified, built up by all kinds of chemical processes, built up with sulphuric acid, strengthened with nicotine—as our friend Sizer was proved to be guilty of the other day—and in all other respects it is made a kind of liquid damnation, which is placed on the market and sold cheaply over the bar. Fancy a hotel-keeper selling three-penny worth of that to a man knocking off work at the wharf. The man stumbles and rolls about, falls under an omnibus, and is injured, or probably goes home and breaks up his family with an axe. This is legislation which I approve of, and I am pleased to see the Home Secretary introduce it, but it only touches the fringe of the question. I would like to see above all other things—and I hope the Government, if they weather the political storm which is likely to

come at any time across the track of the best regulated State—in the coming session will introduce a comprehensive measure which will have for its object the ensuring of a proper and pure supply of liquor to those who consume it. I wish success to this little Bill, which has become necessary because of lax legislation in dealing with the consumption of liquor generally by licensed victuallers. I think whilst it will have the effect of putting down bogus clubs by making those clubs who do get registered fulfil the conditions, and if they are successful in that respect it may induce them in the near future to launch out into legislation which will have an even far more reaching and beneficial effect as far as this is concerned. There are one or two points which require amendment in committee, and I think if the Minister is at all amenable to reason, he may see reasons for adopting the suggestions for amendment.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): I do not see that the dissertation on the liquor traffic which we have had has anything to do with the Bill, which is a Bill to amend the laws relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor by making better provision for the registration and control of clubs. I think that it is about time we had legislation of this kind. A lot of clubs have arisen in Brisbane and other parts of the State which are not beneficial to the community at large, and they are let off with a less fee than hotels, so far as registration is concerned. As far as the adulteration of liquor is concerned, there are, no doubt, many hotels—I am not speaking of clubs—where adulteration has taken place. We had a case before us the other day, which I am glad has been dealt with in a proper manner. I hope that not only hotel-keepers but clubs which attempt to adulterate liquor to that extent will meet with the severest punishment that the law can give. We know that numbers of young fellows, belonging to cricket, or football, or other athletic clubs, are in the habit of forming clubs for their own enjoyment, and in which they can obtain liquor, but I do not think that it is for their own benefit or for the benefit of the community that they should be allowed to do so, and I hope that this Bill will prevent anything of that sort. I believe in justice, and I would like to see clubs placed on such a basis that the people carrying on the ordinary liquor trade would not be interfered with. Hotel-keepers are very closely watched; they have to pay a big license-fee for the right to sell drink, and other fees for billiard-tables, and I think it is unfair that bogus clubs should be allowed to carry on by paying such a much smaller fee. A lot has been said about Sunday trading, and we know that people can go and drink in clubs all day and all night long, and all day Sunday if they like, whereas, if they go into hotels, they are watched, and the hotel-keeper and the men found drinking there on Sunday are fined. Although the authorities may have taken the action they thought best, Sunday drinking is going on as strong as ever. The police watch, but they have to go away for their meals, and while they are away people go in and drink as much as they want. I would like to see *bonâ fide* clubs started, and those that are not *bonâ fide* knocked out. I will probably have something more to say when the Bill gets into committee, when, with the assistance of hon. members of the Opposition, the Government, I have no doubt, will be able to produce a measure satisfactory to the licensed victuallers and to the community at large.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It seems strange that there should be all this agitation about amending the Liquor Act at this time, particularly when we have such urgent legislation awaiting

[Mr. Lesina.]

our consideration that we have been asked and are going to sit five days a week. Under the circumstances, one would have thought that the Home Secretary, in introducing this Bill, would have portrayed a strong case, showing the evils it is intended to remedy, but although I listened very closely to what the hon. gentleman and others have had to say, I have looked in vain for a strong case being made out. This is not on the platform of a certain political party, but it seems to me that because some of the friends of the hon. member for Barcoo are interested, this measure has been brought forward. That is the reason why this measure was placed in the Governor's Speech, and why it has been introduced at this early part of the first session of this Parliament, before we have had an opportunity of discussing the Estimates, or the licensing question generally, or the other urgent measures promised. The hon. gentleman said that there were thirteen clubs in and around Brisbane, and he mildly hinted that one or two were not *bonâ fide* ones. But the hon. member for Clermont has told the House that the Bodega Club is a mushroom one—a proprietary one—the profits from which go into one man's pockets. The opinion of the leading police officers here and of the leading lawyers—members of the bar and others—is that the present law is quite strong enough to meet the needs with regard to clubs—that there is sufficient power to enforce the administration of the law. The hon. gentleman has got the administration of the Licensing Act in his hands, and if there are such crying evils existing as the hon. member for Clermont has pointed out—and I am not prepared to say that there are not—it is his duty to put the provisions of the Act into force and redress the evils before he introduced a measure of this sort. The Government have been fifteen or sixteen months in office, and they have had plenty of time to see exactly where they stood in this matter, but for some reasons they have not done that, and this matter of administration, like other matters of administration, has been neglected by them. Under the present Licensing Act it is provided—

The club must be established for the purpose of providing accommodation and meat and drink for the members thereof upon premises of which such association or company are the *bonâ fide* occupants.

