

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY 20 AUGUST 1907

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 20 AUGUST, 1907.

The SPEAKER (Hon. John Leahy, *Bulloo*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

BALANCE-SHEET OF QUEENSLAND NATIONAL BANK.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received from the Auditor-General a letter dated the 16th instant, covering his report on the balance-sheet of the Queensland National Bank, Limited, as laid before the bank in general meeting on the 15th instant.

Ordered to be printed.

PAPERS.

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

- (1) The annual report of the Department of Public Lands for the year 1906.
- (2) The report of the Public Service Board for the year 1906.

QUESTIONS.

COSTS IN JIMBOUR CASE.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Burke*) asked the Attorney-General, without notice—

When will he lay upon the table a return of the costs in connection with the Jimbour case?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. W. Blair, *Ipswich*) replied—

I may inform the House that I have a return giving all particulars concerning the case almost completed, and I shall lay it upon the table of the House as soon as the final decision of the Land Court is given.

COMMISSION DUE FOR SALE OF CROWN LANDS.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

What amount, if any, is still due by the Lands Department as commission to agents outside the State for the sale of Crown lands and the introduction of intending settlers?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*) replied—

F. E. Pulsford, £560 6s. 1d.; A. S. Murphy, £264 7s. 7d.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): I desire to make a personal explanation, with the permission of the House.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACARTNEY: When addressing the House on Thursday evening, I find that I slipped into a mistake in some of the figures which I used on that occasion. The return laid upon the table of the House by the Home Secretary on the 7th August gave the total number of votes cast in all the electorates as 151,898. On looking through that return, I find that double electorates were only dealt with so far as the individuals voting were concerned, and not for the number of votes which individuals cast. It will be seen that in such double electorates individuals cast two votes. To make my figures compare fairly with that return, I should have

either added to the number contained in the return, or I should have deducted from the number of votes which I said had been cast the number by which they were increased by the inclusion of the two votes cast by voters in double electorates.

The HOME SECRETARY : I pointed that out.

Mr. MACARTNEY : If the hon. gentleman will refer to my remarks he will see that I deliberately stated that I did take that into consideration, so that when I quoted 85,948 as the number of votes that had been cast for the Opposition members and defeated Opposition candidates, I believed I had quoted the correct figures on that basis. I find, however, that this was not so, and that the gentleman who had collected the figures for me had omitted to carry out my wish in that respect, a matter I inadvertently overlooked myself. That brings about this result : That of the 151,898 votes cast, about 73,306 were cast for the Opposition on the basis mentioned, and not 85,948, and the balance, of course, amounting to 78,592, were cast for the Government, including the Labour party—thus showing a difference of about 5,296. I may also state that I included as a member of the Opposition the member for Warrego, because I take it that the member practically returned is a member of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER : The hon. member must not refer to that.

Mr. MACARTNEY : I also included in the Opposition the hon. member for Croydon, for I take it that he is more an Opposition member than a member of the Government or Labour party. I desire to point out the error into which I dropped, but otherwise I believe my figures to be approximately correct. The object I had in quoting those figures was to refute the statement that the Government had a great preponderance of the people of the country in their favour. (Hear, hear!)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : You are not entitled to go beyond a personal explanation.

The PREMIER : You cannot make a fresh speech.

The SPEAKER : The hon. member must not introduce new matter.

Mr. MACARTNEY : I have no wish to introduce new matter, but just to substitute other figures for those which appear in *Hansard* already. I do not wish to gain any benefit from pursuing this course of action, and I say that those figures do not alter my argument in the slightest degree as regards the general result of the figures. If my introduction of this matter leads the Home Secretary to submit to the House the official figures, then all that I desire will be gained.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) : When I moved the adjournment of the debate on Thursday evening last, it was not with any desire to prolong this debate, but because knowing some members on my left who were under the grip of influenza were anxious to get some speeches off their chest, I deemed it my duty to keep the matter going for some little time longer. I do not intend to dwell at any great length this afternoon on the Governor's Speech, but I propose to offer a few observations on some of the items dealt with in that Speech. I notice that in the first part of the Speech reference is made to His Excellency's recent tour in Northern and Central Queensland. Queensland has been singularly

fortunate in having as Governors such good men as Lord Chelmsford, and others who have preceded him, as representatives of His Majesty. Lord Chelmsford has taken a deep interest in Queensland, as is shown by his recent tour through the State. I observe that last Thursday, His Excellency, who is expected to entertain the people, and who does entertain them, gave a ball to the citizens, and that the place was over-crowded. When we have such a good man as our Governor as Lord Chelmsford, I think we should give him a decent place in which to entertain the people. Government House is very nicely situated, but there is not much room in the building, and the Governor has to put up with very great inconvenience when entertaining the citizens at various times. It is about time that the Government erected a proper ball and supper room, so that the Governor might be able to entertain the people without being put to so much inconvenience as he is at the present time. With regard to the reference made in the Speech to the Conference of Premiers, I think it is desirable now that we have the Commonwealth Government, and especially in view of the way in which the States have been treated by the Federal Government, that these conferences should take place. At the same time, I question very much whether they are going to result in very much good to the States. We know that petty jealousies exist among the States, and I am afraid that while those jealousies do exist the results of these Premiers' Conferences will not be of very much benefit to the States. I regret very much indeed that we have got federation. I voted, not against federation, but against the manner in which we entered into federation. We are now experiencing the results of federation, particularly as far as this State is concerned. We have had a tariff introduced which has upset all business and caused no end of concern to the people not only in Queensland but also in all the other States of the Commonwealth. The tariff has been framed to suit Victoria as against the other States. I cannot understand the action of the Labour party in the Federal Parliament supporting a Government which introduces such a tariff, because that tariff will increase the cost of living to the working people of the Commonwealth.

Mr. COWAP : Not much.

Mr. PETRIE : It will increase the cost of living from at least £6 to £8 a year, and on the top of this tariff the members of the Federal Parliament have decided to increase their own salaries. I think it is about time that the people of Queensland, who are about the worst treated of any people in the Commonwealth, rose up in arms and held indignation meetings. I should suggest taking charge of the Customs, and of the other departments which we have given over to the Commonwealth.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : What, what!

Mr. PETRIE : I am sure the Treasurer would take very good care of the money that was handed over to him. It seems to me that the sooner we secede from federation the better it will be for the State of Queensland. We have been treated shamefully in every respect. It is not a fair thing for Federal members to increase their salaries without first consulting the electors. I know that if members of the State Parliament attempted such a thing, they would have no show on election platforms afterwards. I hope that the people of Queensland are not going to remain quiet over this matter, but that they will hold indignation meetings, pass condemnatory resolutions, and send those resolutions to the Commonwealth Government. I am sure that if

Mr. Petrie.]

we had had our way, and had a little more money on our side to fight Northern and Central Queensland, federation would not have been an accomplished fact at the present time. However, we have got federation now, and we have to make the best we can of it. I only wish there was some loophole by which we could get out of the union. Reference has been made to the refusal of those citizens who are officers of the Federal Government to pay the income tax. It is a fair thing that every citizen should pay such a tax if it is imposed, and that no citizen, no matter whether he is a Federal officer or not, should be exempt, and I hope those officers will be made to pay. There are a good many matters referred to in the Governor's Speech, and I think it will take us more than this session—in fact, more than this Parliament—to pass them. There are twenty-one measures mentioned, some of which are very important. A great deal has been said about the policy of the present Government and that of the leader of the Opposition being almost identical. They are identical in this respect: that the good parts of the policy of the Government are what the leader of the Opposition left behind him when he vacated the Treasury bench, and what he put before the country at the last general election. Those parts we shall heartily support, but in the details with regard to carrying out that policy we are directly in opposition to the Government. As an illustration of what I mean I may refer to one measure which is now before the House—that is, the Elections Acts Amendment Bill. I think an amendment of the Elections Acts is necessary, but not in the direction proposed in that Bill. Much has been said in condemnation of the postal ballot, but if anybody benefited by the postal vote, no doubt the majority of members sitting on the Government benches benefited by it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. PETRIE: The Labour party were evidently not awake to the value of the postal vote, or else they would have worked it for all it was worth. The hon. member for Croydon very properly described the Bill which has been introduced as the "Women's Revenge Bill," because it is a Bill to take revenge on the women, whom the Government now wish to disfranchise. Not only will they disfranchise the women, but they will disfranchise a number of other electors by doing away with the advertising of the bi-monthly registration courts. The cost of advertising is only a matter of £2,000 or £3,000, and there is plenty of money spent in other directions which could be very well spent in that way. How are you going to get people to go to the courts of petty sessions in order to see if their names are on the lists passed by the courts? You will not get them to do that, and the result will be that many hundreds will be disfranchised. I hope that when the Bill goes into Committee something will be done in the direction, not of knocking out the postal ballot altogether, but of safeguarding it, possibly by limiting it in its operation. It would be far better to do that than to adopt the proposals made by the Government to please the gentlemen sitting on the cross benches to my left. There is no doubt that the Premier promised that when he got his vessel safely round the rocks by the help of members sitting on this side—when he got it out of the breakers, and steered round the Speaker's rocks and the Chairman of Committee's shoals—that when he got this done, with the help of the socialist members, he would help them by giving them an Elections Bill in which he would drop the postal ballot behind him. I cannot understand how a number of members sitting on the Government side can support such a measure, because had it not been for the postal ballot

many of them would have lost their seats. I hope that when the next election comes off the women of Queensland will not forget the men who are going to vote for the throwing out of the postal ballot.

Mr. MAXWELL: Are you serious?

Mr. PETRIE: The hon. member knows that I am always serious in anything I say on this matter. At all events, I am honest if I am not serious. I am honest in politics, and as long as I have the honour of being in the House I shall continue to be honest in politics. I notice that it is promised that wages boards will be established. I think that is a very good thing, although, perhaps, the junior member for Ipswich would prefer a conciliation and arbitration board. We are well aware that conciliation and arbitration boards have been an utter failure in New South Wales and New Zealand. The establishment of wages boards will be the means, I hope, of stopping strikes and ensuring industrial peace. A great deal has been said about two recent strikes in this State—one at Howard and the other at the Brisbane Gasworks. With regard to the strike at the Brisbane Gasworks, I was speaking to an employee of that company the other day, and he told me that if the men had approached the manager of the gasworks the matter in dispute would have been settled without any trouble, but that when they formed their union, they appointed an outside man as secretary, and he came in and did all the talking on their behalf. Of course, the manager put his back up at this. If the men had gone the proper way about the matter, there would have been no strike. I do not think that 9s. per day is too much for the work those men are doing; they deserve every penny they earn. But, when a body of men wish to benefit themselves I do not think they go the right way to work when they enlist the services of outsiders, because, as soon as they do that, trouble is likely to arise. With regard to the Howard Colliery strike, a few years ago, at the invitation of Mr. Rankin, I travelled to Howard and was accompanied by the hon. member for Rosewood, the hon. member for Gympie (Mr. Mulcahy), and the hon. member for Cairns (Mr. Mann). Mr. Rankin was a first-class host, and when we were at Howard we saw everything about the mine—the men, and their cottages—and I must say that they appeared to me to be a happy, prosperous condition. When talking to Mr. Rankin the other day I mentioned the strike, and he said he was never against the forming of the union, but that what he was against was being dictated to by the union as to how he should manage his colliery. I believe that the whole cause of the trouble originated in the introduction of a man from Ipswich. Mr. Rankin told me that they had 100 men employed at the colliery at the present time, and were able to carry out all necessary work. As to the condition of the miners, I know that the wives of the miners often drove to the mines in sulkies in order to bring their husbands home from their work. I do not think there are many other parts of the world where you will see that kind of thing, and, in my opinion, it shows that the men must be in a very prosperous condition, and that they cannot be starving as has been stated by some hon. members. I am not against unionism. I rather believe that men should form unions and try to better the condition of the working classes; but very often men do not go the proper way to work in order to accomplish what they have in view. While on this matter I should like to refer to that part of the Speech where it is stated that the railway officials and others are to have an eight-hours day—and, I believe, also fortnightly pay. It is

[Mr. Petrie.

not stated whether they are to have an increase in their wages; but I think the Minister for Railways recently stated in reply to a question that the men would be paid for overtime, or something of that sort. There is another matter that I should like to refer to in this connection. It is about six months ago that the Secretary for Works introduced the eight-hours system and minimum wage into Government contracts, following upon similar lines which had been adopted by the Commonwealth. What I blame the Government for is that while they insist that contractors and others who tender for Government work should employ the workmen for only eight hours a day, pay them the minimum wage, and that sort of thing, the Government do not act up to those conditions themselves. I had a good deal to say on that matter during

[4 p.m.] the elections, when I pointed out the inconsistency of the Government.

I have had a good deal to do with men in the building trade and in other directions, and I contend that the Government should set a good example in this connection to private employers. They should not make a pretence of doing it, but should start at home and show the people of the State that they are in sympathy with the movement.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do you believe in Government employees getting union rates of wages?

Mr. PETRIE: I believe that many men in the railway service have started work at 1 or 2 p.m., and have not stopped work until 10 o'clock at night, and for this they have got the magnificent pay of 5s. 6d. a day. I do not think the Government have much to glory in in that direction. They should "practice what they preach;" but, unfortunately, like many others, they do not do it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do you believe in it?

Mr. PETRIE: I believe in paying a man a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. I am just as much in sympathy with the working classes as the junior member for Ipswich, and I know as much about working people as he does. I know that the Labour party have been the means of introducing some very good measures in this House, and I give them all credit for them; but I am afraid that in a lot of ways they are misguided, and if they would only give and take a little more it would be better for the party and for those for whom they are working. I think the party are mistaken in their tactics in regard to immigration. I believe that if the policy of our leader in regard to immigration were followed it would be of benefit to the State. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Toowong, we have a Government on the one hand which will not allow men to come here unless they are under contract; and, on the other hand, we have the Commonwealth Government which will not allow anybody to come here under contract. Well, how can we get people here? In the past many men landed here with, perhaps, not more than 2s. 6d. in their pockets, but yet those men helped to build up the State. From 1880 to 1891 wages were steady, uniform, and high, showing that under immigration wages were far better than when we have not had immigrants coming in. I believe that a resumption of immigration would lead to similar results now, and that it would be far better for the working classes themselves. The Labour party are frightened, and it was through them, in the year 1893, that immigration was stopped, because they said it was bringing wages down. I think they made a mistake, as statistics prove that immigration has had just an opposite effect to what they imagined. A lot has been said about the unemployed. I saw in one of the evening

papers the other day that Mr. Buss, of Bundaberg, received a telegram from Mackay, stating that there was a dearth of labour there; that small sugar-growers could not get men, and that if that state of things continued they would have to give up growing sugar altogether. There are plenty of men hanging about the street corners who will always be in the unemployed ranks. They will never work for more than two or three days at a time, and then they work with great reluctance. Those are not the class of men we want to bother about. It is a pity we have not some other way of dealing with them. I maintain that we want a vigorous immigration policy. If we had 100,000 people coming here every year, what would it mean to the bootmaker, the baker, the butcher, and all those people? We live upon one another, and we ought to place no restrictions on the introduction of a proper class of immigrants. The Labour party—and they know it perfectly well—are always crying out for a white Australia, but we are going quite the wrong way about it. We shall have the Northern portion of this beautiful State—the pearl of the Commonwealth—with nothing but the black races in it if we are not careful, and that before very long. I hope that some of those who are so antagonistic to immigration will reconsider the matter, because it is a very serious affair. We want to go ahead. We have good seasons, and to the good seasons and not to good government is attributable a great deal of our progress. Probably we should progress a great deal more if we had less legislation and better administration. I wish now to say a few words with regard to old age pensions. I am very glad to know that something is to be done in this direction; but I am of the same opinion as the Premier was when he was at the Conference of Premiers in Melbourne last year, and which opinion he has since changed for some reason or other. I believe this is a matter for the Federal Government to deal with. They are imposing additional burdens through the Customs and Excise equal to about £800,000 per annum on the people of the Commonwealth, and no doubt they have some idea of dealing with old age pensions. We should go slow in the matter until we see what the Commonwealth Government are going to do. I noticed in one of the evening papers the other day that a deputation of Northern members waited on the Home Secretary with regard to the establishment of what I may call "A Northern Dunwich." That is a matter that has been spoken of for a long time, but I do not think the hon. members gave any very good reasons in support of their request. There are at present in Dunwich about 230 persons from various parts of the North. The members who waited on the Home Secretary said that, if an institution were established in the North, a great many more people would go there than come to Dunwich, as many will not come down to Dunwich. Well, if those people can exist in the North, or if they can be kept there by their friends, there is not much need for establishing an institution up there. Besides, many of the Northern people are always saying that it is necessary for people in the North—particularly for old people—to come further South after they have been there for many years, so as to get the benefits of the change of climate that they so much need. Now, they cannot find a better climate than that of Dunwich. I am not going into the question at any length on the present occasion, as there will be an opportunity of doing so when the Bill is before us; but I notice that the cost to the State for Dunwich and the indigent allowance is something like £42,590 per annum, and it is increasing every year. It is commencing to become a serious

Mr. Petrie.]

matter; and, while we all admit we should do something for our aged poor, I think the question could be much better dealt with by the Federal Government, for the reason that people who may have "borne the burden and heat of the day" in Queensland may be compelled to go to another State after having lost all they possess, and they would be simply shut out of a State pension system, and it is therefore preferable that the whole matter should be dealt with by the Federal Government. We might go on as we are doing at present until we see what the Commonwealth Government intend to do. There is a Bill promised to amend the Local Government Act. That is very necessary, although, of course, I do not know what amendments will be made until I see the Bill. Our local authorities want more encouragement than they have been getting for the last few years, and I believe the country districts particularly ought to get endowment once more. I also believe that the Government ought to pay rates on all Government property. In the country districts the local authorities have not much money, and they have very expensive main roads to keep in repair, and those roads are used not only by their own people but by people outside their districts altogether.

Mr. COWAP: You supported the Government that took the endowment off, though.

Mr. PETRIE: We know all about the Government that took it off, but they had to do something at that time.

Mr. PAGER: This Government accepted their Estimates.

Mr. PETRIE: Yes; they accepted our Estimates. There is no use talking about past administration. We all know that, if our leader had liked to continue in office, he had a majority of one or two at the time he resigned, and if he had waited a day or two longer he would have had a majority of six or eight, and he would have been on those benches to-day; but he was too honest. We have in our leader a man who is honest in politics. He went through the drought and other troubles, and everyone knows that, if he had had good seasons and had remained on those benches, the State of Queensland would have been in a far more prosperous condition than it is now. I hope that, whatever amendments are proposed in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, will be suitable to the interests of the majority of the people. The Home Secretary has had a good deal to do with local government, and his experience ought to stand him in good stead. I do not think there is much chance of the Government restoring the endowment, but we intend to make a little bit of a fight for it. With regard to the referendum in connection with the Bible in State schools, I shall only say that I intend to give the measure my support. It has been promised, and a great many members pledged themselves to support it; and, if the Premier is sincere in regard to introducing the Bill, I believe it will receive the support of a majority of the House. There are many things promised in the Speech, and we shall be lucky if we pass them all in three years. I regret that no reference has been made to a reduction of members and a redistribution of seats. Those matters have been before the people of Queensland for some time. The hon. member for Toowong showed from returns that, although this party only numbers twenty-nine—practically thirty—we represent a majority of the electors.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Nearly a majority.

