

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

TUESDAY, 18 JUNE 1918

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, 18 JUNE, 1918.

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

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Police Investment Board for 1917.

Regulations, dated 12th February, 1918, under the Elections Act of 1915.

Regulations, dated 7th February and 12th April, 1918, under the Public Curator Act of 1915.

Regulation, dated 23rd November, 1917, under the Workers' Compensation Act of 1916.

Regulation, dated 17th January, 1918, and Order in Council dated 14th March, 1918, under the Workers' Compensation Act of 1916.

Orders in Council, dated 14th March, 1918, under the Insurance Act of 1916.

Statement of receipts and expenditure of the Public Curator for 1917.

Ordered to be printed.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO

HON F. T. BRETNALL.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones): I understand that yesterday was the Hon. Mr. Brentnall's eighty-fourth birthday, and I have very much pleasure in congratulating him on his health and the vigour he shows in this House very frequently.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: And the intelligence.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Although probably we hold widely different political opinions, I congratulate him and wish him very many happy returns of the day. (Hear, hear!) I wish him very many more returns of the day, if not in this Chamber—(laughter)—at all events I wish him many more happy birthdays. The hon. gentleman shows great vigour, vitality, and intelligence. I understand that he was appointed to the Council in the year 1886, so that it is only fitting to congratulate him upon having reached the age of eighty-four years. I offer him my personal congratulations and also congratulations on behalf of the Government.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRETNALL: I wish to acknowledge with very much gratitude the kindly act of the Minister. I have very little to say in reply, except perhaps this—that I have spent some part of the last thirty-two years in this Chamber with pleasure to myself, and I hope with some advantage to the country. (Hear, hear!) It has been my endeavour from the first day I came here to act conscientiously and faithfully to the call that was made to me on coming here. I came here to serve no particular interest: I came here to serve the country itself: and I maintain that principle still, and I am going to do so to the end whilst I am able to come here. It is a tempting thing to say

Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

something about partyism, but I refrain because I am very sorry that such a thing should have come into this House at all; but I take the opportunity, if I may be permitted, of beseeching hon. members to put the country first—to put the interests of this country before all other considerations, and let us try to concede a little from both sides of the House in order that we may advance the welfare and interests of Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

NOMINATION OF HON. L. McDONALD.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move, and I do so with not a little pleasure—

“That the Hon. L. McDonald be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament.”

Unfortunately the Hon. Mr. McDonald is absent this afternoon, and will not be here to vote for himself, but I am sure it is the wish of a majority of hon. members that the gentleman I nominate should be appointed Chairman of Committees. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I am satisfied that the Hon. Mr. McDonald will fill the position with honour to this Chamber. I am sure he has a knowledge of the Standing Orders that will fit him for the position. He is a studious young man, and, although he had no parliamentary experience prior to his appointment to the Council last year, I am satisfied that he has all the capabilities that will enable him to adapt himself to the honourable position to which I have much pleasure in nominating him. I regret that he is not here because it would give him at least an opportunity of voting for himself—(laughter)—but, in his absence, hon. members might be somewhat generous and vote for an absent man. It will show a good spirit on their part if they vote for a man who is not here to help himself.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You are not allowed so considerate for absentees.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I do not want to prolong the debate, but I think it would be fitting for me to say that I know the Hon. Mr. McDonald. I regard him as a personal friend. I have been in touch with him in the Labour movement for some considerable number of years, and have always found him an honourable, upright man, and very well worthy of the position to which I nominate him. (Hear, hear!)

HON. B. FAHEY: The Council has been treated to a very neat speech by the hon. gentleman who leads it. He appeals to the chivalry of hon. members, and asks them to exercise their votes in favour of an absent gentleman. I am always prepared to justify my vote in this Chamber, and I know that the hon. gentleman has very wisely two strings to his bow on this occasion, so that, even although the Hon. Mr. McDonald may have cause to retire, the hon. gentleman has another candidate, and a very able candidate too. (Hear, hear!) I am always prepared to justify my action in this Chamber, and I intend to do so on this occasion. Before I knew that any of these Richmonds were in the field—any Richmond in fact other than the Hon. Dr. Taylor—in reply to a circular from

that gentleman I promised him my vote and my support, and I intend to abide by my promise and support him.

Question—That the Hon. L. McDonald be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 12.

Hon. F. Courtice	Hon. P. Murphy
“ W. R. Crampton	“ T. Nevitt
“ A. J. Jones	“ G. Page-Hanify
“ H. C. Jones	“ L. Perel
“ H. Llewelyn	“ E. B. Purnell
“ F. McDonnell	“ R. Sunner

Teller: Hon. I. Perel.

NOT-CONTENTS, 23.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. C. F. Marks
“ F. T. Brentnall	“ E. D. Miles
“ C. Campbell	“ T. J. O’Shea
“ W. H. Campbell	“ A. H. Parnell
“ G. S. Curtis	“ E. H. T. Plant
“ A. A. Davey	“ W. Stephens
“ B. Fahey	“ E. J. Stevens
“ E. W. H. Fowles	“ W. F. Taylor
“ G. W. Gray	“ A. J. Thyne
“ T. M. Hall	“ H. Turner
“ A. G. C. Hawthorn	“ A. H. Whittingham
“ P. J. Leahy	

Teller: Hon. P. J. Leahy.

Resolved in the negative.

NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF HON. W. F. TAYLOR.

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: I move—
“That the Hon. W. F. Taylor be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament.”

There is little need for me to elaborate the motion, as most of us have had experience of the Hon. Dr. Taylor as Chairman of Committees. The hon. gentleman has been a member of this House for a good many years now, and he has acted as Chairman of Committees for a Parliament and a-half, and we must all agree that he has done his work in an able and impartial manner. The point may be raised, as no doubt it has been raised, that the position of Chairman of Committees ought to go round from one member to another. But that is a matter on which individual members may differ in opinion. There may be other gentlemen in the House who would fill the position just as well as the Hon. Dr. Taylor, but that remains to be proved, and, acting on the old adage that the devil we know is better than the devil we don’t know—if I may use such an expression—I ask you to plump for the Hon. Dr. Taylor. It seems to me that there is something radically wrong in the way nominations are made for the position of Chairman of Committees when we have more than one nomination. The odds are, to use a sporting phrase, that the last nominated member will be elected, and it must be admitted that the nominee of the Government has the pull in this matter. I kept back my nomination till pretty late, but not so late as the last nomination of the Government. Naturally, the Minister was not going to adjourn the House until that nomination was put in, and I do not blame him, but it seems to me that there is something wrong in the way the nominations are made and in the proposal to take them in order. However, I feel pretty certain that the Hon. Dr. Taylor will be almost unanimously elected. I do not know whether the question of procedure in this matter is one for the

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall.

Standing Orders Committee to look into, but it is a matter which should receive consideration.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why not amend the Standing Orders and adopt the exhaustive ballot system?

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: I think the Standing Orders Committee should take the matter into consideration. I now submit, with pleasure, the nomination of the Hon. Dr. Taylor for the position of Chairman of Committees during this Parliament.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: I should like to say a few words in connection with this matter, as the next motion on the paper is that I be appointed Chairman of Committees. I have learned a little bit since I have been in the Council, and in connection with this particular matter I have learned a great deal. With all my commercial and worldly experience, I have learned a great deal which will be of very great value to me in the Council.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Then don't give it all away, or they may be just as wise on the other side.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: It is not necessary for me to say that I have nothing whatever to say against the Hon. Dr. Taylor. While he was in the chair, he carried out his duties to the best of his ability, and I think to the general satisfaction of the House. But I know that it is the honest opinion of a large proportion, in fact the majority of members on both sides of the House, that this particular office—the highest position to which the Council can appoint one of its members—is one to which every member of the House may legitimately aspire. I think it is one that every member who takes an active interest in the work of the country in this Council should be encouraged to occupy rather than discouraged from aspiring to. I have always held very strongly that the position should go round, and that the Council should not elect a continuous Chairman of Committees. We should, I believe, be doing our duty to the country if we gave various members of the Council an opportunity to occupy this position, and in this opinion I am sure the majority of hon. members agree with me. I have here "Hansard" for 1907, and I find that at page 121 it is stated that the Council proceeded to the election of the Chairman of Committees. The Hon. Mr. Norton had been the Chairman during the previous Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Thynne had just returned from a visit to the old country, and he got up in his place and proposed—

"That the Hon. Peter Macpherson be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament."