The accommodation must be provided and maintained from the joint funds of the club, and no persons must be entitled under its rules to derive any profit, benefit, or advantage from the club which is not shared equally by every member thereof.

It must have been proved to the satisfaction of the licensing justices at a quarterly meeting that the club is such an association or company as in this section defined, and that the premises of the club are suitable for the purpose.

Later on the section said—

Upon the complaint of an inspector the manager, steward, or other person conducting or managing a club, may be called upon to show cause before justices why the registration of the club should not be cancelled. And upon the hearing of the complaint, unless it is proved to the justices that the conditions of this section continue to be fulfilled with respect to the club, the registration shall be cancelled and the exemption aforesaid shall no longer extend or apply to persons selling liquor in such club.

To all intents and purposes, the onus of proof is thrown on the club to show that it is carried on as a *bonâ fide* club, and for the profit of all the members and not for any proprietor. If the evils that are said to exist do exist, why do not the members of the Government see that the law is enforced, for the present law is perfectly clear, and there would be no difficulty in enforcing it. But we have had a general election, and hon. members opposite seem now to follow on the lines of the least resistance, and they are

acting under instructions from a certain section or association which is supporting them. I have a letter in my pocket which I received this afternoon, which shows more than anything that this legislation is dictated by the Licensed Victuallers' Association. [The HOME SECRETARY: The temperance people want this Bill.] I do not know that it is not a wise thing to make ample provision for the registration of clubs, and I am going to render every assistance I can to make this a good measure; but members of the Government should not beg the question; they should see exactly where they are. When the hon. gentleman says that one of the reasons for the introduction of this Bill is to afford protection to the young fellows of the State, I join issue with him. I do not think that the clubs in and around Brisbane do the amount of harm to young fellows that has been represented, and I know that the question of selling liquor in most of these clubs is an incidental consideration; in many cases the profits from that source are a mere bagatelle, and are certainly not the main, or even an important means of support to the club. One reason given by the hon. gentleman for the establishment of these clubs was that persons who failed to obtain a license estab-

[8 p.m.] lished a proprietary club. [The HOME SECRETARY: I said it was quite possible.] With the exception of the instance mentioned by the hon. member for Clermont, I do not know of any instance in which that has been done. [The HOME SECRETARY: There are many instances in Great Britain.] But we do not usually legislate because of something that is happening in some other country. We generally wait until something is happening in our own midst. There are a number of clubs in and around Brisbane, but I do not think they represent the crying evil which has been indicated by the Home Secretary. I certainly have no personal knowledge of clubs selling liquor on Sundays or late at night, and I never hear any complaints about that sort of thing. The hon. gentleman made an allegation that there are over 2,000 members in the various clubs in Brisbane; but there are hundreds of men in Brisbane who are members of three, four, five, and even of six different clubs, and their names will appear as often on that list. [The HOME SECRETARY: I said that was the total membership list.] That amounts to practically 2 per cent. of the total population of Brisbane, which looks very large, but, if you deduct the names of those who appear more than once on the list, the percentage will be considerably reduced. The hon. member for Bulloo mentioned that he is a member of seven different clubs, but he probably does not go into most of them once a month. At any rate, the Home Secretary has not shown us that any crying evil exists, and he might have devoted his energy to a much more important aspect of the question.

Mr. J. LEAHY: This Bill, as far as I understand it, is intended to regulate and curb the evils that arise from the careless management of the liquor traffic. It is supposed that people are able to get rid of the restrictions that attach to hotels by forming themselves into clubs, where they can escape the penalties imposed upon them for drinking late at night, and where they can do other things which cannot be done in hotels. Although there is a great deal of that in Queensland, I do not think there is anything like as much as some hon. members seem to imagine, and the Home Secretary certainly gave us no evidence to justify him in asking the House to pass this Bill. He gave us nothing that I recollect, except mere rumour. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Toowong, supported

Mr. J. Leahy.]