Mr. PETRIE: However, that is not much good at the present time. I have some figures

[*Mr. Petrie.*

here, but I do not propose to weary the House by quoting them. But taking Toombul, the electorate which I have the honour to represent, it is the largest single electorate in Queensland. There will be 7,000 voters on the roll; there were nearly 7,000 on the roll at the last election. More than half that number are women. Why should not Toombul have two members when some of the double electorates—Maryborough, for instance—have not much more than 4,000 electors on the roll? I represent more people than the Premier and some of his colleagues. With the Commonwealth now in existence, I do not see that it is necessary for us to have seventy-two members in this House. I think we should reduce that number considerably. And I hope that before this Parliament is finished—should it continue right to the end of its term—that a Bill will be brought in dealing with the reduction of members and a redistribution of seats. If it is not brought in by the present Government, I hope it will be brought in by any Government that may take their place. I notice reference is made in the Speech to the prickly pear, and that £10,000 is offered to anybody who will eradicate the pest. I think the Government are quite safe in making that offer. It is easy to kill the pear, but the difficulty is to keep it down. The easiest way out of the difficulty would be to allow persons to take up the land, and give it to them on condition that they clear it of prickly pear. If groups were formed under those conditions, there would be some chance of getting rid of it. I know at least of one firm in Brisbane who have been experimenting down Nudgee way in the eradication of this pest. I think the late Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Denham, has seen the crude way they have of dealing with it. Of course, they want something definite before they can go into it in a proper way. They first cover the pear and then steam it. There are many ways of doing it, and it would be easy to kill; but where you have large tracts of country thickly covered with pear I do not know how you can apply the machinery for getting rid of it. I think the far better plan would be to give the land to people who like to take it up, on condition that they clear the ground of pear.

Mr. MAXWELL: They are doing that now.

Mr. PETRIE: There are a good many other pests—one is the water hyacinth. I do not know whether any amendment in this direction will be introduced into the Local Government Bill. In my district, down Nudgee way, some of the dairymen who have swamps in portions of their paddocks have had the swamps covered with this water hyacinth, and they have cleared it away under instructions from the Toombul Shire Council. There are also a few small reserves down there which have been covered with it. When it has been cleared, the trouble is that it has come along again after heavy rain. It comes down from the head of Enoggera Creek, and we have it at the head of the Brisbane and the Bremer rivers. We have all seen it floating about in the river recently, almost covering the water from one side of the river to the other, and the Harbours and Rivers Department have had to take steps to clear it away, as it interfered with navigation. I hope something will be done to eradicate these various pests, as they are national affairs, and should be dealt with in that way. I hope that not only the Government but every member of the House will deal with this matter. These pests may not appear to some people to be very serious at present, but every year they are getting worse. We see Government reserves and roads covered with lantana and prickly pear. It is hardly fair to expect the local authorities to compel private owners to

clear their lands of these pests, when the roads and reserves are full of it. It is a matter which the Government should take in hand, and deal with quickly, and I hope effectively in the long run. I would like to mention something with regard to our railways. I hope we are going to have a vigorous railway policy, because railways and immigration, if we want to get closer settlement on our lands, are the proper ways to go about it. I am with the senior member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Carnarvon that a preference should be given to our Queensland natives. I have not very much to do with land, but we had a man lately in my district who had been dairying in a small way in the suburbs. He has five big stalwart sons, and he is anxious to go out further and do something for them on the land, but he can get no "show" at all. And no wonder, when we see what is transpiring with regard to men from the South, especially with regard to the amount paid for commission, which is shown by the return placed on the table of the House. We cannot wonder that our men have been cut out, while these New South Wales and Victorian settlers have had the preference. I hope, before the session is ended, something more will be said on that subject. I think it is not a matter that we can congratulate the Minister about. I am not against legitimate commission being paid, but I am against anything of that sort. I do not wish to cast any aspersion on the Minister for Lands, or any member of the Government; but it looks to me that there is a great deal more behind than we are aware of. While dealing with railways, I notice that reference was made by the hon. member for Woolloongabba—he was speaking, no doubt, for his electorate, and very properly so too—with regard to utilising the South Brisbane railway wharves like—I think he said—Pinkenba. I would like to tell the hon. member that Pinkenba is all right; I will be able to look after it. (Laughter.) But we have not been properly treated there with regard to our railway wharves.

Mr. MAXWELL: I thought you said it was all right.

Mr. PETRIE: We want additional accommodation. Plans and specifications have been prepared, and tenders were to be called; but for some reason or other it was suddenly stopped. I have no objection to steamers coming up to town. I say that in time—although probably I shall not live to see it—we shall have wharves probably from Pinkenba right up to Bulimba. (Hear, hear!) But when we enter into our mail contracts with the large mail steamship companies there is no doubt that Pinkenba is the deepwater port, and it is much more convenient for them to stop there than to come up to town. We have done very good work with regard to our harbour and river, but there is a lot more to be done, and it will take some years to do it. There is a great amount of danger in the navigation, and it speaks all the more for the pilots of Brisbane which we have in our service, who are so inadequately paid, that they can bring the ships in safety right up to town. I hope the Government will allow Mr. Thallon, in whom I believe we have a good man, to exercise his powers. Although he is supposed to have certain powers, we know that he does not get the privilege of exercising them, and if he were only allowed more of a free hand it would be more for the benefit of all concerned. I hope to see the establishment both of the new services, *via* Torres Straits, connecting with the East, and also the continuation of the Orient Steamship service. I have been down at Pinkenba, where I have seen large steamers waiting for a berth, and I do not think it is to the credit of the Government that such a thing exists, and as soon as the

Railway Commissioner is allowed to put on additional accommodation, which will cost something like £3,000, and give us proper communication to the wharves by railway, the better it will be for all concerned. We know the Commissioner has been trying to do all he can to increase the Treasurer's surplus, and has done well out of the railway; but, unfortunately, I think the rolling-stock has been allowed to run too far before being taken to the repairing shops. At some of our railway stations they have been repairing fences. Sawn hardwood palings have been put on, and the new palings are simply covered with oil and left, and we have a sort of piebald fence. I say that is "penny wise and pound foolish." Now that people are travelling from all over the world by these new steamers, we should have decent stations when they come here. We have on some of our stations low platforms.

Mr. KENNA: The Central Station is the best station in Queensland.

Mr. PETRIE: The Central Station is a good one.

Mr. KENNA: Then we have Woolloowin—one of the best stations in Queensland.

Mr. PETRIE: I admit that is so; but there are a lot of stations down that way which are not up to date. I am speaking, however, not about my own particular electorate only, but of other parts of the State as well. Where there is a lot of traffic these low platforms should be done away with, and a higher platform made. They are positively dangerous, and, if an accident happened, the Commissioner would be let in for damages, which would more than pay for several of those platforms being raised. I hope that the Minister for Railways will encourage the Commissioner. I know the Commissioner would do lots of things if he had the money; but, unfortunately, they have not allowed him enough money, and he has to do the best he can. So far as the Ipswich works are concerned, I suppose £500,000 of money has been spent there. They have lovely machinery, and turn out very good work, but I do not know whether they keep a proper supply of timber for the work. That was pointed out by myself and other hon. members some time ago. If we want to turn out good carriages and trucks, the workmen must have

[4.30 p.m.] proper material and seasoned timber. The result of that complaint was that the Government did advertise for large supplies of timber in the log. They want to keep timber for years before it is used for that work. If they are not able to cope with the work, I agree with the hon. member for Woolloongabba—although I do not know much about a railway workshop being established at Woolloongabba. I should like to see one established at Eagle Junction. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) I think that would be more convenient for the Central and Northern lines.

Mr. COWAP: Northgate Junction would be better.

Mr. PETRIE: The member for that particular district is not here this afternoon. I will refer the hon. member to him on that question, and I have no doubt he will be able to give a very good answer. There are a good many more matters, but I do not want to take up too much time this afternoon. A lot has been said with regard to the coalition that did not come off; but I do not think we need to be concerned because that coalition did not come off. I take it that the majority of the people wanted a coalition, and that it was the best thing under the circumstances.

Mr. COWAP: Not at all.

Mr. PETRIE: But our side cannot be blamed, and they feel proud of the position they took up.

Mr. Petrie.]

We did not approach the Government. They approached our leader, and the result was a sell. But probably they will get a sell when the next election comes off. As I said before, we have passed certain rocks which were in the way, and which we were nearly being wrecked on. The Government came over to the officers and crew of that lovely ship called "Liberty and Progress." They came and asked them to help to navigate their vessel, as they were exposed to dangerous rocks and shoals. But when he went back to call his officers and crew together, they said, "No; we are not going to give up our emoluments here; we are not going to have any coalition." They could see their Labour vessel in the offing leaking with socialism. Although the stormy petrel was flying above the mast, they said, "Let us approach them and see what we can get from them." They approached them, and what has been the result? The skipper of the vessel said, "Yes, we will see you through, but we will tell you exactly what you have to do for us. First of all, you will have to bring in an Elections Bill, but you must leave the postal ballot behind you, although a lot of you are very glad you had it, and there would have been less of us among the crew if it had not been for that." I should like in all seriousness and earnestness to tell a lot of members on that side of the House who once belonged to this good ship and which they have deserted—they want to seriously consider their position. You may go on for a while steering with indifferent success. It is from the steerage no doubt, and you are depending on this other vessel which will shove you on the rocks before you know where you are.

Mr. KENNA : You are getting tangled up.

Mr. PETRIE : I am not tangled up. It will wreck you eventually on the rocks of the Trade Disputes Bill. We throw out the life-line to you now. I believe the hon. member for Warwick and the Attorney-General would boldly come over to us here but for certain reasons with regard to these portfolios. I won't say anything about the judgeship—I should not blame him for taking the judgeship if he got it. I do not speak with any disrespect of hon. gentlemen on that side, I speak in a political sense; they are all good friends of mine. Still, I take exception to what the Attorney-General said with regard to the way in which some of our elections were conducted. He said we had money behind us from the capitalistic Press, and from other men of means, and I am glad the hon. member for Toowong repudiated that statement. I again refute it. Speaking for myself, I never saw or received any money in that way, if there was any. I think there is no truth whatever in it. The Attorney-General's powers of imagination perhaps carry him a long way, but he made a popular speech. We know whatever his political opinions are, he is such a popular little gentleman that Ipswich will always return him. Even the ladies have the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman, and he will always have their support.

Mr. BOWMAN : He has got a strong rival in you. (Laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE : However, I will say this—that the women have far more sense than men. A good many showed it at the last Federal and State elections. I do not intend to say anything further on the Address in Reply. I will have many more opportunities of saying something when these Bills are in Committee, and possibly I will have a chance of saying something when the Financial Statement is before us. I thank the House for the patient hearing they have given me, and I hope and trust that whatever happens we will all do the best we can

[*Mr. Petrie.*

to further good legislation, no matter from what side of the House it is introduced, and do our best to lead this State into prosperity and make it what it should be and ought to be—one of the best States of the Commonwealth. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) : I should like to offer a few remarks before this debate closes. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any very great length, but I consider it my duty to pass a few remarks, and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen of the House, to extend to me the same leniency which has been extended to other new members. I do not ask for any more, but I notice that the House has been very kind and considerate to the new members, and I am quite confident they will extend the same consideration to me. (Hear, hear!) It is hardly necessary for me to congratulate the Government on bringing such a liberal programme before the country. They have had congratulations heaped upon them from almost every part of Queensland, and also from every part of this Chamber. I shall just refer briefly to a few Bills mentioned in the Speech. The first I come to is the Elections Acts Amendment Bill. There have been various opinions expressed as to whether it is desirable to alter this Act, particularly in the direction of the postal vote. Personally, I consider that it is absolutely essential that the postal vote should be abolished, in order that the elections may be fought out on fair and honourable lines. I am of opinion—and I am not the only one who considers—that the past elections were not fought out on the honourable lines they should have been. I can speak on this question from what I may term an unbiassed point of view, because in my electorate the postal vote was used to the extent of something like 10 per cent. There were forty-four postal votes recorded in my favour, and my opponent got forty-one. Some hon. gentlemen have stated that it is necessary that the postal vote should be altered in order to please the Labour party, and others have supplemented that by saying it is "the women's revenge Bill." Well, I am of opinion that it is necessary to abolish this postal vote, so as to prevent unscrupulous electioneering agents manipulating votes for the particular benefit of the party in which they are interested. By abolishing the postal vote you will abolish the means of manipulating votes in that particular direction, and that is the reason why I am personally strongly in favour of its abolition. The Speech also states that a Bill will be introduced to amend the Income Tax Act. The party to which I have the honour to belong have always considered that £200 would be a fair and reasonable exemption under the Income Tax Act. I understand that that is the exemption which the Government propose to make, and I am very pleased that such a proposal is contemplated. In Great Britain the exemption, I understand, is £160, and £200 in Queensland is only about equivalent to £160 in Great Britain. Therefore, I consider £200 a fair and reasonable exemption. The next Bill on the list is a Bill to establish a central technical college. That is a step in the right direction. The leader of the Opposition, when speaking on this question the other night, said that he considered that from an educational point of view a University was more necessary in Queensland at the present time than anything else. I take the liberty of doubting that statement. It may be correct as far as the electorate of the hon. member is concerned, but I can assure the House that it does not apply to the far Western electorates of Queensland. I maintain that until every boy and every girl in Queensland has an opportunity for getting a primary education, not one shilling of the

taxpayers' money should be spent in the erection of a University. (Hear, hear!) There is plenty of scope for the increase in the number of travelling teachers. During the time I was fighting the last election I found families over 100 miles away from any school. I maintain that those children should have the same privileges given to them as are given to other children in other parts of the State by means of travelling teachers, and until those children are provided for in this respect I will never support the expenditure of any money on the establishment of a University.

The HOME SECRETARY: The travelling teachers are to be increased.

Mr. NEVITT: I am pleased to know that such is the case, but I say that until every child in Queensland has an opportunity of getting a primary education I will never support the establishment of a University. (Hear, hear!) The next matter to which I wish to refer to is the Old Age Pensions Bill. That is a matter which the Labour party has always agitated. One hon. member said we should go "slow" on this particular question. I have always found that it is the policy of the people on top to go slow on matters of this kind. They have very little thought for the soldiers of industry. This party, however, consider that the soldier of industry is just as much entitled to an old age pension as a military or a naval man. The next question I propose to deal with is the Wages Board Bill. This also is a measure which the party that I have the honour to belong to have been advocating in season and out of season. We would prefer a Compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, but on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, we welcome this measure for the establishment of wages boards. A few weeks ago I was speaking to a man who is in charge of a shop which contained £1,200 to £1,400 worth of stock, and that man is in receipt of a salary of less than £2 a week. Is that a fair salary to pay a man who is in charge of stock to the value of £1,400 or £1,500, an amount which is turned over several times in the course of the year? I contend that it is not fair and reasonable remuneration, and under a Wages Boards Bill that would be altered.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He might be sacked altogether.

Mr. NEVITT: There is not much danger of that happening, but the person employing such a man would be compelled to pay him a fair and reasonable wage. And all we ask is that a fair and reasonable wage should be paid the men who have to work for their livelihood.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The business may not be paying.

Mr. NEVITT: A business that turns over £1,400 or £1,500 worth of stock several times in the year can hardly be said not to be paying, and surely the man who is in charge of that property should not be asked to work for a salary of less than £2 a week. The next matter I wish to refer to is the Licensing Act Amendment Bill. On looking over the report of the Comptroller of Prisons, I find that a large percentage of the inmates of our asylums and prisons are there owing to the influence of drink, and I think the licensing laws should be amended in many directions. Drink is one of the greatest evils the human race has got to put up with, and any amendment in the licensing laws of Queensland will be thankfully accepted. The next matter I shall refer to is the Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. As an hon. member interjects, it certainly needs amendment. For instance, it needs amendment in regard to that section which provides that workmen meeting

with an accident shall derive no benefit under the Act until the expiration of fourteen days after the accident. The next matters on the list are the Children's Court Bill and the Poor Prisoners' Defence Bill. I cannot understand why a Poor Prisoners' Defence Bill was not passed many years ago. The State employs all the power and all the influence it possesses to prove a man guilty of a crime for which he has been arrested, but not one farthing is given to help a man who is not in a position to brief counsel himself to prove his innocence. I am pleased to see that the time has come when the Government recognise their responsibility in this matter, and propose to introduce a Bill of that description. The next matter is the proposed State Insurance Bill. I consider that a step in the right direction, and shall be glad to give it my support. With regard to the steamship service *via* Torres Straits, that has been referred to by some hon. members as a mail service. We have no power to enter into a mail contract. All we can do is to offer a bonus to the owners of a particular line of steamers to run *via* Torres Straits, and as a Northern member I have every sympathy with such a proposal. Some years ago, when we had a mail service in Queensland *via* Torres Strait and British India, the people in the Northern parts of this State were much better served than they have been served since, and if a service *via* Torres Strait can now be inaugurated it will benefit Northern Queensland to a very considerable extent. Such a service will have my warmest support. Now I wish to refer to one or two matters which are not mentioned in the Governor's Opening Speech. The first is the question of the erection of State smelters, which I believe would be a splendid thing in the interests of the mining industry. I understand that some of the late members of the present Government, during the late election campaign, promised, or partly promised, that State smelters would be erected. In the electorate which I have the honour to represent, some copper miners have been called upon to pay as much as £9 per ton to get their ore to port. That is a disability which no industry should have to labour under, and if the Government would only erect State smelters the amount that would be saved in converting the ore into matte before transportation would be sufficient to make the erection of those smelters a profitable transaction. Among the disabilities under which copper-miners labour at the present time are that they have to give 21 cwt. to the ton in disposing of their copper, which is an injustice, and that no matter what other mineral the ore may contain outside copper they do not get one farthing for that other mineral. It is a well-known fact that in the Cloncurry district a great deal of the ore contains a fair percentage of gold, but even if that ore contains 1 oz. of gold per ton, the copper-miner does not get one farthing for that gold. Those are the conditions under which copper-miners in the Leichhardt district are working to-day, and they are conditions which should not be allowed to continue in any industry. I sincerely hope that the Government will be able to see their way to place an amount of money on the Estimates for the erection of State smelters. There are other disabilities under which copper-miners labour, and I trust the Government will render assistance in removing those disabilities. One way in which they might assist the industry is by providing water on the long stages which carriers have to travel over at the present time. The Leichhardt field is situated from 170 to 180 miles west of Normanston. According to Mr. George Muller, a carrier,

The Largeroy Dam has been dry four weeks now, which has made a dry stage of 28 miles between the

Mr. Nevitt.]

Leichhardt River and Wombie Station. In a few weeks this stage will be increased to 40 or 45 miles. The Leichhardt district will then be cut off from Normanton for wheeled traffic—that will be disastrous for Normanton.