The Hon. Mr. Thynne gave as a reason for that proposal—I do not want to read his remarks—but, practically, his sole reason for proposing the Hon. Mr. Macpherson was that, in his opinion, the office should go round. The Hon. Mr. Thynne was followed by the Hon. Mr. Fahey, who perfectly agreed with the Hon. Mr. Thynne in the opinion he had expressed, and said he did not think the office should be an hereditary biller for anyone. After that the Hon. Dr. Taylor spoke, and I think it is just as well that I should read a few sentences from his speech. That hon. gentleman said—

"As a somewhat old member of this House, perhaps I might be allowed to

say a few words on this subject. So far as the Hon. Mr. Norton is concerned, I can say he has filled the chair with credit during his tenure of office, and, were he nominated again, it would give me very considerable reflection as to whether I should vote for him or not. My personal feeling would be to vote for him, for the reasons I have just stated; but I hold strongly, and have always held, that the office of Chairman of Committees should be filled as much as possible by different members. I quite agree with what has been said by the Hon. Mr. Fahey, and had the Hon. Mr. Norton been nominated this afternoon I certainly would not have voted for him for that reason. I consider that we should all aspire to the position—I, myself, may aspire to it when I grow a little older and possess more knowledge of parliamentary affairs—and I do not see why I should not have an opportunity of filling the chair. I do not see why the old state of affairs should prevail. I remember myself that it was the habit at one time to appoint the same Chairman of Committees Parliament after Parliament. I think one hon. gentleman held the position until he became too feeble. That is a position which I do not think should obtain."

I shall not read any more. Hon. members will see that the opinion held by the Hon. Mr. Thynne, by the Hon. Mr. Fahey, and by the Hon. Dr. Taylor was that the office should go round, and that opinion was expressed very strongly. Some extraordinary thing has happened in the meantime which has evidently caused those gentlemen to change their minds. Of course, to change one's mind is a good thing sometimes, because it is a sign of life. Never to change one's mind is only a proof of stagnation, so that it is a proper thing for a man to change his opinion if he has good reason for doing so. I have not asked a single hon. member to vote for me. I think you are going to reject the candidature of the Hon. Dr. Taylor on the ground he mentioned—namely, that he has held the position for two Parliaments, and that it is right that the office should go round. The reason I mention this circumstance is that I want to ask you for your support after you have defeated the Hon. Dr. Taylor. In any case, I feel that I have done my duty in bringing prominently before the Council the necessity for something to be done in regard to the appointment of the Chairman of Committees. Personally, I shall be glad to occupy the position.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: Why did you second the Address in Reply on a previous occasion?

HON. A. A. DAVEY: At the beginning of my speech on that occasion I stated that I seconded the adoption of the Address because I was requested to do so, but that I in no way committed myself to the principles enunciated therein. I thought I did the proper thing, and I hope hon. members will admit that I acted in an honourable and straightforward way, as I always endeavour to do in connection with any matter with which I am associated. Before this question goes to the vote, I want hon. gentlemen to understand that, if they reject the nomination of the Hon. Dr. Taylor, I am a candidate for the position. I should like to occupy the position; I thoroughly agree with my hon. friends, including the Hon. Dr.

Hon. A. A. Davey.]

Taylor, that it is a position to which every member should aspire, and which should go round. There is not one little bit of ill-feeling in my nature in taking up this attitude. That is foreign to my make-up. Whatever the result of this election may be, after all the camouflage has been cleared away and all the engineering has ceased, I shall be perfectly pleased to give the greatest assistance possible to the Hon. Dr. Taylor or any other member who may be elected to the position, and I would even be prepared to act as a Temporary Chairman as I did during the last Parliament.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Before the motion is put, I should like to emphasise very strongly the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Whittingham with regard to the necessity for revising the Standing Orders in connection with the appointment of the Chairman of Committees.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You are on the Committee?

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I am not on the Standing Orders Committee. As a matter of fact there are very grave omissions from our Standing Orders in regard to this matter, and this session has brought them very conspicuously before the notice of hon. members. One of them is this: Standing Order No. 16 gives one the clearest impression that a Chairman of Committees must be appointed at the beginning of each Parliament. In fact, it says a Chairman shall be appointed "at the commencement of each Parliament." The Standing Order then says that the Chairman of Committees who has been appointed "shall hold office until his successor is appointed," so that, if this Council did not appoint anyone Chairman of Committees, the Chairman of Committees of the last Parliament would continue in office. I understand that was what was going on in this House at the beginning of the session, and it brought upon the Council a very sharp and well-deserved reprimand from the President, and that brought about nominations for the position. The Standing Orders need a little riveting in that direction to make it incumbent upon the Council to choose a Chairman of Committees at the beginning of each Parliament.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: This is the beginning.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Yes, but there is nothing in the Standing Orders to say that the Council shall choose a Chairman of Committees. The Standing Orders Committee might well consider Standing Order No. 16 and stop one or two things in that regard. Then with regard to the second point: We have five candidates before us this afternoon, and, as the Hon. Mr. Whittingham pointed out, the last candidate has the best chance under certain circumstances. As a matter of fact, if he has not the best chance, then if the first candidate is elected, the names of the other candidates cannot be put before the Council at all, which is hardly a fair thing. I suppose most hon. members know who will be chosen this afternoon, but at all events, those nominees whose names have been submitted under notice of motion ought to have an opportunity of obtaining some expression from hon. gentlemen. There are two obvious ways. One is by exhaustive ballot, which may be fair or unfair; and the other way is by preferential ballot, which is conspicuously fair. This is the only office in the gift of the Council carrying emoluments. There is no Standing Order which

says how we are to elect a Chairman of Committees, and the President laid down a ruling that he would take the notices of motion in the order in which they were handed in, and a vote would be taken upon them. As a matter of fact I understand the notices of motion do not appear on the business-paper in the order in which they were given. I understand from the Hon. Mr. Whittingham that the motion for the appointment of the Hon. Mr. Davey was given in before the motion for the appointment of the Hon. Dr. Taylor.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: That is not so.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to inform the hon. gentlemen that the Clerk informs me that the notices of motion were placed on the business-paper just in the order in which they were handed in to the Clerk.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I must accept that, although there seems to be a little difference of opinion in regard to the matter.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: There is no doubt about it.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: There is no question about the Government being last and also first in the matter, and there is no question that my own notice of motion was second. But the main point is this: that the Standing Orders Committee might well receive a recommendation from the Council to consider the revision of Standing Order No. 16 and also to consider the best way of electing a Chairman of Committees.

Question—That the Hon. W. F. Taylor be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole Council during the present Parliament—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 20.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. F. McDonnell
.. E. T. Brentnall	.. P. Murphy
.. C. Campbell	.. T. J. O'Shea
.. W. H. Campbell	.. A. H. Parnell
.. G. S. Curtis	.. E. H. T. Plant
.. B. Fahey	.. W. Stephens
.. G. W. Gray	.. E. J. Stevens
.. A. G. C. Hawthorn	.. W. F. Taylor
.. P. J. Leahy	.. A. J. Thynne
.. C. F. Marks	.. A. H. Whittingham

Teller: Hon. T. C. Beirne.

NOT-CONTENTS, 12.