by another legal member on the other side, the hon. member for Musgrave, that it is not necessary to pass this Bill at all to regulate clubs in the manner that is deemed necessary by members of this Chamber. Well, if it is necessary that clubs should be regulated in the manner proposed in this Bill, why has the existing law not been put in force? Even at this eleventh hour, if the law is as it is said to be by two members of the legal profession, what is the object of going on with this Bill? [Mr. NIELSON: The hon. member for Toowong pointed out that proprietary clubs can be dealt with by the existing law.] Very well, I do not see any objection to any kind of clubs except proprietary clubs. Those are the very clubs that objection exists against. Looking over the Bill, it really seems to me that it is proposed to give more power to clubs than exists under the present law. In section 18 of the Liquor Act of 1885, it is provided that "a club must be established for the purpose of providing accommodation and meat and drink for the members thereof," whilst this Bill provides that these things shall not only be provided for members, but for their guests. When we are endeavouring to restrict the sale of grog in clubs, why should the door be opened wider? [The HOME SECRETARY: The inspector has power to deal with them.] Perhaps the inspector under this Bill will be the same inspector as exists under the present law, which two members of the legal profession say contains ample provisions for dealing with proprietary clubs, and yet that law has not been administered at all; and probably that is what will happen under this Bill. Evidently there was some reason for the inclusion of guests in the Bill, but, so far, we have had no explanation from any Minister as to what that reason was. I am not prepared to say it does not admit of an explanation, but I am asking why those words have been included. If it was a wicket gate before, it is a broad way this time. I am very glad to see the Bill introduced. I am supposed to have some interest in the liquor business. I have not a very great interest in it; but any interest I might have would never influence me in trying to prevent any measure going through this House that would be likely to do away with grog altogether, and keep it out of the country. [Honourable members: Hear, hear!] I think it would be a good thing for the country if the liquor traffic was wiped out, as more evil arises from it than from anything else in the world. I do not think we will ever be able to wipe it out; but it would be an exceedingly good thing if we could. I was reading the other day a very able work written by Sir Horace Plunkett, one of the members of the present Ministry at home. It is a work written on Ireland, which has been so much quoted to-night, dealing with the great problems that confront them in Ireland, and really in every other country just now. It is always considered in Ireland that the rents which they have to pay are very heavy, and that they weigh down the agricultural industry. The rents amount to about £5,000,000, whilst the whisky and beer bill of the same country amounts to no less than £14,000,000; so that the rent, heavy and unjust as it is, is a very small matter compared with the beer bill. I suppose the same thing applies in other countries, and, if we could get rid of that altogether, we would be going a long way towards settling the troubles that afflict humanity. It is supposed that this Bill will lead to a more rigid discharge of the duties of inspectors; but, unless the Minister who has introduced the Bill is careful to see that those instructions are carried out, I do not know that we shall find ourselves much better off than we are at the present time. My

[Mr. J. Leahy.

experience of clubs in Brisbane—and I think I am a member of every one except these underground clubs—I belong to all the respectable clubs in Brisbane—seven or eight of them—and I have never seen any abuses in connection with them. They are remarkably well conducted. I am not in as good a position as some other hon. members to say whether they keep the same good quality of liquor, but I believe they do, and, if they do not, it is their own fault. They do not supply grog to the general public, and the bulk of the clubs insist upon the best article being supplied, and I believe it is. Whilst drinking is carried on, I believe that these clubs, instead of being an injury, are a benefit, because, if people will drink, it is better that they should drink good grog than bad, and I believe they get a good class of grog in the clubs. In justice to the clubs I speak of, I must say that their management and the behaviour of their members is excellent. If there are other clubs where abuses exist—where people who own these proprietary clubs get round the Act and establish a kind of bogus club, of which any man may become a member for a day or a year by paying 1s.—that is the kind of club that should be suppressed. I have not gone very carefully into the Bill, but trust that no hardship is imposed by way of taxation on legitimate clubs. If it is, I shall oppose it. If a club is a *bonâ fide* one for the use of certain subscribers, I do not think it should be burdened with taxation, but if it is a bogus club it should be suppressed. I do not mind the imposition of a registration fee at all, but I do object to billiard-table licenses, and so forth, which would be a hardship upon legitimate clubs. Altogether, I think the balance of evidence is in favour of the Bill, and as far as I am concerned it will have no opposition; but I trust, as it is a non-party measure, when we get into committee the Home Secretary will accept such reasonable amendments as may be necessary.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*): The Home Secretary, in introducing this Bill, said its object was twofold. First of all, to suppress proprietary clubs; and secondly, to get some little revenue from clubs. Everyone is agreed that an amendment of the law for the suppression of bogus clubs is necessary. The Licensing Act of 1885 excluded from the operation of the Act—

The sale of liquor on premises *bonâ fide* kept as a club provided that such liquor is only sold to members of such clubs and their guests.

The hon. member for Bulloo will see that the words he referred to in the Bill are similar to the words I have quoted. [Mr. J. LEAHY: That subsection (e) is the Liquor Act is repealed.] That is so; but the words the hon. member referred to are similar to the words I have quoted from the Act of 1885. The Legislature therefore recognized the necessity for making some provision for clubs; and I think, in dealing with the mischief which this Bill proposes to remedy, we should not unduly interfere with the rights of clubs against which no complaint has been made. Provision is made for the exemption of certain city clubs, except so far as registration fees are concerned, but that provision will only affect clubs which may be termed fashionable clubs. I rise more particularly to draw the Home Secretary's attention to a club which will be most harshly treated by the withdrawal of the right to sell liquor if the Bill passes in its present form; that is the Turn Verein, a club registered under the Act for the purpose of cultivating gymnastics, recreation, the preservation of health, the cultivation of social intercourse and literary tastes. That has

been registered under the Liquor Act of 1885 for the past twenty years. It has a membership of 130, with a subscription of £1 12s. 6d. annually, and there are besides between 500 and 600 other subscribing members who do not participate in the benefits of the club. The institution owns valuable property worth £1,500, and it would be a great injustice to a large section of the community if this Bill is permitted to pass into law. I trust in committee the Home Secretary will agree to an amendment which will meet the case of this and certain other clubs in a somewhat similar position, which are well conducted institutions which will be treated very harshly under the Bill as it now stands.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