I consider that it is the duty of any Government to provide water in a case of that kind. In that particular district I do not suppose 5 per cent. of the land is held in fee-simple. Therefore, it seems to me, it is the duty of the Government to put down a bore or to build a dam there, so as to allow the residents in the district to get their ore to the nearest port. The next question I wish to bring before the House is the injustice inflicted by the construction of the present Cloncurry Railway. In the election manifesto issued by the leader of the Opposition that hon. gentleman stated that he believed in the trade of all districts going to their natural ports. Cloncurry is situated about 250 miles south-west of Normanton, and in round numbers it is 500 miles from Cloncurry to Townsville. Under those circumstances I ask hon. members whether the trade from Cloncurry is now going to its natural port by that railway? As the late Hon. W. Browne, at one time member for Croydon, stated, the leader of the Opposition and one or two members of this House have done more to crucify the port of Normanton than all the rest of the people in Queensland. When the present leader of the Opposition built the railway from Hughenden to Richmond in 1900, there is not the slightest doubt it was his intention that that railway should be carried on to Cloncurry, and, although the hon. gentleman was not in power when the extension was made from Richmond to Cloncurry, he did his best to assist in trying to get the Government of the day to build that line. The construction of the railway in that direction is one of the greatest injustices that has ever been inflicted on the people of North Queensland, as the railway is taken 500 miles from port as against 250 miles if the line had been taken to Normanton or to a port on the Gulf of Carpentaria. There are a number of groups of mines situated to the north and north-west of Cloncurry, varying in distance from a few miles up to 130 miles from the Gulf port. These groups are the Lady Clare, Mount Remarkable, Hamilton, Centipede, Mount Metalie, Longamund, Una, Mighty Atom, Mount Cuthbert, Warwick Castle, Crusader, Dobbyn, Eclipse, Boundary, Big Ben, Mount Gordon, Mount Oxide, and Bower Bird Goldfield, which is 100 miles north-west from Cloncurry. These are groups of mines and not individual mines. I do not think one of the copper mines in the Cloncurry district is more than 300 miles from the Gulf ports, as against 500 miles to Townsville, and when the Cloncurry Railway is constructed it will be from 30 to 100 miles distant from those mines. When the Bower Bird Goldfield was first opened it had a promising outlook for twelve or eighteen months. At that time the people of the Carpentaria district were under the impression that the Cloncurry Railway would not be very far distant; but owing to the injustice inflicted upon that particular part of country by the manner in which that railway is being constructed, the Bower Bird Goldfield never had an opportunity of getting developed. At the present time there is a small company being formed for the purpose of giving it another trial; but for the past seven or eight years it has been practically abandoned; not one miner has been working on the field. The facts I have given furnish reasons why a railway should be constructed from one of the ports on the Gulf of Carpentaria in the direction of Cloncurry. There is another matter which I wish to bring under the notice of the House, and

[Mr. Nevitt.

that is in connection with the railway from Almaden to Georgetown. The hon. member for Croydon referred to this matter, but there are one or two phases of it upon which he did not touch. The matter is one which materially affects the district I have the honour to represent as well as the district represented by the hon. member for Croydon. There is a movement on foot at the present time to have this railway taken in the direction of Charleston. If it was taken by a direct route to Georgetown, it would make a difference of 42 miles. I maintain that the construction of the present line under existing conditions is an injustice, because, under the terms under which the syndicate build the railway, they are allowed to manipulate the freight charges. They are allowed to charge 50 per cent. over and above the charges made by the Government. And that practically means, as far as the consumers of this particular district are concerned, that they will have to pay 61 miles extra railway freight. Another phase of the question is that it will cost about £82,000 more to take the railway to Charleston than it would to take the line to Georgetown. I am quoting now from an article which appeared in the *Mundic Miner* on the 21st June of the present year. Personally, I am not conversant with the distances given, but I presume they are fairly accurate.

I shall read for the information of [5 p.m.] the House a portion of the article to show that there is a reason for taking into consideration whether the company shall be allowed to construct the railway by such a roundabout route—

Mr. Pagan practically stated that the Chillagoe Company were of the opinion that the northern route would not tap the mineral belt. How erroneous this is we will show. Also, we will show the advantages of the direct route as against the roundabout route *via* the Einasleigh copper mines and over the Newcastle Range. First, as to the distance and approximate cost of the two routes. These are as follows:—

ROUTE VIA CHARLESTON.	Miles.
Almaden to Charleston, as surveyed	... 152
Charleston to Marquis	... 4
Marquis to Georgetown (estimated)	... 21
Total distance, Almaden to Georgetown	... 177
At £2,500 per mile this would cost	... £442,500
To which, however, must be added the extra cost of crossing the Range—say	... 30,000
Making the total outlay	... £472,500
BRODIE'S GAP ROUTE.	Miles.
Almaden to Georgetown	... 135
To build which would cost, at £2,500 per mile	... £337,500
Or a saving of £135,000. Add the cost of extending the line to the Marquis—21 miles at £2,500 per mile	... 52,500
Total cost, Almaden to Marquis, <i>via</i> Georgetown	... £399,500

or a saving of £82,500 as against the route *via* Charleston, sufficient to extend the main trunk line from Georgetown to the Gilbert River. Can there be any doubt as to which is the shortest, cheapest, and quickest route to build the Georgetown railway?

I maintain that this House should take that fact into consideration, because the State guarantees 2½ per cent. on the money expended by the company. Why should we saddle ourselves with the interest on £82,500 for fifteen years, and then, at the end of that period, have to find the principal in addition? Another matter I wish to bring under the notice of the House is the Land Court. I am told that the Government have no power to direct the Land Court to hold sittings in any locality. On 5th July, a Land Court was gazetted to be held in Normanton.

About a month or six weeks before that date the people of Normanton were notified that the Land Court dates had been upset owing to unforeseen trouble in connection with the Jimbour Estate. At a later date a Land Court was gazetted to be held at Richmond, and not at Normanton at all. The whole of the holdings coming under revision at this Land Court are within the land district of Normanton, and it is an injustice that the people of the Normanton and Burketown districts should be compelled to travel 400 or 500 miles overland to attend that Land Court. In some instances it would take them ten or twelve days to get to Richmond in order to place their cases before the court, and that is an injustice that no lessee should be subjected to.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Was that represented to the Land Court?

MR. NEVITT: It was represented to the court. I got a telegram from the shire council at Normanton, asking me to interview the Land Court in connection with the matter, and after two days' consideration they came to the conclusion that they could not possibly go to Normanton, and that they would be compelled to hold the court in Richmond. The court should certainly reimburse people who are compelled to go there for the extra cost they are put to. The other night the hon. member for Oxley said—

Shearing and crushing are done between June and December, so that a large number are free after the end of December. And, perhaps, so long as we have to employ white men, it is well they are free to some extent, so that they may come down to the southern part of the State, or go to the southern part of Australia, and recuperate themselves before they return.

MR. MANN: He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. NEVITT: There are two implications there to which I take exception. He says, "Perhaps, as long as we have to employ white men." I sincerely hope that the days of black labour are done—(hear, hear!)—but apparently from the point of view of the hon. member—possibly I may be going too far—but it appears that he would like to see black labour again, as that is the only inference that can be drawn from his statement. Again, the hon. member implies that the Northern part of Queensland is not a fit place for a white man to live or work in, because he says that after five months' work there a man must come to the Southern part of the State, or to the Southern part of Australia, to recuperate. I have had twenty years' residence in Northern Queensland, and I have never been south of Townsville until seven or eight weeks ago; and if this is the kind of climate that men from the North of Queensland are to come to to recuperate in, Heaven preserve me from it, because ever since I have been here I have had nothing but coughs and colds, and members on all sides have been troubled with similar maladies. I maintain that North Queensland has just as good a climate as the Southern part of the State, and the man who has resided in the North can do as good a day's work in North Queensland as he could do in the Southern part of the State. (Hear, hear!) I do not think it is right for any member to make a statement of that kind, because it is a reflection upon the Northern part of the State, which, I maintain, has one of the finest climates in the universe. I do not wish for anything better. Certainly there are two months in the year when it is a little trying; but Brisbane has been equally as trying to me during the past month as ever the Northern part of the State was. The next point which I wish to take notice of is a remark made by the senior member for Mackay, Mr. Paget, who said that miners

are scarce. He said that he held a secretarial position for some mining company on the Leichhardt, and that he had sent thirty or forty miners there during the last month. If the hon. member had only paid attention to the hon. member for Croydon when he was addressing the House, he would have known that during the past five or six months some 700 men have left Croydon to seek work elsewhere simply because they could not get it at Croydon. That fact should have shown the hon. member for Mackay that there was no necessity for him to go to Gympie to get miners. Only the other day I received a letter from a friend of mine in Normanton who has had to hump his swag and go looking for work in the Cloncurry district. He is a carpenter who has resided in Normanton for twenty years, and yet the hon. member for Mackay said carpenters were going from the South of Queensland to compete with men at present out of work in North Queensland. Another matter mentioned by the hon. member for Mackay was the Seaforth Estate. The hon. member stated that a number of members had made use of the Seaforth Estate during their election campaign. I certainly referred to it during my campaign, and I think that every Government has to be judged by its works. The Crown lands ranger, Mr. Gray, was asked to report on the estate, and these are the figures he gave:—160 acres of scrub land at 40s. per acre, £320; 3,770 acres of good forest land at 26s. 8d. per acre, £5,026; 2,263 acres of inferior land at 10s. per acre, £1,131—making a total of £6,480, or an average of £1 0s. 10d. per acre. Those are the figures that I referred to during my election speeches, and since I came here I have confirmed them by reference to Mr. Gray's report, which I found in the library. Mr. Hazenkamp, who was acting land commissioner, was also called upon to make a report in connection with the estate. He would not even endorse that report as to the value on account of the poor nature of the land, which he said was sandy and stony. Mr. Hume, who, I understand, was the chairman of the Land Court—I have been unable to find his report, but I found extracts from it which were made use of by other members on the floor of this House—and according to them, in his first report, he said that, if this estate was in the South it would be worth 15s. per acre. Further on in his report he said that, as mere land, it would not fetch 30s. per acre, as it consisted of rugged mountain and ti-tree flats. I understand the estate was purchased for the purpose of cutting it into small holdings for the cultivation of sugarcane, and yet the chairman of the Land Court says that it consists of rugged mountain and ti-tree flats. And yet the late Government, whose members claim that they ought to be now occupying the Treasury benches, gave £3 13s. per acre for the estate, and I understand that not a single acre has been taken up to the present time. That is not all. What value did the owners place upon the land themselves? The divisional board to whom these people paid rates valued the property at 15s. per acre. The owners of the land turned round and said, "The property is not worth 15s. per acre; you are valuing it too high. We appeal against your valuation." And they appealed successfully, and got the valuation reduced to 12s. 6d. per acre. And yet we find the late Government paying £3 13s. an acre for the land! If for nothing else than that, I maintain that such a Government should never again occupy the Treasury benches. (Hear, hear!) I do not intend to occupy the time of the House any longer. I simply thank hon. members for the courtesy they have extended to me, and for the kind and patient hearing they have given me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nevitt.]

Mr. McINTYRE (*Aubigny*), who was received with "Hear, hears!" said: I do not wish to sit all through this debate and say nothing. Being one of the Darling Downs "Black Soil Crowd," there are not very many of us to give our opinions and say a word for the people of that locality. There are several reasons why I should not let the opportunity pass without saying something for the electorate that I represent. One reason is that it is an important agricultural electorate in the vicinity of Toowoomba. Another reason is that, owing to the unfortunate illness of the late member, Mr. O'Brien, it has not been represented in this House as it should have been. Mr. O'Brien had a very severe illness, and he was not able to be present at all times to represent the district. It is my intention to take care that this state of affairs does not continue any longer. As long as I have the honour to represent the electorate of *Aubigny* I intend to look after the wants of the district in the way they should be looked after. (Hear, hear!) I would like to say a word with reference to the disposition of parties in this House. I have listened to a great deal that has been said from the other side, from the Labour corner, and from the Government side. There appears to be an impression that the present condition of parties is not satisfactory, but it is the most satisfactory arrangement that it was possible to make under the circumstances.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McINTYRE: In the country, after the elections were over, there was a great deal of talk about how the Government were going to carry on with the small number of twenty-five members in the party. The general opinion expressed by those who supported me, and on the whole of the Downs, was that an arrangement could be made whereby the Labour party would support the Government.

GOVERNMENT and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McINTYRE: It was looked upon as the most natural and most likely arrangement to take place.

Mr. COWAP: The only one possible.

Mr. McINTYRE: A good deal has been said by Opposition members about a coalition, and there has been a ring of disappointment in most of the speeches heard from that side of the House, but I think the arrangement that has been made is the most satisfactory that could have been made under the circumstances. A number of the supporters of the present Government have been members of the Labour party at some previous time, and the Labour party are in sympathy with the ideas of the Government, and are nearer to their political views than the party sitting in direct opposition.

Mr. RYLAND: I should think so.

Mr. McINTYRE: We had an evidence of that the other night when the division took place on the Elections Bill. If a coalition had been formed, the position of the Ministerial party would have been very mixed in that division. (Laughter.) I notice that several amendments in connection with the Elections Act Amendment Act are proposed to be introduced. I think we have got too much legislation altogether. I think that careful and advanced administration of the laws we have got will tend to the prosperity of the country more than the passing of these measures which are on the paper. (Hear, hear!) The Elections Act Amendment Bill is, however, a step in the right direction. I intend to support it, because I was aware of the corruption which took place during the last election in connection with

the postal vote. The Income Tax Amendment Bill is a measure which I intend to support all I can, especially in connection with the doing away with the income tax on the increase in stock. I can assure you that in Goombungee, there is a great number of farmers who come in there to get my assistance in making out their income tax returns. I think the form is badly drawn up. The document seems to have been invented by some lawyer who wanted to make a fortune and puzzle people, because it is a most difficult return to fill up. The people have complained every time about being wrongly taxed in connection with the increase in stock. They are first taxed on the increase, and when the increase is sold they are again taxed on the profits. I think an amendment of the Act is necessary. Old age pensions is a matter to which I have not given a great deal of attention, but I believe it is a very wise measure, and better than sending the old people to Dunwich or giving the indigent allowance, as at present. I have no doubt that it is a Bill that will commend itself to the House and to the country. It is a Bill I thoroughly believe in, but I want to know where the money is coming from and how much it is going to cost the taxpayers of the State. The Bill to establish a central college is, I think, a very good one. The Land Act Amendment Bill will, I hope, go in for localising our land laws. I look upon land settlement as one of the most important things in connection with a State like this. If we can settle people on our lands we shall have prosperity. I think the administration of the Lands Office should be carried out in such a way that every man with a family—or even if he has no family—who is desirous of going upon the land should have an opportunity of getting a piece of land on such easy terms that he can remain there and make a living on it. As far as the prickly pear selections are concerned, I thoroughly believe in a system of giving away all the prickly pear country for nothing. Give a man his deeds immediately he has got the pear cleared off, without his paying the Government a penny for them.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Give him a bonus.

Mr. McINTYRE: There are thousands and thousands of acres in this State covered with prickly pear, and if it were offered to people for nothing they would not take it up. I think the Government will have to go further and offer a bonus to people to induce them to take up the land and clear away the pear. We do not know what the Local Government Act Amendment Bill is going to be, but I hope it will be in the direction of assisting local authorities by the restoration of the endowment, or in some other way. I know the great difficulty there is in keeping our roads in a fair state at all in the outside electorates. There are thousands of people living in the ranges who pay little towards the upkeep of the roads, and the shire councils are bound to make roads to those places. It is practically impossible for the shire councils in the present condition of things to keep the roads in good order. The Bill to amend the Factories and Shops Act will be a measure that will receive my assistance. As to the referendum on the Bible in State schools, I think it will be a very great mistake to have Bible reading in the State schools; but I intend to vote for the measure to have a referendum. At the same time I do not think the reading of the Bible in State schools will be satisfactory, as I think that the difficulties in connection therewith are so great as to be insurmountable. A Mining Act Amendment Bill, which is foreshadowed, is also a necessary measure. The Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation

[*Mr. McIntyre.*]

Act is, I think, very much needed. The farmers all over the Darling Downs look upon this measure as a regular curse. The farmer is working his holding with his own family, and he does not think it necessary to ensure against accident; but if he employs a man for a few days, and this man meets with an accident, the farmer is responsible to the extent of £200. This is a very great hardship, and I hope it will be remedied. I understand there is another measure that we are to have—a State Insurance Bill—and I hope that under that measure it will not be necessary to have a Workers' Compensation Act at all, but that both Bills will be combined into one good Bill. There are other Bills mentioned, such as a Rabbit Boards Act Amendment Bill, which I think will be a very good thing. Then there is also the State Insurance Bill and the Barron Falls Electric Power Bill. I do not intend to say anything more about the Governor's Speech. I do not think it is wise to make too long a speech on this debate. (Hear, hear!) When I come down here I never anticipated that members would talk so much about the late elections, and spend so much of the time of the House. It is not really assisting the business of the country at all. I am pleased to see that the Government intend going in for a vigorous railway policy. I do not think that there can be a more important measure before this House than one for the extension of our railways. We out in the agricultural districts, where people are living 20 and 30 miles from the nearest railway station, know how difficult it is to bring produce in and make a profit on it. Railway extension is a very important matter, and in the electorate of Aubigny I intend to go in strongly for two railway lines. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) It is absolutely necessary in that district—to keep the people on the land and assist them to get their produce to market and make a profit from maize, potatoes, and other things which are bringing such low prices in that district—that we should have railway extension. But the people in that district do not want railways for nothing. They are prepared to come under the provisions of the new Act, and pay 3 per cent. interest and working expenses on the lines which they ask for. The people in that locality also need good roads. The local authorities could well go in the direction of making good roads. I really think the Government should do something to assist the councils by spending money on the main roads. If the main roads were put in good repair by the Government, the farmers could get their produce to them, and thereby have a chance of getting to a railway station. When I was travelling about during the election campaign I saw a great number of carts with broken wheels and shafts lying about the roads. One poor man had tipped his dray over and broken his shaft, and the repairs cost him £3, while the produce brought him £2 10s. in the market. In that locality there are 40 miles of the Main Range densely populated from one end to the other, and you have no idea what the ranges and spurs are like which they have to climb over with their produce. As far as the Queensland people are concerned, it has been said that the Minister for Lands has been assisting the people from the South to a greater extent than he has assisted the natives of this State. I certainly think the people of this State should be allowed to settle in groups under the same conditions as those from the South. The group system is particularly adapted for the settlement of families. I know a number of families, men with two or three boys and girls, who are most anxious to go on the land if they are allowed to form groups, and I think it ought

to be encouraged in every possible way. The improvement of the prickly pear land is another matter which wants taking in hand soon. I look upon the country as being faced with three very great plagues—the prickly pear, the tick plague, and the rabbits. I think the Government ought to take these matters in hand. They are great dangers which are threatening the State and should be grappled with at once. The Torres Strait mail service is another matter which is very desirable. That service will open up markets for our products in Eastern countries. If we do not develop an export trade we shall be in a worse position in the future. The export trade which has been established and assisted by the present Government has been the means of improving the position of the people on the land more than anything else. As far as the trade with the other parts of the world is concerned, I think the present Government has done a great deal for the dairymen of Queensland in bringing the Orient steamers up to Pinkeuba, as it has enabled them to ship their butter and obtain the prices ruling in the world's markets. (Hear, hear!) If this had not been done the farmers on the Downs and other parts of the State would not have been able to get their products to the other side of the world as cheaply and as quickly as they have been able to do. I do not wish to detain the House long, but

[5.30 p.m.] I would just like to say that there are three matters which are of very great importance to us at the present time—land settlement, immigration, and railways. Although the Government programme does not state very much about immigration, yet I look on it as one of the most important matters before the country at the present time.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. McINTYRE: When you consider our enormous territory stretching away to the very North. We have our tropical part—a great area without anybody living on it. The late Minister for Agriculture has expounded to some extent how the rubber industry could be payable in the North, and yet we have only got a handful of people—not as great as the population of Sydney or Melbourne—scattered over this enormous territory. The most important need of this State at the present time is a bold and progressive immigration policy. The Labour party require that immigrants should be provided with work before they come here, but I cannot see it. In my district there are numbers of wheatgrowers who have paid as high as 8s. a day and more for men who would harvest the crop. Last harvest they could not get them. It is well known to the people out there that men are very scarce, especially good men. You can pick up men travelling about the road, who are really worthless. It is impossible to get good men, and if we do not bring labour into the State it will be disastrous. With regard to the shipping companies, I hope if any agreement is made with regard to the mail service, or the service *via* Torres Strait, the Government will insist that the steamers shall not stop at Melbourne or Sydney, but come right on to Brisbane, which will give us more advantages for the export of our produce. I think it would be a very shortsighted policy for the Commonwealth Government to enter into any arrangements with the shipping companies without first consulting the Queensland Government, so that the steamers could make Brisbane a port of call, and we could get our produce away and have the same advantages as the other States. The dairy produce in the way of butter and cheese which has been exhibited at the Brisbane show has been quite equal to any which could be

Mr. McIntyre.]

produced in any part of the world, and it would be a great loss to this State if we should be blocked in any way from getting the produce away at the right time. I hope this session may be productive of much good, and that members from both sides of the House will combine together for this object. Before I came here I had no idea that the party lines in this House were so distinct. I thought all those who had the welfare of the State at heart would work harmoniously together, show their desire to do their very utmost to push the country ahead, sink all party differences, and work together for the common good of the State. I hope this feeling will develop.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are looking forward to the millennium.