Hon. F. Courtice	Hon. T. Nevitt
.. W. R. Crampton	.. G. Page-Hanify
.. A. A. Davey	.. I. Perel
.. A. J. Jones	.. E. B. Purnell
.. H. C. Jones	.. R. Sumner
.. H. Llewelyn	.. H. Turner

Teller: Hon. W. R. Crampton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

THE PRESIDENT: In compliance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 13, I nominate Hon. A. A. Davey, Hon. B. Fahey, Hon. T. Nevitt, and Hon. W. Stephens to form the panel of Temporary Chairmen of Committees during the first session of the twenty-first Parliament of Queensland.

INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

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

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

[Hon. A. A. Davey.]

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

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

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the second reading of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I hope no attempt will be made to rush either this Bill or the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill through. I do not know whether the Bills are exactly the same as the measures we had here last session. In any case, they are of such importance that we should have ample time to study them, and I hope that, even if the hon. gentleman moves the second reading to-morrow, he will allow the debates to be adjourned until next week to give us time to consider the Bills.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Although I have moved that the second readings of the two Bills stand Orders of the Day for to-morrow, it does not necessarily follow that I shall move the two second readings to-morrow. Possibly it would be wise to do so, and then the debates might be adjourned until the following day or for two or three days. I have no desire to rush the Bills through. They are practically the same as the Bills introduced here last session. There are one or two alterations only in each of the two Bills. I would suggest that we might dispose of the second reading of one of the Bills to-morrow and adjourn the debate until the following day. I am quite willing that that course should be followed.

Question put and passed.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

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

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. R. SUMNER: It is not my intention to take up the time of the Council for many minutes, as I have been suffering from an attack of dengue for some time and do not feel quite up to the mark. In common with other hon. members, I would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. They left no doubt as to the position in which they stand. I would also like at this stage to congratulate the Hon. Dr. Taylor on his election to the office of Chairman of Committees. I voted against him, as I was pledged to support the candidate from this side of the Chamber, but I certainly would have supported the hon. gentleman but for that, as he has been a very good Chairman in the past. I congratulate him, and I am sure he will do justice to the position and to himself. (Hear, hear!)

So far the criticism from the Opposition of the Governor's Speech has been very mild. We have had such redoubtable critics as the Hon. Mr. Fowles, the Hon. Mr. Leahy, the Hon. Mr. Davey, the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, and others; but very little criticism has

been offered in opposition to the proposals of the Government as set forth in the Speech, and I have almost come to the conclusion that it will be only necessary for the leader of the Government to present the Bills as they come forward and then they will receive the blessing of this Chamber.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: I suppose that our amendments will be incorporated in them?

HON. R. SUMNER: We will see them as they come along. So far, the criticism has been very mild, and rightly so, because, since this Chamber met last year something has taken place. The Government which had been instrumental in bringing those measures forward have been before the country, and they have come back with an increased majority—such a majority as has never been known in the history of the other Chamber. That being so, I think it is the duty of this Chamber to pass whatever measures the Government bring forward, especially the ones that were rejected or mutilated last session.

Some reasons were given by the Hon. Mr. Leahy why the Government won in the farming elections at the recent elections. He said that one reason was apparent to hon. members, but he would not mention it. I have no hesitation in mentioning it. I suppose he meant the strong feeling there was amongst certain British-Australian-born subjects at being disfranchised at a referendum poll that took place some time ago. That may have had some little effect in inducing men to cast their votes for the Government, but that was not the sole reason. I have never been able to understand why farmers have not always been amalgamated with the Labour party. They are working people, and their interests would be much better served if they were identified with the Labour party. They have nothing to hope for or to gain by supporting the Tory party or the privileged classes. I have expressed that opinion dozens of times on the platform when addressing meetings in farming constituencies, and I believe that, if the Labour party do their duty, and pass the measures that are foreshadowed in their platform, it will be a long time before the farmers support any other party.

Mention has been made during the debate as to the position of this Chamber. At the very inauguration of the Labour movement the Labour party made no mistake when they placed the abolition of the Upper House as the first plank in their platform. They showed themselves far-seeing men. They had past history behind them. They saw what had happened in the Legislature of the old land, and how the House of Lords, the hereditary Chamber, had practically been the means of blocking every attempt to give any liberty, any franchise, or any help to the great mass of the workers.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: This is not an hereditary Chamber.

HON. R. SUMNER: Hon. members on the other side know that every effort that was put forward in the old land, whether it was to obtain a little extra franchise—and they have not got a complete franchise yet because of the existence of the second Chamber—was blocked. Every attempt to amend the factory laws, when they wanted to raise the age at which children might work in factories from eight to ten years was blocked

Hon. R. Sumner.]

by the second Chamber. Every attempt that was made to give any liberty was met with the outcry, "You are going to ruin the industries of England." I went through some of the phases of the movement at that time. Every effort that was made to improve the condition of the people, whether it was in the direction of passing factory legislation or in connection with the education of the children, was blocked by the House of Lords. I believe the old country would have been in a better position to-day in the present great war had it not been for the existence of the bicameral system. We know what has happened with regard to one part of the United Kingdom. We know how many years ago, when representatives of the people of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland passed a Home Rule Bill, it was thrown out by the House of Lords. I believe the old country is suffering from the result of that action to-day. Every effort the workers have made to improve their position has found an enemy in the privileged classes in the Upper House; and the men who formulated the Labour platform in this country in the early days made no mistake when they placed the abolition of the second Chamber as the first plank of their platform. Perhaps they have not made much progress. The Council is still here, but I believe, notwithstanding the popular vote that was taken last year, that it will not be long before this House will be abolished. It is only a few years since we were able to get the first Labour Government in the Assembly, and I believe the time is coming when not only the second Chamber will be wiped out here, but every other second Chamber in Australia.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: And the other Chambers as well.

Hon. R. SUMNER: I helped in some measure to bring about federation. At the time the question was before the people of Australia I was opposed to a second Federal Chamber, even although it was to be elected on the same franchise as the House of Representatives. I can see no necessity for the establishment of a second Chamber, except as some protection for the smaller States. I do not think the Senate has justified its existence as a help or protection for the smaller States, and even to-day I would be quite prepared to support a movement for the abolition of the Senate. Some reference has been made to the need for a revisory Chamber. We know that some of the Bills come from the other Chamber in a very imperfect form. Something might be done to put measures in proper phraseology.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We do it for you.

Hon. R. SUMNER: There is scarcely an Act on the statute-book that does not provide work for lawyers every day. I was reading the Federal debates the other day, and I noticed that one hon. member said that it was very difficult to understand Bills as they were printed. He said there were three languages. There was the ordinary English language that was used in Parliament, then there was "journalese," and then there was another which might be called "draftsmanship." No doubt Bills that come before us very often are couched in language that it takes a lawyer, or even a Philadelphia lawyer, to understand. Anyhow, I believe that great changes are coming to pass in that direction, as democracy is on

[Hon. R. Sumner.

the increase. It is said that the world is in the melting-pot, and that no [4.30 p.m.] man can say what will remain when it comes out of the melting-pot, but I believe that democracy will then have a greater say in the affairs of the nation than it has ever had before. The Hon. Mr. Leahy, when speaking to the Address in Reply, made a very remarkable statement. He said that whatever the Government do is done worse than it would be done by a private individual. If that is true, I cannot understand the things that are taking place in the world to-day. I do not think that any member in this Chamber will dispute the statement that private enterprise or private initiative has failed badly. The incentive in private enterprise is profit, and that is almost its sole incentive. If we look at the history of the British Parliament or the history of our own Parliament, we shall find that Parliament has spent a great deal of time in making laws compelling people under the system of private enterprise to do the right thing. If they were to carry out the laws they have passed fully and efficiently, the Government would have to employ a multiplicity of inspectors—almost as many inspectors as employees.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You are getting that way now.