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

## MEAT AND DAIRY PRODUCE ENCOURAGEMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

### SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*): In the year 1893 there was an abundance of stock, and there was brought into this House a Bill which I believe has been for the benefit of a large number of stockowners and dairymen. Probably few measures have been of greater benefit to the State than the Act to encourage the manufacture and export of meat and dairy produce. The preamble of that Act said—

Whereas it would tend to encourage the manufacture and exportation of meat and dairy produce from Queensland to subscribe a portion of the capital required for the erection of suitable buildings and machinery for those purposes: and whereas such manufacture and exportation is for the common and especial benefit of all owners of cattle and sheep within the colony, and it is equitable and just that such owners should contribute towards the funds necessary to meet the required expenditure.

It was for the common benefit of stockowners. The money was appropriated specially for the erection of meatworks and dairy works. There was a tax of 15s. for every 100 head of cattle, and 1s. 6d. for every 100 head of sheep; 90 per cent. of the money derivable from cattle was allocated for the erection of meatworks and all the money raised from the sheep assessment. Section 12 of the 1893 Act provided that moneys repayable by borrowers should be disposed of and applied for the encouragement and manufacture of meat and dairy produce in such manner as Parliament might from time to time direct. No provision was made for issuing certificates of money received from the various parties who contributed. In 1895 the Act was amended, and provision was made for issuing certificates for moneys which had been paid and for moneys hereafter to be paid, and that Act repealed section 12 of the Act of 1893. It provided that the Minister might, out of moneys repaid to him in respect of advances made under the provisions of the principal Act, repay to the holders of any certificates the amount thereof, or such part of such amount, as might be available for the purpose of repayment. It simply provided that the repayment by the borrowers of principal and interest might be restored to those who contributed to the fund. This goes a step further, and provides that the amount at credit of the meat fund in Southern and Central Queensland and in Carpentaria, which has not hitherto been loaned out, may be returned to those who contributed under the Act of 1893. To recapitulate: Under the

1893 Act there was no provision for issuing certificates or returning the money. The 1895 Act provided for returning to contributors the amounts that had been repaid by way of interest and redemption. We now find there is a considerable amount at credit which has never been loaned out, and the Government are able to return such moneys, which under the Bill we propose to get power to repay. The assessment was very well responded to; the amounts received were very large and have not all been utilised. In Southern Queensland there were two assessments at the full rates. In Central Queensland there were two assessments at the [8.30 p.m.] full rates and one at the half rates.

In Northern Queensland there were two assessments at the full rates and one at half rates, and in Carpentaria there was one assessment at the full rates. The amounts received in respect of these assessments are as follows: In the Southern division, for the meat fund, £41,913 15s. 6d.; in Central division, £42,492 15s. 8d.; in Northern division, £29,808 16s. 3d.; and in Carpentaria, £5,837 10s. 6d.; a total to the meat fund of £120,052 17s. 11d. The meat fund and dairy fund are kept distinct. We are dealing tonight only with the meat fund, because at the present time there is only £82 available for redistribution with respect to the dairy fund. The advances made from the meat fund in Southern Queensland have been £30,582, in Central Queensland £28,852 15s., in Northern Queensland £38,102 10s., and in Carpentaria £2,900. I remarked that under the 1895 Act power was given to restore to contributors such moneys as had been repaid to the fund. [Mr. J. LEAHY Under the 1893 Act?] Under the 1895 Act. The 1893 Act gave no power to return money, but the 1895 Act repealed section 12 of the 1893 Act, and provided, in section 3, for the return of the moneys that had been received in redemption of interest and principal. Under the power given in the 1895 Act the following amounts have been returned to the contributors to the fund: In the Southern division three repayments of 3s., 2s., and 3s. in the £; a total amount repaid in the Southern division of £14,999 0s. 10d. In the Central division three repayments—3s., 2s., and 2s. in the £, or a total of £12,04 14s. 6d. In the Northern division there have been three repayments of 6s., 2s., and 2s. in the £, or a total of £13,286 9s. 2d., and in Carpentaria there has been one repayment of 1s. in the £, a total of £418 11s. 3d. Seeing that there has been no application for advances for the establishment of fresh meat export works for a period of rather more than five years, and also that the cattle and sheep have been so depleted by reason of the drought that there is not sufficient cattle offering at a remunerative price to entice anyone to establish any further meatworks, the Government consider that the amount now standing to the credit of the meat fund in the divisions mentioned in the Bill should be returned to the contributors, it being thought highly improbable that the amount now proposed to be returned will ever be required for the purposes for which it was obtained. In the event of the Bill being endorsed by the House, the actual amount to be returned—the moneys we have in hand which have not been utilised, and for which we see no prospect of utilisation—totals £29,502 2s. 3d. [Mr. J. LEAHY: Has this money been paid back?] No, we are holding this; it was never expended, and under the 1895 Act we only return to the taxpayer the moneys that have been utilised in buildings, and have been