Mr. McINTYRE: There may have been hard things said during the election campaign, but we should all try hard to work for the good of this country. I think we are only sent here like the directors of a very large company; we are sent here by the people to look after their welfare, and we are paid by the people for that service. If we do not do our duty, then the people will call us to account when the next election day comes. I am going to assist all I possibly can, and I hope that this session will be fruitful of good and wise legislation, that the prosperity which has existed for the last three or four years will increase, and that when the next election comes round we will be able to go before the people, and say that we have worked hard and successfully, and pushed the State a step ahead in the right direction.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): It is usual for hon. members of this House to tender to the mover and seconder of the resolution our congratulations on the way in which they addressed the House. As far as the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba is concerned, I was thoroughly conversant with the fact—having heard him on several occasions before—that he would certainly do well in this House. Nor was I mistaken. With regard to the hon. member for Cook, he has only to follow in the wake of his father, who was raised to Cabinet rank—and he was a gentleman I had known for many years. I have much pleasure in congratulating those two gentlemen on the way in which they addressed the House. It has been stated in many places that the native element has not been fairly represented in this Chamber. But what do we see here to-day? We see on the Treasury benches four gentlemen who are natives of Queensland, and one who is a native of Tasmania. Surely that is a fair representation of Queensland on the Treasury benches! The fathers of two of those gentlemen who have risen to Cabinet rank were Cabinet Ministers previous to them, and the father of one of the other gentlemen was—and I did a good deal to help him to become—one of the members of the first Parliament of Queensland. The only thing that I regret—and I am thoroughly satisfied in my own mind that if their parents could have looked forward to see the political position they occupy to-day they certainly would regret it to the same extent—is that they follow in the footsteps of the socialists. (Laughter.) Their position is decidedly queer to me. They should certainly occupy a position under the leader of the Opposition, and should not follow in the wake, or be under the dictates, of the leader of the Labour party. I have nothing to say against the Labour party. When I entered this House in the first instance, I entered it as a Labour man, but under certainly different circumstances to what prevail to-day. The gentle-

[*Mr. McIntyre.*

men who formed the Labour party at that time were some of the best men—such men as Glassey, Hoolan, Cross, Sim, and King—men who were thoroughly honest and above board, and able to carry out the duties devolving upon them. There are many things in the programme that has been put forward by the Government that are remarkably good, and some of which I am prepared to support. I spoke about the Elections Act Amendment Bill on its second reading the other evening, but there are many things in it which can be amended in Committee. No doubt the Elections Act requires amending to a certain extent, but not on the lines as indicated by the Bill. I am not in favour of doing away with the postal vote. I have not, to any extent, benefited by it one way or another, but, as I stated on the second reading of the Bill, and I reiterate the same fact again, the very persons they tried to serve—those political justices of the peace—are the very people who came down and got these votes against them. However, there may be a day, perhaps, when we will be able to return the compliment. As I indicated before, we should have a reduction of members, and also a redistribution of seats. I know a great many people are opposed to that—particularly the Labour socialists—but I have advocated that for many years in this House. We are certainly over-legislated for, taking into consideration the way the Federal Parliament has been carrying out their duties—doing no good for the country—simply raising their own screws and putting money in their own pockets. I think that should not be allowed. I believe, in the event of anything of that nature being introduced into the House, it should be put before the country, and let the party who wish to become a member declare whether he is in favour of his screw being raised or otherwise. (Hear, hear!) I think that would have been the proper line to act on, and the resolution should not have come into operation until the members met their constituents again. With regard to the income tax, I decidedly am in favour of that as propounded by the leader of the Opposition. He stated in the event of there being a large surplus—and which surplus is now in existence—something like £400,000—the income tax should not be collected—that it should remain in abeyance until the state of the finances required it to be collected. That was the position taken up by the leader of the Opposition throughout the whole of the elections, and it was also approved of by those supporting him. That would be much better than hoarding up a large amount of money, and making the people still pay up a large sum when it is not required. But I regret to say the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, particularly those who occupy the Treasury benches, will not have a measure of that kind. I am one of those who believe, if we are to have an income tax at all, that in place of having an exemption of £160 or £200, every man in the country ought to pay something, no matter how small it may be, towards the up-keep of the State. With regard to the old age pensions, I am certainly in accord with the leader of the Government. I am not in favour of the Commonwealth Government having anything whatever to do with it, because it is well known that hon. members are more in touch with, and know the wants of the old people in the particular districts they represent, than the members of the Commonwealth Parliament, who have very large districts to represent. But the great cry these people are making about trying to procure the old age pensions is very far fetched indeed, and the appeals for assistance do not meet with the response they ought to do. There is an old party in Ipswich whom I know, and whom the junior member for Ipswich also

knows, as I think he has had something to do with it, who applied for assistance to the Home Department, and this is the reply she received—

Referring to the application made by you for the State allowance, I have the honour to inform you that, after due inquiries, it has been decided that the allowance cannot be granted.

I am aware that, as far as this party is concerned, her sons and daughters are in affluent circumstances, and when a letter like this is sent to a party, the police, who know all the circumstances, should call upon the sons and daughters to maintain their parents. The authorities should see that the matter is carried out in its entirety; otherwise, they are remiss in their duty. I know of two or three similar cases in my own electorate where the relatives are in good circumstances, and these people should be compelled to keep their relatives. Instead of that they are turned out on the streets to starve, and I know it is through the food supplied by a good many of the people in the neighbourhood, and by ladies' societies, that these poor people are actually kept from starving.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Where do these people live?

MR. KEOGH: They live in Ipswich, and I can give their names—and the hon. member for Ipswich also knows them. Two of the sons are working in the Railway Department to-day, and getting good wages, and this woman is in very poor circumstances. I know the Attorney-General is just as well aware of it as myself. I say when the sons are in a position to keep their parents they ought to be made to do so, particularly when they are in the employ of the Government.

THE HOME SECRETARY: You can only do that under the present law if they go to Dunwich.

MR. KEOGH: If you asked some of my country people to go to Dunwich it is just like holding a red rag to a bull; I know that to be a fact, and it would be far better for the department if they could give outside aid. I know myself in some instances, particularly under Mr. Airey's administration, that, instead of raising the amount to 5s., in some instances he reduced it to even 2s. 6d. I know of one case where the wife was seventy-five years of age, and the husband eighty, and the Government actually would not give the two allowances—they would only give one. Within the last few days the old man, who was receiving the 5s. a week, has dropped off, and I was called upon to see these people and ascertain if I could get the 5s. for the old woman. But Mr. Airey would not give the two amounts, and it was rather hard that these two old people should have to live on 5s. a week. I am decidedly opposed to that kind of thing, and I hope that under the auspices of the Home Secretary and the Minister for Railways, who are, I know, kind and good hearted men, the separation of the sexes when people

[7 p.m.] do go to Dunwich will be discontinued. I trust that the present administration will keep the matter of old age pensions in their own hands, and not leave it to the Federal Government. The State member for a district is more in touch with the parties who require indigence allowance than members of the Federal Parliament, who have large districts to represent like Moreton and West Moreton, and who do not come so often in contact with persons who require relief as do members of the State Legislature. This, therefore, is a matter which is more within the province of State members than of Federal members, and this House is the proper place to come to in order to see that redress is given to our poor, infirm, and

unfortunate. It is a pity that we have any poor; but it is an old saying that the poor we shall have always with us, and I trust that the gentleman who now occupies the position of Home Secretary will dispense State charity in a better way than it has been dispensed heretofore. Another proposal foreshadowed in the Speech is the establishment of a central technical college. I am decidedly in favour of anything which will bring education more within the reach of the poor people of the State. As far as the University is concerned, when that matter was first mooted I thought the object was to establish an institution for the children of parents who were in a position to pay for their education at a University, and that the institution would not be available to children whose parents were not able to pay for a University training. I trust that if a University is established arrangements will be made to give opportunity for higher training to boys who have shown by their educational attainments in the lower schools that they merit such assistance. I would favour any education scheme which would tend to lift the people on to a higher plane. The Speech further states that there is to be an amendment of the Land Act. Ever since I have been in the House I have never known a Minister for Lands who has not brought in an amending Land Bill. I trust that an amending Bill will be introduced this session, and that it will contain a provision under which our own people will be given the first show in the selection of land. I believe that the leader of the Government stated at Rockhampton that it was the intention of the Government to give to the youth of Queensland 160 acres of land. If that is so, I am with the hon. gentleman in that proposal. If we hold out inducements to persons in the old country, and also in other parts of Europe, to come to Queensland and select land, I contend that it is only fair and just that our own people should be given the first show in this connection. Where pioneers have settled on the land, and the land in the immediate vicinity is surveyed for selection, I think that our own people, the children of our pioneers, those men who went into the backblocks and suffered great hardships in the old days, should have the first chance of selecting those lands. I remember the time when it was stated in this House that even a cabbage would not grow on the Downs. To-day the members representing the Darling Downs assert that it is the garden of the State of Queensland. While I do not altogether say that, I do say that we have magnificent country on the Downs. My electorate is one of the first and oldest settled districts in Queensland. The residents of Rosewood had a great up-hill battle to fight: they had the land to clear, and in the early stages of their efforts they had to live on very little. I have known persons who settled there who had to cart a bag of flour from Ipswich to Marburg, a distance of 10 miles, which gives some indication of the difficulties with which they had to contend in the early stages of settlement in Queensland. The people who go into the country now have not to put up with any of the inconveniences which were then endured. I hope the Premier will carry out his intention of giving our own people the first show in the selection of lands. Give them every opportunity of settling on the lands. Give prickly pear country to people who are willing to reside on it. It will be a blessing to get rid of the prickly pear pest, and the only way we can do that is by settling people on the land and giving them pear infested country for nothing, as long as they will undertake to clear it.

MR. JACKSON: The Government do give it to them for nothing.

Mr. Keogh.]

Mr. KEOGH: I am very pleased to hear that, as I see that nearly every week some prickly pear lands are taken up. I trust that this selection of prickly pear land will go on, because if the prickly pear is allowed to infest the country, the land will not be worth very much. Seeing that there is a possibility of immigration being instituted, I cannot help looking back to the time when the fathers of some gentlemen who are now members of this Chamber did all they possibly could to bring immigrants to Queensland. I remember when an hon. member, now deceased, who was for a long time father of this House, I refer to the late Mr. William Henry Groom, advocated placing the people on the lands of the Darling Downs. I remember also the present Archbishop of Queensland, Dr. Dunne, advocating the settlement of people on the Darling Downs, and I remember what Dr. Lang and Dr. Quinn did to introduce immigrants and settle them on the lands of the State. Some of those immigrants who settled on the land are now independent men, and they constitute some of our best settlers. If we could only get back to the system of bringing people to Queensland which was then adopted I believe it would be an excellent thing for this State. If we brought here such men as were introduced in the olden times we should have no cause to regret our action. The men who are coming now are no doubt good men, but they have not the same things to put up with that we had to put up with in the olden times. Many of the early settlers had to hump their swags for miles and miles, and in those days it was not the best of the land that was given to the people to settle on, because, unfortunately, the best lands were locked up in the hands of the squatters. I would be very pleased to see some of the old stock here now. They were good men—very different from the financial institutions and banks which now own their properties—which have neither body nor soul. In those days people were expected to settle upon stony ridges and sandy places where, as the saying is, you could not feed a bandicoot. However, many of these people triumphed over all their difficulties. The best Land Act ever passed in Queensland, and the one under which the greatest number of people settled, was the Land Act of 1868, under which a man could take up land at 2s. 6d. an acre. I should like to see that Act once more in force, as I am sure that it would induce hundreds and hundreds of people to come here from the old country. Or, I would like to see the old land-order system once more in force, under which so many people came to Queensland under the parties I have already referred to. It may be said that in many instances the land orders were misapplied. I grant that; but, even if they passed out of the hands of certain individuals, they passed into the hands of others. Many of the large estates on the Darling Downs were in a great measure purchased by means of these land orders. Even supposing that such a thing should occur again, it would pay the country threefold to hold out inducements of that kind, because the great majority of the people at home—particularly in the grand country in which I had the honour of being born—and the people of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Germany like to have a little bit of land which they can call their own. I remember well when there was not a single house in the Rosewood district, and when our British people passed it by. It was not until the Germans came there that our people learned how to make use of scrub lands, and to-day the Germans have homes for themselves throughout the whole of the Rosewood Scrub. They are the people who deserve credit for the work they did. I say, without fear of contradiction, that that district was really one

[*Mr. Keogh.*]

of the first settled in Queensland. I had the honour of introducing you, Sir, to that electorate with other gentlemen. You can bear me out that it is one of the closest settled districts of the State, and that there are no more thriving homesteads anywhere, and there are no more jolly and hospitable people than the German settlers in the Rosewood district.

Mr. KENNA: Are there any Chinese there?

Mr. KEOGH: There are a few about Normanby, but not about my constituency. I allow the hon. member to have the credit of having Chinamen in his electorate. We have none in my electorate and we can get on without them. I hope the Land Act will be so administered that it will induce people in the home countries to come and settle here. One blessing is that they will not now be offered the same class of country that was offered to people in the early days, when the good lands were entirely locked up in the hands of squatters. I am decidedly opposed to an Act which was passed last session. With other hon. members on this side of the Chamber, I did all I possibly could to frustrate the sum of £500,000 per annum being given to any member of the Government to misspend without having to come to this House to have his actions ratified. The previous Administration did not allow that to be done. They allowed £200,000 to be spent in one year, but no purchase could be made until ratified by Parliament. That is not so to-day, and what is the result? Look at the Jimbour Estate! Had the measure of which I speak not been passed last session, Jimbour would not be as it is to-day. To-day, from what I can learn, we are bound to take that estate, and at a price which will not permit the Government to sell it for less than £4 or £4 10s. an acre. I assert that a greater portion of the land is not worth that money, and that it will be a dead loss to the State. Of course, in the first instance there is a loss of about £15,000 in legal expenses. I thought that the Government in their wisdom would not take the land over; and it certainly would be far better to pay the £15,000 and have that as a first loss, than to purchase the estate at a price which will involve a much greater loss. It is to be hoped there will not be such a heavy loss as I anticipate. The hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches and their supporters, who empowered the Secretary for Lands to spend £500,000 a year, must bear the blame. I suppose by and by they will say that it is like the Seaforth Estate. That is a dead letter. But I hope the Jimbour Estate will not be as bad an investment as I fear it will. I know the greater part of the estate, and, although experts have been all over it, I have no hesitation in saying that although the land on the plains about Jimbour and the woolshed is real good arable land, it is no earthly good for growing crops, because it has not the rainfall that there is at Jondaryan and in other parts of the Downs. The climatic conditions are not as favourable as nearer Toowoomba, and the land is not nearly as good as we have on this side of the range. For grazing purposes Jimbour cannot be beaten in Queensland, but it is no good for mixed farming. I should be very sorry to put even my greatest enemy—and I trust I have no enemies—(hear, hear!)—on 160 acres of that country. All the hon. members who have spoken have gone in for railways. I have a railway on the brain as well as other hon. members. I regret that some of the Downs members have not spoken of the line to connect Brisbane and Warwick, and which would reduce the distance between the two places by 60 miles. This is a line for which many thousands of pounds were voted some years ago. It ought to be the very first line

constructed. The first section of that line is in the electorate which I have the honour to represent—that is, from Rosewood up the Bremer Valley to Rosevale. From there it would go right on to Cunningham's Gap. I say nothing with regard to the alternative line from Mumbilla. If it is the intention of the Government to proceed by that route, the first thing they would have to do would be to take up that dog's-leg track between Ipswich and Harrisville, because it is not fit for heavy traffic. I refer to the Fassifern Railway. That line, I remember, was constructed under the auspices of the late Hon. John Macrossan, and a circumstance brings it to my mind at the present moment. I was on a deputation to that

hon. gentleman with regard to some [7.30 p.m.] roads which were required through the electorate. The hon. gentleman said that, in so far as the wishes of the deputation were concerned, the roads of the colony were the railroads, and that the Government had nothing further to do than to give them those railroads. I regret to say that the hon. gentleman's first initiation of a railway has been one of the worst lines in Queensland—that is, the line from Ipswich to Fassifern. While on the matter of railways, I would like to ask where a new station-house is required more than at Ipswich? I am speaking outside my electorate, but I cannot help it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about Rosewood electorate?

MR. KEOGH: Rosewood is doing fairly well. By and by I will call attention to the wants of that electorate, and I have not the slightest doubt that the Minister for Railways will extend the same courtesy and cordiality which he has always shown to me. My requests will be very small ones. As far as Ipswich Station is concerned, it is one of the dirtiest holes in Queensland, and there should be better means of access and egress to and from the station. I wish to refer to a small matter which I brought under the notice of the late Secretary for Railways, who sits on this side of the House—the fact that a fee of 5s. is charged to an applicant for examination for appointment as a railway guard or porter. Only to-day there has been an examination at Ipswich by the department, and in every instance the candidates had to send in 5s. with their application. I think this is obtaining money under false pretences. It is the poorer class of people who apply for examination as guards and porters in the railway service. I would not complain if those who were successful paid 5s. and had 2s. 6d. returned. But why should the Government extract 5s. from those poor people who are not successful? I say it is not a right thing to do. Not only is it done in the Railway Department, but it is done to an even larger extent in the rest of the public service. The amount of £1 and over is collected in some cases and never refunded. Why should not that rule be annulled? It is taking money out of the pockets of the people. I trust that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will take the matter into consideration, and hand back this fee out of the large surplus which he has got. I have no doubt it can be done by an Executive minute. I can show that this charge had not been made under the auspices of the Philp Government, but it came into operation when Mr. Morgan occupied the Treasury benches. The following is a copy of the regulation on the subject:—

Railway Department,
Brisbane, 18th August, 1905.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, with the advice of the Executive Council, has, in pursuance of

the provisions of the Railways Acts 1863 to 1902, been pleased to approve of the following clause, No. 6A, being added to the Railway Staff Regulations of 1899.

ARTHUR MORGAN,
Secretary for Railways.

6A. Each candidate will be required to pay a fee of five shillings to cover the cost of examination, which amount must be remitted to the secretary to the Commissioner for Railways before the examination for which the candidate is entered takes place.

J. F. THALLOX, Commissioner for Railways.

The official seal of the Commissioner for Railways was affixed hereto this eighteenth day of August, 1905, in the presence of—

T. S. PRATTEN, Secretary.

I hold that when this amount has been collected it should in every instance be refunded. I had, to a certain extent, a promise from an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, the late Secretary for Railways, who took a favourable view of the question, and when speaking from the Treasury benches he said he was surprised that such a sum was collected. However, the regulation speaks for itself. Surely the Government in their wisdom, and seeing they have a very large surplus, will do away with the impost and allow fair play. They say they have to pay for the examination, but, after all, what is it? They send up one or two employees from the Railway Department who are in receipt of their salaries all the time, so that there is no extra expense incurred. I contend that this method of practically taking money from poor widows and orphans is unjustifiable, and the sooner it is rectified the better. I may tell the present Administration that it will be a feather in their cap if they remedy this grievance. Not only will members of the House be pleased at their action, but the general public outside will certainly give the Premier kudos for his humane action. I have not much more to say than this, but I trust the present Administration will introduce their Bills in a straightforward and honourable way. I have no doubt that the gentlemen on this side of the House, together with our leader, will be only too pleased to help the Government on with any good measures, but I warn them they should bring no contentious matter forward—(laughter)—because the moment they do, I, for one, will vote against them. I have no hesitation in saying that throughout the whole of the last session of Parliament, when the Government, with the assistance of my friends and my leader on this side, carried their measures through, I was opposed to assisting them, and asked my leader why we should support them. Now they cannot carry out their measures without the aid of the Labour party, and in matters where the Labour party are touched, I do not blame them for voting to keep them there, but I blame our party for doing so. I certainly will not support the Government in any of their measures, no matter what they are, if they bring them forward the same as last session. I give them this as a parting shot. (Laughter.)