Hon. R. SUMNER: Yes, and we shall continue getting that way so long as private enterprise remains. In spite of the laws which have been passed, and of the inspectors who have been appointed to enforce the laws, it has been found necessary for the Government in various allied countries to adopt measures to control production. From the earliest times until the present day the time of Parliament has been spent in passing laws to control private enterprise in some shape or form.

Hon. A. J. THYNNE: Would you wipe out private enterprise altogether?

Hon. R. SUMNER: I have here an extract from a letter written by the American food controller, Mr. Hoover, to President Wilson, in which he points out the fearful danger to private enterprise and recommends complete Government control, and states that the Government should take over and operate the food-packing plants.

Hon. G. S. CURTIS: Yes, during the war.

Hon. R. SUMNER: If it is better to do that during the war, will it not also be better to do the same thing in times of peace? If private enterprise takes advantage of people and their necessities in a time of war, surely private enterprise will do that to a greater extent during times of peace. What are we doing in Australia? We know what is happening in Great Britain, but even there the Government do not do enough. Anyone who reads the public papers will see that there have been thousands of prosecutions of people who have attempted to evade the law passed for the control of private enterprises in the interests of the people. The Australian Government are expending and controlling over £220,000,000 this year—six times the total wages paid in the whole of the 15,000 factories in Australia, three times the added value of their total output. It is handling an amount equal to 4s. out of every 5s. received by the people in wages, salaries, and income combined. The Commonwealth employees number 50,000, and the Commonwealth

Government are controlling prices, shipping, and coal; running factories; and talking of building ships, arsenals, etc. Even in Australia, at this distance from the seat of war, the Government find it necessary to take many things into their own hands and run and control them. Therefore, I cannot understand the remark of the Hon. Mr. Leahy, when he said that if the Government do a thing they do it worse than private enterprise would do it. It is always understood that when a man gets work from the Government—no matter what Government may be in power—he gets a soft job, and I believe that feeling is operating to a certain extent to-day, but it is dying out, and it will die out still more. I hold that it is the duty of a man when he works for the Government to do his very best and give a full return for the remuneration he receives. The man who does not do that is injuring himself and is deteriorating morally. But, as I have said, that feeling is now passing away. The time is coming when there will be a gradual extension of State activities towards the collective ownership of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

The problem of repatriation has been mentioned in this Chamber. I will give way to no man in the desire to see that the men who left these shores for the front are placed in as good a position when they come back as they were when they left, or even in a better position than they occupied before they left to fight in the present war.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Why don't you give them freehold?

Hon. R. SUMNER: Wait a minute, and I shall refer to that matter. This matter of repatriation opens up a big problem. It is an undefined problem, and one in which parliamentarians and experienced officers in the public service have had no experience. We are practically groping in the dark, and we can only hope that the best wisdom of the best men in the country will be obtained to solve the problem. I believe that any Government that may happen to be in power will give their assistance in the efforts made to solve this much-vexed problem. But there is a great danger of the State and Federal activities overlapping. This should not be the case. Whatever is done should be done by one central authority and on some uniform system. No matter whether a man comes from Queensland, or from Western Australia, or from any other State, his case should be dealt with on some uniform system. The Federal Government have recently passed a most comprehensive measure dealing with repatriation. The primary object of that measure is to re-establish returned soldiers in civil life. The Federal Government have appointed a Central Commission in Melbourne, and State boards with local committees in various States; and they have already appointed a staff, which is composed, according to the statement of the Minister for Repatriation, of 90 per cent. of returned soldiers, and he hopes that when the scheme gets into proper working order this representation will reach 100 per cent. The principal method to be adopted at the initiation of the scheme of repatriation is to secure the registration of returned soldiers. Provision is made for the registration of the men before they leave England, or when

they are on board ship leaving the old country, and the register is to contain particulars regarding the condition and status of every man, so that all that information may be in the hands of the authorities before a man lands in Australia. A sustenance allowance is provided. In the case of a single man this allowance is £2 2s. per week, in the case of a married man with one child it is £2 12s. 6d., and in the case of a married man with four children it is £3 6s. While a returned soldier is receiving this sustenance allowance, an endeavour will be made by the labour bureaux and labour exchanges to find him employment. Vocational schools and national workshops are also to be established. The Federal Government have made an agreement with all the State Governments, except Queensland, that the State is to provide the land for returned soldiers, and that the Commonwealth will provide £500 capital for each soldier settler. Queensland has provided land for soldiers. If the Government had not stepped in and done something in this direction years ago, a good many men would not be in the position they are in to-day. But, as I have already said, there should be no overlapping in this matter. I believe that the collection of income tax, the collection of land tax, and many other things can be better and more cheaply done by one authority than by several authorities. I was reading in the newspaper the other day a statement to the effect that the cost of collecting the income tax in New South Wales was about 1½ per cent., while the cost of collection by the Commonwealth was 2½ per cent. The State Government employed 114 officers, and the Federal Government had 600 employees. Those figures show what an amount of money would be saved by the Federal and State Governments combining and making one collection by one set of officers of all such taxes. The same argument applies to the work of repatriation. There ought to be some effort at combination in the work, and the whole thing should be controlled by one central authority. The Queensland Government have already done a lot in connection with this matter, and they should get the credit for what they have done. It does not matter to me whether the work is done by the Labour party or the Liberal party, so long as it is done. What we want is to see the work done effectively. It is no use saying that the Queensland Government have done nothing in this matter. I say they have done practically more than any other State Government in Australia.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Who said they had done nothing?

Hon. R. SUMNER: I am not alluding to anything said by the hon. gentleman, but I say that has been said, though as a matter of fact they have done a great deal. Look at the criticism there has been on the Beerburum Settlement. It was said that a farmer was going to visit the Beerburum Settlement and tell the people what his opinion was about it. This farmer went there, stayed a few hours, looked round the settlement in a motor car, and afterwards addressed a meeting in Market Square. What did he say in that address? He said that Beerburum was a little lonely and desolate for the men, and that the land was not as well suited for the purpose to which it was devoted as it should be. I have had some experience,

Hon. R. Sumner.]

practically the experience of a lifetime, in this class of cultivation, and I can tell you that the land was selected by experts—not by the Government. There is a Land Settlement Committee, which meets every fortnight. I am a member of that committee, and I can tell you that it is not composed of Labour politicians, but is composed of earnest-minded and practical men. I think there are only about two Labour politicians on the whole committee.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Perhaps that is why it is so successful.

HON. R. SUMNER: Perhaps it is, and perhaps it would have been equally as successful if they had all been Labour politicians. The land was bored and tested by experts, and on their recommendation it was selected to grow pineapples, and I believe pineapples will be grown there successfully, and that the men on that land will, in a year or so's time, be able to make a living for themselves. So far as I am concerned, I do not look to these land settlement schemes as being such a success as is foreshadowed, and I would not be disappointed if many did fail. Hundreds who have gone out privately have failed with better chances than these men ever had. A lot of these men are taking up a new kind of life under new conditions, and what if some of them do fail? If they do happen to go back a little it is up to the country to put them right, and I believe the country will do it. I got a report from the Land Settlement Committee this afternoon, and I would like to get it into "Hansard" for the guidance of other people. It reads—

"BEERBURRUM SETTLEMENT (BRISBANE DISTRICT).

Total area—51,000 acres.

Area surveyed—21,688 acres into 484 portions of about 20 acres upwards.

Area allotted—2,052 acres to 69 soldiers.

PIKEDALE SETTLEMENT (STANTHORPE DISTRICT).

Total area—17,000 acres.

Area surveyed—4,368 acres into 138 portions of from 18 to 75 acres.

Area allotted—114 acres to 4 soldiers."

I know that a friend of mine came back suffering from a lung disease, and he could not follow his usual occupation. He went up to that settlement, and we had a letter from him the other day to the effect that he is delighted with the place and is doing well, and is working in the hope that in a year or two he will be able to establish a home. The report continues—

"OSWALD'S TRACK SETTLEMENT (INNISFAIL DISTRICT).