*Hon. D. F. Denham.]*

repaid by the borrower in interest and redemption. [Mr. J. LEAHY: Section 4 provided that.] Yes; it gave that power. I believe the money will be of material assistance to those who receive it. In the Southern division the amount held to their credit is £12,336 11s. 9d., or equal to 5s. 6d. in the £ of total assessments. In the Central division £14,332 9s. 6d., or equal to 6s. 8d. in the £, and in Carpentaria £2,833 1s. 2d., or nearly 10s. in the £. So far as we know, there is no likelihood of more than one loss in respect of the meat fund. I see by my notes that in the one instance of the Mackay works a loss may have to be borne of about £3,000—[Mr. PAGET: Let us hope for it.]—but the secretary says that even if the whole sum of £6,000 is lost, the interest earned by others will more than cover such loss. So that we have on evidence that an Act passed in 1893 has worked out to the manifest advantage of the stockowners. They have obtained that advantage, and in due course will have returned to them every penny they contributed to the fund. The Bill is brief, and, I think, clear, and I have much pleasure in moving the second reading.

HON. R. PHILP: This is a very desirable measure, and I understand that it proposes to return the money which has been contributed, and for which there has been no application for some time. At the present time we have far more meatworks in the country than we need, and I think it is very desirable that the money should be returned to the unfortunate stockowners who have suffered so much from the drought. The Act did a great deal of good in the first place, but at the present time the meatworks are only kept going for two or three months all over the State. [The PREMIER: I hope their prosperity will soon start again.] I hope so, too, but I think it will be a long time before the present works are kept going fully. [The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is due to new members to advise them of the position.] The Bill is really for the purpose of returning the stockowners the money, and I have no objection to it.

MR. J. LEAHY: I would like to ask a question, but do not wish to speak at length on the Bill. The Minister, in his explanation, stated that a certain proportion of money that was contributed under this fund would go to the dairy business. [The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: 10 per cent.] This is the meat business that is coming back, and portion of it was not employed at all. Do I understand that the two funds were kept separate, and the money that has been collected towards the dairy factories has been invested? [The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.] The distribution now will be the distribution of money that did not go into the dairy fund.

MR. FOX: I would like to ask the Minister if interest will be allowed on this money the same as in the Savings Banks? [The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The interest is 1 per cent. on current account.]

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

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

#### SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL SELECTIONS BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*): In 1901 a Bill was passed with the object of allowing a number of people from a certain part of Europe—[Hon.

[*Hon. D. F. Denham.*

R. PHILP: Bessarabia.]—and speaking what was in Queensland and Australia an unknown tongue, to settle together and form a community of their own. That Bill enabled the Minister for Lands of the day to put aside a certain area of land, and allow these people to select within the borders of the area named selections of agricultural homesteads, with a maximum of 320 acres. The principal people for whom the measure was passed—owing to certain events, which it is not necessary to refer to now—did not become citizens of Queensland. They never left their native shores in the south of Russia. Although the measure did not apply to those for whom it was really passed, nevertheless it was put into operation with regard to two other communities, and with regard to one of these communities at any rate it has operated successfully. It has been put into force with regard to several farmers from Cheshire, who are on the area of land near Degilbo, but who, I am afraid, have not yet been particularly successful so far. It has also been put into operation in the case of a number of farmers who have taken up land in the Ringing Plain district, not many miles from Dalby; that community is doing well, and there is a probability of other farmers from Victoria coming here. The Act as it stands only permits the Minister to set aside areas of land for a special body of persons, and to throw it open as agricultural homesteads, and what I am asking for now is to allow the Minister to have power to throw open such lands as agricultural farms. Under the 1901 Act, it was designed for persons of a certain nationality—Bessarabians; but we found in practice that it operated successfully with regard to communities of our own fellow-countrymen in Australia. I have mentioned two instances, and in the case of the Victorian farmers they are working well. Quite recently I had applications for land to be so thrown open in my own electorate—from several farmers who wished to form a group—but I found myself in this predicament: that the land that these people applied for had been first thrown open for selection and had not been taken up—it is good scrub land, and, owing to its proximity to the railway, its value had risen to more than 2s. 6d. an acre, and I found myself in this position: that I must either accede to their request and allow them to take up this land as homestead areas at 2s. 6d. an acre, while I knew it was worth more, or else run the risk—the distinct risk—of shutting out from our lands a most desirable class of settlers; so I decided that it was better to let the land go below its proper value in order to secure these desirable settlers from the south. [Honourable members: Hear, hear!] I do not want to find myself in that predicament again, and the only request in this Bill is that the Minister may be able to throw land open in this way as agricultural farms and charge the minimum of 10s. an acre for it. It was hinted during the debate when the 1901 Bill was going through, that the principle might operate with disadvantage to our own settlers—that blocks of land could be thrown open to people who came from beyond our borders, and that advantages would be given to them in this way which were denied to our own citizens. Well, the answer to that is this: that I am sure no Minister—and certainly not this Minister—would offer these facilities to people outside, unless first of all our own people had had an opportunity of selecting it. But, having been thrown open for selection to Queenslanders, and not having been selected, I say that it is a fair thing not to restrict the Minister with regard to the selling price. [Mr. J. LEAHY:

I suppose some of it would bring £2 or 30s. by auction.] I am bound to say that there is some plain country, only a quarter of a mile away from the land I have referred to, which brought 35s. an acre. There is nothing else in this Bill, and the principle has been affirmed three years ago. It will simply give the principle a more practical application, and I move that it be now read a second time.