MR. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): Like most other hon. members, I was a victim to the prevailing epidemic a little while ago, and that has prevented me from speaking earlier in the debate. But it has given me the advantage of hearing a number of other speeches. While admitting there have been many good and interesting speeches delivered, I must state that this debate on the Address in Reply has been one of the tamest and most spiritless debates that I have ever listened to. Probably that is to be accounted for by the fact of the peculiar situation of parties. Nobody knows where we are.

MR. PAGET: We know where we are, at any rate.

Mr. Hardacre.]

Mr. HARDACRE : I do not think some of the hon. members do know where they are. A few weeks ago they were in negotiation with the Government to join them. Then they were in a state of mild opposition, and now they are in a state of violent opposition. The members on this side of the House thought they were going to violently oppose the Government. We thought, from the attitude of the Government and their negotiations with the Opposition, that we were bound to have to fight against the two most powerful forces in this State. To-day, instead of that, we find ourselves promising to give some kind of vague support to the proposed Government measures, and I think that this uncertain state of things has led to the somewhat uninteresting debate. There have been many good speeches delivered, but one stands out, to my mind, above the rest—that is the speech made by the Hon. the Attorney-General. It was one of the finest oratorical deliverances that has been made during the whole of the debate. There is only one little thing about it—it seems to me to have an old familiar face, as if I had seen it somewhere before. It was Macaulay, I think, who had such a retentive memory that he said that if “Paradise Lost” was destroyed and obliterated from the English language, he would be able to restore every passage from his memory. I think, if the speech of the Attorney-General was obliterated from *Hansard*, I could go through the election campaign reports, and get a little bit from Ipswich, a little bit from North Brisbane, a little bit from Rockhampton, and bits from elsewhere, and piece the whole together so as to have a perfect replica of the Attorney-General’s speech during the debate. There is no doubt that he is a most excellent advocate. If I had a friend who wanted his character whitewashing, I certainly, after the deliverance of the Attorney-General, would go to him in order to bring out his character perfectly white and clean. I do not know whether even if a blackamoor presented himself, he would not have really changed the colour of his skin if he had been under the Attorney-General’s oratorical efforts. However, I must admit that the Attorney-General made an excellent defence so far as the Government is concerned. He did not adopt the usual argument of lawyers, “abuse the other side.” He simply gave the whole of the best facts he could for the Government, and left out altogether the other things that could be said with justice against the Government. It may not be wise to fight again our battles at this particular time, still it may serve a useful purpose. The Attorney-General has led off, and he has given a defence of the Government, and, seeing we are all going to be a happy family in future, it would be just as well if we were to leave a kind of marking-post behind, showing where we stood when we became a happy family, and from what particular point we started. It is also necessary, even from an historical point of view, that we should have a statement from my side of the things that have caused the trouble and brought us into our present position. I recognise amongst the Government there are two forces—one force for good, and one force for evil; and I recognise that the Hon. the Attorney-General is amongst those good forces. If we had to deal with the Attorney-General only, I am of opinion that we never should have had any trouble, and I am of opinion that we could get on well together. If they would only export the Hon. the Premier and repress the greedy proclivities of the Secretary for Lands, I think we should be a very happy family indeed. These two forces make a kind of Jekyll and Hyde, the character mentioned by Stevenson. One day he was a most humane and generous kind of man, and the next day he was a most

[*Mr. Hardacre.*

evil and wicked personality, hating and despising his former self. So we have with the Government—one day they are all that is good and nice. Then we find them the next day hating the things they did yesterday and rejoicing in the ungenerous and unkind things they did to-day. The Attorney-General may possibly remember the old story of the knights who disputed about the colour of the shield. One knight asserted that the colour of the shield was white, and the other knight, with equal tenacity, asserted that the colour was undoubtedly black, and on investigation it was found that the shield from two different points of view was in reality black and white—it was both white and black. Looked at from the sunny side it was of a silvery colour, and looked at from the other side it was of a bronze or black colour; and, as far as I have seen the Government, they are really a black and white Government. They have done some undoubtedly good things, and they have done some very bad things. They claimed credit at the elections for having done many good things they were compelled to do by this party, sometimes in the House and sometimes in caucus. They were informed that if they did not refrain from doing those evil things they would not have the support of this party, and this party should have got credit for some of the good things which the Government claimed credit for doing. At any rate, the Government did some evil things, and it was the evil things we fought over and which caused all the trouble during the last Parliament. We could count the good things they did on the fingers of both hands, but if you count the evil things you could not count them on the fingers of both hands three times over. I do not wish at this particular time to indulge in any recriminations, but I believe for every bad thing we fought the old Philp Government on, many of the things done by the present Government have been quite as bad, and, in some cases, even worse, than was done by the other party, that I, for one, fought for many years. It is just as well to place on record the reverse side of the shield, and I have no intention of dilating further upon it than to show what I think will be borne out by the actions of last Parliament, so that there will be a record for future reference, in case of necessity, and will give some indication as to why we are in our present position. First of all the Government appointed, or reappointed, Dr. Maxwell, at a salary of £3,000 a year. They sold 50,000 acres of land at Coongoola, on the railway, within close proximity to Charleville, to the exclusion of *bona fide* selectors.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You voted for the sale of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: I did not vote for it; and the very first opportunity I had before the crisis I expressed my disapproval with that particular sale.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You voted for it in caucus.

Mr. HARDACRE: I did not do anything of the kind. Then, the Government kept on the poll tax for the first twelve months, until they were compelled to take it off by the action of the *Worker* and the deputation led by the leader of the Labour party.

The PREMIER: Why did not the *Worker* compel the previous Government to take it off?

Mr. HARDACRE: That is just what we did. We defeated the old Philp Government for keeping it on. (Government laughter.) The Premier knows I was one of the principal members of this House who assisted to defeat the old Government for keeping it on. However,

that is what they did, and it is one of the things which was the beginning of the trouble amongst the Labour members sitting behind the Government. Then the Government mercilessly and cruelly retrenched the public servants and dismissed a large number. They broke their election pledges in many cases. After being compelled to give a promise to restore a portion of the special retrenchment, they tried, by a trick, to break their promises at the end of the year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They did not try, they did it.

Mr. HARDACRE: They were not successful, and they had to restore whatever surplus that did exist at the end of the year. They also cruelly and unjustly reduced the endowment to hospitals, and charitable institutions to a less degree. They abolished the endowment to local authorities. They broke their election pledges in connection with the promise that there should be no increase of taxation. And, in addition to that, they imposed a large number of taxes both by legislation and by regulations, amongst them being the following:—They imposed the increase in stamp duties, for which they, and myself, defeated the old Philp Government in attempting to pass into law; they increased the timber charges by new regulations; they increased the harbour dues by a new Harbour Dues Act; they continued the poll tax and the £1 payment for the first year; they increased the income tax largely, while making a small exemption; they taxed the natural increase of stock, and I shall have something to say about that also at a later period of my remarks; they proposed the betterment tax, with which I have no fault except this: Whilst I probably made the ablest effort to defend it in this House (Government laughter), I am in favour of the Premier's betterment proposal, at the same time I objected to it having been brought in, because it was in contradiction to the Premier's manifesto; and for this reason: That it was a slap in the face to the Darling Downs men who sat behind the Government, on the promise that there should be no taxation of that kind. Whilst I am strongly in favour of a tax upon betterment—either by a land value tax or by the method proposed by the Premier—still, having made a pledge of that kind to the constituencies, and having behind him a number of men to whom a tax of that kind was most obnoxious, I certainly say the Premier should have refrained from introducing a measure of that kind, and causing trouble behind him. (Government laughter.) If there had been the slightest desire to consider the men who were supporting the Government they would not have introduced such a measure in defiance of their pledges. They also proposed a gun license tax, and I remember well that that was one of the actions of the Government which caused a great deal of irritation amongst the members sitting behind them. They passed a Savings Bank tax. They increased the railway fares and freights throughout the country.

The PREMIER: What!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You must have slept for a number of years.

Mr. HARDACRE: We had three increases in railway fares and freights. One was passed during the drought of 1903. I remember how we denounced the railway rates imposed at that time by the Philp Government, when Mr. John Leaby was Minister; but on top of these high railway rates imposed by the old Government, we had two other increases imposed by the Morgan Government. We had an increase in 1904, signed by Arthur Morgan, and then we had a special increase in the rates in the Central District only, imposed in 1905.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And when I proposed a vote of want of confidence in the Philp Government for raising the railway rates, the hon. member was conspicuous by his absence.

Mr. HARDACRE: I may tell the hon. member that we were only prevented from doing that by the present Premier himself. (Government laughter.) We had the utmost difficulty at that time trying to work the Premier, and, whilst we were trying to urge him to take advantage of the opportunity, the division bell rang and the resolution was put.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, and you were conspicuous by your absence.

Mr. HARDACRE: Quite so. I was very sorry. I was not wilfully absent at that time. I was trying to get the Premier to come in and accept the hon. member for Lockyer's resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And left me to be what might be called the laughing stock of the Assembly. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: All I can say is what I have already stated. Then they thinned the gangs of railway employees in my electorate twice after the previous Minister for Railways had done it once. They then [8 p.m.] reduced the wages of men employed in the construction of railways in my district from 7s. 6d. to 6s. per day, though that district is more than 200 miles from the coast, and the cost of living there is high. They made an agreement with the Queensland National Bank in secret, without permitting this House to see the details of the agreement for two years.

Mr. GRANT: What was in it?

Mr. HARDACRE: A great deal was in it. That agreement was one of the most unfortunate things that ever passed this House, because by it we lost a large sum of money.

The PREMIER: How much money did we lose?

Mr. HARDACRE: I may tell the hon. gentleman one way in which we lost money. We got our own money back on the one hand from a fund on which we were paying £2 12s. 6d. per cent. interest, and that money was put into the current account on which we got only 1 per cent. interest.

The PREMIER: No, that is not so; it is being used.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is not all being used. On the current account the bank pays only 1 per cent., and that is the reason why they paid back four instalments in advance.

The PREMIER: What a deep financier you are. (Government laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: A deeper financier than the Premier. We had four Premiers' Conferences on financial matters, and then no satisfactory conclusion was arrived at, and after that we had a Federal bank proposed by the Premier.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Nobody took any notice of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Nobody took any notice of it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And yet you are supporting the Government.

Mr. HARDACRE: I have told this House before that I did not support the Government. When they did those things I fought the Government, and I shall fight them again if necessary. No one in this House can throw a stone at me, and say that I violated my principles, or that I pretended to support the Government. When they did wrong things they had my opposition, and when they do wrong things again they will have my antagonism

Mr. Hardacre.]

again. The Government also sold land by auction in large areas, and in larger quantities in one year than any previous Government had done. They also passed three syndicate railways—namely, the Munro tramway, the Lilydale and Burketown Railway, and the Etheridge syndicate railway. Then, worst of all, whilst they were cruelly retrenching public servants throughout the State, and were cruelly retrenching hospitals and charitable institutions, they began to do what the old Government used to do—spent public money in their own electorates on works which, in many cases, were entirely unjustified. I remember that, in 1896, when the hon. member for Townsville was Minister for Railways, we had a proposal submitted to the House for the construction of a railway from Mirani to Cattle Creek. It is rather singular that Cattle Creek should be the name of the terminus of another railway. We fought that proposal because the railway ended on the property of one of the members of the Government.

Mr. PAGET: No, it did not; it ended on public lands.

Mr. HARDACRE: Well, it ended near the property of a Minister, and we fought it for that reason. Then, after having fought things of that kind when introduced by the old Government, we were asked by the present Government to support another railway which was as bad, as black, and as unjustifiable as any that had been passed in the worst time of the old Philp Government, when we fought them so bitterly. There was the railway from Dalby to Bell, running through some 24 miles of freehold land, and terminating almost at the door of the holding of the Minister for Lands.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What absolute nonsense you are talking! Why, it was 13 miles away. There has been for twenty-five years a railway within 12 miles of the property.

Mr. HARDACRE: Well, I know it ended at the township of Bell, and ran through the property of Jimbour.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why, it is further away than a railway that has been there for thirty years.

Mr. HARDACRE: The line certainly runs through 24 miles of freehold property through the township of Bell, and through the property of Jimbour, and so bad was the proposal that the railway experts, even the Commissioner for Railways, recommended to this House that if the railway was constructed through that freehold land, the owners of the land should be called upon to contribute something in the form of revenue.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are doing so.

Mr. HARDACRE: They are doing so now.

Hon. R. PHILP: And you have to thank the Opposition for that.

Mr. HARDACRE: We protested against that kind of thing being done by the previous Government, and yet we were asked to support it when done by the present Government. I remember that the present Premier came to me and asked me what was the matter. I replied that unless the betterment principle was applied to those freehold lands, that railway was one of the most scandalous jobs I had ever witnessed in this House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where was the job? Who on this bench was benefited?

Mr. HARDACRE: That it was a job was shown by the fact that it did not pay for axle

[*Mr. Hardacre.*]

grease for the first five months after it was built; there was a loss of £700 in addition to working expenses.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Has it cost the public one penny?

Mr. HARDACRE: Not now. I went to the late Premier, Mr. Morgan, and asked him to give me, personally, a promise that if we allowed the railway to go through, the betterment principle would be applied to it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You take yourself a great deal too seriously.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Minister for Lands thought my constituents took him seriously when he went up there, but they did not. There is a betterment tax on that land now, but we did not get that betterment tax until two years after it was promised, until after two years' onslaught by myself and other members compelled the Government to bring in the betterment proposal. They did it as a death-bed repentance, largely in order to avoid the opposition of the electors on that particular matter. When the proposal was introduced we had the inglorious and rather amusing spectacle of the Ministers divided amongst themselves, of the Minister for Lands getting up and fighting the proposal of his own Government to introduce the betterment principle, and calling upon the Opposition to help him and to save him from his friends. Then the Government passed a number of political railways—railways in the electorates of Ministers and of supporters of the Government.

Hon. R. PHILP: The railway to Blackall.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, that one particularly; that was one of the worst of the lot, and it made the Government the laughing-stock. As rails were being carried along the Central line for that railway you could hear men saying, "There goes George Kerr's railway." (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They could not say there goes Hardacre's railway.

Mr. HARDACRE: No, they could not; I did not grab the big potato. Then we had a promise to give £2,500 as a loan to a syndicate in the Roma district. One of the most prominent promoters of that Roma oil syndicate was one of their own supporters.

Mr. HUNTER: No, he is not.

Mr. HARDACRE: Well, he was one of the promoters.

Mr. HUNTER: No.

Mr. HARDACRE: I say he was one of the promoters, and very prominent among the promoters. I know from my own knowledge the interest he had in that particular matter. After all, the venture turned out to be a failure, and there was no justification for the promise given by the Government. Then we had the Government expending money in districts represented by their supporters, and refusing expenditure and assistance in districts represented by their political opponents. I made only three proposals during the whole of last Parliament for expenditure in the district which I represent. One was in connection with finding work for the unemployed. There had been a deputation to the present Premier on the subject of finding work for the unemployed, and the hon. gentleman stated in reply that he was carrying out a number of works at different places, but that he would welcome a suggestion from anyone on that matter. I told him I thought I could make a very good suggestion in regard to the Central district, and went home and carefully worked out a calculation involving an expenditure of £300 on ringbarking country. This

was such a good proposal that the Lands Department, to whom it was submitted for report, recommended it favourably. But it was nearly six months before I knew what had become of the proposal. I then found, to my astonishment, that on the report being returned to the Treasurer from the Lands Department with a favourable recommendation, the Treasurer minuted it: "This matter must not be gone on with until after Christmas." Christmas came and it was not gone on with. In each case in which I made application for the expenditure of money in my electorate I had an absolute refusal, and I am convinced that this was purely and solely because I and others showed independence in our criticism and refused to give the Government our servile support. Then they allowed Dr. Roth to leave this State after it was proved, perhaps not legally proved—though I think it could be legally proved from the evidence which was submitted—at any rate it is morally true—that he had really stolen aboriginal specimens belonging to this State.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No.

Mr. HARDACRE: Well, I am not a lawyer, but I believe it can be proved. I do not know that I need go any further into these matters, except to say that there is ample justification for the stand members of the Labour party took in the last session of the last Parliament in protesting against some of the actions of the Government, which were responsible for some of the dissatisfaction existing in the party behind them. Coming to the present position, the leader of our party has stated the position very well indeed. There is little to add, except this: Since the resolution passed by our party was read in this House an attempt has been made to screen the position involved in that resolution. The Premier said that we had promised him a general support, and several other members had made the same statement. I do not know what other members are going to do. I only know that I am not going to give him a general support. I am going to take a very independent stand in this House. I am going to do exactly what is involved in that resolution. I am going to give support to the good measures brought in by the Government, and I am going to oppose any bad measures which they introduce.

The HOME SECRETARY: There will be none for you to oppose, then.

Mr. HARDACRE: I am very glad to hear that. There was no difference whatever between the first and the second statement of the leader of this party, except, perhaps, the intimation, more or less clear, that we were favourable, generally speaking, to the measures mentioned in the Government programme. I admit that the programme is a fairly good one.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Administration can do what it likes so long as it does not introduce bad measures.

Mr. HARDACRE: I put my position very clearly at the end of last session, and I put it exactly in the same way during the whole of my election campaign. Speaking on the Dalby to Cattle Creek Railway District Bill, I said—

The introduction of the Bill was one of those actions which did one good. It was as pleasant as an oasis to a weary traveller in a desert.

Then I said, towards the end of my speech—

He wished to say here and now that so long as he was a member of the House, a representative sworn to do justice and watch the expenditure of public money, he should fight against all measures introduced by any Government which perpetrated such atrocious, wasteful, and extravagant expenditure as was involved in passing the Dalby-Cattle Creek Railway without applying the betterment principle to it. If he came back

again, the Government would get his strong opposition if they did things like that, but, if they did things like that now proposed, they would get his warmest support.

The Premier said he was not going to have the ship of State steered from the steerage. I think that is an unjustifiable reflection on the action of members of this party. I would appeal to the hon. member for Oxley, or to other members of the Ministry at that time, if ever this party, when sitting behind the Government, harassed them, or tried to bring in unreasonable measures, or tried to steer the ship of State. I think it will be admitted that we scarcely ever interfered with their actions, or raised objections to them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why, you were boasting a few minutes ago that you made us do things.

Mr. HARDACRE: Do things that were entirely harmonious. For example, the Attorney-General, the other night, said that the Government restored one-half of the public service retrenchment. That was one of the things that we made them do. We made them do it, not by suggesting things to them, but by opposing what they proposed to do. First of all, they proposed that there should be no restoration of salaries at all, and it was because of the bitter feeling of our party against breaking election pledges in that wholesale way, and because we gave them to understand that we would not submit to it, that they came down with their proposal to restore one-half the amount. The statement that we in any way desired to steer the ship of State from the steerage is unjustifiable.

Mr. COWAP: Do you call yourself the steerage?