Total area—157,300 acres.

Area surveyed—28,793 acres into 217 portions of from 70 to 320 acres.

Area allotted—Nil.

[Hon. R. Sumner.

SUNNYBANK (BRISBANE DISTRICT).

For Soldiers' Homes.

Area acquired—301½ acres, all of which has been surveyed into ½-acre lots."

In the Belmont district land has also been selected for bee farms and poultry farms.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You have not mentioned Cairns.

HON. R. SUMNER: I saw that criticism in regard to Cairns, and I would point out that no land, unless it is received as a gift, is set apart for soldiers; and no land is operated upon until it is inspected by experts. Even if land is set apart, it does not say that it will be used unless it is certified by the experts that it is fit for the purpose for which it is set apart. I am of the opinion, and always have been, that the best land should be given to our soldiers. If you give a man a bad bit of land, you might just as well crucify him at once; but give a man a good piece of land, and, if he is sincere and wants to make a living, there is no doubt but that he will succeed. I think members of the committee should insist, whatever may be done in the way of land settlement for soldiers in Queensland, that some of the best land available at the present time is set apart for that purpose. The report goes on—

"The Land Settlement Committee beg to report that during the fortnight ended 10th June, 1918, the following applications have been received:—

Beerburum	4
Workers' Dwellings	28
Sugar	1
Bank advance	10
A.F. Lands	16
Stanthorpe	2
Total	61

"They also beg to report that up to 10th June the following applications have been dealt with:—

1. Number of discharged soldiers
 - (a) Who have selected land ... 347
 - (b) Who are undergoing a course on training farms ... 21
 - (c) Who have been provided with homes ... 264
 - (d) Who have applied for financial assistance to develop lands ... 322

Of these, 174 have been approved.

2. Area selected—101,701 acres.
3. Area available—294,364 acres.
4. Advances for settlement purposes—£145,698 16s. 3d."

Evidently the Government are doing something, and so far as I know they are doing it economically and well.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: That is Commonwealth money.

HON. R. SUMNER: No, it is all State money. They are doing it economically and well, but there is a danger of overlapping, and I hope some arrangement will be come to between the Commonwealth and State Governments in regard to the matter. When we went into this scheme first the Commonwealth Government wanted to establish

Soldiers' Labour Bureaux all over Australia, and they were appointing sixteen men in Queensland, while there was a Labour Bureau in Queensland with branches all over the State whose services had been at the disposal of the War Council. The arrangement was working satisfactorily and they were doing good work, but all that was to be done away with. It is a pity that this duplication of effort should be allowed to go on, and some arrangement ought to be come to with regard to these matters. I know that all the men connected with the War Council have put in good work. I hope there will be a combination of efforts in regard to repatriation, which is still undefined, and we are still working in the dark to some extent. If that is arranged, repatriation will be able to make the progress that it deserves.

I should like to say a word or two now in regard to the taxation measures. I think it was a mistake—my vote showed that—that the measures brought before us last session were rejected by this Chamber.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It saved the State £80,000.

Hon. R. SUMNER: It is a mistake to add deficits to the floating debt at this period, because we shall have enough to meet in the future in connection with war expenditure. The opponents of the Government, during the elections, said that they ought to curtail expenditure. The Treasurer assures us that he has done his best in that direction, and one can quite understand that, with the increased price of materials, no business concern can run its business at the same cost as previously, and in addition, the high cost of living has led to demands for increased wages on the part of the public servants. It is a wonder to me that many of the public servants, especially those in the Railway Department, are satisfied with the remuneration they are receiving. I know it must be almost impossible for many of them to live. So far as I have seen, no suggestion has ever been made by the Opposition to make ends meet except by taxation. It would be a mistake for the Government to add anything in the shape of a deficit to the floating debt. We shall have to be prepared to pay more in the future, because we shall have, at the end of June, in connection with the other Australian States, debts amounting to £400,000,000 and Commonwealth debts amounting to £300,000,000, of which total £500,000,000 will be non-producing. According to the war census taken some time ago, the figures are not very encouraging. Whether those figures are correct or not is another matter, but we were told that, excluding trust moneys, the total income of the people of Australia was £240,000,000, of which only £80,000,000 is available for taxation. I mean by that, that £120,000,000 is exempt under the exemption clauses of the Federal and State Acts. Up till now 15 per cent. of that total income is being taken by the States and Commonwealth by way of income tax. We are not doing our fair share even then, as we are only paying 1 per cent. out of the revenue of Australia towards meeting the current expenses of the war. Great Britain, with all her trouble and with all her huge expenditure, is paying 20 per cent. out of current revenue towards the expenses of the war, while we in Australia are passing it on to posterity, and yet we talk about being taxed for war purposes.

We are not taxed at all yet for war purposes. That is coming in the future. We are just printing pieces of paper to keep the printing machines going; circulating them in the form of loans, and passing the debt on to posterity. Perhaps posterity will have a say in the matter. In high finance, people talk about millions and millions as if they were playing a game of marbles. I say we are merely passing on our debt for the people of the future to meet, and we are not doing our fair share towards meeting the expenses as they occur. I know that Australia is worse situated than perhaps Canada or the United States. Take wheat alone. We have had great difficulty in shipping wheat from Australia. If we had been able to get the prices they have received in Canada, the United States, and the Argentine, it would have meant many millions to this country, but, owing to the shipping difficulty, we have been unable to do it. They fixed the price of wheat in Canada at practically 10s. per bushel, while in Australia the farmers are only getting about 3s. 6d. per bushel. But we have been getting good prices for our metals and good prices for our wool, and the figures I quoted in regard to the income of Australia were those obtained by the war census taken at the commencement of the war, and the income of Australia must be vastly greater now. If we examine the balance-sheets of the various banks, we find that, notwithstanding the war loans that have been floated, the deposits in the various banks keep on increasing, showing that the people must be doing well and that greater prices must be received for the products they are selling. I want to reiterate that I do not think Australia at the present time is doing her fair share towards meeting the current expenses of the war. I think they are doing wrong in making the interest on the loans they have floated non-tax paying. That is a wrong principle, but it is not a matter for this Chamber. It is a mistake to attempt to put all this burden on to posterity, and those who live in the future will have a say as to whether they are going to meet the debt or not.

One of the things we ought to devote our attention to is increased production—(hear, hear!)—not only on the land, but also in the number of our industries. A writer once gave it as his opinion that the [5 p.m.] man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before renders a greater service to his country than the whole race of politicians, and there is some truth in that. I believe it is the duty of this Parliament, and of the whole of Australia, to do all they can to increase production, and to make the lands available at the least possible cost to the people, and to see that they are provided with markets for their products. What wasted energy we have seen in Australia! You have only to travel along the coast as far as Gympie to see hundreds, if not thousands, of abandoned farms. Men have gone there and spent their all in clearing and fencing the land, and then they have had to abandon their holdings because the land was not fit for the purpose for which it was taken up, although it was sold by the Department of Public Lands and our administrators as agricultural land. In my opinion, even since the Labour party came into power, we have not administered the advances to settlers in the liberal spirit in which I would have

Hon. R. Sumner.]

done, and in which it was intended they should be administered. I believe that some day this country will become a great cotton and oil producing country, in spite of all the adverse criticisms which we have heard.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The conditions of labour will have to be made very much more stable.