HON. R. PHILP: I take it that the Minister wants to have power to proclaim groups for agricultural farmers? [The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes.] Well, I think the land should be sold at its true value, and that the price should not be restricted to 2s. 6d. an acre. We should encourage people to settle here. I was very glad to hear the Minister refer to the Bessarabia business, for I think that was a good thing to do at the time, and I do not regret that Victorians got land on similar terms. But what is the use of the Minister for Public Lands trying to encourage people to come here and settle on the land, when the Treasurer brings in a Bill to tax all land in Queensland every year? [Government members: No, no!] I have not read the Betterment Bill, yet some hon. members have told me that that is the effect of it, and if the Betterment Bill is passed, I am sure no one in Queensland will want to be a freeholder. [Mr. MANN: It will break up big estates.] It will be a direct blow at the very best people in Queensland—the people on the land, both small and big. What is the use of encouraging people to settle on the land when the Treasurer proposes to tax them every year when they come here? When the divisional boards increase the values on land, he says that he is going to get his share. I would like to know if the Treasurer would like to pay the decreased value of land here for the last twenty years. I remember that some twenty years ago, a lot of land in a mangrove swamp near Cairns was sold for £40,000, and now it would not bring a quarter of the money paid to the Crown for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is wandering away from the question before the House.

HON. R. PHILP: We are discussing land settlement. No one is more keen than I am to see people settled on the land, and when people have increased the value of their land by their own exertion the Treasurer is going to tax them every year. [Government members: No, no!]

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not proceed with that line of argument as it is outside the scope of the Bill.

HON. R. PHILP: The Treasurer had not the courtesy to tell us what his Bill meant this afternoon, but some hon. members who have read the Betterment Bill have told me the effect of it: that the Treasurer is going to take 1½ per cent. on the full value of the land.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: However, I think this Bill should pass, and I will support its second reading.

Mr. SPENCER (*Mr. Moran*): I quite understand the provisions of this Bill, and the Minister for Lands and the leader of the Opposition seemed to think that it would be better to throw open lands in this way as agricultural farms than as agricultural homesteads, and so get higher prices. [Mr J. LEAHY: The Minister would differentiate in some cases.]

I say we should settle people on the land at almost any cost—almost give it away—but it should be thrown open as agricultural homesteads, say of 640 or 320 acres. I know that a great injustice was done to my district by an area of land which we petitioned to have thrown open as agricultural homesteads being thrown open as agricultural farms, and the consequence has been that it is turned into a sheep-walk. I know one case where a man and his wife took up 1,280 acres, and simply put it to that purpose, instead of cultivating it, as would have been done had it been opened as agricultural homesteads. That is the thing we want to put down. We want smaller areas so that we will get *bonâ fide* settlers. I have no sympathy with the

[9 p.m.] policy of opening land to agricultural farm selection because you get a bigger price. The main thing is to settle people on the land as cultivators, and that you get by throwing it open as agricultural homesteads. In the back-blocks I would certainly increase the area of homesteads to 640 acres, as I am satisfied that in that country a man cannot make a living on a lesser area. I say advishly that in the past no Government has been able to grapple successfully with the existing conditions of land settlement. The lands on the Downs and the lands farther west are two entirely different matters, and, unless the Government can give us more liberal lands laws and more liberal administration, we cannot hope for that success which we would all desire to see. Administration also has been a curse in our district. I know men who have taken up selections, and it has been eight months before they have been able to get on to the land, simply because they could not get their occupation licenses. I would like, as I say, to see the area of homesteads in our country increased to 640 acres. People are crying out for land in those areas, and they cannot get it. The scrub and pear are growing on the land, and, instead of being an asset, it will become a liability to the State. I know dozens of men who have come to our district and have not been able to get land on the conditions they wanted. I know land that is slightly infested with prickly pear, and applications have been made to have it thrown open as prickly-pear selections. The commissioner or the Crown lands ranger will not do that unless it is so heavily infested that it is impossible to clear it. If we want to settle people on the land, we will have to give them more liberal treatment, and in the West we will require to give them larger areas. [The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What do you mean by more liberal treatment?] Well, in addition to giving homesteads up to 640 acres in the Western country. I speak of my own district because I have a special knowledge of it. Then, when a man applies for a selection, instead of having to wait until the Land Court decides that he can get an occupation license, the local commissioner should be able to issue a license to occupy. Then, instead of a man losing six or eight months, and perhaps missing a crop, he will be able to get on to the land at once, fence and improve it, and get in his crop. Then, again, when land has any pear on it—I would not care if there was only one pear on every acre—it ought to be thrown open as prickly-pear selections. Under the present Act, a man gets a ten years' lease for a prickly-pear selection, and he has to clear one-fifth of the infested area every year. I would like to see the law amended so that, if he chose, he could clear the whole area in one year, and that, if he kept it clear for