Mr. HARDACRE: After many years we found the ship of State in the hands of buccaneers and pirates. We fought them, captured the ship of State, and turned it, as we believed, into an honest merchantman. We put our own men in charge, expecting them to trade in a legitimate way; but we found them commencing to turn buccaneers and pirates; and when we murmured at them doing it, the captain tried to put us in irons. (Laughter.) In other words, we contracted as passengers to be taken to Sydney, and when we found the captain was taking us to New Guinea amongst the blacks, we thought it was about time to protest and to insist upon being carried where he contracted to take us. It has been said that the new arrangement is a victory for the Labour party. Well, it has been a victory for the Labour party. For once the Labour party showed backbone, stood firm to their principles, and showed some respect for their own dignity. They decided to stand true to their principles whether the Kidston Government stayed in or went out, and by remaining firm they came out on top; and I believe that if they will do it in future they will come out on top again. It is not only a victory for the Labour party, but it is a victory for honesty. This party did nothing more in that respect than return to its old position of being an honest party. I think I may claim to be one of the early pioneers of the Labour movement in this State. At any rate, I was one of the first members of the Parliamentary Labour party in this House. I came here in the year 1893, and I am the only remaining member of those who came in in that year who is still in the Labour party. We fought all these years, above everything, as an honest party. We commenced small in numbers, but we grew to be thirty-four strong, and I believe we grew to that number by gaining the confidence of the people on the ground of being a politically honest party. We had upon our banners at election time again and again, "Vote for Labour and honest government." Even our

Mr. Hardacre.]

opponents respect us for the honesty of our purpose and the integrity of our principles. On those grounds we fought until we captured nearly half of the House. Then came a time when we placed ourselves under the leadership of the present Premier, and we began to abandon our principles; we began to be inconsistent in our actions; we began to do things we protested against; and in four years we sank from thirty-four to the small number of seventeen members.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What happened to your platform in the meantime?

Mr. HARDACRE: We had torn it to shreds under the leadership of the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have one-half of it on the statute-book.

Mr. HARDACRE: I admit we have some of it on the statute-book, but we have shattered our party. We have paid too high a price to get those small reforms on the statute-book. We shattered the movement to which I believe more than any movement the people of this country have to look for the improvement of their industrial and social welfare. Our party cannot afford to juggle with its principles. If we were like other political parties, we might resort to expediency, but our party is not for a day. It has a to-morrow, and a to-morrow, and a to-morrow after that; and, if we are to retain the confidence of the people in the future, we shall have to do as we did in the past and appeal to them on the grounds of honesty and sincerity of purpose. I do not wish to indulge in any personalities, but I think if the Premier had ever any sincere regard for the Labour movement he ought to cover himself with sackcloth and ashes, and shed bitter tears for the injury he has done to democracy in this State. A good deal has been made of the three-party system, and it has been said that it is an evil system. I do not know that it is an evil system necessarily. It all depends on the character of the third party. If the third party is an honest party; if it holds the balance of power, and shows that it has the interest of the people at heart, I believe that the three-party system would be a good one for this State. If this party is true to itself, the people need have no fear for the administration or legislation of this State. But whatever evils there may be in the three-party system, I can conceive of something worse. That is a system which has on the one side of the House an overwhelming majority behind a dominant Government, and which, in spite of all criticism, can do anything it likes merely by the brute numbers behind it. Anything is better than that; and it is certainly a very much more democratic system to have three, or even four, or even a dozen parties—or, if necessary, for even every member of the House to be a party—so long as he is true to his convictions, and knows in his own mind that he is doing his best so far as legislation is concerned. After the number of years I have been here I have come to see a great deal of virtue in the old principle of the Irishman who, when he found there was a Government in the country to which he was going, said at once, "I'm agin it." There is a great deal of virtue in being "agin the Government," even if it is a good Government—although I do not say I am against any Government. A strong Opposition is a very necessary thing in connection with the passing of good legislation. If this party tries, as I think it ought to try—and as I think it will try—to preserve not only its own independence, but the independence of other members, it will deserve well, not only of this House, but also of the people of Queensland.

Mr. RYLAND: We have a strong Opposition now.

[*Mr. Hardacre.*]

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. The Premier in speaking at the commencement of the debate said with truth that the progressive [8.30 p.m.] portion of the country had sent into the House two progressive parties, and that it was only personal feeling which made any doubt at all as to what kind of Government there should be. He admitted, I think correctly, that possibly he himself was to blame in connection with any cause there might have been for personal ill-feeling. I was pleased to hear his utterances, because it seemed to show a kind of repentant attitude for his own conduct at the time. If there is any man to blame for the trouble which was caused, I believe it is the Premier; perhaps unintentionally, but nevertheless it was so. When I first knew the Premier, he was a fairly courteous man, but when he assumed office he became swaggering, bullying, bouncing, and discourteous not only to members but to public deputations, and under that kind of action there is no doubt that members got irritated and began to show a little feeling.

Mr. GRANT: You are the only member who has complained of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; the first week he assumed his official position as Treasurer, he practically shut one of the present members from his office. I know deputations have had to wait hours for the Premier's convenience, and he has not made the slightest apology. I do not want to indulge in these things, or I could say a little more. I do not know whether the Premier's attitude is one that will last or not. When you come to think of the bitterness with which the elections were fought, and the bitter hostility displayed to some members of this party, and that when he was a member he used all the powers and forces of the State to down members who were politically opposed to him, it seems to me that his present position, knowing that he has to depend on some of those members whom he tried to defeat, is a sort of deathbed repentance. Whether it will stand the strain of a resurrection time I am not quite sure. It is to be hoped it will, and if he shows a sincere desire to get on with the hon. members of this House, there is no doubt that other members, including myself, will be anxious to get on with him. There are just one or two matters, before passing away from that subject, which I would like to refer to, and one is the sincerity of the Speech. It is hoped that the Premier will be sincere; but we have to judge the Government and the Premier, not by their words, but by their actions. (Hear, hear!) We heard him again and again in this House use the word "progressive"; that his Government is the Progressive Government. I must say that I have come to look with hesitation on those who call themselves "Progressivists." When I find the Government calling itself "Progressive" down in the Federal Parliament making a tariff that will crush the life-blood out of many people of Australia—

Mr. COWAP: You are a freetrader, are you not?

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; I am a freetrader. I am opposed to all taxes upon the commodities of the people. I say that when we find them levying taxes which will fall crushingly upon industries and articles of food, it is time we began to look askance upon anybody calling himself a "progressivist." It was in the time of the French Revolution, when all the atrocities were being committed, that the celebrated Madame Roland, one of the characters of that time, as she was being sent to the guillotine, looked upon the statue of liberty and said, "Oh, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name." And so we

have had evil things done under the names of democracy and progress. I, for one, am going to judge this Government, not by its professions, but by its actions in the future. Only a few short weeks ago we had one of the most undemocratic things done by this Government that I think has ever been done in this State. It is only a few weeks ago that we had appointments made to the Legislative Council which I think were most unpopular in the country—I will not say that of all of them.

Mr. MANN: Most of them were popular.

Mr. HARDACRE: I will say that some of them were good, but there were others which were not good, and when I think we had coming from a so-called democratic Premier an appointment of a man who had failed to win an election—

Mr. COWAP: What about Hinchcliffe?

Mr. HARDACRE: Certainly, many years intervened. (Government laughter.) However, I do not complain about Mr. Hinchcliffe. No one could put the appointment of Mr. Hinchcliffe on a par with the appointment of the Hon. Peter Airey.

Mr. COWAP: He is not as good a man.

Mr. HARDACRE: Mr. Hinchcliffe is a man who, if he failed to get into the House, was never so unpopular as the Hon. Peter Airey was. Mr. Airey was a man who, by his actions in the Government, made himself so obnoxious to the people of the country that he failed to win a seat in Parliament, and yet, immediately after, a democratic Government appointed over their heads a man to rule and reign over them. The people said, "We will not have this man"; the Government said "You shall have this man, and, what is more, we will not only place him in the Upper House, but make him a member of the Cabinet." I protested at the time, and I protest again. If these are the democratic things on the programme, I do not think the Government will last very long.

Mr. MAXWELL: There are some things which they deserve credit for.

Mr. HARDACRE: "Two blacks do not make a white." There are quite a number of other things which are no good, which I will leave until we get more certain knowledge about them. There is one important matter which will have to come up for discussion at an early date, and that is the Jimbour Estate—why the bungle was made, and why the proposal to spend £500,000 or thereabouts in the electorate of the Minister for Lands.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You get hold of your facts, and come along with your statements.

Mr. HARDACRE: All I know is that everything seems to be poured into the Minister's electorate. If it is railways—he has got all the surveyors of the country nearly in his electorate at the present time. He turns nearly all the selectors into his district, and amongst the first batch of selections thrown open in Great Britain, lo and behold! there is shown amongst them, prominent above all, land in the Dalby electorate! We have the Dalby to Bell railway in his electorate; then we have a proposal to spend £500,000 on the purchase of Jimbour Estate; and now I find he has a whole group of surveyors intensely active to build railways in that electorate, while other districts cannot get surveyors to survey railways. They are scarce all over the country, because they are in the electorate of the Minister for Lands. I would

like to read a little paragraph which I have here from, I believe, his own paper. It says: "Surveyors in the Dalby district have been showing unprecedented activity." (Laughter.) The paper is a Dalby paper, and says—

It is worthy of note that more surveyors have been at work in the Dalby district during the first six months of this year than has ever been the case before. This relates not only to officers connected with the Department of Lands, but also to surveyors under the direction of the Minister for Railways. So far as railway operations are concerned, Messrs. Southerden, Grant, and Whish are all engaged simultaneously upon the survey of lines in this district.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Grant is getting on well with the Chinchilla-Taroom project. Mr. Southerden has completed Kainkilemmun towards Bismarck, and is now doing Bell towards Jandowae, while Mr. Whish is finding a route from Dalby to the south of Cobbareena. In lands surveying, Staff-Surveyor Steele has been designing in the Bell district, and is now at Jandowae, and with work ahead at Durong, Surveyor Jack is designing large areas on Juandah. Surveyor White is beginning operations at Perth, and Surveyor Burbank at Wilambilla. Surveyor Robertson is working towards Tara. Surveyor Turner, from Victoria, has been engaged on permanent surveys on Kogan and Perth country, and is now taking up the same duties at Juandah, Surveyor Shield has work near Chinchilla, and Surveyor Markwell is running permanent lines at Bell.

(Laughter.)

The list is not exhausted, but it is enough to show unprecedented activity.

(Laughter.)

Mr. COWAP: I wish there were some up our way.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Roma newspaper is, to use a vulgar term, howling like blazes at all the surveyors being in the Dalby district, and they cannot get surveyors in the adjoining district of Roma.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is a strange thing.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is not a strange thing—it is a most usual thing, evidently.

Mr. HUNTER: Who told you that?

Mr. HARDACRE: I saw it in the paper.

Hon. R. PHILP: The Minister said there were no surveyors there.

Mr. HARDACRE: I would just like to deal briefly with the administration of the Lands Department. Under the present system large sums of money are being expended in payment of private agents' services, which has the effect of concentrating settlement towards the Dalby district, and so starving country land offices, and preventing settlement on other lands.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What are the districts you are speaking of?

Mr. HARDACRE: I know some of the land offices where there is a demand for land, and in some places you cannot get a map up to date within five years. In my district there has been a request made again and again—even for a young officer.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I never refused a single request you made to me.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not think that is true. I wrote a letter some considerable time ago, and I have not received any reply to it. The Minister knows he was up during the election time, when a request was made to him to appoint an officer in the Springsure district, but I suppose, now the elections are over, he has forgotten all about it.

Mr. Hardacre.]

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is very good to you.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not mean to say the Minister has not treated me generously in some things, but I have never troubled him a great deal. However, that is not the question; the question is the system of administration. Whatever may be the merits of private agents, the system starves the country districts while placing settlers all over one portion of the State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not true.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is true. It has that particular tendency. I would just like to refer to some disputed matters during the election time. The elections, as we know, were fought most bitterly, and, I believe, with about as large an amount of misrepresentation as has ever occurred during any election in the history of Queensland. So much so that one of the Brisbane newspapers termed it, and I believe rightly, "A campaign of mendacity," and whilst there was perhaps misrepresentation all round, still I believe it could be said with justice, the biggest amount of misrepresentation came from the Premier. In fact, he proved himself a past master in the art of political sophistry, and I intend to clear up one or two disputed matters of that time. First of all, there is the question of the reduction of the endowment to local authorities. I asserted, as one of my reasons for opposition to the Government, and taking an independent stand, that they had injured the country districts by retrenchment in various ways, and by abolishing the endowment to local authorities. The Premier, at Rockhampton, said the abolition of the endowment was made by the former Government.

Mr. MANN: Quite correct.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is not correct. I say it is one of those half-truths which Tennyson tells us is the blackest of lies. The fact is that the abolition of the endowment was proposed in Mr. Cribb's Treasurer's Statement before the Philp Government was defeated.

Mr. GRANT: There was no provision on the Estimates for it.

Mr. HARDACRE: No. But before they could carry their Estimates into law they were defeated, and the new Government came in, and the new Government did what the old Government merely proposed to do. And what is more, the present Government not only did what the old Government merely proposed to do, but they have done it ever since.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And you helped them do it.

Mr. HARDACRE: What nonsense! I opposed it and have protested ever since. I have spoken again and again against the matter, and one of the grounds of my antagonism to the old Government was the abolition of the endowment to local authorities.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No; that is not the ground.

Mr. HARDACRE: At any rate that is the fact. It was not only done, but it has been done ever since; and, what is more, when a deputation of the members of the local authorities came to the Premier last year, and asked for a restoration of the endowment, he told them clearly and distinctly it would never be restored while he was Premier.

Mr. GRANT: Quite correct.

Mr. HARDACRE: I say quite wrong. I represent a country district which suffers under

[Mr. Hardacre.

that kind of thing, and I say it was an injustice to the most sparsely-populated districts—districts far from the coast—that they should be burdened with the cost of maintaining and keeping in proper order the national highways of the State. We ought not to impose on the small communities a burden of that kind unless assisted by the larger populations from the coast—from the consolidated revenue—in order to do the pioneering work, and the result has been a very high tax on the selectors of the country districts, and an increased rate which they ought not to be called upon to pay.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is not that taxing land values?

Mr. HARDACRE: If it was taxing land values I would be one to support it, and to some extent I admit it is taxing land values. (Government laughter.) I admit that while it is taxing land values where land is valuable, in the country districts the rate is not on the land values at all—in the country districts the rates are levied upon the selections—Crown lands—which are capitalised at twenty times their annual value. The State has thrown the additional burden of taxation upon the struggling selectors in the country districts.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And you proposed to tax them.

Mr. HARDACRE: I never proposed to tax them. At any rate, I protested at the elections against the abolition of the endowment, and I strongly protest now at the misrepresentation of the present Government—that the Government whom I supported should try and accuse the old Government of abolishing the endowment. There is another question which affects my district—the question of the income tax on the natural increase of stock. That also was ground for debate during the elections, and again the Premier threw upon the late Government the responsibility for the tax on the natural increase of stock. Now, what are the facts? They are very similar to the case of the endowment to local authorities. The late Government introduced the income tax when the charge was made by the Commissioner on the increases in stock, and the pastoral lessees appealed against it, and carried their appeal to the Supreme Court. And at that very moment—while the question was under consideration of the Supreme Court—the present Premier and Treasurer actually came down with an amendment of the Act, making law what was still *sub judice*.

Mr. RYLAND: It was a weakness in the Act.

Mr. HARDACRE: The point was this: The concluding portion of the amendment made the increase in stock subject to the tax. The hon. member for Tuowong said, "You are actually interfering with the Supreme Court"; and the Premier said, "Yes, to this extent—that we are providing that it 'shall be so,' and at that very moment the case had not been concluded in the Supreme Court. The opposition was raised by this side of the House; and, in spite of the opposition of the hon. member for Mitchell, Mr. Cooper, it was passed into law by this Government. So that there, again, the Government tried to fix the consequences of their own wrong on the late Government. Then there was the question of the long haulage of goods. That was fought out in Rockhampton. The whole thing was misrepresented. The long-haulage rates were imposed, and hon. members of the Central districts know very well they were imposed by the Morgan Government. The 1903 classifications were imposed by Mr. John Leahy, when he was Minister for Railways.

Then there was the 1904 general classification, signed by Arthur Morgan; and then there was a special long-haulage rate imposed only in the Central districts in 1905, signed also by Arthur Morgan.

Mr. GRANT: You are taking up a wrong position—you do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. HARDACRE: I know this, it was the influence of the two Rockhampton members who got the alteration in the rates, in order that they might protect the merchants of Rockhampton from the loss of trade, and I protested against it. And I suggested, if they wanted to retain the trade, they could do it, not by increasing the rates from beyond Rockhampton, but by decreasing the rates from Rockhampton to Longreach.

Mr. GRANT: As a matter of fact your action went to prove we did not put these rates on—you are taking up a wrong position.

Mr. HARDACRE: The special long haulage clause of 1905 reads—

The rates per ton payable in respect of the carriage of goods from stations on the Southern and Western Railway to stations on the Central Railway beyond Rockhampton, and from stations on the Central Railway west or north of Rockhampton to stations on the Southern and Western Railway, shall be in accordance with Schedule IIc. hereto.

Then there is a very long schedule of the classes imposed and signed by Arthur Morgan in 1905.

Mr. GRANT: The point that they wanted to make was that the other crowd had put them on. You are taking up a wrong position. The hon. member for Oxley takes up the position that the other side put them on.

Mr. HARDACRE: The position I take up is this: That I fell out with the Government, and I fell out with the Government over certain things—(laughter)—which I said were wrong. They passed additional taxation and imposed increases in the railway freights. I opposed the Government on these matters, and, instead of meeting those charges as they ought to have done—instead of admitting the correctness of the facts—they tried to put the blame on the Opposition.

Mr. GRANT: You are simply altogether wrong. You know you are wrong.

Mr. HARDACRE: I know I am entirely right, and I know what I said in the House. The hon. member was so defeated himself that he had not a single leg to stand on when the fact was made evident in Rockhampton. There is one other matter I would like to deal with—that is, the alleged improper use of loan funds. That was made a great deal of, and it is just as well we should clear that matter up, too. The leader of the Opposition said that the Premier had repeatedly accused him of misappropriating loan funds for revenue purposes. "Misappropriating" was, perhaps, not exactly the word used, but undoubtedly the meaning was there in the way the statement read. What are the facts? The Premier has said that it means a difference of £200,000 annually in our

[9 p.m.] interest payments. Let us look at the facts. During the last twenty years there has been floated a large number of loans, and those loans have not always been floated at par. Altogether, from the foundation of the colony, there have been authorised to be floated £40,000,000 odd, but the amount actually raised by way of loan was £36,000,000 odd, leaving a nominal loss, according to the Premier, of £3,954,000. The interest on that, the hon. gentleman says, is £200,000

annually. There is a little bit of jugglery in the way those figures are dealt with. The hon. gentleman is only £1,500,000 out in his calculation. The amount of money authorised to be raised by way of loan was £40,000,000, but the amount actually sold was £39,000,000, so that the net loss was £2,954,000, as against the Treasurer's £3,954,000, and the interest on that amount is only about £99,000 per annum. These matters extend over the whole period of the history of the State.

Hon. R. PHILIP: Fifty years.