HON. R. SUMNER: I have often thought we ought to make much greater use of our University than we are doing. There is beautiful machinery lying idle at the University, and many of the professors are also idle through so many of the students having gone to the war. Both machinery and professors ought to be made very much more use of in connection with increasing production under some science bureau. A great deal could be done in the way of experimenting in the way of manufacturing oils from cotton seed and other vegetable products. There are many ways in which we could stimulate production. A more congenial climate cannot be found, and I know no land in which life on the land can be pursued under healthier conditions. I have always advocated that every encouragement should be given to men who do hard work on the land. They do not work eight hours a day. They are at it early and late, and they should be given the very best conditions possible. (Hear, hear!) Their surroundings should be made as congenial as possible. I do not see why country life should not be equally comfortable and happy as city life. (Hear, hear!) I often think it is the fault of the people themselves. In some country places where the men are well off they make no attempt to build themselves nice homes, or to make their surroundings attractive. The result is that the young people drift away to the towns. I believe that, if the Labour party keep in power, the present state of affairs will be altered very much for the better. I believe that the Labour party will remain in power for a long time to come, and that it will be many years before we shall see a Liberal party again occupying the Treasury benches.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Question!

HON. R. SUMNER: I am satisfied that the Labour party will remain in power so long as they do their duty and stick to their platform, and do not allow themselves to be sidetracked. If they carry out their programme in the way of nationalising industries, and giving the people free access to the land, and establishing markets, I believe we shall see a great accession to our rural population.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We must give them freeholds.

HON. R. SUMNER: I thank hon. members for the hearing they have given me under the circumstances. (Hear, hear!)

HON. E. J. STEVENS: I must congratulate the hon. member who has just spoken on having made a very useful and practical speech, although there are some points on which I do not agree with him at all. One was with reference to the rendering invisible of the Legislative Council. With regard to repatriation and the collection of income tax and land taxes, I am thoroughly in accord with him. There is nothing more likely to bring about unification, which

[Hon. R. Sumner.

is earnestly desired by a great number of people, than the way in which people are harassed by the collection of the different income taxes, and the waste of money that is incurred in connection with that collection.

I go some way with those hon. members who think that the Address in Reply should be taken as read and practically done away with. The only use I have seen for it in the past has been that it has given the Government of the day an opportunity of killing time until they had some of their measures ready to bring before this Council. I have not spoken on the Address in Reply for many sessions past for that reason. I take advantage of the opportunity on this occasion because circumstances may arise by which I shall be prevented from being in my place for very long. I refer to health reasons. I therefore take this opportunity of expressing my views on certain Bills which will come before the Council during this session. A number of Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech are measures that we have had before us already. There are some new ones, and some others that I had not an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon when previously before the Council, and I intend to say a word or two on some of those, leaving our old friends to be dealt with on some future occasion.

The first I notice is the Health Act Amendment Bill. I think we are all agreed that the Health Act requires amending very drastically indeed. More power and more initiative should be placed in someone's hands, and that power and initiative should be used in such a way that the provisions of the Act will be enforced. The City of Brisbane Bill is one that has been before the public in various ways for a very long time, and I think it would be a good thing. It would save a good deal of expense, and be very much better for the city generally.

Then I come to the State Iron and Steel Works Establishment Bill. That is a measure I have not had an opportunity of speaking on before. Taking the intention of the Bill as disclosed in the name, it should be a good thing. Where individuals are not able, or are not willing, to do something, it is manifestly a good thing for the country, for the advancement of trade and the circulation of money, that the Government should enter upon such an undertaking. As to the matter of a few thousands of pounds here or there, I do not think that ought to enter into consideration of the question at all. So long as a fair case is made out I think the Government should be supported in carrying out their views.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hear, hear! I am very glad to hear you say so.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: Then we are promised a Dairy Produce Acts Amendment Bill. A good many of the farmers recently expressed themselves in favour of that. Some years ago, when I spoke in another place, I drew a picture describing the general farmer of sixty years of age who had worked the greater part of his life on a farm, and contrasted him with the middleman who disposed of his products in the city. I pointed out the very great difference in the appearance of the two men. The one was bowed and half crippled with rheumatism and hard labour. The other had a great corporation,

which was covered by a white waistcoat. I do not think I need elaborate on the subject any further; the inference is very clear. The Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill is something new to me. I understand it deals with the judges, which is rather a delicate subject to deal with, and one that most hon. members have flinched from in the past. I have expressed my opinion regarding some judges in the past; I am not going to enter on it at length now, but we are here to say what we think. Fortunately, we are protected by parliamentary privilege from a libel action, and that should enable a man to speak out who might feel nervous about saying what he would like to say under other circumstances. I have had an experience in politics of something over forty years, and, although not a particularly noisy member, I have been a fairly active one during that time, and I have seen a great many judges come and go. Generally speaking, we should be satisfied with the judges we have at the present time; but in the past we have had some very indifferent specimens. I go further, and say we have had some bad ones, and what has happened in the past may happen again in the future. If a man is not fit to be a judge, he is not likely to improve with old age, and a time limit should therefore be placed on the age of judges. A judge is in no way different from any other man. He is a human being, and he has the same attributes as other human beings. He has the same passions and the same feelings, and, although his training may lead him to have a more judicial mind, if he is an excitable man—and some judges are excitable—he is apt to forget what his training should have taught him and give relief to the feelings which actuate him. We have seen judges on the bench here, if they were not actually drunk—that is to say, they could not sit up—they were in such a condition that they had no right to have a man's life or property placed in their hands. We have known cases of judges who had to be doused with cold water before they could take their seats on the bench.

Hon. G. S. CURTIS: What! in Queensland?

Hon. E. J. STEVENS: In Queensland. We have seen judges go to sleep on the bench and wake up and deal with a case. We have known judges—I am using the plural so that it cannot be said that I am indicating certain individuals—I go that far to cover them up—we have known judges brought from the lowest haunts in Brisbane, and drugged and soured with cold water to enable them to sit on the bench and deal with important cases. What has happened in the past may happen in the future, and we should take what precautions are necessary to prevent a man of that sort from having a seat on the bench beyond a certain age limit. I do not know what is in the Bill, but on general principles I am thoroughly in accord with it.

The Constitution Act Amendment Bill is our old friend. (Laughter.) I need hardly say that I am not in favour of the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Neither is the Hon. Mr. Perel—one sensible man over there.

Hon. E. J. STEVENS: I am glad to find that there is an hon. member of intellect like the Hon. Mr. Perel with me in this

matter. It may come to pass that the Council will be abolished, but I do not think it will be done by a vote of the people. (Hear, hear!) I have heard a good many expressions of opinion outside from politicians—some very strong politicians on the Socialist side. They think it better that there should be two Chambers. Of course, there is a division of opinion as to the constitution of the Council. Some are in favour of a nominee Council, others of an elective Council, and so on, but, whether members are nominated or elected, I think they should only hold their seats for a certain number of years. We must all admit that, when men reach a certain age, they are not as good as they were before they reached that age. I confess that I am getting an old man now, and that I cannot perform my duties as easily and as satisfactorily as I should like to do. I absented myself from this House a good deal last session because I felt that I was not able to deal with questions which were brought before Parliament as fairly and as squarely as I should, and that in attempting to do so I might further injure my health. The Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill is a measure that is needed.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: In what direction?

Hon. E. J. STEVENS: In the direction of improvement.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: In the franchise?

Hon. E. J. STEVENS: Well, we will defer the consideration of that matter until we get the Bill. There is, no doubt, an earnest desire among many politicians to bring about a better understanding between capital and labour. I think that can be done; but there are different methods of doing it. The process advocated by some reminds me very much of the case of a man suffering from toothache. He has bad toothache; but after a time the pain goes away, and he says, "If this returns I shall have to get the tooth taken away." The pain comes on again and becomes very bad, and so the man makes up his mind to go to a dentist. He meets the dentist and the battle is won. We all know that patients in time come to realise that they have to meet the dentist. The Hon. Mr. Whittingham, in referring to the Land Act Amendment Bill, suggested that some compromise might be effected with regard to that measure, and I think the logical deduction from that suggestion is very clear. There are different ways of extracting a tooth. It is not necessary always to get a tooth out with a hammer and chisel; it is the object of the dentist to relieve the sufferer with as little pain as possible; and the same principle should operate in dealing with capital and labour.