*Mr. Spencer.]*

two years more, he should get a title in fee-simple to the land. Of course he must keep it clear, and not allow the pear to grow up again after it was cleared. Then, in more heavily infested country, where a bonus has to be paid, I would give him the right to clear the land in one year, and then, if he kept it clear for two years more, he could get his title; but I would not pay the bonus until five or ten years, whichever the Minister might decide. That would be a great inducement—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to the hon. member that the question with which he is now dealing is quite foreign to the Bill.

Mr. SPENCER: I will not continue on that subject, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the land will be thrown open in homestead areas, as under that form of settlement you will not only get more settlement, but you will also get a better class of settler, although I admit that you will get a lower price for the land. But, instead of having selectors who will take up agricultural farms and graze on them, you will get farmers who will cultivate the land.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am generally in accord with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Maranoa. Of recent years we have been getting further away from the agricultural homestead form of settlement. The success of the Darling Downs to-day is due to the fact that settlers were able to take up their lands as homesteads, and, if the same principle were extended to all parts of Queensland, and persons were allowed to select homesteads in suitable localities, we should have greater prosperity than we now have. The Secretary for Public Lands referred to the fact that there is a community in his own electorate that acquired land two or three years ago under the Act which he is now partially repealing, and that that community is in a flourishing condition. I believe it is one of the most flourishing communities in the whole of this State, and the settlers are a credit to Queensland; but I believe not one of them would be here to-day had they not had the opportunity of acquiring the land as agricultural homesteads, and not as agricultural farms. There are a very large number of our people who would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of settling upon the land on agricultural homesteads if those homesteads were available in anything like suitable localities. It is all very well for Ministers to say that there are some millions of acres of land in Queensland that may be taken up as agricultural homesteads, and that are not taken up. The fact is that the land is in localities where it will not pay selectors to go. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Maranoa, we will be doing the best thing for this State if we settle people upon the land wherever it is available for them, and wherever it is possible for them to get. We have various forms of land settlement. A man who is able to afford it can acquire land in close proximity to railways under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act; he has a very long time to pay for the land, and he has all the advantages of convenience to market. But the settler who has to go far out has none of these conveniences, and if he has to pay for his land as an agricultural farm he is not likely to make the use of it that the agricultural homesteader is doing. I should like to see a reversion to our former principle of land settlement, so that the man who has absolutely nothing should have an opportunity of settling on a homestead near a populous centre. That is why I am not altogether in sympathy with the amendment

[*Mr. Spencer.*]

now proposed. The Minister is looking at the matter from a Treasury point of view, though I feel sure he would rather look at it from the point of view of settling families on the land. The hon. gentleman admits that he has obtained a second community of Victorians who have been attracted here by the cheap price of our land in proximity to railways. Is he going to attract another community of Victorians or South Australians by raising the price to at least four times as much as was paid by the two communities who are now settled in Queensland? I do not think he will attract persons by that means. If he were to make it generally known throughout Australia that he is prepared to treat with these communities, and give them land at 2s. 6d. an acre in suitable localities, he would induce a very worthy class of immigration to this State. I am really sorry that he has introduced this measure with the object of increasing the price of land in localities close to railways where the land at the present time belongs to the State. Put the people on the land, and though the land may be cheap, the settlement that will follow will more than compensate for the cheapness in the price of the land. What we want above all things is close settlement, and we shall not encourage that close settlement by making the price of land prohibitive to the class of persons who are longing to go on the land, and who would make good settlers. I am sorry the Minister has seen any necessity to make the amendment now proposed.

Mr. MARTIN (*Burrum*): Unlike the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, I can see good cause for the introduction of this measure, because I understand that it is the intention of the Government to construct light lines of railway in agricultural centres, and that they are going to construct those light lines out of revenue derived from the land which will benefit by the railways. Therefore, I think it is necessary to introduce such an amendment as is contained in this Bill. There is a great deal in the contention of some hon. members that we should not charge too much for our land, and that our main object should be to induce people to come here and settle. I am one of those who hold that in years gone by a great mistake has been made by different Ministers in charging so much for the land. They have, in my opinion, overlooked the first principle of land settlement for the sake of obtaining revenue. But I can see good justification for this amendment, which will apply to such lands as are thrown open in agricultural centres where light lines of railway are to be constructed. Therefore I welcome this measure.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

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

#### GRACEMERE CEMETERY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Council intimating that they agreed to the amendments made in this Bill by the Assembly.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. The business to-morrow will be the consideration in committee of the Registration of Clubs Bill, the similar stage of

the Meat and Dairy Produce Encouragement Act Amendment Bill, and the similar stage of the Special Agricultural Selections Bill.