Mr. HARDACRE: Over fifty years. Seeing that many of those loans failed to float at par, we could not say that the amount had been put into our till. That there has been leakage—perhaps leakage is a better term than misappropriation—it is true, and that leakage is one which ought to be stopped. It is a leakage which the Premier rightly alluded to as one which should be guarded against in the future, but to say that there was the slightest tint of dishonesty or misappropriation, or even to insinuate that in the smallest degree, is a statement or insinuation entirely without foundation. With regard to the programme contained in the Governor's Speech, I admit that in many respects it is an exceedingly good one. There are a number of measures which are good but are not very important, as, for instance, the Boiler and Machinery Inspection Bill, the Surveyors' Bill, and the Bill for the establishment of a central technical college, and so on. Then there are one or two good measures which are very important. Among these are the Old Age Pensions Bill, the Wages Board Bill, and the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill. But, after all, I am not very deeply enamoured of the Government programme. Practically, the Premier has put into the programme for this session all his policy speech at Rockhampton, and I am not very enthusiastic over that. While admitting that it is a fairly good programme, still I do not think it is going to set the Thames on fire. As a matter of fact, we have every one of the measures proposed in this Speech in force in other States of the Commonwealth or elsewhere, or they have been proposed by other Premiers, some of whom do not take to themselves to any great extent the appellation of democratic or progressive. Take, for instance, the reduction of railway fares and freights. In the adjoining State of New South Wales a month or two ago, they carried into operation a very much larger reduction of railway fares and freights than is likely to be brought about in this State. Again, we have the Premier of that State advocating the establishment of a wages board such as is indicated in the Governor's Speech delivered to this Parliament. In Western Australia they are going even further in democratic legislation; they are imposing a land value tax. In all the other States of the Commonwealth they have a land value tax, and even in Great Britain there is a land value tax for stock. In Great Britain also a new Foods Bill has been introduced by Mr. John Burns.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And a Resumption of Estates Bill has been introduced.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, a Resumption of Estates Bill has also been introduced. I have been in this House for fourteen years, and during that time I have seen a constant stream of new faces coming and going, and I am beginning to see that after all we have to depend for reform, for good legislation, not so much on members of this House as on the thought and opinions of the people outside the House. We are merely a registering body in this House, a straw to show

Mr. Hardacre.]

which way the current is going. If the Government were to cease to exist to-morrow, I do not think that we should fail to have every one of these measures on the statute-book before many years are past, no matter what Government may be in office. We are flies on the wheel. I do not know whether hon. members have read Æsop's fables, but many of them are very good. I remember one about a gnat settling on the horns of a bull, and after he had been there for some time he asked permission of the bull to depart. The bull said he did not know he was there and that he would not have missed him if he had gone. That is very much the position of the Government.

Mr. GRANT: Do you think the Government would miss you if you went?

Mr. HARDACRE: During the election contest the Premier, in appealing to the people, stated that the Labour party were practically useless, that for fourteen years they had been in the wilderness, and that it was not until his Government came into office that they had got all the good things which were passed by the last Parliament. I should like to say here and now that it was the fourteen years' advocacy of those measures by members of this Parliament outside the House which really won the reforms that were passed by the last Parliament. I think the Premier meant to refer to the time when Sir Samuel Griffith introduced his policy in 1888, when the hon. gentleman said that, if we had not been foolish at that time, we should have got all these good things then. As a matter of fact, I was one of the men who supported Sir Samuel Griffith at that time. I supported his candidature for North Brisbane then; but, strange to say, the Premier was one of the foolish people who was supporting Sir Thomas McIlwraith as against Sir Samuel Griffith. In fact, he was writing "Odes to the Hero of Civilisation," Sir Thomas McIlwraith.

Mr. GUNN: Sir Thomas McIlwraith was the greater man of the two.

Mr. HARDACRE: I am beginning to think he was. But even if Sir Samuel Griffith had been returned to power in 1888, I do not believe he could have given the people the electoral reforms we have got to day. Adult suffrage was made possible by its advocacy outside the House during all the intervening years of stress and struggle of the members of the Labour party. They really won the reform, which was merely put on the statute-book by the Government in the last Parliament. I believe there is a great amount of truth in that almost inspired exclamation of Lytton's "Richelieu"—

Beneath the rule of men entirely great
The pen is mightier than the sword.
Behold the arch enchanter's wand,
Itself a nothing,
Yet taking sorcery from the master's hand
To paralyse the Cæsars and to strike
The loud earth breathless.

I believe it is only by agitation outside, by creating new opinions and sentiments in the minds of the people, that we are going to get reforms in the future. With regard to the policy of the Opposition, I may say that there are many good things in it. There is a good deal of development in it. The distinction between the Government policy and the Opposition policy seems to be that the Opposition favour the development of our resources as a means of bringing about better conditions to a greater degree than the Government, and to a lesser degree they favour social and industrial legislation. On the other hand, the Government seem to favour social and industrial legislation as a means of improving the conditions of the masses and to a lesser degree the development of our

resources. I believe the policy of our party is superior to both. It combines the good things of the policies of the other two parties. I agree with the remark made the other night by the hon. member for Toowong, Mr. Macartney, that if we can make prosperity we can lift up wages without any industrial and social legislation at all. But I would ask the Opposition how it is that during the years their party was in power they did not make prosperity, if their policy is the correct one? There is an old axiom enunciated by Cobden in the anti-corn law agitation which is as true to-day as it was then: He said that if we can make two masters run after one man wages will rise, but if two men have to run after one master wages will fall. If we can create permanent and increasing prosperity we shall solve the Labour question, but the trouble is that in spite of all the development that has taken place we have got no nearer a solution. We have been told on both sides of the House that three things are necessary to solve our difficulties. The first is more railways. If more railways are going to make us prosperous we shall very soon be prosperous, for it seems to me that almost every man in this House has had a deputation to the Secretary for Railways, asking for a railway in his district. We are told that the three essentials are more railways, more population, and more settlement. I would ask hon. members who believe that how it is that twenty years ago, when we had less railways, less population, and less settlement, Queensland was more prosperous than it is to-day?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And wages were much lower.

Mr. HARDACRE: Wages were much higher. I came to Queensland in 1883, and I assert fearlessly that from 1879 to 1886 was one of the most prosperous times Queensland has ever had. I assert that on the authority of Coghlan and other writers.

Hon. R. PHILP: We had a vigorous railway policy and a vigorous immigration policy then.

Mr. RYLAND: And a vigorous loan policy, too.

Mr. HARDACRE: Since that time we have had 800 miles of railway built; we have 200,000 more people, and we have much more settlement; so that if these things mean greater prosperity, how is it that we are not more prosperous than we were then? Wages were higher in 1883, and employment was easier to get than to-day, although I admit that we are now on the upward grade of prosperity. Looking back over the history of Australia, it will be found that there have been fluctuations of good times and bad times; but from the foundation of Australia wages have not increased despite all the development that has taken place.

Hon. R. PHILP: Quite wrong.

Mr. HARDACRE: Over £200,000,000 of public money has been spent in Australia, and wages to-day are not nearly as high as in 1861. The golden age for Australian labour was in the golden years between 1851 and 1861. The next golden era for Australian labour was between 1879 and 1886.

Hon. R. PHILP: Yes; when a big lot of people were coming into the country.

Mr. HARDACRE: Of course there were, and that is where the Opposition make the mistake. They came to the conclusion that because two things happened at the same time—increase of prosperity and increase of population—the increase of population is the cause of the increase of prosperity, whereas the reverse is the case. In those golden times, between 1851 and 1861, there was a rapid rush of people from all parts of the world to Australia. There was the

[Mr. Hardacre.

biggest increase in population that has ever taken place in Australia—an increase of nearly 750,000. Since that time the influx of population has been declining, until between 1891 and 1903 there was actually an exodus of people from our shores. In the twelve years of depression in Victoria there was an exodus from that State alone of 144,000 people, and it is remarkable that in Australia to-day there are practically only two States which are gaining by an influx of people. These facts should prove that it is not the influx of population that causes prosperity, but the increased prosperity that causes influx of population. It is a strange thing, as is shown by these remarkable figures of the Commonwealth Statistician, that there are only two States in Australia which are gaining population, and they are gaining it at the expense of the other States, while the States of New South Wales and Western Australia are more prosperous than the others.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Western Australia is not prosperous.

Mr. HARDACRE: She is prosperous, but she is not gaining in her population. There is a less influx to Western Australia than there was last year. New South Wales is comparatively prosperous to-day, but she is gaining her population from the other States. The figures for 1902 and 1903 show that there was a depressed time in Queensland, and there were many departures from Queensland in these years, but now that we have prosperous times again, the population is coming back. Therefore, instead of advocating an increase in population and trying to force them into the States in undue numbers before they can be absorbed, we should make the State ready for them first. If you put 1,000,000 people down here before breakfast to-morrow, you will have thousands of unemployed in our streets.

Hon. R. PHILP: No one advocates that.

Mr. HARDACRE: To advocate an increase of population is not a policy that will bring about the result we desire. The right way to do is to do as the Labour party are advocating, and that is to make Queensland prosperous first, and if you do that you will have people rushing our shores who will be only too glad to share our prosperity. When we get wages up, there will be a flood of labour coming from other places. They will only be too glad to come in to get the increased rate offered here. The system of bringing people here at the expense of the State to compete with labour for the employment that is already here, is an artificial system and tends to reduce wages below their normal rate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You are arguing that if you can make Queensland prosperous then people will come here. Well, in order to make Queensland prosperous you must have plenty of labour to develop its industries.

Mr. HARDACRE: If there is one thing the Opposition believe in it is the law of supply and demand, and if they allow wages to go up to their normal level people will come to share the high wages that are existing, and they will do it without the expenditure of public money—and especially the workers' money—to bring in these people to compete against them. That is one thing I want to point out in the policy of the Government, also in the policy of the Opposition. There is one important factor left out. We have heard a great deal about the establishment of wages boards, and all the good they are going to do. We have had wages boards in Victoria, and I would ask: Is Victoria in that supremely prosperous condition that will make any difference to the worker?

Mr. MANN: Wages are higher there than here.

Mr. HARDACRE: Wages are lower in Victoria than in New South Wales, and, in some respects, than in Queensland to-day; and the e is more poverty in Victoria, particularly in Melbourne, than there is in Brisbane to-day. I say that both sides have left out something in their calculations. I am not a great believer in the wages board systems. It is a good system, but I do not think it is going to do all that is claimed for it, for the reason that it does not control prices. It may fix the money rate of wages, but it cannot control the price we have to pay for the cost of living. It is shown in New Zealand particularly, that after all the industrial and social legislation which was passed there, and after all the money borrowed and expended in the construction of public work—after all the years of Seddon premiership, at the end of his term all the prosperity which had temporarily con- passed out of the hands of the workers into the hands of other people—who obtained practically the whole of the benefit.

Mr. LESINA: You have to pay higher prices for everything in New Zealand to-day, and rents are also much higher. It is a good place to get out of.

Mr. HARDACRE: I had a letter from an Australian in New Zealand the other day, and he informed me that wages were lower there to-day than they were in Australia. This is what the Premier, Mr. Seddon, in 1905, which was not long before he died, said to trade unions—

The workers . . . in spite of the increased wages they were receiving, they found themselves, on account of the increased cost of living, no better off at the end of the year than they were formerly. There were people, who were not employers and not workers, who came in and scooped the money. These he indicated were the people who took the increased value of land and property as their profit, and they reaped the revenue of the employers' enterprise, and the workers' industry.

The platform of the Labour party contains many fine measures, but to my mind it contains one supreme important thing, and that is the taxation of land values. And I would just like to call the attention of members of the House to the new phrase in which we have embodied that important taxation measure. We have now expressed it as follows: Not a land tax, not a tax on land values, but a tax upon the public by created land values, that is after the expenditure of public money in railways and in various other ways. The Government, in doing these things, increased the value of land in this country, so why should they not get some revenue from it? If the Government do not get any revenue from it somebody else will take it, and the community generally will have to pay the increased price to those who obtain the land. No matter what we do, whether we construct public works, increase the population, or increase settlement or whatever we do, the effect of it ultimately will be—unless we stop the system—that all the benefits will pass out of the hands of the people into the hands of the private landholders. I do not wish to take up the time of the House much longer, but I hope with other hon. members that the session will be productive of good, and I hope that at the end of this Parliament—if we last so long as that—we shall be able to say that we have passed some really good measures which have substantially improved the condition of the worker. We have in this country great opportunities—a country of vast resources. We have, more than anything, a country which at the beginning of its history had not the evils of the older countries so fixed or so deep as they are in other countries of the world, and therefore

Mr. Hardacre.]

they are very easily removed. We ought to endeavour to get to the root of our troubles by dealing with the social troubles, not by passing palliative measures, as they do not cure the evil, but merely soothe it for the time being; but we ought to endeavour to go deeply to the root of our trouble, and try to make of this country—

In this new childhood of the world
Life of itself shall leap and play,
Fresh blood through Time's shrunk veins be hurled,
And labour meet delight half way.

(Hear, hear!)

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): Like other hon. members who have spoken, I desire to tender my hearty congratulations to the [9.30 p.m.] mover and second of the Address in Reply on the able way they gave their speeches in this House. I would also go further, and extend my congratulations to other young members like the hon. member for Nundah and the hon. member for Carpentaria, who spoke so well to-night; and I wish especially to commend the hon. member for Herbert for the able manner in which he put the wants of his constituency before the House. I trust his earnestness will produce some effect before his term in this Parliament expires. I feel sorry I cannot tender my congratulations to the member for Croydon, Mr. Creagh, for the reason that he spoilt an otherwise good speech by saying that the late member, Mr. Murphy, was put out of this House because he was not in his place when he should have been, and because he did not advocate the wants of North Queensland.

Mr. CREAGH: Show me where I said that.

Mr. MANN: You will find it in *Hansard*. Hon. members who were here will remember that Mr. Murphy was one of the most consistent attendants at this House. I have been through his record for last session, and I find that Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kerr, and myself were the only three members of the Labour party who attended this House on every occasion when the House sat. I may point out that in the short time the hon. member for Croydon has been here he has already been absent on one occasion. For a new member that does not look a very good record. He made a very able speech advocating the claims of North Queensland, and no man had a better reason for doing so, because in every polling-booth but one on Croydon the hon. gentleman was defeated. He only got a majority in one place, and he drew the bulk of the votes which sent him down here from Woothakata and other electorates in North Queensland.

Mr. CREAGH: That is not true.

Mr. MANN: As a matter of fact, he retained a justice of the peace for weeks in and around Chillagoe, and other mining centres getting votes for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CREAGH: Where did you get your information from? Who has been "pulling your leg"?

Mr. MANN: Let me say this: that the hon. member came down here with the intention of setting the Brisbane River on fire. The very first day he addressed the House he read members a lecture, telling them how they ought to behave. He was not five minutes in the House before he lectured the House with regard to the order of the debate. He came down here with the idea that because he was big pumpkins in Croydon he was going to be big pumpkins here. But he will find that before long he will be very small potatoes indeed. I do not wish to deal with the hon. member any longer.

[*Mr. Hardacre.*]

I think before Parliament is over he will get the little bit of conceit taken out of him by the members of this House, and go back to Croydon a sadder but a wiser man. The Creagh party came down to this House thinking they had nothing to do but to offer himself to the various parties in the House. He got in here by promising support—

Mr. JACKSON: On the Labour platform.

Mr. MANN: Yes; to the Labour platform. He went down to Normanton: where the late member for Carpentaria had a long confab with him, and he had the assistance of that gentleman to get to this House. As a matter of fact, Mr. Forsyth, when defeated, said, "Well, we have lost Carpentaria, but we have gained Croydon." (Laughter.) I believe the Creagh party got here through his paid assistants telling the miners who had left Croydon that he was a better Labour man than Mr. Murphy, and that if he were returned he would be a better member than Mr. Murphy. He comes down here. He has no platform to follow. The Government would not give three-pence for his support. The Labour party does not want him, and the Opposition do not know what to do with him. After the next election we shall see Mr. Murphy down again, for the reason that he was one of the best advocates in this House for the railway from Almaden to Georgetown, and I believe if Mr. Murphy had not voted for that railway he would not have got the opposition of the extreme Labour party in Croydon, and would not have been defeated. Another member who spoke was the junior member for Mackay. He made a very able speech from his own point of view, but he also spoilt his speech by claiming that his party was a progressive party, and had more at heart the interests of the people on the land than members on this side. That is altogether overdrawn. The party to which he belonged did not desire to people the land themselves, but imported cheap Polynesian labour to do it for them. On one occasion I heard the hon. gentleman make a pitiful appeal to the then Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Denham, at Cairns to keep the kanakas here. It is a matter of fact that the senior member for Mackay was advocating the keeping of the kanaka in the country. It had been agreed that Messrs. Chataway and Swayne were going to oppose Mr. Paget in the interests of the black labour party. However, Mr. Chataway is in the Federal Senate, and Mr. Swayne sits in the House here. We well know that Mr. Paget is in his heart a white labour man, still he has to come round to a certain extent to the views of his black labour constituents.

Mr. KEOGH: What did you pay for that? (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: Speaking about the agricultural conference at Cairns, it amused me very much to hear the late Secretary for Agriculture get up and make a powerful appeal to the Government to carry out certain plans in aid of the various industries of the State. When that hon. gentleman was up at Cairns, he was shown the ravages of the cane grubs, and it was pointed out to him that in one year alone in the Cairns district something like £10,000 worth of cane was destroyed. He did not then get up in his place and urge the Government to go in for a scheme to try and exterminate the grub. No; but when he gets over to the cold shades of Opposition, he asks this Government to do their best to wipe out the tick!

We have had ticks in North Queensland since 1893, and during that time there has been very little effort to wipe it out. But as soon as the pest comes down here, and touches the industry the hon. gentleman is concerned with, he gets up and asks the Government to try and wipe out the ticks and save our herds. To show how much concerned the hon. gentleman was with helping the settlers, I may say that he visited Atherton in my company. I introduced a deputation of the leading farmers of Atherton, and asked, among other things, that we should have a State farm established there. The hon. gentleman refused, and said that the people in Atherton evidently did not appreciate the nursery at Kamerunga, or they would not have asked for a State farm at Atherton. As a matter of fact, Kamerunga is on the coast, and the climate there is as warm as anywhere in North Queensland. Atherton, on the other hand, is on a tableland, and the climate is cooler, and I believe better than anything we have in Queensland, except the Darling Downs. I am glad the hon. gentleman was taken to task by the hon. member for Carpentaria for speaking as he did about white men having to come down here to recruit their health, after the arduous labour in the canefields at Cairns. The hon. member for Carpentaria said there was a climate up there equally as good, if not better, than anything in the South of Queensland, except the Darling Downs.

Mr. PAGET: The country should be opened up.

Mr. MANN: He also asked the Secretary for Agriculture whether he would send up two stud bulls. He promised to send up the two bulls, and when I waited on him to remind him of his promise, he would not send them up, for fear they would die of ticks. He was not willing to risk two bulls in the interests of dairying in North Queensland, but now, when he sits on the Opposition bench, he urges the Government to spend £60,000 in establishing a mill on the Johnstone. I would like to see a mill there myself. Further than that, he advocates that something should be done with the Kamerunga Nursery, and says that the manager has neglected his work in showing people round the nursery. As a matter of fact, if the manager did nothing about the nursery at all, but left it in the hands of the overseer, I am certain the work would be just as well carried out as it is at the present time. Every time the Estimates came before the House I strongly advised the Hon. the Secretary for Agriculture to go in for the growing of seedling cane at the Kamerunga Nursery. He promised to do so, but it has never been done; and to-day, if the canegrowers of Queensland want to get seedling cane—and everyone who knows anything about the industry knows that the seedling canes are the best varieties we have now got—we have to get this cane from the Acclimatisation Gardens in Southern Queensland or from Mackay. It would amount to no extra expense to establish the growing of seedling cane at Kamerunga. With all his desire to assist the Northern industries, that hon. gentleman, when he had the power, would not extend a helping hand in a small matter like that to the canegrowers in my district. He is very anxious that we should go in for growing rubber, and wait eight or ten years for a crop to mature, but he will not do a thing to help the dairying industry, which we hope to establish, and which we can see our way of getting immediate profits from, and he will not do a thing to help in the growing of a better variety of seedling cane, when he knows it would be of great assistance to the

industry. As the Minister for Railways says, he only left the department last February, and I can safely say during the term of his office I went to him on various occasions and asked him for something for North Queensland, and the hon. gentleman never gave me anything other than a report by the Entomologist—a report that was fourteen years old—although the Cane-growers' Association at Nelson wrote down to him repeatedly calling his attention to the effect of the ravages of the grub. That is all I have to thank the hon. gentleman for while he was in office. Leaving the Secretary for Agriculture and coming back to the hon. gentleman who was once a Minister—I refer to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, the hon. member for Leichhardt. I listened with a great deal of interest to his periodic whine against the Government, and if I did not know what was the reason of his antipathy against this Government I would feel inclined to believe he was honest in his continued growl against the administration of this Government. The hon. gentleman, who was a Minister himself, and, unfortunately, was one of the worst Secretaries for Public Lands we ever had in Queensland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He was only a Minister for twenty-four hours.