No one will deny that the socialist party achieved a great victory at the last election; but I am not one of those who admit that the victory was gained entirely by the advance of socialism in the country. That it has advanced is undoubted. It has advanced with great strides, and has taken root and spread in directions where it had not spread before. But there are other reasons for the victory gained by the socialist party. One reason is that the question of conscription was again placed before the electors by the Federal Government. Another reason is to

Hon. E. J. Stevens.]

be found in the constitution of the National Political Council and the general want of organisation in the Liberal party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: And the constructive policy of the Government.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: I do not propose to deal with that. With regard to conscription, I think it was a fatal mistake to bring that question before the people again. There was no earthly excuse for doing so. It was all very well for politicians to make long speeches and say that the people desired conscription; but it is quite evident that the conscription referendum only brought about trouble which might have been avoided. The disfranchisement of the German people in the Commonwealth was a matter which influenced people very strongly at the last election. The German trouble was an important factor in the election, as is shown by the fact that in every electorate bar one—Fassifern, where there was a large German population—the Government gained a victory. The result of the referendum clearly proved the ignorance of the Federal Government with regard to the feeling of the country when they thought that by debarring Germans from having a vote they would carry conscription. The Germans resented their action very strongly, and possibly many of them will be strong opponents of the Liberal party in consequence. The want of organisation of the Liberal party was one of the most lamentable features of the election. It is said that there were 30,000 more names on the rolls than there are adult persons in Queensland, and I ask what greater evidence could we have of the lack of organisation of the Liberal party when they did not discover that in time to have it remedied? I admit that there are always more names on the rolls than there should be; but this has not happened at any previous time to the same extent as it occurred at the last election. The constitution of the National Political Council was another very strong cause of the defeat of the Liberal party. The gentleman who was appointed president of the council was not a free agent; he was an employee, and was not free to give advice. He could not afford to give the advice that should have been given. I understand that he is a very clever man, and I have nothing to say against him personally; but the fact that he chiefly represented the sugar industry should have operated against his appointment. The very first manifesto he issued in connection with the Liberal platform was a sugar manifesto from beginning to end—sugar, sugar, sugar. It was not surprising, therefore, that the old cry of black labour and cheap labour should have been raised, and that the opponents of the party made the most of it, and said that, if a Liberal party were returned to power, they would flood the country with Japanese and other cheap labour. Will any hon. gentleman say that such arguments were not used by the Labour party at the last election? It is quite easy to understand that they would suggest that if the Liberal party were returned they would go in for black labour and Japanese labour for the sugar industry.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: And a lot of persons did say that.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: I have no doubt they did. Another matter which had a very great influence in the last general election of this date, as it has had an influence in Australia for some time past, is Home Rule

for Ireland. There is no doubt there are many thousands of men in this country who are not Irishmen or Roman Catholics, but who are strongly in favour of Home Rule. That question has been a very important factor in politics, and will continue to be until it is settled one way or the other. Home Rule has been dangled before the people interested in it for more than a generation. Why are there so many signs of violence in Ireland at the present time? The reason is simply that the people believe that, no matter what is said about Home Rule, there is no intention of granting it. I have had a long experience in politics, and my firm conviction is that until Home Rule is granted there will be no settled peace, not only in Great Britain, but also in her Dominions, and in Queensland in particular; and those who oppose Home Rule in this country are courting defeat every time. I have nothing more to say on this matter or on any other matter at the present time. I hope that my health will be sufficiently good this session to allow me to be in my place and help hon. members to do the business of the country. (Hear, hear!)

HON. P. MURPHY: I am impelled to make a few remarks on this occasion by the observations of the last two speakers—one on this side, and one on the other side of the House. I give it as my opinion that, if the debate were kept up to the same high standard as those two hon. gentlemen have reached, there would be less trouble in front of us than we have had in most sessions since I have been a member of this Chamber. I congratulate those two hon. gentlemen upon their speeches, for they were well conceived, and nicely and inoffensively delivered. I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply upon the very able manner in which they performed the duties allotted to them. It is my duty also to congratulate the Premier on the success of the Labour party at the recent general election. That success was largely due to his ability and personality. It has been admitted that socialism is spreading and is getting more popular in the country, and I think that had a good deal to do with the success of the Labour party at the last election. But, be that as it may, I believe that before the other party obtain office, the party that I stand alone in representing in this Chamber will come into power; that is, the National Democratic party.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: We all belong to that party.

HON. P. MURPHY: I support the Labour party because their ideas are very much nearer my own ideas than are the ideas of the other party. That is the reason why I gave them a little support. I do not profess to be a Labour man. I have never attended a Labour meeting, and have never been asked to do so; but their policy is more in accord with my political principles than the policy of the Liberal party. Therefore I have given the Labour party support, believing that their ideas of justice and liberalism are more in consonance with my own ideas than are the ideas of the other political party, and I shall continue to support them until the party I represent comes into power. I heartily congratulate the Premier on his success at the last [5.30 p.m.] elections. It was, to my mind, a unique occurrence that a party, after being three years in power, should be

[Hon. E. J. Stevens.]

returned with such a large majority. In connection with everything in life, no matter what it is, the first day of its creation the elements of disintegration set in, and, when a political party, having been three years in power, go to the people again to seek their approval and that approval is given them in a pronounced way by returning them with a larger majority, it is something to be proud of.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They had the same experience in Western Australia and New South Wales, and they went out at the end of the second term.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: A different Labour party entirely.

HON. P. MURPHY: Dealing with the Address in Reply, I notice that the first two or three paragraphs in His Excellency's Speech are devoted to the war, and I may say that I am in thorough accord with every sentiment expressed in the Speech so far as the war is concerned. Probably I might go a little further than His Excellency. It is desirable and entirely essential that the allies at the present time should be successful.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. P. MURPHY: The freedom of the world, not for one hundred years, but for a thousand years or longer, depends upon the allies winning this war. I do not believe that any people in the world will benefit more by the allies winning the war than the people of Germany themselves. They are fighting at the present time to uphold militarism, and the allies are fighting for the very opposite purpose—to uphold the power of the people. Everyone who loves freedom must be in favour of the ideals of the allies in connection with this war. (Hear, hear!)

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Against the course of conscription.

HON. P. MURPHY: I do not like conscription, as I believe the present war is the result of conscription. Prussia initiated conscription in Europe. Largely she had been preparing for this war ever since the battle of Jena, when she was defeated by the French, and Napoleon enforced a limit of 43,000 in regard to her standing army. Prussia, although she agreed to that condition, got round it by adopting conscription. She trained a certain number of men each year, and then turned them away and trained another lot, so that she never had a standing army of more than 43,000 men, but in a few years she had the whole of the men of Germany trained soldiers, and she saw that by continuing that policy she would have a fair chance of being able to dominate Europe, as she has been doing ever since. The result of that system of conscription is what we see to-day—a war in which she is assisted by Powers which are supposed to be very weak—Austria-Hungary and Turkey—and opposed by the most vigorous nations in Europe, and so far she appears to have held her own. I hope the war will bring about a different end to that which Germany expects, and I believe the fact of America coming in to assist the allies will result in the defeat of the Central Powers, which we are all so very anxious to see. I am one of those who firmly believe that every man who is of age, and is able and strong, should go to the war, and, if he does not feel inclined to go,