Mr. J. LEAHY: It is rather early to adjourn at a quarter past 9 o'clock. The hon. gentleman asked for an additional sitting day this afternoon, and said there was so much business, and it was so urgent, that it was necessary he should have more time to deal with it. And here we are at a quarter past 9, and the Government have no business to do. We are entitled to be treated with more respect.

HON. R. PHILIP: The position is quite amusing. We have appointed an extra sitting day, and now, at a quarter past 9, there is no business to go on with. What business are we to have to-morrow? Are we to go on with the Estimates? We are to come here next Monday, and now, at this early hour, there is no business to do. The other night the Premier maliciously kept us here until a late hour. I think it would conduce to better temper on both sides of the House if the hon. gentleman would allow the House to adjourn at half-past 10 or before 11 o'clock every night. I hope we shall get through the business which has to be done in two or three weeks. As far as I am concerned, I will not offer any opposition to any measures they bring in, because I can see the more measures they bring in—the more rope they have—the sooner they will hang themselves.

The PREMIER: I have asked the House to adjourn at this early hour, not because there is no business to do, for there is plenty of business on the paper to keep hon. members busy—[Mr. J. LEAHY: Why not go on with it?—but because I think hon. members opposite have behaved themselves so well this evening that they are entitled to some reward for their good conduct.] [Mr. J. LEAHY: You will never get a medal for that.] The hon. gentleman has been attitudinising. [HON. R. PHILIP: You are the most pompous man in the House.] Perhaps that is true, but I am not the most ill-tempered man in the House. Now I will let the hon. gentleman into a secret. Perhaps he was not aware when he spoke that the reason the House is being allowed to rise so early is because when we desired to take the committee stages of certain Bills we were informed the Chairman of Committees was not in his place. [HON. R. PHILIP: He is present now.] Yes, I am aware of that. The Chairman was on duty, but we thought he was absent. It was for that reason we decided not to proceed with the committee stages of these Bills, otherwise the hon. gentleman would have had an opportunity of continuing business until 10.30. The leader of the Opposition has made an appeal to me to let the House off every night at 10.30. I am quite prepared to make that the average adjourning hour so long as there is nothing in the nature of obstruction during the afternoon sitting, but if hon. members opposite think they are at liberty to waste the afternoon and early evening in making long speeches and delaying business, and then expect us to adjourn at 10.30 they will be disappointed. The House ought to do a certain amount of business each day, and we will expect it to do so. I hope it will decide to do so before 10.30, but if it does not, then it must do it by 12.30. [Mr. J. LEAHY: You will not be the judge of how often or how long I should speak.] I have no desire to set any limit on the number of speeches the hon. gentleman delivers, but we must get some work done. [Mr. J. LEAHY: You have never been blocked. You have been assisted.] I am ready to admit that we have not been blocked, but we have taken effective measures to prevent blocking.

HON. R. PHILIP: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be further heard?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILIP: I have never heard such an ill-tempered speech from the leader of any Government. The whole of this session we have tried to help him, but against our wishes he and his supporters have been speaking at unnecessary length on certain measures. Not a single measure has been stonewalled. We had the opportunity at various times of blocking measures, but we did not do it. We are here to do business, but we do not care to be treated as children, and we will not be treated as children either by the Premier or the leader of the Labour party. We have the right to speak at length, if necessary. I say we have cut down speeches regularly in order to get through business. [Mr. J. LEAHY: I have been checking myself the whole time.] As far as I am concerned, I will not help to get through business if the Premier talks like that. I have been prepared all the time to help him, but he gets up and tells us that if he does not get business through he will adopt other methods. That is not the way to get business through.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to hon. members that this is a most irrelevant discussion.

HON. R. PHILIP: The Premier started it.

The SPEAKER: It is not the usual practice to debate the ordinary motion for the adjournment of the House at the termination of a sitting. It is a departure from the usual practice, and I hope the hon. member will not transgress at any length.

HON. R. PHILIP: We have been prepared all this session to help the Premier, and he has never helped us in any way. He comes in in an ill-temper and looks at the clock—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member is not in order in speaking in that manner on the motion for the adjournment of the House.

HON. R. PHILIP: Is the Premier in order in making such remarks? Every remark he makes I will always reply to. I am prepared to help the Government carry on business; but personally I have no respect for the Premier—not the slightest. [The PREMIER: I do not want your respect.]

Mr. KERR: Am I in order in addressing the House?

The SPEAKER: As I have pointed out before, this debate is very irregular. It is customary to allow the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition to speak on the motion for adjournment, but it is not the practice to debate the motion.

Mr. KERR: I will have a cut at the leader of the Opposition to-morrow.

The SPEAKER: I feel assured the hon. member does not wish to depart from the usual practice.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-six minutes past 9 o'clock.

*Hon. A. S. Cowley.]*