Mr. MANN: During the time he was a Minister he gave away a township reserve—turned the people off it, and handed it over to the station. That was what no other Minister would ever have done. Now, we know as a matter of fact the only real grievance the hon. member for Leichhardt has against the Government is because he is not in the Ministry. It is an open secret that he forced the late Labour Government—the Dawson Government—to take him into their Cabinet by threatening to leave the party if they did not do so, and it is a well-known fact if a portfolio were given to him now he would swallow all the bad administration he says that this Government is guilty of. He is simply fighting for his own ends, and at any time the Premier could buy off Mr. Hardacre's opposition by giving him a portfolio. As a matter of fact, he told me he really had a grudge against the Premier, because Mr. Kidston had a scheme for the redistribution of seats, and the reason he opposed Mr. Kidston so bitterly was, that in that redistribution of seats, Leichhardt was to be wiped out and put into another electorate, and, consequently, Mr. Hardacre would lose his seat. That is really the only grievance the hon. member has against the Government—it is personal and one-sided. Coming back to the junior member for Mackay, he dealt with a subject I take a good deal of interest in. He spoke very strongly on the sugar industry, and advocated a system of higher protection. Well, more protection might be necessary, but the purpose would be served equally as well if the Commonwealth Government applied the dumping clauses to sugar coming into the Commonwealth.

Mr. PAGET: They tried it.

Mr. MANN: If we produce enough for our own requirements, I think the Federal Government are justified in keeping other sugar from coming in so long as we only charge a reasonable price for our own product. Before asking for protection, I would point out that, in my opinion, it is possible to pay a greater amount for the cane than the farmer is getting now without increasing protection at all. I think if we take the average of the whole of the sugar grown in Queensland, 10 tons of cane make one ton of sugar. The average price

Mr. Mann.]

would pan out something like 14s. a ton—that is, £7 a ton paid for the raw material of which the sugar is made. I just looked the matter up last week, and the prices paid for sugars were these—

	£	s.	d.	
Brewers' crystals	20	15	0	per ton
1X and 1A	20	0	0	"
No. 1 Ordinary	19	15	0	"
No. 2 "	19	5	0	"
No. 3 "	17	10	0	"

So lumping the whole together, an average price of £19 9s. The raw material is practically worth £7, and the refined product is sold at the average price of £19 9s. I think, even allowing that the manufacturers pay £4 a ton excise, they could very well afford to pay a bigger price for the cane than what they do.

Mr. PAGET: That is the refined article.

Mr. MANN: That is the refined article. The difference is between £7 and £19 9s., and I am quite satisfied that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company could pay a bigger price for the cane than they do. As a matter of fact, they pay a bigger price for the sugar at the central mills than what they pay their own farmers—allowing a fair price for manufacturing. The central mill in my district in one year paid £1 0s. 5d., as against 13s. 7d. paid by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. This shows that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company do not give the tenants as good a price as they might do. If they gave the tenants the real value of the cane, less the cost of manufacture, as the Government mills do, I think the tenants would be well satisfied, and could afford to pay better wages than they do at the present time. While on that subject, it may not be out of place if I said a word or two with regard to the immigration policy of the Government. I may say I heartily endorse their policy, and I hope and trust they will exercise the greatest care to see the labour market is not overstocked. It would be a great calamity if the labour market is undermanned, but it would be a much greater calamity if it is overstocked. During last season not one single farmer in the district I represent had a satisfactory cut from the workers. For that reason alone I intend to support the Government scheme of immigration, but I do not believe for one moment in the wholesale immigration policy advocated by my friends sitting on the Opposition benches. I think it would be a mistake to bring people out here in large numbers at the present time, and have those men suffering hardships and writing home and telling their friends what they have to suffer in Queensland, because if that happened we should cut off our supply, and should get no more immigrants until the hue and cry had died down. I am not one of those who believe that if we made things prosperous here people would come to Queensland of their own accord, for this reason: that many labourers, agricultural labourers especially, in the old country are unable to pay their own passages. A man would require to be twenty-five or twenty-six years of age before he could earn enough to save money to pay his passage to Queensland and have a few pounds in his pocket on arrival. We want to get these people here young, so that they may become fairly acclimatised. If they reach the age of twenty-five or twenty-six years they will very likely get married, and then they will not be able to save money and come to Queensland. I believe in bringing out good labourers, farm labourers in preference, but I desire to see them paid good wages. A ploughman who comes to Queensland from the old country, and who has been brought up on a

[Mr. Mann.

farm, knows just as much about ploughing as any man employed on the land in Queensland, and for that reason he should get equally good wages. If the Premier insists that a fair standard of wage shall be paid to immigrants, then I am satisfied that we shall not be swamped with too many new arrivals in Queensland. When the hon. gentleman first started to bring labourers here, the planters opened their mouths very wide, and talked about bringing out immigrants in thousands; but as soon as the Premier desired them to put their views before him in a concrete form, and to undertake to find work for these men on arrival, to provide employment for them for a certain period, and to pay a deposit of £5 for each immigrant, the demand dwindled down to about 600. I admit that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company are bringing out immigrants, and that that may possibly have to some extent accounted for the limitation of the demand. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company failed to obtain a sufficient number of labourers in Great Britain, though, judging by what has been said, there is any amount of labour available in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and they brought out Spaniards or Austrians, or men of some other nationality.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not correct.

Mr. MANN: I say this with all due respect to the Spaniards: I would sooner at any time see a Dane, a German, or a Swiss introduced as an immigrant than a Spaniard. I say that knowing that I have Spaniards in my electorate, and that I shall have to face them when I go back there. I am sorry that when the company found they could not get immigrants from Great Britain they did not go across to Northern Europe instead of going to Southern Europe. I am sorry to see that the official Labour organ in this State, which is supposed to advocate the ideals of the Labour party, and to assist in protecting the interests of workers, should go out of its way to cast a slur on the good name of immigrants coming to our shores. If there are 500 or 600 people on board a boat, there will be amongst them a few undesirable characters, and some horseplay may be indulged in, but the *Worker* went out of its way to brand some of the immigrants who recently came to our shores as thieves. I will read what that journal said on the subject in a sub-leader.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What paper are you quoting from?

Mr. MANN: I am going to quote from the *Worker*. I find, however, that someone has lost my place. Still the fact remains that the *Worker* went out of its way to throw a slur on those immigrants. It is not their fault that they have come to our shores. Very likely they have been told by an agent at home that they are coming to a better country than England; and it is a far better country than England for a man to get a living in, and to improve his position in life. I remember that I used to read the *Worker* in my callow youth, and that they then made a great cry about the "daylie" Press.

Mr. JACKSON: No one takes notice of the *Worker*.

Mr. MANN: But they appear to try in almost every issue to outdo the "daylie" Press. If the *Worker* believed that the capitalistic Press lied it would never have copied the statements which appear in a recent issue. Here is what it has got to say about the recent immigrants—

It was no common brand of immigrant that burst open a box addressed to the Queensland Treasury and

extracted therefrom 1,153 £1-notes belonging to the Government that was paying their passage money from the land of their fathers to these Elysian shores.

It was a deed that marks them out for great things when their bursting energies shall have had an opportunity to range at large in this happy hunting ground of private enterprise, with its magnificent and unlimited resources.

Then see with what deftness they can adapt themselves to exploits of less dazzling dimensions.

The officers said that a number of thefts were reported. An Italian who was on board had some money in his belt. The belt was cut, and the money taken out. At Colombo a section of the men made away with some of the ship's linen, but a boatload was recovered.

If my memory serves me, when the captain of that boat was interviewed on arrival, he denied most of the statements which had appeared in the Press. I went to the Immigration Depot, and there met Mr. Brennan, a most courteous gentleman, and he said that that shipload of immigrants were the most orderly, decent, and cleanly young fellows he had ever seen in the depot. I think that a paper which sets up to battle for the cause of the workers should not give workers who come here to this State honestly such a name as the *Worker* has done in this case to start with. It is a crying shame. I do not think the *Worker* has ever fought the battle of the workers as it should have done. At the time the Mulgrave Central Mill was besieged with unemployed, who were there literally in scores, the local labour paper repeatedly stated that the mill would not start crushing for another month, and that there was plenty of labour available. But the *Worker* published an advertisement calling for more workers. The *Worker* might very well have taken the advice of people who were on the spot. The local paper pointed out in almost every issue that there were more men in the neighbourhood than were required, but the *Worker*, in order to have a jeer and a taunt at some of the men who erected that mill—men I do not believe in—as they tried as hard as possible to keep the black man there—invited other men to go to an already overcrowded labour market. When I was speaking some hon. member interjected that I should take no notice of the *Worker*. Perhaps it is unwise to take any notice of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: You used to read it very carefully at one time.

Mr. MANN: I read it carefully now. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that the *Worker* had done more to popularise socialistic ideas in Queensland than any other paper.

The time the *Worker* was in the [10 p.m.] zenith of its power was after it pulled down the flag of "Socialism in our time," and went for measures calculated to bring together the settler, the miner, the town resident, and, in fact, the whole of the working population of Queensland. Since that time the *Worker* has tried to penalise settlers on the land. We had the junior member for Ipswich saying that some of the men on the repurchased estates would have been better under the soil than on top of it. On top of that the socialistic party desire to impose a land tax on all land over the value of £300. Suppose a man takes up 70 acres of land at a cost of £5 an acre, that gives a value of £350, which means that, although he is only struggling to make a bare existence, he will have to pay a land tax, according to the platform of those who believe in "Socialism in our time."

Mr. BOWMAN: Do not you believe in a land tax.

Mr. MANN: Yes, and I have always advocated one. I advocated one at the last election. But I believe in a sensible land tax. I

believe in such a land tax as that proposed by the Federal Labour party—a land tax to burst up big estates and not harass the small settlers. The Labour party propose to exempt up to £200 on the income of the artisan, the miner, and other workers; but they seek to penalise the settler as soon as ever he has a piece of land worth more than £300. That is one reason why I would not sign the Labour platform at the last election, and why I think the Labour party are making a mistake by cutting adrift from themselves the support of the bulk of the people on the land. The junior member for Ipswich expressed the opinion that, now that we are getting the Cloncurry district opened up and the Almaden-Georgetown Railway built, this should satisfy the rapacious appetites of Northern members. One of the hon. member's colleagues, the hon. member for Herbert, put in a very powerful plea for some railways in his district; and, in spite of the fact that the Georgetown Railway will be a big factor in opening up the district I represent, I want to see one or two more railways yet. The Atherton Scrub will stand opening up, and I believe if it is opened up there will be an influx of settlement there second to nothing in Queensland. I am pleased to say there is a trial survey going on now, and if that railway is built it will go a long way to provide land for those who are now landless. If the people there get on well, we shall not have these young men troubling the junior member for Ipswich, Mr. Maughan, about entering the Ipswich railway workshops or the Police Force. I am not satisfied with the way settlement is going on there at the present time. I believe the Hon. the Secretary for Public Lands is doing all he can do to induce the people to go up there, but his agent, Mr. Pulsford, evidently desires to put people as far off Atherton as ever he can. In the leaflet which he has distributed he recommends people who want to inspect the Atherton land to go to a man named Louis Carmen, at Emu-ford, which is not near Atherton at all. If a man inquires for Louis Carmen, he has to go back to Mareeba, and then take a train along the Chillagoe Railway to Emu-ford. If the Minister is sincere in his intention to settle that district, and I believe he is, it would pay him to give over this idea of valuing the timber on the land. If men go there intending to embark in dairying on a large scale they want to fell as much timber as they possibly can. The result of this will be a glut in the timber market. They cannot sell their timber, and unless it is sheltered from the weather it will rot. Most of it will have to be burnt off; and these men will have to pay for something they get no benefit for. The case would be very well met if a royalty was charged on all timber sold, and a man was allowed to sell any timber he pleased off his land, so long as he was cultivating the land. That is to say, a man felling the timber on 20 acres which he intended to cultivate should be allowed to sell the timber and pay a royalty to the Government.

Mr. JACKSON: Sell or burn it, whichever suits him best.

Mr. MANN: That would remove a long-standing grievance in the Atherton district. A lot of the stuff we have seen in the *Courier* and other papers about indignation meetings up there is a lot of tommy-rot.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: One or two old residents went round, got a drop of Walker's whisky in them, then formed themselves into a deputation,

Mr. Mann.]

and walked round to the post office and sent off wires to an all-too-credulous Press which believes all it hears. As the representative of that district I may say that most of the level-headed men up there want to see settlers from the South. They believe that if settlers from the South go there the district will go ahead; but they want at the same time to see a sufficiency of land set aside for the local requirements. If that is done I am satisfied the people of Atherton will be very well pleased.

Mr. JACKSON: When will that land be thrown open?

Mr. MANN: I think it will be thrown open in October. It will not be ready in September. The majority of the people up there are well pleased with the administration of the Secretary for Public Lands. When I was on the platform I advocated his administration, and they were so well satisfied with it that I got a thumping big majority at Atherton.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: In one part of the Atherton district I got every settler's vote. No other candidate got a single vote there.

Mr. PAGET: What are to be the areas?

Mr. MANN: A good many people advocate that 200 acres is too small an area for a man with a family who wishes after a time to go in for dairying on a rather large scale. I think the land should be thrown open in areas of from 160 to 300 acres. If that is done, I believe it will give universal satisfaction. I hope the Minister will hurry on—as I believe he is doing—the surveying and designing of that land. But before the land is of any use to settlers a railway must be built. If that is done, there will be a big rush for the land. I have been told by people from the Northern Rivers, who have gone up there, that land similar in quality to the land at Atherton has been sold on the Northern Rivers for £27 an acre. I expect in the near future, if our butter market keeps up, to see a big demand for Atherton dairy lands. They have a good market there, and they will be able to take all the butter they can make for the next ten or twelve years. I do not know that I have got much more to say on that. In reading over the Governor's Speech, I see one item here which interests me very much. That is a proposal to harness the Barron Falls, and start industries in Cairns. I hope that we will soon have the town lighted up with electricity, and that it will be used in running our saw-mills and sugar-mills; and also, that in the near future we will have an electric-car service worked from the power generated by the Barron Falls. I noticed when the leader of the Opposition was speaking that he made the remark that I made a misstatement during my electioneering campaign in saying that the Philp Government had leased the Barron Falls for the sum of £150 per annum. I did make that statement, but as soon as I found that I had made a mistake I corrected it. But I may say this: that the price which the Philp Government were charging for the falls for a term of fifty years was just what their own engineer reckoned the falls were worth for a term of one year. I may say, though, that the Government of that day—the Philp Government—leased to the Chillagoe Company a wharf, one of the best wharves in Cairns, for £150 per annum, and I mixed up the price they were receiving for that wharf with the Barron Falls. We always noticed that the Philp Government were

[Mr. Mann.

exceedingly kind to syndicates. That company now want an enormous sum for that wharf. If the wharf is not kept in repair it will fall to pieces in two or three years; still, they want an enormous sum of money of it. I am sorry to say that some of the Cairns people are inclined to give them the enormous sum they are asking for the wharf, but we have not got a syndicate-loving Government in power, and the people there are simply waiting until the lease falls in. In saying that the Philp Government handed over the Falls for that sum I made a mistake, but they really handed over the wharf to that company for the sum named. Although Mr. Philp made such a fuss about that little mistake I made, I went to his meeting in Cairns, and on that occasion the Philp candidate, Mr. Tills, in making his opening speech, informed the people of Cairns that we owed it to Robert Philp that the second section of the Cairns Railway was built. As a matter of fact, that section was finished in 1891. Mr. Tills also said that we owed to Robert Philp the fact that we got the Musgrave Central Mill, although that mill was built and working in 1896, before Mr. Philp became a Minister.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: That is not correct.

Mr. MANN: If he had got up and corrected his own candidate for making those mistakes I would have thought a good deal more of the hon. gentleman. Although the hon. member for Toowong said the other night that I only got 732 votes, or something to that effect, the fact remains that the democratic candidates polled more votes than the Philp candidates did, and I would not mind fighting another election again now if I thought I could get a straight run between myself and a Philp candidate.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL: Now is your chance.

Mr. MANN: I see that we are going to get an Income Tax Amendment Bill. I hope that all salaries will be exempt up to £200. If that is contained in the measure it will have my warmest support for the reason that there are many people getting incomes over £200 a year who are not in a good way at all. Any amount of them have heavy insurance to pay on their lives, they have families, and perhaps a sickly wife, and even if they get £300 or £400, when you come to consider the doctor's and other incidental expenses that have to be paid, there are many of these men who are not so well off.

Mr. PAGET: The Treasurer did not say so last year.

Mr. MANN: Well, I am saying so now.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Will you support it?

Mr. MANN: I would not mind supporting it. We are to get an old age pension scheme, which I intend to support. I hope that the Treasurer will make the amount as large as the revenue will permit him to do. The Boiler and Machinery Inspection Bill will be a very good measure. Although in many places the boiler inspection is supposed to be carried out now, the inspection is only a partial sort of one. There is no real inspection done, and I think that a measure of this kind should be passed into law as soon as possible, and the inspection of boilers carried out rigidly. While on that subject, I may mention that the hon. member for Herbert mentioned the large number of hours that the engine-drivers had to work. I am at one with him that we should pass a Bill to limit the hours of engine-drivers as much as possible, for a man can only be at his post for a limited time. If a man has to attend to his

engine for ten or twelve hours a day he is bound to neglect his duty, and we might see an explosion or something worse happening because of this. The men employed on the locomotives on the sugar fields also work long hours. Of course, they get time off, but the fact remains that if a man is engaged for long hours on one of those locomotive engines going over rough tracks, as they are on those narrow-gauge tramlines, he must suffer a great deal from vibration. In the interests of public health no man should be allowed to drive any State engine or any locomotive engine on a tramline for a longer period than eight hours. There are a lot of measures mentioned in this Speech that I would like to deal with, but I will not take up the time of the House. I am sorry that there has not been a Trades Disputes Bill included in the list of measures to be introduced this session. I advocated that measure during the whole of my election campaign, and as soon as I came down here I saw in the *Worker* that a resolution has been carried by the Wharf Labourers' Union at Cairns to the effect that they did not want a Trades Disputes Bill, but they wanted a Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. I would be in favour of that if I knew who the judge was who was going to be appointed. I would like to see that he was not one who would be too impartial.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You want to have a say in it.

MR. MANN: From what we see of the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill in New South Wales, I do not think it has been a success. If I thought it would be a success, I would certainly support a Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, because, after all, what is aimed at is some satisfactory method of arriving at what is a fair day's work, and what is a fair day's wages, and how many hours a day a man should work. The Wages Boards Bill may largely assist to settle the vexed question of wages, and, if it does not, I hope that the Government will bring in a Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I have spoken longer than I intended, but I would just like to mention that Mr. Creagh—I do not know where he is member for—he should be the hon. member for Croydon, but he is only the Creagh party—but that hon. member said that he never stated that Mr. Murphy was out of the House. On looking at *Hansard*, page 136, I find these words in the speech of the Creagh party—

As a matter of fact, the only thing I commended him for during the whole of the election was for voting for that particular railway. The reason he was thrown out was because he did not vote for the North enough when he was in the House; and was absent from the House when he should not have been.

MR. CREAGH: Hear, hear!

MR. MANN: I think it was a mistake to make a statement like that. He beat Mr. Murphy, and should have been generous when Mr. Murphy was down, and not go kicking him. I hope that we will see the same old party back in this House next Parliament—that is, Messrs. Murphy, Woods, Maxwell, and myself—advocating the extension of the railway from Georgetown to Croydon. If the Croydon people want to get that railway they should send down Mr. Murphy to battle for them, because he was the most ardent battler that the railway found in the whole of this House. I desire to thank hon. members for the patient hearing they have given me.

MR. ADAMSON (*Maryborough*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at twenty-one minutes past 10 o'clock.