in some way or other he ought to be compelled to go. I do not believe in conscription, because conscription means setting the nations against each other to see which can raise the largest army, and in the end the most populous nation must have the largest army, and then the old idea "might and not right," which never led to freedom, would prevail in the world. With His Excellency I condole with those who have lost relatives and friends in the war. I think they deserve the sympathy of everyone, and it is the duty of each country to do everything possible for the returned soldiers. I was pleased to hear the Hon. Mr. Sumner, this afternoon, make such an able defence of the measures adopted by the Queensland Government in that regard, and so far as my knowledge goes, he is absolutely right. The Land Settlement Committee, of which he is a member, and of which I have the honour of being a member, is under the Chairmanship of the Hon. Mr. Hunter, and I am quite certain that Mr. Hunter has the genuine interests of the returned soldiers keenly at heart. He has established a system of land settlement at Beerburrum and other places, and has also started bee farms and poultry farms, and now they are preparing to start hog farms. The hog is becoming a valuable animal now, and the time will come very soon when the hog industry will be the principal industry of this State. In no part of the world have they better bacon and better hams than are now being produced in Queensland. When I was travelling with the Hon. Mr. O'Shea it was our custom to have bacon once a day, and as we went through Canada and America we made a comparison of the bacon produced in those countries with the bacon produced in Queensland, and we came to the conclusion that right along the line Queensland bacon was the best, and for this reason, that, generally speaking, the lean of the Queensland bacon is finer and juicier than that of any other bacon in the world. I remember some time afterwards, when travelling in New Zealand with another hon. member of this Council, the Hon. Mr. Beirne, we saw one large window there full of hams, and the "Pineapple" ham of Queensland was marked 2d. a lb. higher than the New Zealand hams. I can remember the time very well when nearly all our bacon came from New Zealand, and our own bacon sold in the market at 4d. a lb. It was so badly butchered and so badly cured that the New Zealand bacon sold at 1s. a lb. dearer than Queensland bacon, and I was surprised to see Queensland hams ticketed up at 1s. 2d. and their own hams at 1s. I was very indignant that they should be selling Queensland hams so dear, and I went in and saw the manager and asked him how it was that he did not sell the Queensland ham at the same price as the others. He said "The reason is that we cannot get enough to sell, and we shall have to put on a higher price soon. The users of the hams are the best judges of the quality, and they are willing to pay 1s. 2d. for Queensland ham rather than buy New Zealand at 1s." New Zealand was always considered the home of the hog and bacon, but Queensland can beat them in quality, and I am sure we can beat any other country in the whole world.

HON. B. FAHEY: Yorkshire?

HON. P. MURPHY: Yes, Yorkshire or Belfast, or any other part of Ireland. However, they cook their hams better there than they do here, and that is the reason they are

Hon. P. Murphy.]

sweeter; but, given the same treatment, the Queensland hams are equal, if not superior, to anything in the world. There has been a good deal said against His Excellency's Speech. It has been ridiculed, and it has been said that there is nothing in it of any use to the people. If it contained nothing but the one paragraph which I am going to read, then it is well worthy of the party which put it before Parliament. On the question of land settlement, His Excellency says—

“My advisers are continuing their policy of increasing facilities for land settlement, and with the result that there is a distinct increase in selections as compared with last year's record.”

HON. P. J. LEAHY: There is less production.

HON. P. MURPHY: It is good news that there is an increase compared with last year.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Very small.

HON. P. MURPHY: There is an increase. The settlement of soldiers on the land in Queensland will be a good thing for this State, because it will enable them to live an outdoor, healthy existence, and their children in time will become settlers and add to the wealth of Queensland.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Every politician should be made to own a farm.

HON. P. MURPHY: I would be glad to see the hon. gentleman go on the land.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I have been on the land a long time.

HON. P. MURPHY: At all events, it is cheering to learn that there has been an increase in settlement, and that statement has not been contradicted even by the hon. gentleman who is the leader of the party opposite, and who has had more to do with land settlement than any other member of the party. In my opinion, at all events, if the Government had nothing else in the Speech than that one paragraph it would be well worthy of any political party. There is nothing they can do that will benefit the State of Queensland and the people of Queensland more than the settlement of people on the land. The more they can settle the better it will be for the country. The paragraph dealing with land settlement continues—

“Many selectors who held land as agricultural farms have brought their holdings under perpetual lease tenure.”

I do not care what form of land tenure we have so long as we settle enough people on the land. I believe that agricultural settlement is most useful, because it will settle the largest number of people, but I have no objection to pastoral settlement. Where the land is unsuitable for agricultural settlement why should we not have plenty of pastoral settlement? I am satisfied that the leasing system is more advantageous with respect to pastoral settlement. I suppose nine-tenths of the lands in Queensland used for pastoral purposes were held under that tenure, even before the advent of the present Government.

HON. R. SUMNER: They ought to make them keep the prickly-pear down.

HON. P. MURPHY: I quite agree with the hon. member, but that is quite another

[Hon. P. Murphy.]

question. I believe that what is good for the pastoralists in respect of land tenure is good also for the agriculturist. Probably freehold tenure may be all right about the cities and for suburban allotments, but I believe the leasing system is more to the advantage of the farmer as well as of the pastoralist, because they can use the capital that they would pay away for the freehold in purchasing stock and in cultivation, and making use of the land. I was told some ten years ago by a man who had been in Canada for a great many years that the whole cost of local government in Canada was practically borne by the rent of the land. The system in Canada at that time was to let the land on lease, commencing at 3d. an acre for agricultural land, and increasing the rent by that sum until it got to 1s. an acre, and then it ceased altogether. There was so much land sold under that system that the land was practically free from rates altogether. If that is so, the system is worthy of the consideration of any Government. The paragraph in the Speech goes on:—

“Cecil Plains Repurchased Estate, comprising an area of 120,947 acres, has been surveyed into 208 portions; about one-third of the estate (40,475 acres) has been set apart for soldier settlement.”

This is admittedly one of the best pieces of land in the world, and the Government ought to get a great deal more credit for having made that purchase than they have hitherto got. I do not know which member of the Ministry was instrumental in having the estate purchased, but he certainly deserves to have a statue erected in his honour somewhere on the Darling Downs, because there is no doubt that it is one of the finest bargains ever made by any Australian Government. Although they had to pay a big price for the land, they are not forgetting the returned soldier, for they have set apart for soldiers' settlement over 40,000 acres on the estate. Speaking of the returned soldiers, it is within my knowledge that many of the returned soldiers say they do not want to come to the towns. They may say, “We belong to such and such a district”—it may be Bundaberg, it may be Rockhampton, it may be Townsville, or Herberton, or anywhere else—“we would like to get a piece of land in that district to be near our fathers, or our fathers-in-law, so that they may give us some assistance. Can we get land in our own districts?” The Government always say, “Do you know of any Government land there?” If the soldiers say “Yes,” the Government say, “In that case we will reserve it, and you will get it.” I believe that in that way some 150 returned soldiers have been settled on land in other places besides the settlements at Beerburum and Stanthorpe. I am safe in saying that the present Government, largely on the initiative of the ex-Minister for Lands (Mr. Hunter), have done more for the settlement on the land of returned soldiers than any other Government in Australia. I do not say that from any desire to disparage what has been done in Victoria, or any other State in the Commonwealth; but I do not say that even the Government of Queensland have done enough yet. I think that every man who has risked his life at the front and comes back to Australia and is inclined to settle on the land should be given every assistance in order to enable him to do so. Of course, some of the returned men are wounded in

such a way that they will never be able to do heavy work again, and men like that should be considered too. But men who are inclined to go on the land should be helped as much as it is possible for the Government and people of Queensland to help them. I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the Council do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow will be the second reading of the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill. I will move the second reading of the Bill, and the debate may then be adjourned until the following day.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Or the following week?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I would remind hon. members that we are adjourning early this evening to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen; but, when we have so many Bills before the Council, it will probably be necessary to sit a little later in the evening. I am not desirous of sitting after 6 o'clock, and the Bills may be passed probably by 6 o'clock; but, with three or four Bills before the Council, probably it will be necessary to-morrow and the following day to sit after 6 o'clock. It will depend on how we get on with the business.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: May I be permitted to make a remark? Considering that to-morrow is private members' day, and hon. members on this side are studying the convenience of the Government by not having any motions down for to-morrow, the hon. gentleman will have no reason to complain about the adjournment to-morrow, seeing that to-morrow is our day and we are making him a present of it.

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at five minutes to 6 o'clock p.m.